

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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?

<div>P</div>	IC · KZ · PR · CL · BL · AI · II · POP	85	<div>M</div>	IC · PR · BL · AI · II · POP	52
<div>Y</div>	IC · KZ · BT · BL · AI · POP	52	<div>V</div>	CL · POP	25
<div>i</div>	BT · AI	25	<div>E</div>	AI · POP	20

b. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

<div>H</div>	IC · KZ · PR · BT · CL · BL · AI · II · REJ	95	<div>O</div>	IC · KZ · PR · BT · CL · BL · AI · II · REJ	74
<div>T</div>	II · REJ	20	<div>c</div>	IM · II	20

ISO A → 

L

U

    ISO B → 

D

E

N

Z

i

j


*In alphabetical order: AI Affiliation Index AMB Ambitendent APP Appreciated BT Betweenness CL Closeness CON Controversial DIS Disliked HU Hub IC In-Degree II Influence Index IM Impact ISO Isolated KZ Katz MAR Marginal POP Popular PR PageRank 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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?

NN 38, NE 102, RE 22, ND 7%, NC 17%, NT 28%, NR 43%



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

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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	N, P, e	0.08	0.17	0.04	0.01	0.30	0.05	
B	F, Y, f	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.02	
C	M, P, V	0.08	0.16	0.03	0.05	0.28	0.08	
D	a, d, l	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	
E	C, G, M	0.14	0.19	0.04	0.05	0.28	0.02	
F	B, I, N	0.11	0.17	0.02	0.02	0.11	0.01	
G	M, f, i	0.08	0.17	0.04	0.08	0.29	0.02	
H	C, J, Q	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	←
I	F, N, W	0.05	0.14	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.01	
J	Y, k, l	0.11	0.18	0.04	0.03	0.28	0.01	
K	P, R, h	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.06	←
L	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
M	E, G, j	0.19	0.23	0.06	0.11	0.35	0.01	
N	P, V, e	0.11	0.18	0.03	0.03	0.32	0.08	
O	A, i	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	←
P	A, Z, e	0.24	0.25	0.07	0.12	0.42	0.02	
Q	P, V, f	0.08	0.16	0.03	0.05	0.27	0.07	
R	N, S, d	0.14	0.19	0.03	0.08	0.29	0.01	
S	P, R, V	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.22	0.08	
T	P, b, h	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.05	←
U	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
V	-	0.16	0.21	0.05	0.00	0.40	0.00	→
W	E, F, I	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.01	
X	P, V, g	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.07	
Y	J, i, l	0.19	0.23	0.06	0.13	0.37	0.01	
Z	C, e, h	0.05	0.16	0.03	0.08	0.31	0.03	
a	D	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	
b	E, M, j	0.05	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.21	0.02	
c	F, R, d	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	←
d	R, Y, l	0.08	0.16	0.02	0.03	0.23	0.02	
e	A, P, V	0.11	0.19	0.06	0.01	0.34	0.07	
f	G, Q, Y	0.08	0.16	0.03	0.05	0.28	0.01	
g	E, M, X	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	
h	Y, Z, i	0.11	0.17	0.03	0.07	0.31	0.01	
i	M, R, h	0.11	0.18	0.05	0.14	0.35	0.04	
j	E, M, b	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.02	0.26	0.02	
k	J, Y, l	0.03	0.13	0.02	0.00	0.22	0.01	
l	J, Q, Y	0.14	0.20	0.05	0.05	0.29	0.01	

