## Framing the moves and choices: Hab Crew 2004.05.03

| **Element** | **Descriptive and normative questions** |
| --- | --- |
| (A.1) Imposing their own coherence and values on a situation | * *What coherence is the practitioner imposing on the situation?*

Mainly the existing set of plans, constructs, and formalisms from the hab crew and Mobile Agents projects, which this session was only one in a series with more or less the same participants over a couple of years, including many pre-planning meetings. The team was used to working together and familiar with the tools, process, subject matter, and environment.* *What values is the practitioner imposing on the situation?*

Several. One is the importance of the mission in the context of the larger space research effort in general and the particular set of related projects that made up the Mobile Agents effort. Another was accomplishing the needs and planned agenda within the very tight timeframe, and producing the expected materials with sufficient clarity and quality. He also had a research interest in the way the tools were working for the purpose, both individually and together. Another is the ‘sanctity’ of this particular meeting and its video recordings (he defended it from several interruptions from “important” other matters during the course of the session.* *In what ways are these congruent (or not) with those of the participants?*

As an intact team working on close quarters on a project of high importance to all of them, these values were quite congruent with those of the participants. |
| (A.2) Constructing narratives to account for how the situation arrived at the current pass / breaches in canonicity  | * *What is the narrative the practitioner is using to construct the situation?*

Mostly (nearly all) what information was needed to perform the upcoming EVA effectively (so situating within a narrative of “what does it take to conduct an EVA”) as well as the ongoing effort to tie together the data, tools, and concepts associated with the Mobile Agents project. Too, a narrative to do with the unfolding understanding of, and history of previous visits to, the Lith Canyon area as well as the previous meetings of this particular team and the analysis work they had already done. On a lower level, an expectation of how Compendium in particular was supposed to function.* *What is its degree of internal consistency?*
* *How useful is it?*

It appeared to be highly internal consistent and useful. The only breaches came between narratives – e.g. the concerns of the particular meeting in the context of the larger project (in the face of the interruptions, determinations of which was more important), as well as the mildly frustrated expectation of how the tool should work to do multiple node linking.* *How evocative and inclusive is it?*

The set of narratives appeared to be inclusive of all that occurred during the meeting (i.e. no problematic breaches). There were several slight fissures between the knowledge (what’s obvious to) the geologist participants and that of the practitioner, which were swiftly and collaboratively resolved. |
| (A.3) Eliminating prejudices and preconceptions | * *What prejudices may be active?*
* *What preconceptions may be active?*
* *What personal desires or goals may be active?*

None detected. |
| (A.4) Personal authenticity in the practice setting | * *In what ways is the practitioner acting in an authentic manner (vs. received, affected, etc.)?*

The practitioner appeared to be acting in a highly authentic manner. |
| (A.5) Mediated objects and other interventions should preserve openness and dialogicity | * *How do the representations the practitioner constructs or modifies foster openness and dialogicity?*
* *How do they inhibit them?*.

Following, as they did, a simple question-and-answer format, the representations that the practitioner constructed in this session appeared to foster dialogicity and openness. This was also seen through the conversational style of the meeting and demonstrated willingness to be guided and to make changes when requested. The participants were able to suggest new topics and see these incorporated immediately into the representation.  |
| (A.6) Artifacts should be clear, expressive, and helpful | * *How clear are the artifacts produced/modified by the practitioner?*
* *How expressive are they?*
* *How helpful are they within the context of practice?*

The representations were very clear, and expressive given a knowledge of the context and subject matter. |
| (A.7) Perseverance in the face of checks and resistance | * *What checks to forward progress does the practitioner encounter?*

Only several slight and swiftly resolved checks. One to do with some difficulty in linking multiple nodes, and several to do with the right way to group some of the items, particularly in the topic added at the end (“Sample Bag Nomenclature”). * *What resistance from participants, materials, etc. occurs?*

No resistance from participants. Some resistance from the material in the sense of having to remember and find certain items in past meetings and navigating the complex body of Compendium maps.* *How does the practitioner respond in the face of these?*

Swiftly and surely, with a high degree of collaborative help from the participants.  |
| (A.8) Clear and focused communication | * *How clear is the practitioner's verbal communication?*

Very clear, direct, and focused.* *In what ways does the practitioner maintain focus on the aspects of importance in the situation?*

Several times the practitioner made quick decisions to move on to new topics or fend off interruptions, which he did through verbal interactions with the direct participants and other team members. He also kept the visual focus on the current items of discussion and kept things neatly grouped. |
| (B.1) The importance of participants' impulses and desires; attention to what may be bothering or affecting participants | * *What observable or discoverable participant impulses, desires, or other factors are operating in the situation?*
* *How does the practitioner address these?*

The participants appeared to share the same orientation and goals for the meeting, with more of an emphasis on the geology itself than the practitioner. The practitioner continually encouraged them to make decisions about what to include or not to include, how far to take a given line of questioning, etc. |
| (B.2) Unfinalizability; preserve room for surprise, imagination, and creativity to emerge | * *In what ways do the practitioner's actions reflect an attitude of unfinalizability toward the participants and their interests, concerns, and agency?*

Similar to B.1. Even though the agenda was planned in advance, the practitioner exhibited willingness to open new topics and go in the directions suggested by the participants.* *In what ways does the practitioner preserve or close off room for surprise, imagination, and creativity to emerge?*

None detected except within the constraints of needing to finish the meeting on time (especially after the final interruption). |
| (B.3) Dialogic orientation | * *How do the practitioner's actions and communication open up or close off dialogue in the situation?*
* *In what ways does the practitioner display openness and sensitivity to the different participant voices (vs. summarizing them into abstractions or types)?*

The practitioner continually encouraged the participants to decide how far to take areas of discussion and to decide on how far to go. He appeared to be open to their initiative within the constraints of the session. Since the team was intact and familiar with each other, there was no abstracting. He made many shared references to past work, sessions, ideas, and field sessions. |
| (C.1) Heightened degree of connection between people, setting, purpose, and medium  | * *How do the practitioner's actions help create this kind of connection and integration?*
* Other than a somewhat palpable feeling of accomplishment and shared value of each other, there was no special feeling of “heightening” what was apparently already there between this group of people.
* *In what ways are the distinctions or boundaries between people, setting, objects, etc. made stronger or lesser?*

The willingness to go back and retrieve previous ideas and place them in the current map appeared to please the participants by showing them how their past work could be useful and valuable in the current situation; they appeared to gain some understanding of how the tools could help them in this manner. |
| (C.2) High level and quality of communication | * *How does the practitioner elevate (or diminish) the level and quality of communication in the practice setting?*

Covered above.  |
| (C.3) Importance of the past as the background and context to the practice setting | * *In what ways does the practitioner reference or bring in elements of past work, ideas, or events?*

As mentioned above, discussions, ideas, and materials from past EVAs and mapping sessions permeated the entire session. * *Are such "background" elements combined with "foreground" (current) concerns, ideas, or representations?*

Covered in C.2.  |
| (C.4) The relationships of parts to parts and to the whole | * *How does the practitioner focus on both individual details and the relationships of those details to the 'big picture' and each other?*
* *How are the moves from parts to whole accomplished?*

References to the ‘big picture’ were largely implicit or mentioned in conversation during this session. The specific agenda and emergent topics covered in the session were ‘governed’ by an implicit understanding of how they fit into the whole of the project. There were conversational mentions of other teams (e.g. the RST) and issues but they were not explicitly reflected in the maps themselves during the session. |