

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?

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

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

H	IC · KZ · PR · BT · CL · BL · AI · II · REJ	95	O	IC · KZ · PR · BT · CL · BL · AI · II · REJ	74
T	II · REJ	20	c	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 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. 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 NX Density 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 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. 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 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. 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 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. 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

4J · Y · k · l

A · N · P · e

E · M · b · j

3Y · d · l

Y · h · i

B · Y · f

N · V · e

F · I · W

F · I · N

G · M · i

E · G · M

E · M · g

D · d · l

C · P · Z

P · Z · e

R · c · d

C · E · M

Strongly Connected Groups

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

22A · C · E · G · J · M · N · P · Q · R · S · Y · Z · b · d · e · f · h · i · j · k · l

4B · F · I · W

Weakly Connected Groups


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

36A · B · C · D · E · F · G · H · I · J · K · M · N · O · P · Q · R · S · T · V · W · X · Y · Z · a · b · c · d · e · f · g · h · i · j · 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.

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 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.

DEMO | GROUP 1

SNA | RAW SCORES

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 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.

DEMO | GROUP 1

SNA | RANK SCORES

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 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. 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 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. 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

H · M · O

H · O · e

H · O · S

H · K · W

H · W · b

H · M · X

O · S · T

B · O · T

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.

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 Centrality IC In-Degree Centrality KZ Katz Centrality NO Node 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. 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 RE Number of Mutual Edges SD Standard Deviation SK Skewness

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 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.

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	H	1	E	1	P	1	l	1
M	1	O	2	M	2	M	2	Y	1
Y	1	P	3	R	2	Y	3	V	1
l	2	a	4	P	2	l	4	E	1
V	2	Y	5	N	2	J	4	P	1
E	2	V	5	Y	2	R	4	M	1
F	3	M	5	i	2	h	5	d	2
R	3	R	6	h	3	E	5	e	2
e	3	A	7	l	3	F	5	f	2
i	3	T	7	j	4	e	5	R	2
N	3	l	7	V	4	V	5	Q	2
h	3	E	7	d	4	i	6	Z	2
J	3	J	8	Z	4	f	6	N	2
C	4	N	8	G	4	A	6	i	2
G	4	i	8	D	5	G	6	J	2
I	5	h	8	I	5	j	7	I	2
d	5	Q	8	e	5	Q	7	j	2
j	5	F	8	F	5	I	7	G	2
Q	5	f	8	J	5	d	7	F	2
b	5	e	8	f	6	N	7	C	2
Z	5	W	8	C	6	Z	8	h	2
f	5	d	8	k	6	C	8	b	2
A	6	L	9	Q	7	b	8	k	3
k	6	g	9	g	7	B	9	D	3
D	6	C	9	b	7	g	9	c	3
B	6	G	9	c	8	D	9	B	3
X	7	K	9	A	8	S	9	g	6
c	7	Z	10	X	8	X	9	A	6
S	7	b	10	B	8	W	9	X	6
g	8	X	10	S	9	k	9	S	6
U	9	U	10	W	10	a	9	W	8
W	9	I	10	U	11	H	10	U	8
L	10	j	10	T	12	c	10	L	8
K	10	S	10	L	12	U	10	K	8
T	11	B	11	K	12	T	10	T	9
a	12	D	11	a	13	K	10	O	9
O	13	k	11	O	14	L	10	H	9
H	14	c	12	H	15	O	10	a	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.

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	0.15	-1.61	3.18	0.00	4.00
Orientation	38.00	-2.00	3.00	0.50	1.03	1.38	1.35	0.24	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	0.16	-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