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	N, P, e	6	14	10	21	10	9	
B	F, Y, f	8	26	27	19	24	20	
C	M, P, V	6	18	18	12	13	1	
D	a, d, l	8	28	25	20	26	33	
E	C, G, M	4	6	11	11	13	17	
F	B, I, N	5	15	22	17	22	34	
G	M, f, i	6	12	9	6	12	12	
H	C, J, Q	9	29	31	29	27	31	←
I	F, N, W	7	22	26	25	23	30	
J	Y, k, l	5	10	8	15	14	23	
K	P, R, h	9	29	31	29	27	7	←
L	-	9	30	32	29	27	36	↔
M	E, G, j	2	3	2	4	4	25	
N	P, V, e	5	11	12	16	7	3	
O	A, i	9	29	31	29	27	24	←
P	A, Z, e	1	1	1	3	1	19	
Q	P, V, f	6	16	16	13	16	4	
R	N, S, d	4	8	14	7	11	32	
S	P, R, V	8	24	24	26	19	2	
T	P, b, h	9	29	31	29	27	8	←
U	-	9	30	32	29	27	36	↔
V	-	3	4	5	29	2	36	→
W	E, F, I	8	27	29	22	25	27	
X	P, V, g	8	28	30	27	26	6	
Y	J, i, l	2	2	3	2	3	29	
Z	C, e, h	7	20	13	5	8	11	
a	D	8	28	28	29	26	35	
b	E, M, j	7	23	23	28	21	15	
c	F, R, d	9	29	31	29	27	18	←
d	R, Y, l	6	19	20	14	18	14	
e	A, P, V	5	7	4	23	6	5	
f	G, Q, Y	6	17	17	10	15	26	
g	E, M, X	8	28	30	24	26	16	
h	Y, Z, i	5	13	15	8	9	22	
i	M, R, h	5	9	7	1	5	10	
j	E, M, b	7	21	19	18	17	13	
k	J, Y, l	8	25	21	29	20	21	
l	J, Q, Y	4	5	6	9	12	28	

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?

IC	RK	KZ	RK	PR	RK	BT	RK	CL	RK	HU	RK
P	1	P	1	P	1	i	1	P	1	C	1
Y	2	Y	2	M	2	Y	2	V	2	S	2
M	2	M	3	Y	3	P	3	Y	3	N	3
V	3	V	4	e	4	M	4	M	4	Q	4
l	4	l	5	V	5	Z	5	i	5	e	5
E	4	E	6	l	6	G	6	e	6	X	6
R	4	e	7	i	7	R	7	N	7	K	7
i	5	R	8	J	8	h	8	Z	8	T	8
h	5	i	9	G	9	l	9	h	9	A	9
F	5	J	10	A	10	f	10	A	10	i	10
e	5	N	11	E	11	E	11	R	11	Z	11
J	5	G	12	N	12	C	12	l	12	G	12
N	5	h	13	Z	13	Q	13	G	12	j	13
f	6	A	14	R	14	d	14	C	13	d	14
d	6	F	15	h	15	J	15	E	13	b	15
Q	6	Q	16	Q	16	N	16	J	14	g	16
A	6	f	17	f	17	F	17	f	15	E	17
C	6	C	18	C	18	j	18	Q	16	c	18
G	6	d	19	j	19	B	19	j	17	P	19
b	7	Z	20	d	20	D	20	d	18	B	20
j	7	j	21	k	21	A	21	S	19	k	21
I	7	I	22	F	22	W	22	k	20	h	22
Z	7	b	23	b	23	e	23	b	21	J	23
B	8	S	24	S	24	g	24	F	22	O	24
g	8	k	25	D	25	I	25	I	23	M	25
D	8	B	26	I	26	S	26	B	24	f	26
S	8	W	27	B	27	X	27	W	25	W	27
X	8	a	28	a	28	b	28	a	26	l	28
W	8	D	28	W	29	H	29	D	26	Y	29
k	8	g	28	g	30	K	29	g	26	I	30
a	8	X	28	X	30	L	29	X	26	H	31
O	9	H	29	T	31	V	29	L	27	R	32
c	9	c	29	O	31	c	29	U	27	D	33
H	9	T	29	H	31	a	29	c	27	F	34
K	9	K	29	c	31	k	29	T	27	a	35
U	9	O	29	K	31	T	29	H	27	V	36
T	9	L	30	U	32	U	29	O	27	U	36
L	9	U	30	L	32	O	29	K	27	L	36


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

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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?


