

The Class Reminiscences of Nov 13!!!

Recapitulating the oscillation between certainty and strong ambiguity, this class attempted to refresh some concepts. For instance, pursuing a predefined successful career in order to be successful as individual, it can reveal the continuity of **certain** events and a lack of choice. Consequently, in order to alter such events we can measure our chances and consequences to have a perception of **risk** in order to make choices. Nevertheless, if this latter estimation is not as objective as is expected, we can still decide and predict but with limited data under an **uncertainty** scenario. To exemplify; if we ignore where is the bread in the supermarket the first time, and then we try to find it by our own, after checking every line will know where it is for the next time. However, if the supermarket layout is constantly changing, then the prediction will face more complexity and **weak ambiguity**. For instance, it is not possible to anticipate a court of law decision, where every judge has its own beliefs and truths, although the final resolution is a collective decision it is still subjective. Lastly, if the environment remains changing and the individuals also alter the scenario, those are symptoms of **strong ambiguity**. To exemplify, in order to produce a delicious pizza, the lack of predictability during the work dynamics and the volatile criteria of the cookers can alter the final pizza. Then, the negotiation here helps to establish a truth together.

From another stance, there are sorts of approaches digging into innovation aspects. Indeed, the battles are designed to induce ambiguity, sensemaking analyses the decision by experience, science in action extend the meaning of practice and black swans has the focus on unpredictability.

Firstly, the **Battles** are a divergent learning dynamic to promote radical innovation. Even though, it is evident that innovation can perform in both; convergent and divergent directions. The drawback in the convergent experience is the incremental innovation as in close organizations, although encompasses team working in the class. Hence, there is still room to improve the collaborative dynamic in the divergent mindset. Throughout Battles, is also faced the dichotomy of retrospective and prospective schemes since the aim is to create new knowledge. Moreover, the situations selected reflect a binary choice to induce a controlled conflict before the reconciliation.

Secondly, **Sensemaking** was introduced by Karl E. Weick and it is acknowledged as a process by which people give meaning to their collective experiences. Since, every individual make a retrospective analysis from the experience, then they decide to continue or not with an idea. Therefore, a decision here has its base in what you already did, implying both a priori or at posterior criteria. Even though, here the assumptions are created for the future, it is not enough for actions. More reflection and comprehension aid people to become aware that they can make some changes to the course of action.

Thirdly, the **Science in Action** study by Bruno Latour, explain how social context and technical content are both essential to a proper understanding of scientific activity, emphasizing that science can only be understood through its practice. This latter work declares that fate of facts and machines is in later user's hands. Additionally, the science in action tends to study things before those are solidified and black boxed.

Hope this helps! All the best,

Berioshka, Notekeepers Team