Aesthetic	F
Improvisation	ctiti
Narrative	
Sensemaking	r
Knowledge/Technique/Skil	
Context / Situation	

	Aesthetics	Ξ.	nprovisa	ensemaking Narrative	hnique/Skill	t / Situation	
	etic	Ethics	isation	<u>₹   ⊊</u>	Ę	2   8	
Dimensions/aspects	Š	Š	3 (	9	Ŀ	= 3	Rationale
Shaping dimensions Group A: Aspects having to do with initial plan and other pre-session factors such as choice	_						
of method and approach							
Choice of method	Х			x	Т	Т	Because it has to do with the giving of narrative form to the episode, the framing of what is expected to happen
2. How much of the shaping and process is "emergent" vs. pre-determined						X	An aspect of the session itself, not of practitioner action
3. Granularity of the pre-created structure (degree and complexity)	×			x			Aesthetics because it has to do both with the shaping given to the pre-created structure, and narrative because it is about the expected (canonical) interaction and meaning given to the representation in advance
4. Ambitiousness of the planned approach	×	х		×			Shaping decisions about the scope/scale of planned approach (how 'ambitious' is the form); ethics in that it has to do with how much/what kind of interaction and expectations there will be of the participants; narrative in the expected sequence and shape of events and how they are expected to play out in terms of the approach
5. Degree of practitioner adherence to the intended method during the session		х		x			Ethics in the choice-making of whether it is better (or not) to stick with the intended method; narrative in the playing out of either staying within the intended frame or not
6. Participant adherence/faithfulness to the intended plan						×	Calls on practititioner ethics to know how to respond to participant moves away from intended plan; similar in terms of how practitioner interprets and responds to participant 'challenges' to the intended narrative framing
Group B: Practitioner interaction with participants							
7. Density of practitioner verbal moves (frequent vs infrequent)		x					Shows decision to verbally intervene or not; in sum how much to intervene verbally with participant conversation / actions
8. Practitioner willingness to intervene – frequency and depth of intervention		Х					Same as (7) but more general
9. High practitioner "drive" of the session vs high participant "drive"							Just as concerned with interventions as (7) and (8) but more explicitly "narrative" since it has to do with how much the
The second of the second to high participant affect		Х		X	_	_	practitioner works to make the session conform to their narrative framing (whether pre-planned or emergent)
10. Degree of practitioner-asked clarifying questions to participant input		~					Ethics because it involves a practitioner move to a) make sure they understood a participant, and b) acknowledging (to some degree) the validity of that input; sensemaking since it involves the 'fit' between new input and the purpose or plan; narrative since it has to do with conforming the input to the understood frame of reference
11. Degree which practitioners requested validation of changes to representation	×	X		x x	+	$\top$	Same as (11) but including the aesthetics dimension since it involves a change to the representation (shaping)
					T		Every gating is an ethical choice (to include something or not). This could be said to be narrative also since in some ways
12. Degree of practitioner "gating" of participant input		X					it is pervasive, but it seems less direct than some of the others
13. Degree of intervention to get participants to look at the representation		×		×			Every intervention is an ethical choice (to direct participant attention away from whatever else they might be paying attention to). Narrative since it has to do with getting participants to engage with the intentional artifact. This could also be in the realm of aesthetics since it has to do with looking at the representation, but that is indirect it's not a shaping move per se
14. Degree of collaboration between multiple practitioners (if applicable)		×					A different kind of 'ethics' since it has to do more with sharing and communication between the practitioners as opposed to between practitioners and participants, but still has to do with choice-making about how people will be brought into the intentions and direction.
15. Degree of collaboration/co-construction between practitioners and participants		x		x			Narrative in the way the two parties are connected within the intended/understood frame. Ethics in the choices the practitioners make about how much collaboration/co-construction to enter into, foster, avoid, etc.
Group C: Characteristics of the session and discussion							
16. Multiplicity/heterogeneity of focus aspects				×			This has to do with where the practitioner pays attention, what they are paying attention to what they need to focus on in order to keep the session going (though not sensemaking in the sense of responding to an anomaly). Ethics in that they are making a choice of what to focus on (though this seems a bit of a stretch)
17. How "good"/successful was the session?			工厂	ľ	l	Х	This one does not really conform to any of these dimensions; rather it's a measure of the session itself.
18. Degree of expressed participant resistance, disagreement, etc.						×	This can be an outcome of ethical or aesthetic choices, but not practitioner action in and of itself. Rather it's a measure of what the practitioner has to make sense of.
