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Abstract
Creative Hypothesis™ explores the formulation of hypotheses — e.g. potential solutions to problems, explanations to phenomena, answers to questions, or ideas for innovation — and improves decision-making improving the understanding to create these options.

1 Professional value

Science assumes responsibility for the testing of hypotheses, but shows no interest in the procedures of their conception and formulation. Nonetheless, such procedures are crucial to those who rarely have the opportunity to ‘test’ their hypotheses before presenting them for ‘real world’ proof — particularly professionals carrying a ‘creative’ label, such as journalists, novelist and essayist, teachers and students, playwrights and directors, medical doctors, lawyers, and police detectives.

Sapiens Maps™ explore the conception and formulation of hypotheses by delving into mental models rarely revealed, documented, and/ or shared. Information that is typically obscure and abstract becomes explicit, verifiable, and reproducible — in a way, a technical view of how ‘sapience’ works.

2 Workflow

![Workflow Diagram](image)

**Figure 1** The work to be carried out over four (4) hours; a number of ‘loop’ iterations may be necessary to achieve a satisfactory model (RBP, CPD, DCD)
3 Programme

INTRODUCTION (1H)

- The objects of interest: situations, processes, plans (Figure 2)
- Exploring creativity: initial model (RBP, CPD, DCD)
- Study, simulation/check, iterations

WORK SESSION (4H)

- Work in groups (2–4 people)
- Interactive assistance

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSION (1H)

- Shared experiences
- Applicability issues

4 Technical notes

METHODS

- Qualitative simulation — QSM[M] (Figure 5)

TECHNIQUES

- Text mark-up — TMU[T]
- Reverse blueprints — RBP[T] (Figure 2)
- Concise process diagrams — CPD[T] (Figure 3)
- Descriptive causal diagrams — DCD[T] (Figure 4)

AUDIENCE

- Literature professionals (e.g. journalists, novelists, essayists)
- Academic practitioners (e.g. scientists, engineers, architects)
- Consultants (e.g. medical doctors, business advisors)
- Legal professionals (e.g. police detectives, judges)

COMPETENCES

- Identify and get to know elements of interest (e.g. ‘indicators’)
- Identify and get to know causal relationships between elements
- Think clearly and explain how we conceive ideas
- Try to achieve ‘wild’ ideas, and trace where they are coming from
- Try to create a story, build a system, or draft a plan
- What is the challenge to make these ‘original’?
- Register and communicate this efficiently

\[ a \] Perdicoulis, 2014b
\[ b \] Perdicoulis, 2014a
\[ c \] Required to some extent; to be reinforced in the workshop
5 Protocols

![Figure 2](image_url)  
**Figure 2** Generic Reverse Blueprint (RBP) representing a *balancing* feedback loop

![Figure 3](image_url)  
**Figure 3** Generic Concise Process Diagram (CPD)

![Figure 4](image_url)  
**Figure 4** Generic Descriptive Causal Diagram (DCD); feedback and assessment in gold

![Figure 5](image_url)  
**Figure 5** Qualitative simulation on an RBP: starting at element C will only stop at element E, but also involves a reinforcing feedback loop (marked in Gold)
6 Materials and preparation

**Case-study/Work material** Participants should bring their own material (e.g. situations, ‘problems’) in (human) memory or documentation (e.g. digital or printed media).

**Software** Systems Planning™ diagramming can be carried out manually, with pencil and paper. Optionally, participants are welcome to use their own diagramming software, such as *Graphviz*\(^1\), *LibreOffice Draw*, *OmniGraffle*\(^2\), or *Visio*.

References and further reading


\(^1\) v. starter file (Perdicoúlis, 2011b)

\(^2\) v. stencils (Perdicoúlis, 2011c,d,e)