

Cross-Session Shaping Analysis

March 2010

Cross-Session Shaping Comparisons

Group A: Aspects having to do with initial plan and other pre-session factors such as choice of method and approach	IBIS/issue mapping			New/unique/hybrid methods				
	1. Choice of method	AG1	AG2	AG4	AG3	RG1	RG2	RST
2. How much of the shaping and process is "emergent" vs. pre-determined	Takes pre-determined course			Combination of pre-determined and emergent				Emergent
	AG4	RG1	RG2	RST	AG1	AG3	Hab	AG2
3. Granularity of the pre-created structure (degree and complexity)	High				Low			
	RST	Hab	AG2	RG1	AG4	AG3	AG1	RG2
4. Ambitiousness of the planned approach	Hab	RST	AG3	RG2	AG1	RG1	AG2	AG4
5. Degree of practitioner adherence to the intended method during the session	AG4	RG1	RG2	RST	Hab	AG1	AG3	AG2
6. Participant adherence/faithfulness to the intended plan	AG4	Hab	RST	RG2	RG1	AG1	AG3	AG2

Cross-Session Shaping Comparisons

Group B: Practitioner interaction with participants	High							Low
	7. Density of practitioner verbal moves (frequent vs infrequent)	Hab	RG2	AG4	RG1	AG3	AG1	RST
8. Practitioner willingness to intervene – frequency and depth of intervention	Hab	RG2	AG4	RST	RG1	AG1	AG3	AG2
9. High practitioner “drive” of the session vs high participant “drive”	High practitioner drive			Mixed practitioner and participant drive			High participant drive	
	RG2	RG1	AG4	AG3	Hab	RST	AG1	AG2
	High							Low
10. Degree of practitioner-asked clarifying questions to participant input	Hab	AG4	AG3	RST	RG2	AG1	RG1	AG2
11. Degree which practitioners requested validation of changes to representation	AG3	AG4	Hab	RST	RG2	AG1	RG1	AG2
12. Degree of practitioner “gating” of participant input	RG2	AG3	AG2	AG1	AG4	Hab	RG1	RST
13. Degree of intervention to get participants to look at the representation	Hab	RST	RG2	AG4	RG1	AG3	AG1	AG2
14. Degree of collaboration between multiple practitioners (if applicable)	RG2	AG4	AG3	RG1	AG1	AG2		
15. Degree of collaboration/co-construction between practitioners and participants	Hab	RST	AG1	AG4	RG2	RG1	AG3	AG2

Cross-Session Shaping Comparisons

Group C: Characteristics of the session and discussion	High Low							
16. Multiplicity/heterogeneity of focus aspects	RG2	RG1	AG3	AG4	AG2	RST	Hab	AG1
17. How "good"/successful was the session?	Hab	RST	AG4	RG1	RG2	AG1	AG3	AG2
18. Degree of expressed participant resistance, disagreement, etc.	AG2	AG1	AG3	RG2	RG1	Hab	AG4	RST
19. Degree of 'noise', chaos, boisterousness etc.	RG1	RG2	AG1	AG3	AG2	RST	AG4	Hab
20. Degree of "meta" discussion	RST	AG1	AG3	Hab	RG1	AG4	AG2	RG2
21. Where was the session on the spectrum from "discussionish" to "mapish"	Most mapish				Most discussionish			
	RG1	RG2	RST	Hab	AG4	AG3	AG1	AG2

Cross-Session Shaping Comparisons

Group D: Shaping of the representation	High							Low
22. How much attention to textual refinement of shaping	Hab	RST	RG1	RG2	AG3	AG4	AG1	AG2
23. How much attention to visual/spatial refinement of shaping	RST	AG3	Hab	RG2	RG1	AG1	AG2	AG4
24. How much attention to hypertextual refinement of shaping	RST	AG3	RG2	Hab	AG1	RG1	AG4	AG2
25. Degree of 'finishedness' of the artifacts	RST	Hab	RG2	RG1	AG3	AG2	AG1	AG4
26. Multiplicity/heterogeneity of move types/categories; diversity of move types	RST	Hab	AG1	AG3	AG4	AG2	RG2	RG1
27. Density of practitioner shaping moves (frequent vs infrequent)	AG4	RG2	Hab	RST	AG3	AG2	RG1	AG1
28. Complexity of the software techniques in use	RST	Hab	AG3	RG2	AG1	AG2	RG1	AG4
29. Degree of 'exclusive'/de-linked practitioner interaction with the representation	RST	RG2	AG2	AG3	AG4	AG1	RG1	Hab

Cross-Session Shaping Comparisons

	Shaping Index scores	Rank in "how good was the session"	Software proficiency rank	Facilitation proficiency rank
Hab Crew (Hab)	83	1	1	1
Remote Science Team (RST)	78	2	1	2
Rutgers Group 2 (RG2)	70	5	4	3
Ames Group 4 (AG4)	66	3	6	5
Ames Group 3 (AG3)	55	7	2	6
Rutgers Group 1 (RG1)	54	4	7	5
Ames Group 1 (AG1)	41	6	5	4
Ames Group 2 (AG2)	18	8	3	7

Cross-Session Shaping Comparisons

	Ames Group 1	Ames Group 2	Ames Group 3	Ames Group 4	Rutgers Group 1	Rutgers Group 2	RST	Hab Crew
Composite facilitation score	24.0	10.0	18.0	20.0	20.0	29.5	33.0	38.0
Composite software facilitation score	11.5	6.0	8.3	8.0	4.0	15.0	20.0	22.0
Composite Compendium facilitation score	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	10.0	11.0
Composite non-software facilitation score	12.5	4.0	9.7	12.0	16.0	14.5	13.0	16.0
Software proficiency score	15.5	18.5	20.3	12.0	11.0	17.0	26.0	26.0
Compendium proficiency score	7.5	10.0	11.0	7.5	6.0	9.0	16.0	16.0
Non-Compendium software proficiency score	10.5	11.5	12.7	6.5	6.0	11.0	15.0	15.0

Composite Facilitation Ranking

	Score	Rank
Hab Crew (Hab)	38.0	1
Remote Science Team (RST)	33.0	2
Rutgers Group 2 (RG2)	29.5	3
Ames Group 1 (AG1)	24.0	4
Ames Group 4 (AG4)	20.0	5
Rutgers Group 1 (RG1)	20.0	5
Ames Group 3 (AG3)	18.0	6
Ames Group 2 (AG2)	10.0	7