19. Degree of 'noise', chaos, boisterousness etc.						×	This can be an outcome of ethical or aesthetic choices, but not practitioner action in and of itself. Rather it's a measure of what the practitioner has to make sense of.
20. Degree of "meta" discussion						×	This can be an outcome of ethical or aesthetic choices, but not practitioner action in and of itself. Rather it's a measure of what the practitioner has to make sense of.
21. Where was the session on the spectrum from "discussionish" to "mapish"						×	This can be an outcome of ethical or aesthetic choices, but not practitioner action in and of itself. Rather it's a characteristic of the session itself
Group D: Shaping of the representation							
22. How much attention to textual refinement of shaping	X				I	$oxed{\Box}$	A characteristic of aesthetic shaping of the representation itself.
23. How much attention to visual/spatial refinement of shaping	X	1			╀	-	A characteristic of aesthetic shaping of the representation itself.
24. How much attention to hypertextual refinement of shaping 25. Degree of 'finishedness' of the artifacts	X	1		-	╁	╬	A characteristic of aesthetic shaping of the representation itself.  A characteristic of aesthetic shaping of the representation itself.
26. Multiplicity/heterogeneity of move types/categories; diversity of move types	X	H	-	+	V	,	This really seems more like a 'behavior' measure than one of the principal dimensions per se
1201 Transplace, received of those especy categories, aircrate, or those types	_				^		The real, decine more and a penarior measure than one of the principal difficultion per se

27. Density of practitioner shaping moves (frequent vs infrequent)							Is this really aesthetics/action in and of itself? It is a measure of how much shaping is actually done. But it might be
28. Complexity of the software techniques in use	X		-	-	×	-	more 'technique'.  This is more 'knowledge' or 'technique' or 'skill'
	-				T		Ethics since it reflects how much the practitioner chooses to give direct/complete attention to the representation as
29. Degree of 'exclusive'/de-linked practitioner interaction with the representation	╄	Х					opposed to interacting with the participants.
Framing dimensions Clarity of Artifacts			_		_	_	Aesthetics direct reflection of the practitioner shaping of the artifacts.
Narrative Consistency and Usefulness (A.2.2)			)	,	+	+	Directly concerned with narrative framing, not other sorts of practitioner action.
Inclusiveness of the Narrative Framing (A.2.3)	+	X	5		1	╁	Directly concerned with narrative framing, not other sorts of practitioner action.
, and the state of							Directly concerned with narrative framing. However, sometimes practitioner action with participants (sphere of ethics)
Evocativeness of the Narrative Framing (A.2.3)	x	х	>	<			brought out the evocativeness more, and sometimes the way the practitioner shaped the artifacts made them more (or less) evocative).
Openness and Dialogicity Pertaining to the Mediated Objects	x	х					One of the main ways that aesthetics and ethics touch directly, since it has to do with the ways that shaping of the representation interlace with the ways participants can and do talk.
Resistance From Participants and Materials	×	×	,	c x			Aesthetics because it is about the encounter of practitioner with representation; ethics in how the practitioner deals with resistance from participants; narrative in that often the resistance comes from trying to maintain "fit" of representation or participant action with overall framing; sensemaking in the encounter with resistance and figuring out what to do about it
Addressing and Incorporating Participant Impulses and Desires	×	x	x >	x x			Aesthetics in the ways these are taken up (or not) in the representation; ethics in the direct encounter and decisions about how to deal with these; sensemaking and improvisation (when it occurs) in the spontaneous ways practitioners deal with these when they emerge; narrative in the understanding of what is a breach, what is included in the framing, what is ignored.
Sensemaking Moment dimensions							
Types of Triggers							
Incoming input doesn't fit structure; no place to put/contain current input	x		>	( x			Aesthetics in having to consider where the input fits in the representation; narrative in understanding what fits and what doesn't; sensemaking by definition.
Current container (representation structure) not really working	X		>	( x			Aesthetics in sensing that the representation structure isn't working; narrative in understanding why it is working or doesn't; sensemaking by definition.
Too much too fast (too much coming in at once, too much going on)	4			X	Х	1	Sensemaking in trying to deal with all the incoming information; skill in being able to keep up with it or not.
Ambiguous input from a participant	╄			X	4_	_	Sensemaking in trying to figure out what the participant's input means.
Someone going off in another direction than intended with so much energy that can't be stopped		x		×			Ethics in the inherent need to decide to rein this in; sensemaking by definition.