Non reciprocal edges

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



Reciprocal edges

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



Half symmetrical edges

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



Reversed half symmetrical edges

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



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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?


Cliques

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




Strongly Connected Groups

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



Weakly Connected Groups


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



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. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

NN 38, NE 63, RE 4, ND 4%, NC 31%, NT 12%, NR 13%



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



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. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	H, L, T	0.05	0.15	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.05	
B	O, T, g	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	←
C	O, W, a	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.05	←
D	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
E	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
F	H, L, T	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.05	←
G	A	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	←
H	O, S, W	0.38	0.35	0.15	0.10	0.47	0.03	
I	H	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	←
J	A, O, R	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	←
K	H, U, a	0.08	0.18	0.05	0.02	0.25	0.06	
L	-	0.08	0.17	0.02	0.00	0.10	0.00	→
M	H, O, X	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.06	←
N	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
O	H, Q, U	0.32	0.31	0.14	0.13	0.42	0.04	
P	H, a, d	0.05	0.16	0.02	0.03	0.21	0.06	
Q	P, V, f	0.03	0.16	0.05	0.08	0.27	0.00	
R	-	0.03	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	→
S	H, O, T	0.03	0.16	0.05	0.01	0.28	0.06	
T	O	0.14	0.21	0.05	0.01	0.30	0.02	
U	-	0.05	0.18	0.06	0.00	0.29	0.00	→
V	-	0.03	0.14	0.02	0.00	0.21	0.00	→
W	H, K	0.08	0.19	0.06	0.02	0.30	0.04	
X	H, a	0.03	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.05	
Y	K, O, P	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	←
Z	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
a	K, T, g	0.22	0.24	0.05	0.03	0.25	0.02	
b	H, W, a	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.06	←
c	H, L	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.04	←
d	-	0.03	0.14	0.02	0.00	0.17	0.00	→
e	H, O, a	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.07	←
f	H, a	0.03	0.14	0.02	0.01	0.20	0.05	
g	-	0.05	0.16	0.03	0.00	0.21	0.00	→
h	O	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	←
i	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
j	-	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	↔
k	O	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	←
l	O, a	0.00	0.13	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.04	←

*In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

ID	CHOICES	IC	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	H, L, T	6	13	14	8	15	8	
B	O, T, g	8	17	17	13	17	15	←
C	O, W, a	8	17	17	13	17	9	←
D	-	8	18	18	13	17	23	↔
E	-	8	18	18	13	17	23	↔
F	H, L, T	8	17	17	13	17	8	←
G	A	8	17	17	13	17	22	←
H	O, S, W	1	1	1	2	1	16	
I	H	8	17	17	13	17	14	←
J	A, O, R	8	17	17	13	17	18	←
K	H, U, a	5	6	7	7	8	4	
L	-	5	8	13	13	14	23	→
M	H, O, X	8	17	17	13	17	5	←
N	-	8	18	18	13	17	23	↔
O	H, Q, U	2	2	2	1	2	12	
P	H, a, d	6	12	11	5	10	6	
Q	P, V, f	7	11	9	3	7	21	
R	-	7	16	16	13	16	23	→
S	H, O, T	7	10	6	11	6	2	
T	O	4	4	8	9	3	19	
U	-	6	7	3	13	5	23	→
V	-	7	14	12	13	9	23	→
W	H, K	5	5	4	6	4	13	
X	H, a	7	16	16	12	16	7	
Y	K, O, P	8	17	17	13	17	17	←
Z	-	8	18	18	13	17	23	↔
a	K, T, g	3	3	5	4	8	20	
b	H, W, a	8	17	17	13	17	3	←
c	H, L	8	17	17	13	17	11	←
d	-	7	15	15	13	13	23	→
e	H, O, a	8	17	17	13	17	1	←
f	H, a	7	14	12	10	12	7	
g	-	6	9	10	13	11	23	→
h	O	8	17	17	13	17	19	←
i	-	8	18	18	13	17	23	↔
j	-	8	18	18	13	17	23	↔
k	O	8	17	17	13	17	19	←
l	O, a	8	17	17	13	17	10	←

