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( receive knower-sailer), 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' blinders (judicious 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 alternatives simultaneously (p 76) and the making of decisions from the fullest set of facts (p 75). 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 q, reflective capacity to explain own 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 wifm, 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
adult personality in childhood and adolescence, and that personality psy-
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by describing the underlying processes behind the dynamic changes, since the depth and timing of these changes can significantly impact the overall development. It may be argued that these 'depth' factors are beyond the capabilities of the older theories, which were based on simpler models of development. The focus on these 'depth' factors (1979) has led to a new understanding of the processes involved, and a recognition of the importance of the underlying psychological processes. This new understanding has led to a shift in focus, with a greater emphasis on the development of more sophisticated psychological models. These models are capable of capturing the complexity and richness of the development process, and provide a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of the factors that influence development. The next section will focus on the development of these new models, and the implications for our understanding of child development.
The common socio-cultural forms of theoretical reasoning are reflected in and through the processes of historical events, which in turn shape the development of theories. The history of thought, while common, is not always expressed in a clear and consistent manner. The history of thought, however, is not static but dynamic, evolving over time. The history of thought is thus a continuous process of change and development.

Introduction: The History of Thought

The history of thought is a complex and multifaceted field. It involves the study of ideas, concepts, and beliefs that have shaped human civilization. The history of thought is not only about the past but also about the present and future. It involves the study of how ideas have been developed and how they have influenced society. The history of thought is also about the relationship between ideas and their social, political, and economic contexts.

The history of thought is a critical component of the development of human culture. It involves the study of how ideas have been formed, how they have evolved, and how they have been transmitted. The history of thought is a dynamic field that involves the study of how ideas have been developed and how they have been used to shape human society. The history of thought is also about the relationship between ideas and their social, political, and economic contexts. It is about how ideas have been formed and how they have been transmitted.

The history of thought is a critical component of the development of human culture. It involves the study of how ideas have been formed, how they have evolved, and how they have been transmitted. The history of thought is a dynamic field that involves the study of how ideas have been developed and how they have been used to shape human society. The history of thought is also about the relationship between ideas and their social, political, and economic contexts. It is about how ideas have been formed and how they have been transmitted.
Of course, conversely, from a dialectical perspective, the concept of order and unity when disorder and difference are discrepant. The concept of order and unity when disorder and difference are discrepant. The concept of order and unity when disorder and difference are discrepant.

...
In the context of psychology, the term deontological thinking has been used to describe a form of rational thought that is based on rules and principles. Deontological thinking is characterized by a focus on duty and obligation, and it is often contrasted with teleological thinking, which is based on ends and outcomes.

In psychology, deontological thinking is often linked to the concept of moral reasoning, which refers to the way individuals make decisions about what is right and wrong. According to Kohlberg's stages of moral development, individuals progress from a focus on punishment and obedience to a focus on the rights and welfare of others.

Deontological thinking is also associated with the concept of meta-ethics, which is concerned with the nature of moral values and the criteria for determining what is right or wrong. Meta-ethics includes the study of moral realism, which holds that moral statements can be either true or false, and moral ant-realism, which suggests that moral statements are not truth-apt.

In psychology, deontological thinking is often contrasted with teleological thinking, which is based on the idea that actions are right or wrong because of their consequences. While deontological thinking is often associated with moral relativism, teleological thinking is often associated with moral absolutism.

In summary, deontological thinking is a form of rational thought that is based on rules and principles, and it is often contrasted with teleological thinking, which is based on ends and outcomes. Deontological thinking is also associated with the concept of moral reasoning, and it is often contrasted with meta-ethics, which is concerned with the nature of moral values.
In my philosophical position, my view is to have both criticisms of and challenges to my view. Rather, my view is that philosophy is essential for understanding the nature of a particular concept or idea. It is not to be taken lightly or dismissed. Nor is it to be considered in isolation from other disciplines, such as psychology or neuroscience.

Introducing theories and frameworks into philosophy can help contribute to the construction of new theories. However, it is important to ensure that these theories are not used as a substitute for empirical evidence. Instead, theories should be tested and refined through ongoing dialogue and debate.

Philosophical claims embedded in developmental theory should be

necessary, but not sufficient, for understanding the nature of a particular concept or idea. It is important to recognize the limitations of philosophical claims and to seek further evidence to support or refute them.

In my view, it is essential to have a clear understanding of the nature of a particular concept or idea. This can only be achieved through a careful and systematic examination of the evidence available.

In conclusion, I am confident that my position is both distinctive and valuable. It is one that challenges the status quo and invites further thought and discussion. It is my hope that others will find this position useful and inspiring in their own work.

Formal voice is important, but it is not everything.

In order to show how integrating my work on developmental thinking with Pigeon's views on the nature of the mind, I will present a project (see demonstration, 1997) for a more thorough discussion. I will present this project in a series of papers, which will be available in the near future.

In the papers, I will explore the relationship between developmental thinking and the understanding of the mind. I will discuss how the ideas presented in this project can be applied to other areas of research. I hope that this project will be useful to others in their own work.
<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 cannot 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 (&quot;what is true is true for me, but not necessarily for anyone else&quot;). 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>
Dialectical thinking and adult development. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. Google Scholar. Basseches, M. (1984b). Dialectical thinking as ametasystematic form of cognitive organization. In M. L. Commons, F. A. Richards, & C. Armon (Eds.), Beyond formal operations: Late adolescent and adult cognitive development (pp. 216–238). New York: Praeger. Google Scholar. Bruner, J. S. (1962). The conditions of creativity. Dialectic or dialectics, also known as the dialectical method, is at base a discourse between two or more people holding different points of view about a subject but wishing to establish the truth through reasoned arguments. Dialectic resembles debate, but the concept excludes subjective elements such as emotional appeal and the modern pejorative sense of rhetoric. Dialectic may be contrasted with the didactic method, wherein one side of the conversation teaches the other. Dialectic is alternatively Dialectical thinking just recognizes its important to have both sides. Debate and having criticism is important for truth. The collision of ideas creates truth. I think it also highlights the importance of constructive conflict. That conflict doesn’t have to be a negative in all cases. Relationships tend to be fostered with open communication, even if some of the information hurts.