

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?

H

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

90

D

HU · IM

20

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

D


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

90

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 Links NR Reciprocal Links 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	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	F, H	0.29	0.36	0.22	0.10	0.58	0.17	
B	C, H	0.00	0.28	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.13	←
C	F, H	0.29	0.35	0.10	0.02	0.50	0.17	
D	F, H	0.00	0.28	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.17	←
E	F, G	0.00	0.28	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.08	←
F	C, H	0.57	0.40	0.17	0.13	0.70	0.13	
G	A, H	0.29	0.35	0.16	0.04	0.58	0.12	
H	A, G	0.86	0.48	0.31	0.21	0.88	0.03	

IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	F, H	3	3	2	3	3	1	
B	C, H	4	6	6	6	5	2	←
C	F, H	3	5	5	5	4	1	
D	F, H	4	6	6	6	5	1	←
E	F, G	4	6	6	6	5	4	←
F	C, H	2	2	3	2	2	2	
G	A, H	3	4	4	4	3	3	
H	A, G	1	1	1	1	1	5	

IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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?

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

RK Rank IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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

A · G · H

C · F · H

D · F · H

A · F · 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%



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	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	D, G	0.00	0.28	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.11	←
B	D, E	0.43	0.36	0.05	0.04	0.46	0.14	
C	D, E	0.29	0.37	0.27	0.00	0.58	0.14	
D	C, E	1.00	0.50	0.31	0.17	1.00	0.05	
E	C, D	0.43	0.40	0.29	0.01	0.64	0.12	
F	B, D	0.00	0.28	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.15	←
G	B, D	0.14	0.30	0.03	0.02	0.14	0.15	
H	B, D	0.00	0.28	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.15	←

IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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	KZ	PR	BT	CL	HU	ND
A	D, G	5	6	6	5	6	4	←
B	D, E	2	4	4	2	4	2	
C	D, E	3	3	3	5	3	2	
D	C, E	1	1	1	1	1	5	
E	C, D	2	2	2	4	2	3	
F	B, D	5	6	6	5	6	1	←
G	B, D	4	5	5	3	5	1	
H	B, D	5	6	6	5	6	1	←

IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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?

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

RK Rank IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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 · F

B · D · E

B · D · H

B · D · G

C · D · E

A · D · G

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.

NO	IC A-B	NO	KZ A-B	NO	PR A-B	NO	BT A-B	NO	CL A-B	NO	HU A-B
H	-4	H	-5	H	-5	H	-4	H	-5	A	-3
F	-3	F	-4	A	-4	F	-3	F	-4	C	-1
A	-2	A	-3	F	-3	A	-2	A	-3	D	-4
C	0	G	-1	G	-1	G	1	G	-2	B	0
G	-1	C	2	C	2	C	0	C	1	F	1
B	2	B	2	B	2	B	4	B	1	G	2
D	3	D	5	D	5	D	5	D	4	E	1
E	2	E	4	E	4	E	2	E	3	H	4

NO Node IC In-Degree KZ Katz 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?

NN 8, NE 16, NR 3, ND 29%, NC 52%, NT 50%, NR 38%

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
In degree Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.86	0.29	0.29	0.31	1.07	0.53	0.94	0.35	0.00	0.36
PageRank Centrality	8.00	0.02	0.31	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.85	0.44	0.51	-0.73	0.02	0.18
Katz Centrality	8.00	0.28	0.48	0.35	0.35	0.07	0.21	0.10	0.80	0.29	0.28	0.37
Betweenness Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.21	0.03	0.06	0.08	1.25	0.61	1.22	0.64	0.00	0.10
Closeness Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.88	0.54	0.41	0.35	0.87	0.44	-0.25	-1.83	0.00	0.61
Hub Centrality	8.00	0.03	0.17	0.13	0.12	0.05	0.40	0.20	-1.11	0.74	0.11	0.17

NN Nodes NE Links NR Reciprocal Links ND Density NC Centralization NT Transitivity NR Reciprocity Count Frequency Sum Sum Min Minimum Value Max Maximum Value Median Median Mean Mean SD Standard Deviation CV Coefficient of Variation GN Gini Coefficient SK Skewness KT Kurtosis P25 25th Percentile P75 75th Percentile