**In alphabetical order:** *BT* Betweenness *CL* Closeness *HU* Hub *IC* In-Degree *KZ* Katz *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. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

IC	RK	KZ	RK	PR	RK	BT	RK	CL	RK	HU	RK
H	1	H	1	H	1	O	1	H	1	e	1
O	2	O	2	O	2	H	2	O	2	S	2
a	3	a	3	U	3	Q	3	T	3	b	3
T	4	T	4	W	4	a	4	W	4	K	4
W	5	W	5	a	5	P	5	U	5	M	5
K	5	K	6	S	6	W	6	S	6	P	6
L	5	U	7	K	7	K	7	Q	7	f	7
A	6	L	8	T	8	A	8	a	8	X	7
g	6	g	9	Q	9	T	9	K	8	A	8
U	6	S	10	g	10	f	10	V	9	F	8
P	6	Q	11	P	11	S	11	P	10	C	9
f	7	P	12	f	12	X	12	g	11	l	10
d	7	A	13	V	12	L	13	f	12	c	11
X	7	f	14	L	13	j	13	d	13	O	12
V	7	V	14	A	14	i	13	L	14	W	13
R	7	d	15	d	15	h	13	A	15	I	14
S	7	X	16	R	16	g	13	R	16	B	15
Q	7	R	16	X	16	B	13	X	16	H	16
N	8	e	17	M	17	e	13	M	17	Y	17
j	8	c	17	h	17	d	13	j	17	J	18
i	8	b	17	B	17	c	13	i	17	k	19
h	8	C	17	C	17	b	13	h	17	h	19
B	8	M	17	e	17	C	13	B	17	T	19
C	8	Y	17	c	17	Z	13	C	17	a	20
e	8	l	17	b	17	Y	13	e	17	Q	21
D	8	F	17	l	17	D	13	D	17	G	22
c	8	k	17	Y	17	V	13	c	17	U	23
b	8	G	17	F	17	U	13	E	17	j	23
Z	8	I	17	G	17	E	13	N	17	i	23
Y	8	J	17	I	17	k	13	Z	17	g	23
F	8	B	17	k	17	R	13	Y	17	L	23
G	8	h	17	J	17	F	13	F	17	N	23
I	8	i	18	N	18	G	13	G	17	D	23
J	8	j	18	E	18	I	13	I	17	Z	23
M	8	N	18	i	18	N	13	J	17	R	23
k	8	E	18	j	18	M	13	k	17	V	23
E	8	D	18	Z	18	J	13	b	17	d	23
l	8	Z	18	D	18	l	13	l	17	E	23

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

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. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

Non reciprocal edges

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

- A · H
- A · L
- A · T
- B · O
- B · T
- B · g
- C · O
- C · W
- C · a
- F · H
- F · L
- F · T
- G · A
- I · H
- J · A
- J · O
- J · R
- K · H
- K · U
- M · H
- M · O
- M · X
- O · Q
- O · U
- P · H
- P · a
- P · d
- Q · P
- Q · V
- Q · f
- S · O
- S · T
- T · O
- W · K
- X · H
- X · a
- Y · K
- Y · O
- Y · P
- a · T
- a · g
- b · H
- b · W
- b · a
- c · H
- c · L
- e · H
- e · O
- e · a
- f · H
- f · a
- h · O
- k · O
- l · O
- l · a

Reciprocal edges

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

- H · O
- H · S
- H · W
- K · a

Half symmetrical edges

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

- Q · V
- Q · f

Reversed half symmetrical edges

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

- Q · f

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. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

Cliques

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

3

B · O · T

O · S · T

H · M · O

H · O · e

H · O · S

H · W · b

H · K · W

H · M · X

Strongly Connected Groups

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

10

H · K · O · P · Q · S · T · W · a · f

Weakly Connected Groups

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

32

A · B · C · F · G · H · I · J · K · L · M · O · P · Q · R · S · T · U · V · W · X · Y · a · b · c · d · e · f · g · h · k · l

