What are developmental implications, how are adults helped to make real these behaviors and ways of looking at world(what’s implied about meta awareness), how do we know when people do, how do we know when they don’t?

1. **Learn from experience and mistakes create learning opportunities**
   Staff need to learn how to learn(P 17). This learning isn’t classic textbook learning but rather a deep form of iterative, experiential learning that is grounded in a capacity to learn from mistakes(p 61&95).-----rel-I as all went to same school(Received knower-sailor), what types of denial & defensiveness short circuit feedback process. Model 2 mind

2. **Get Root causes through extensive questioning leading to understanding**
   Related to learning is a form of problem solving effective on messy problems that can’t be solved by deductive investigative approach but rather by key principles that inform the investigative process when clues aren’t so clear(P 43) such as using 5 whys and the more complex, connected view of reality implied in that ability to ask those questions(p.82). Also there is a realization that even apparent solutions create new problems(p. 65). How to reclaim questioning from wonder? Seeing systems and interconnections, what are those key principles? See 5 whys at bottom?— HHS diagram--Bassseches

3. **Scientific method using data and analysis to lead to the solutions and root cause**
   A philosophy of empiricism that makes sense of the situation that is often shrouded in opinions and reams of data (P 44). There is a natural tendency to let facts speak for themselves( P 71) without agendas or silos limiting the process of understanding. What’s law of situation? Role of intuition, open to emergence, scientists’ blenders(ludgeous use of sci method—not reify)

4. **Don’t jump to conclusions, suppress out natural need to be “right”, address multiple solutions and depend on teamwork to select the best outcome**
   A capacity to suspend the natural urge to offer a “hero’s solution” from a strong need to be right but rather a personal detachment-beginner’s mind( P. 20) that allows the consideration of an array of countermeasures in the construction of a “tentative way” forward which parallels the scientists’ ways of pursuing multiple alternative solutions simultaneously ( p 76) and the making of decisions from the fullest set of facts (p75). beyond wants to be right is huge developmental leap

5. **Gather understanding through unbiased questioning with open questions leading to a comfortable unthreatening dialog**
   A capacity to ask questions of colleagues in a manner that doesn’t irritate(p 46) or imply a solution(P 82) and it becomes normative to explain how one knows without becoming defensive. Socratic method, awareness of own motive in asking, reflective capacity to explain one’s way of knowing,

6. **Encourage healthy conflict conducted in a safe, no-blame, positive, felt mutuality**
   There is a comfort in respect through conflict(p 73). Conflict is seen as the engine for improvement, and blame(P. 52&54) and negative reactivity (P 71) are less frequent in the work setting. This healthy conflict produces a fact based dialogue(P. 65) where individuals don’t try to retrofit solutions. Beyond wilffm, conflict’s purpose(D. Kramer/irritant), blame when now shouldering responsibility

7. **Most problems are solved and processes improved by people working in the process. They constantly ask “how can things be better?” They take primary initiative and responsibility for constantly making things better.**
   Responsibility and its corresponding authority are commonly sought and grounded closely to the place the work is being done ( 81). The responsible person takes initiative to use the process of gathering facts and involving individuals to establish the authority needed to get the work done and the decision made. Is CI mindset developmental– what are compulsive limits? Proactivity—Dweck’s change focus.

8. **Leaders model these behaviors, and take every opportunity to coach and mentor their people**
   Leaders have the capacity to coach and mentor staff in all of the above ways of being in a LEAN environment. Capacity to challenge and support, know development
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INTRODUCTION

In order to describe unfolding patterns behind the diverse changes of adulthood, we adopt the hypothesis of a simple, dynamic model of psychological development. This model suggests that development is a continuous process involving both growth and decline. The model is based on the idea that development is not linear, but rather occurs in stages, with each stage building on the previous one.

The model includes three main stages: childhood, adulthood, and old age. Each stage is characterized by a different set of developmental tasks. For example, childhood is characterized by the development of basic psychological functions, such as language and cognitive abilities. Adulthood is characterized by the development of more complex psychological functions, such as self-awareness and social competence. Old age is characterized by the decline of psychological functions, such as memory and cognitive abilities.