Needed information is missing	T			X		X	A contextual factor since usually this is something brought to the session; sensemaking by definition.
Realization that a helpful construct or material is somewhere else	L			X		Х	A contextual factor since usually this is something brought to the session; sensemaking by definition.
Participant expresses confusion as to purpose		x	>	x x			Ethics in deciding whether to address the participant issue; sensemaking by definition. Can be narrative as well in the lack of fit w/narrative framing.
Participant expresses unhappiness with what other participants are doing with their ideas/input		x	,	( x			Ethics in deciding whether to address the participant issue; sensemaking by definition. Can be narrative as well in the way the different participant 'doings' with the input fit within the framing.
Seeing things go off course; "veering off"			)	( X			Narrative in the sense of determining what is the 'right' course and what is 'veering off'; sensemaking by definition.
Type of Responses							
Collaborative navigation to find item of interest (Hab)		×					Aesthetics in direct engagement with the representation; ethics in choosing to directly involve/engage participants;
Negotiation/agreement on placement of an item (Hab)	X		X	X	X		improvised response; sensemaking by definition; involves navigation/technical skills.  Aesthetics in direct engagement with the representation; ethics in choosing to directly involve/engage participants;
	X	Х	Х	X	╀	+	improvised response; sensemaking by definition.  Aesthetics in direct engagement with the representation; ethics in choosing to direct/thwart participant impulses;
Acknowledging diverging participant concerns, but directing focus elsewhere ("this is what the focus should be this not that is what we're doing") (AG2)	x	х	х	x			improvised response; sensemaking by definition.
	1						Spans all the action dimensions - aesthetics in interpretation of the representation and responses to it/actions on it;
Clarifying purpose, giving direction/expected behavior (RG1)							ethics in intervening in participant action and making a judgment on it; improvised response; sensemaking by definition; narrative in asserting/describing the narrative framing.
		X	X /	<u> </u>	+	╁	Spans all the action dimensions - aesthetics in interpretation of the representation and responses to it/actions on it;
Process call and offer of alternate solution (RG2)							ethics in intervening in participant action and making a judgment on it; improvised response; sensemaking by definition;
( )	X	х	x >	( x			narrative in asserting/describing the narrative framing.
							Spans all the action dimensions - aesthetics in interpretation of the representation and responses to it/actions on it;
Decision to delink then strong visual validation (RG2)							ethics in intervening in participant action and making a judgment on it; improvised response; sensemaking by definition;
	X	Х	X >	( X		_	narrative in asserting/describing the narrative framing.
Holding forward progress until new strategy is in place (AG4)		х	x	×	x		Facilitative skill in holding forward progress; ethics in choosing to stop participant input momentarily (and also interpractitioner ethics in helping the other practitoner out); improvised response; sensemaking by definition.
Stopping forward progress and asking for help; stop-and-think to recover (AG1, AG4)	L	x	X	x			Ethics in choosing to stop participant input momentarily (and in stepping out of 'expert' role to ask for help); improvised response; sensemaking by definition.
Independent investigation (RST)		x	x	×	×		Ethics in choosing to delink from direct engagement w/participants in service of finding answers; improvised response; sensemaking by definition; required skills with the tools and knowledge of the subject matter and representation.
Meta-comment capturing interim resolution (RST)	x	×	x >	x x			Aesthetics in the choices about how and where to represent the resolution; ethics in choosing to record this as a decision but without direct participant engagement; improvised response; sensemaking by definition; narrative in the way this connects the anomaly back into the overall frame ('healing the breach')
Making silent meta-comment on map (AG3)	×		x	×	×		Aesthetics in the choice to and position of placing this in the representation; improvised response; sensemaking by definition; could be said to reflect lack of facilitative skill.
Aiding and abetting (caught up in the subject matter itself instead of standing above/apart) (AG3)		x		×	Î		No constructive action therefore not 'improvising', can be sensemaking since the practitioner is making sense of the situation even if not constructively.
Stunned silence (AG3)		×			¥		No constructive action nor (seemingly) making any sense of the situation therefore not 'improvising' nor sensemaking. Ethics in the 'decision' not to intervene or try to correct. Can be lack of skill.
		_^_	12 2	2 2-			

Knowledge/Techni	que/
Skill; 6%	
Context / Situation; 6%  Improvisation; 9%  Narrative; 17%	Ethics; 24%  Sensemaking; 20%
Aesthetics; 18	3%