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 1

SNA | RANK DIFFERENCE A-B

NO	IC A-B	NO	KZ A-B	NO	PR A-B	NO	BT A-B	NO	CL A-B	NO	HU A-B
P	-5	P	-11	P	-10	i	-12	P	-9	C	-8
Y	-6	Y	-15	M	-15	Y	-11	V	-7	S	0
M	-6	M	-14	Y	-14	P	-2	Y	-14	N	-20
V	-4	V	-10	e	-13	M	-9	M	-13	Q	-17
l	-4	l	-12	V	-7	Z	-8	i	-12	e	4
E	-4	E	-12	l	-11	G	-7	e	-11	X	-1
R	-3	e	-10	i	-11	R	-6	N	-10	K	3
i	-3	R	-8	J	-9	h	-5	Z	-9	T	-11
h	-3	i	-9	G	-8	l	-4	h	-8	A	1
F	-3	J	-7	A	-4	f	0	A	-5	i	-13
e	-3	N	-7	E	-7	E	-2	R	-5	Z	-12
J	-3	G	-5	N	-6	C	-1	l	-5	G	-10
N	-3	h	-4	Z	-5	Q	10	G	-5	j	-10
f	-1	A	1	R	-2	d	1	C	-4	d	-9
d	-1	F	-2	h	-2	J	2	E	-4	b	12
Q	-1	Q	5	Q	7	N	3	J	-3	g	-7
A	0	f	3	f	5	F	4	f	3	E	-6
C	-2	C	1	C	1	j	5	Q	9	c	7
G	-2	d	4	j	1	B	6	j	0	P	13
b	-1	Z	2	d	5	D	7	d	5	B	5
j	-1	j	3	k	4	A	13	S	13	k	2
I	-1	I	5	F	5	W	16	k	3	h	3
Z	-1	b	6	b	6	e	10	b	4	J	5
B	0	S	14	S	18	g	11	F	5	O	12
g	2	k	8	D	7	I	12	I	6	M	20
D	0	B	9	I	9	S	15	B	7	f	19
S	1	W	22	B	10	X	15	W	21	W	14
X	1	a	25	a	23	b	15	a	18	l	18
W	3	D	10	W	25	H	27	D	9	Y	12
k	0	g	19	g	20	K	22	g	15	I	16
a	5	X	12	X	14	L	16	X	10	H	15
O	7	H	28	T	23	V	16	L	13	R	9
c	1	c	12	O	29	c	16	U	22	D	10
H	8	T	25	H	30	a	25	c	10	F	26
K	4	K	23	c	14	k	16	T	24	a	15
U	3	O	27	K	24	T	20	H	26	V	13
T	5	L	22	U	29	U	16	O	25	U	13
L	4	U	23	L	19	O	28	K	19	L	13

In alphabetical order: BT Betweenness CL Closeness HU Hub IC In-Degree KZ Katz NO Node

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. Whom would you choose to spend a free outing with?

NN 38, NE 102, RE 22, ND 7%, NC 17%, NT 28%, NR 43%

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
In degree Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.24	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.84	0.46	0.80	0.28	0.03	0.11
PageRank Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.75	0.42	0.56	-0.79	0.01	0.04
Katz Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.25	0.16	0.15	0.05	0.33	0.17	-1.10	3.09	0.13	0.18
Betweenness Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.14	0.02	0.03	0.04	1.18	0.61	1.24	0.59	0.00	0.05
Closeness Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.42	0.25	0.19	0.14	0.75	0.41	-0.23	-1.59	0.03	0.30
Hub Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.08	0.02	0.03	0.03	1.00	0.51	1.09	-0.30	0.01	0.04

*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 SD Standard Deviation SK Skewness SUM Sum*

b. Whom would you not choose to spend a free outing with?