The model also suggests that development is influenced by a variety of factors, including biological, psychological, and social factors. Biological factors, such as the aging process, play a major role in development. Psychological factors, such as personality and motivation, also play a role in development. Social factors, such as family and culture, also influence development.

The model is designed to be flexible, so that it can be adapted to different contexts and situations. For example, the model can be used to study the development of children in different cultural contexts, or the development of adults in different career settings.

The model is also designed to be useful for understanding the development of individuals, as well as groups and societies. By understanding the processes of development, we can better understand how individuals and groups change over time, and how societies evolve and develop.

In conclusion, the model of psychological development presented in this paper provides a useful tool for understanding the complex processes of human development. It is hoped that this model will be useful for researchers, educators, and policymakers who are interested in understanding the development of individuals, groups, and societies.
The common sense forms of metaethical reasoning are rejected in favor of a more formalized approach to ethical reasoning. This rejection is necessary because it introduces the individual as the primary focus of moral considerations, allowing for a more objective and systematic approach to ethical thinking.

**Introduction**

Ethical reasoning, or the process of arriving at moral conclusions, is a fundamental aspect of human life. It involves the use of reason and logic to make decisions about right and wrong. This process is complex and multifaceted, involving various philosophical and psychological theories.

In this chapter, we will explore the nature of ethical reasoning and its role in decision-making. We will examine the different approaches to ethical reasoning, including deontological, teleological, and virtue ethics, and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each.

We will also consider the implications of ethical reasoning for various aspects of life, including politics, law, and business. By understanding the principles of ethical reasoning, we can make more informed and thoughtful decisions in our personal and professional lives.

In conclusion, ethical reasoning is a critical tool for navigating the complexities of modern society. By developing a robust understanding of ethical reasoning, we can become more effective and ethical decision-makers.
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Of course, as I mentioned earlier, the constitutional order and authority of the United States are such that the government can, and often does, act in ways that are contrary to the interests of the people. The government's actions are often taken in the pursuit of its own goals, which may not always align with the desires of the people. The Constitution, in its current form, is a product of its time and reflects the beliefs and values of the people of that time. It is not an ironclad rule that cannot be changed by the people themselves. The Constitution is a living document that can be amended to reflect the changing needs of the people.
Dialectical Thinking and Adult Development

Dialectical thinking can be defined as a method of thinking about a subject or problem that involves considering both sides of an issue, recognizing the interdependence of different perspectives, and reconciling apparent contradictions. It is a form of reasoning that allows for a more comprehensive understanding of complex issues or situations.

Dialectical thinking is often contrasted with logical thinking, which is based on a linear, step-by-step analysis of information. Logical thinking may be more appropriate for tasks that require a clear, definitive solution, while dialectical thinking is better suited for situations where a single, straightforward answer is not possible.

In adult development, dialectical thinking is important because it helps individuals to overcome the limitations of linear thinking and to develop a more nuanced understanding of the world. It enables individuals to see beyond the surface level of an issue and to consider the broader implications of different perspectives.

Dialectical thinking is an essential component of critical thinking, which is the ability to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information to make informed decisions. In this sense, dialectical thinking is a valuable tool for problem-solving and decision-making.

