

In the beginning of this scenario, the group received many news articles and a few emails about the world wide web failure. It was easy to dismiss because it appeared to be background information showing no significant importance. All of the articles had similar issues, such as Google and Amazon shutting down and causing billions to go down the drain, so it seemed like it could be easily overlooked without any repercussions. Without this information, the group understood the scenario, but could not extract the necessary facts from it, such as who caused the shut down and why. Based on the perception that this was introductory material, the group overlooked the importance of Stark and Kabocha while waiting for future briefings that could potentially be more important. The cause of the shutdown was Will Stark, but the group ruled him out since he was the boss of the company and made an appearance at the briefing.

In actuality, the seemingly unimportant information led the group to miss the objective. Had they dug more deeply into the articles and background information, they could have more thoroughly realized the tensions between the characters. The group did not look carefully at the article that Kabocha got credit for; thus missing one of Stark's motives. The group did know that Kabocha had some kind of part in the situation, though they generalized that Kabocha had to be the bad guy due to his relation with Stark. Even though Kabocha seemed like he caused the issue, he did not have a motive, so the group could not move forward. Had they built a solid foundation that properly recognized the importance of the original data, they could have compiled all the information into a final analysis. Unfortunately, as the documents continued to pour in, what was originally deemed unimportant became too overwhelming to wade through.

Clearly, the original perception that the material was simplistic led to a false interpretation of its relevance to the case. In analyzing the documents in the scenario, the group

understood what information was given, but could not distinguish between the smoking gun and the red herring. The group was aware of what had happened to Google, but did not see what it had to do with some of the characters. They were also suspicious that Bitcoin was a possible motive, but could not use the IP addresses to point directly to either Stark or Kabocha, making their argument weak and incomplete. They could not interpret it in a way that was useful. Perception and interpretation are directly linked; without one, the other cannot be placed correctly. If the group does not fully look into all of the information, even seemingly simplistic information, only speculation and error will be the outcome. In essence, one must be able to interpret a document as relevant or not before perceiving it as irrelevant - nothing must go unnoticed.