NN 38, NE 63, RE 4, ND 4%, NC 31%, NT 12%, NR 13%

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
In degree Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.04	0.09	1.92	0.76	2.83	8.08	0.00	0.05
PageRank Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.15	0.01	0.02	0.03	1.34	0.58	2.51	6.84	0.01	0.03
Katz Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.35	0.13	0.13	0.08	0.57	0.28	0.18	1.67	0.13	0.16
Betweenness Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.01	0.03	2.41	0.85	3.02	8.82	0.00	0.01
Closeness Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.11	0.14	1.32	0.66	0.99	-0.21	0.00	0.21
Hub Centrality	38.00	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.91	0.50	0.24	-1.34	0.00	0.05

*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 SD Standard Deviation SK Skewness SUM Sum*

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 1

SOCIOGRAM | RAW SCORES

ID	RP	RR	GP	GR	MP	MR	BL	OR	IM	AI	II	ST
A	3	2	3	3	2	0	1	0	5	1	5	ambitendent
B	1	0	3	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	marginal
C	3	0	3	3	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	appreciated
D	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	3	1	4	2	marginal
E	5	0	3	0	1	0	5	3	5	8	6	popular
F	4	0	3	3	2	0	4	0	4	4	6	appreciated
G	3	0	3	1	2	0	3	2	3	5	5	appreciated
H	0	14	3	3	0	3	-14	0	14	-14	0	rejected
I	2	0	3	1	2	0	2	2	2	4	4	appreciated
J	4	0	3	3	3	0	4	0	4	4	7	appreciated
K	0	3	3	3	0	1	-3	0	3	-3	0	disliked
L	0	3	0	0	0	0	-3	0	3	-3	0	disliked
M	7	0	3	3	3	0	7	0	7	7	10	popular
N	4	0	3	0	0	0	4	3	4	7	4	appreciated
O	0	12	2	3	0	1	-12	-1	12	-13	0	rejected
P	9	2	3	3	2	0	7	0	11	7	11	popular
Q	3	1	3	3	1	0	2	0	4	2	4	appreciated
R	5	1	3	0	2	0	4	3	6	7	7	appreciated
S	1	1	3	3	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	ambitendent
T	0	5	3	1	0	0	-5	2	5	-3	0	rejected
U	0	2	0	0	0	0	-2	0	2	-2	0	disliked
V	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	7	5	6	popular
W	1	3	3	2	1	1	-2	1	4	-1	2	disliked
X	1	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	ambitendent
Y	7	0	3	3	2	0	7	0	7	7	9	popular
Z	2	0	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	5	3	appreciated
a	1	8	1	3	1	1	-7	-2	9	-9	2	rejected
b	2	0	3	3	1	0	2	0	2	2	3	appreciated
c	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	marginal
d	3	1	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	5	4	appreciated
e	4	0	3	3	2	0	4	0	4	4	6	appreciated
f	3	1	3	2	2	0	2	1	4	3	5	appreciated
g	1	2	3	0	1	0	-1	3	3	2	2	ambitendent
h	4	0	3	1	2	0	4	2	4	6	6	appreciated
i	4	0	3	0	1	0	4	3	4	7	5	appreciated
j	2	0	3	0	2	0	2	3	2	5	4	appreciated
k	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	2	1	3	2	marginal
l	5	0	3	2	2	0	5	1	5	6	7	popular

