



ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

Shared Thinkscape

**Four perspectives,
one useful conversation.**

Shared Thinkscape compares four individual perspectives across Direction, Evidence, Perspective, and Movement. It is designed to make alignment, difference, and complementary thinking easier to discuss.

INSIDE THIS EXAMPLE

Four-person comparison

Alignment and difference map

Conversation prompts and a seven-day experiment

You don't just take in information. You interpret it.

Two people can hear the same information, attend the same meeting, or face the same problem—and come away with very different conclusions. We select what we notice, decide what seems important, interpret what it means, determine what information we trust, and eventually decide what to do.

Over time, each of us develops patterns in how we do this. Thinkscape makes some of those patterns visible—not to assign a fixed type, but to help you become more aware of how you are approaching a situation.

THE THINKING PROCESS



Thinking moves through noticing, interpreting, deciding, and acting. The orientations below can shape what happens at every stage.

Every pattern offers strengths—and directs attention.

There is no one right way to think. Your natural approach can help you make sense of complexity, identify problems, see possibilities, or move toward action. It can also mean that other signals arrive later.

Awareness gives you the ability to deliberately change your approach when a situation requires something different.

A practical premise

A useful pattern becomes more powerful when a group can recognize its value and deliberately invite what it may leave out.

Organizations think too.

At work, capable people may look for different evidence, interpret the same information from different perspectives, and have different instincts about when to move. Those differences can expose assumptions, identify risks, generate alternatives, and produce better decisions when they become shared understanding and coherent action.

The challenge is rarely that people think differently. It is whether the group can recognize those different starting points early enough to use them well.

A practical premise

Different starting points become an advantage when people can name them, test them, and turn them into a shared next step.

Four dimensions, one more complete view.

Thinkscape looks at four dimensions that often shape how people approach a situation: Direction, Evidence, Perspective, and Movement. Together, they offer a more complete view of what you may naturally prioritize—and what you may need to invite deliberately.

Your Thinkscape is not a judgment about whether you think well or poorly. It is a starting point for using your patterns more deliberately—and for thinking better with people who see the same situation differently.

Direction

Where your thinking begins and directs attention.

Evidence

What makes information credible or convincing.

Perspective

The lens through which you interpret what you see.

Movement

How understanding turns toward decision or action.

These orientations can appear at every stage of the thinking process. They are not a score, a type, or a sequence; they are a shared language for noticing what a situation may be asking the group to invite.

Four people, four dimensions.

The scores below are fictional comparison markers created solely for this example. They do not represent real people or diagnostic results.

Participant	Direction	Evidence	Perspective	Movement
Alex Strategy lead	5 	2 	3 	2
Jordan Operations lead	3 	5 	2 	4
Sam Customer lead	2 	3 	5 	2
Taylor Product lead	4 	3 	4 	5
READ THIS AS A STARTING POINT A Shared Thinkscape does not average people into a team type. It keeps each perspective visible so the group can ask better questions about what it is noticing, trusting, considering, and ready to do.				

Where the group may move together—and pause.

The map looks for nearby patterns and wider variation. Neither is inherently better: each can be useful when it is named and used deliberately.

Direction

Mixed

5

Alex

3

Jordan

2

Sam

4

Taylor

Alex and Taylor lean toward setting direction early; Sam begins closer to the human context.

Evidence

Most varied

2

Alex

5

Jordan

3

Sam

3

Taylor

Jordan wants robust evidence before moving; Alex is more willing to begin with a strategic hypothesis.

Perspective

Broadly shared

3

Alex

2

Jordan

5

Sam

4

Taylor

Sam and Taylor bring a wider view of stakeholders and possible implications into the group.

Movement

Mixed

2

Alex

4

Jordan

2

Sam

5

Taylor

Taylor has momentum toward action while Alex and Sam may want more framing or input first.

USEFUL INTERPRETATION

Variation is an invitation to clarify: What does each person see that the group could miss without them?

A fuller view is already in the room.

This fictional group has several ways of adding value before a significant decision. The aim is not to assign fixed roles, but to invite the contribution a situation needs.

Alex · Direction

Names the decision, outcome, or strategic choice that deserves attention.

Jordan · Evidence

Asks what would make a claim credible and what information is still missing.

Sam · Perspective

Brings customer and stakeholder implications into the conversation early.

Taylor · Movement

Helps the group turn learning into a clear next step, owner, and test.

TRY THIS IN A MEETING

Before deciding, make room for four moves:

1. Frame the choice.
2. Check what is known.
3. Widen the view.
4. Name the next experiment.

Difference can become friction when it stays unnamed.

These are not predictions about people. They are examples of the conversations a group might need when different patterns are active at the same time.

How much evidence is enough?

Jordan may want stronger validation while Alex or Taylor may feel the group has enough to set direction or begin a test.

When do we involve other perspectives?

Sam may want customer or stakeholder implications surfaced before the group narrows the decision.

What does forward movement mean?

Taylor may see a small reversible experiment as progress; others may want a clearer frame before committing.

A USEFUL RESET

When the discussion tightens, ask: Are we disagreeing about the decision itself, the evidence we need, who is affected, or the pace of action?

Three questions, then one small experiment.

Use the patterns to make a real team conversation more useful. The goal is better shared understanding, not agreement for its own sake.

1

What are we each noticing about this decision that the rest of the group may not see yet?

2

What would make the evidence feel sufficient for a responsible next step?

3

Where could a small, reversible experiment give us better information than more debate?

SEVEN-DAY TEAM EXPERIMENT

The four-lens decision check

For one meaningful decision this week, spend ten minutes asking four questions in order: What are we deciding? What evidence matters? Whose perspective is missing? What is the smallest useful next move? Rotate who opens each question, then note what changed in the decision.

Illustrative, not an assessment.

Alex, Jordan, Sam, and Taylor are fictional participants. Every score, pattern, strength, and discussion point in this PDF is illustrative and has not been generated from a person, team, or organization.

WHAT A LIVE SHARED THINKSCAPE DOES

It compares the individual Thinkscape responses of a small invited group. It is a conversation tool—not a performance score, personality label, hiring instrument, or diagnosis of a person or organization.

THE INTENDED FLOW

Each person starts with an individual Thinkscape. Once the initiator opens Shared Thinkscape and invites up to three people privately, the group comparison becomes available after at least three individual responses have been saved.

Thinkscape

Clarity, alignment, stronger results.