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%

ID	Count	Min	Max	Median	Mean	SD	CV	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
In degree Centrality	8.00	0.00	1.00	0.21	0.29	0.34	1.20	0.58	1.42	2.20	0.00	0.43
PageRank Centrality	8.00	0.02	0.31	0.04	0.12	0.14	1.10	0.52	0.65	-2.14	0.02	0.28
Katz Centrality	8.00	0.28	0.50	0.33	0.35	0.08	0.23	0.11	1.13	0.98	0.28	0.37
Betweenness Centrality	8.00	0.00	0.17	0.01	0.03	0.06	1.91	0.75	2.54	6.68	0.00	0.03
Closeness Centrality	8.00	0.00	1.00	0.30	0.35	0.37	1.06	0.54	0.61	-0.82	0.00	0.60
Hub Centrality	8.00	0.05	0.15	0.14	0.12	0.03	0.26	0.12	-1.95	4.16	0.12	0.15

NN Nodes NE Links NR Reciprocal Links ND Density NC Centralization NT Transitivity NR Reciprocity Count Frequency Sum Sum Min Minimum Value Max Maximum Value Median Median Mean Mean SD Standard Deviation CV Coefficient of Variation GN Gini Coefficient SK Skewness KT Kurtosis P25 25th Percentile P75 75th 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 | RAW SCORES

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 RANK

BL	RK	IM	RK	AI	RK	II	RK	ST	RK
H	1.0	D	1.0	H	1.0	H	1.0	H	1
F	2.0	H	2.0	F	2.0	F	2.0	F	2
A	3.0	C	3.0	A	3.0	A	3.0	A	3
G	4.0	F	3.0	G	4.0	C	3.0	C	4
C	5.0	B	4.0	C	5.0	G	3.0	G	4
B	6.0	E	4.0	B	6.0	B	4.0	B	6
E	6.0	G	4.0	E	6.0	D	4.0	E	6
D	7.0	A	5.0	D	7.0	E	4.0	D	7

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.

DEMO | GROUP 3

SOCIOGRAM | DESCRIPTIVES

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	GN	SK	KT	P25	P75
Received preferences	8.00	0.00	6.00	2.00	2.00	2.14	1.07	0.53	0.94	0.35	0.00	2.50
Received rejections	8.00	0.00	7.00	1.50	2.00	2.39	1.20	0.58	1.42	2.20	0.00	3.00
Given Preferences	8.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Given rejections	8.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Mutual preferences	8.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.75	0.71	0.94	0.46	0.40	-0.23	0.00	1.00
Mutual rejections	8.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.75	1.04	1.38	0.62	0.64	-2.24	0.00	2.00
Balance	8.00	-7.00	6.00	0.50	0.00	4.21	inf	0.38	-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	0.00
Impact	8.00	2.00	7.00	3.50	4.00	1.69	0.42	0.21	0.95	-0.03	3.00	4.50
Affiliation index	8.00	-7.00	6.00	0.50	0.00	4.21	inf	0.38	-0.28	-0.39	-3.00	2.50
Influence index	8.00	0.00	8.00	3.00	2.75	2.82	1.02	0.51	0.80	0.32	0.00	3.50
	8.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	1.07	0.36	0.18	-0.94	0.35	2.75	4.00
	8.00	1.00	5.00	3.50	3.38	1.60	0.47	0.25	-0.26	-1.74	2.00	5.00
	8.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
	8.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
	8.00	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.25	0.71	0.31	0.15	-0.40	-0.23	2.00	3.00
	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.62	0.52	0.32	0.14	-0.64	-2.24	1.00	2.00
	8.00	1.00	7.00	4.50	4.25	2.12	0.50	0.26	-0.31	-1.24	2.75	6.00
	8.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
	8.00	1.00	5.00	3.50	3.25	1.28	0.39	0.20	-0.61	-0.02	2.75	4.00
	8.00	1.00	7.00	4.50	4.25	2.12	0.50	0.26	-0.31	-1.24	2.75	6.00
	8.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	1.07	0.36	0.18	-0.94	0.35	2.75	4.00
	8.00	1.00	7.00	4.00	4.12	2.10	0.51	0.27	-0.09	-1.19	2.75	6.00

Count Frequency Sum Sum Min Minimum Value Max Maximum Value Median Median Mean Mean SD Standard Deviation CV Coefficient of Variation GN Gini Coefficient SK Skewness KT Kurtosis P25 25th Percentile P75 75th Percentile