**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.

DEMO | GROUP 1

SOCIOGRAM | NODES ORDERED BY RANK

BL	RK	IM	RK	AI	RK	II	RK	ST	RK
P	1.0	H	1.0	E	1.0	P	1.0	l	1
M	1.0	O	2.0	M	2.0	M	2.0	Y	1
Y	1.0	P	3.0	R	2.0	Y	3.0	V	1
l	2.0	a	4.0	P	2.0	l	4.0	E	1
V	2.0	Y	5.0	N	2.0	J	4.0	P	1
E	2.0	V	5.0	Y	2.0	R	4.0	M	1
F	3.0	M	5.0	i	2.0	h	5.0	d	2
R	3.0	R	6.0	h	3.0	E	5.0	e	2
e	3.0	A	7.0	l	3.0	F	5.0	f	2
i	3.0	T	7.0	j	4.0	e	5.0	R	2
N	3.0	l	7.0	V	4.0	V	5.0	Q	2
h	3.0	E	7.0	d	4.0	i	6.0	Z	2
J	3.0	J	8.0	Z	4.0	f	6.0	N	2
C	4.0	N	8.0	G	4.0	A	6.0	i	2
G	4.0	i	8.0	D	5.0	G	6.0	J	2
I	5.0	h	8.0	I	5.0	j	7.0	I	2
d	5.0	Q	8.0	e	5.0	Q	7.0	j	2
j	5.0	F	8.0	F	5.0	I	7.0	G	2
Q	5.0	f	8.0	J	5.0	d	7.0	F	2
b	5.0	e	8.0	f	6.0	N	7.0	C	2
Z	5.0	W	8.0	C	6.0	Z	8.0	h	2
f	5.0	d	8.0	k	6.0	C	8.0	b	2
A	6.0	L	9.0	Q	7.0	b	8.0	k	3
k	6.0	g	9.0	g	7.0	B	9.0	D	3
D	6.0	C	9.0	b	7.0	g	9.0	c	3
B	6.0	G	9.0	c	8.0	D	9.0	B	3
X	7.0	K	9.0	A	8.0	S	9.0	g	5
c	7.0	Z	10.0	X	8.0	X	9.0	A	5
S	7.0	b	10.0	B	8.0	W	9.0	X	5
g	8.0	X	10.0	S	9.0	k	9.0	S	5
U	9.0	U	10.0	W	10.0	a	9.0	W	7
W	9.0	I	10.0	U	11.0	H	10.0	U	7
L	10.0	j	10.0	T	12.0	c	10.0	L	7
K	10.0	S	10.0	L	12.0	U	10.0	K	7
T	11.0	B	11.0	K	12.0	T	10.0	T	8
a	12.0	D	11.0	a	13.0	K	10.0	O	8
O	13.0	k	11.0	O	14.0	L	10.0	H	8
H	14.0	c	12.0	H	15.0	O	10.0	a	8


*In alphabetical order: AI Affiliation Index BL Balance GP Given Preferences GR Given Rejections II Influence Index IM Impact RP Received Preferences RR Received Rejections*

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 1


## SOCIOGRAM | GRAPH

## 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.

DEMO | GROUP 1

SOCIOGRAM | DESCRIPTIVES

Type I cohesion index : 43.14%

Type II cohesion index : 0.58

Type I conflict index : 12.70%

Type II conflict index : 0.11

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
Received preferences	38.00	0.00	9.00	2.50	2.68	2.27	0.84	0.46	0.80	0.28	1.00	4.00
Received rejections	38.00	0.00	14.00	0.00	1.66	3.18	1.92	0.76	2.83	8.08	0.00	2.00
Given Preferences	38.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.68	0.87	0.33	0.10	-2.66	5.73	3.00	3.00
Given rejections	38.00	0.00	3.00	2.00	1.66	1.32	0.80	0.43	-0.21	-1.76	0.00	3.00
Mutual preferences	38.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.16	0.89	0.77	0.41	0.17	-0.83	0.25	2.00
Mutual rejections	38.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.21	0.58	2.74	0.88	3.55	14.69	0.00	0.00
Balance	38.00	-14.00	7.00	2.00	1.03	4.61	4.49	0.41	-1.61	3.18	0.00	4.00
Orientation	38.00	-2.00	3.00	0.50	1.03	1.38	1.35	0.56	0.21	-1.01	0.00	2.00
Impact	38.00	0.00	14.00	4.00	4.34	3.05	0.70	0.35	1.52	2.49	2.00	5.00
Affiliation index	38.00	-14.00	8.00	3.50	2.05	5.19	2.53	0.36	-1.67	2.92	1.00	5.00
Influence index	38.00	0.00	11.00	4.00	3.84	2.88	0.75	0.41	0.52	-0.12	2.00	6.00

**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 *SUM* Sum