In conclusion, dialectical thinking is a valuable skill for individuals who want to develop a more comprehensive understanding of complex issues and to navigate the challenges of the modern world. By adopting a dialectical approach, individuals can overcome the limitations of linear thinking and achieve a more nuanced and holistic understanding of the world.
knowledge about the world, shaped by individual experiences and cultural influences. There are many interpretations of this knowledge, which is why different perspectives exist. My philosophical position is that we need to develop a comprehensive understanding of the world, not just through knowledge, but also through personal experiences and cultural influences. My goal is to create a framework within which we can understand the world, and this framework should be inclusive of all areas of human experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>A) Metaphysical Assumptions</th>
<th>B) Epistemological Assumptions</th>
<th>Concepts of Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is an objective reality which exists as the individual sees it. Reality and knowledge about reality are identical and known absolutely through the individual’s perceptions.</td>
<td>Knowledge exists absolutely. One’s own views and those of authorities are assumed to correspond to each other and to absolute knowledge. Knowledge is gained through the individual’s perceptions and prior teaching.</td>
<td>Beliefs simply exist; they are not derived and need not be explained. Differences in opinion are not perceived, and justification is therefore unnecessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is an objective reality which is knowable and known by someone.</td>
<td>Absolute knowledge exists, but it may not be immediately available to the individual. It is, however, available to legitimate authorities.</td>
<td>Beliefs either exist or are based on the absolute knowledge of a legitimate authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is an objective reality, but it cannot always be immediately known, even to legitimate authorities. It is possible to attain knowledge about this reality, but our full knowledge of it is as yet incomplete and therefore uncertain.</td>
<td>Absolute knowledge exists in some areas, but in others it is uncertain, at least temporarily. Even authorities may not have certain knowledge, and therefore cannot always be depended upon as sources of knowledge. Knowledge is manifest in evidence which is understood in a concrete, quantitative way such that a large accumulation of evidence will lead to absolute truth.</td>
<td>Beliefs either exist or are based on an accumulation of evidence that leads to absolute knowledge. When such evidence is not available, individuals claim that while waiting for absolute knowledge to become available, people can temporarily believe whatever they choose to believe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is an objective reality, but it can never be known without uncertainty. Neither authorities, time or money nor a quantity of evidence can be relied upon to ultimately lead to absolute knowledge.</td>
<td>Absolute knowledge is for practical reasons impossible to attain, and is therefore always uncertain. There are many possible answers to every question, but without certainty and a way to adjudicate between answers, there is no way to decide which one is correct, or even whether one is better than another. Knowledge is idiosyncratic to the individual.</td>
<td>Beliefs are justified with idiosyncratic knowledge claims and on idiosyncratic evaluations of data (“what is true is true for me, but not necessarily for anyone else”). The individual is the ultimate source and judge of his or her own truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An objective understanding of reality is not possible since objective knowledge does not exist. Reality exists only subjectively and what is known of reality reflects a strictly personal knowledge. Since objective reality does not exist, an objective understanding of reality is not possible.</td>
<td>Knowledge is subjective. Knowledge claims are limited to subjective interpretations from a particular perspective based on the rules of inquiry and of evaluation compatible with that perspective.</td>
<td>Beliefs are justified with appropriate decision rules for a particular perspective or context, e.g., that a simple scientific theory is better than a complex one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>An objective understanding of reality is not possible since our knowledge of reality is subject to our own perceptions and interpretations. However, some judgments about reality may be evaluated as more rational or based on stronger evidence than other judgments.</td>
<td>Objective knowledge is not possible to attain because our knowledge is based on subjective perceptions and interpretations. Knowledge claims can be constructed through generalized principles of inquiry and by abstracting common elements across different perspectives. The knower must play an active role in the construction of such claims.</td>
<td>Beliefs are justified for a particular issue by using generalized rules of evidence and inquiry. However, since our understanding of reality is subjective, any such justification is limited to a particular case, time or issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is an objective reality against which ideas and assumptions must ultimately be tested. Despite the fact that our knowledge of reality is subject to our own perceptions and interpretations, it is nevertheless possible, through the process of critical inquiry and evaluation, to determine that some judgments about that reality are more correct than other judgments.</td>
<td>Objective knowledge is possible to attain. Knowledge is the outcome of the process of reasonable inquiry. The process of inquiry, however, may not always lead to correct claims about the nature of reality since the process itself is fallible. Knowledge statements must be evaluated as more or less likely approximations to reality and must be open to the scrutiny and criticisms of other rational people.</td>
<td>Beliefs reflect solutions that can be justified as most reasonable using general rules of inquiry or evaluation. Criteria for evaluation may vary from domain to domain (e.g., religion, literature, science), but the assumption that ideas, beliefs, etc. may be judged as better or worse approximations to reality remains constant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>