

2

What is Your Hypothesis as You Listen?

<i>Chapter Subheadings</i>		
<i>Ch.2</i>	What is Your Hypothesis as You Listen?	52
54	Developmental listening	
55	Hypothesis, Probe, Content, Structure, Stage, Context, Levels, Devil's Advocate	
57	Levels	
57	Example 1a: Level S-2	
58	Example 1b: Level S-2	
59	Acting from S-2	
60	Movement toward stage 3 (S-3)	
60	Levels revisited	
61	Example 1a: Levels revisited	
61	Counter hypotheses - rereading example 1a	
61	Playing devil's advocate regarding counter-hypothesis #1 (at or close to S-3)	
62	Playing devil's advocate regarding counter-hypothesis #2 (S-4)	
63	Example 1c: Additional probes	
64	Summary of Stage S-2	
66	Chapter 2 summary	
67	Practice reflections	

Fig.		Table		Tables and Figures (Illustrations)	
Chapter 2. What is your hypothesis as you listen?					
	2.1	Parameters of acting from S-2			59
	2.2	Changing orientations across adult stages: S-2 to S-5 [1.1]			64

2

What is Your Hypothesis as You Listen?

(Refer previous page for Chapter 2 Contents)

Chapter 1's high-level overview enables us in what follows to begin thinking about the abilities that are central to leading powerful conversations. The most important of these capabilities is *listening*. This chapter presents a first example of developmental listening, using utterances taken from an S-2 individual. We will get a “feel” for how such a person sees the world, and what, as process consultants, we need to pay attention to in order to be of help.

It also presents two “counter-hypotheses,” meaning ‘educated’ guesses as to what is the speaker’s Center of Gravity. In this way, readers will learn to make distinctions between different main stages they might initially have in mind when attending to the speaker.

Developmental Listening

Readers would do best to proceed as if in the utterances presented *every word* counted. Since developmental listening is all about clients’ spontaneous use of verbal language, readers are encouraged to use their own English-speaking abilities to puzzle out what is implied by what is said (and thus not said directly).

The ability to infer from – rather than interpret – *verbal utterances* is a major tool that needs to be mastered in order to become expert in developmental listening.

Listening is an internal process that is not easily mapped and understood, whether we deal with listening to language or to music. It is different from hearing (an acoustic term) in that it is entirely based on *meaning making*. This fact ties it to our own development, thus our own life, since the meaning we make of things we hear is specific to our own adult history and profile.

This chapter is thus not so much an analysis of listening to clients (or other stake-holders) as it is an outline of what can be accomplished by a developmentally schooled professional.

The first thing that is striking about *listening* is that it is an effort to *understand* somebody else. The underlying notion is that what is said to you makes the claim to be true, and that your task is to understand that truth.

In the helping professions, the verbal material brought forward is also meant to be understood in the sense of being analyzed, in some way. There are many ways to analyze interviews, for example, most are concerned with literal content (themes, etc.).

It is here that developmental listening is in a category by itself since it strives to understand the *structure*, not the *content*, of verbal utterances.

After reading this chapter, it will not astonish you that what is meant by structure is really *stage*. So how, during an intervention, do you listen to discern the *stage* from which a client is speaking to you? While listening happens throughout the helping process, in *evidence-based developmental coaching* it happens very emphatically at the very beginning of the helping process.

Provoking people to reveal their Center of Gravity is the core of what is called *developmental interviewing*. Developmental interviewing is carried out with a hypothetical developmental stage “in mind.” Such hypothesis-based interviewing is what we are exercising in this book.

Hypothesis, Probe, Content, Structure, Stage, Context, Levels, Devil's Advocate

Where do you begin to learn developmental listening and interviewing?

The first thing, clearly, is “to know your stages.” This means to know their characteristics, “know them when you hear them,” and, to help that along, *probe* for them.

This is not easy, but it can be learned from examples and illustrations and from observing an expert. Probing is the real core of this enterprise. *Probing* presupposes that you know what information you are missing, and how and what, therefore, you have to ask a client.

If you don't know what information is missing for you in what you hear, you cannot probe.

And to know what is missing, you have to know *what to listen for*.

This means you need a *hypothesis* as to what you are listening to.

Let's start over. Developmental listening by way of probing is not so different from any other discovery procedure.

When you studied biology as a child, you were given certain properties of bugs to look for so that, when you saw them under a microscope, you could formulate a *hypothesis* (a guess) as to what bug it might be.

It's not so different in developmental listening except that there are no visual cues, because the hypotheses you are following are all “just in your mind.”

And the better you become at developmental listening, the better your hypotheses and your probing for the purpose of engaging fully with them will become.

Look at the developmental enterprise this way: You are using yourself as the instrument of your research: your feelings, your mind, your own developmental stage.

In academic jargon, this is called *qualitative* research, since what you are trying to do is to come up with *qualities* of a person, situation, or environment for classification and give a name to.

It's no different here. Developmental interviewing is “research” (coaching research or other). You are doing qualitative research on a single person, for the purpose of finding out

how that person *makes meaning* in her life and work right now, in order to know

how, based on forthcoming information, you might effectively help that person.

To do so, you are wearing developmental glasses, that is, you are adopting a perspective linked to knowing developmental stages and their differences.

With this knowledge, you can formulate hypotheses (make ‘educated’ guesses) as to what it is you are listening to. In short, developmental listening is a (stage) discovery procedure.

Now, the important thing about this discovery procedure is that you need to be able to *probe* for what is missing to test your hypothesis, or confirm its accuracy.

This is the tricky part which entirely depends on your own understanding and expertise.

As if this wasn't difficult enough, in addition you have to cope with the distinction between *content* and *structure*, introduced above.

So, what is that about?

If we equate *structure* with *stage*, then clearly, the distinction of *stage* from *content* is a matter of discerning what *stage* the *content* expresses or manifests.

That means accepting the notion that any *content* can express a particular *stage*, and that there is no one-to-one relationship between content and structure (stage).

Put differently, when somebody speaks of being, and loving to be, a member of a community, it is easy to hypothesize that the person speaking is an “other-dependent” person living at S-3.

However, this can be highly misleading, since somebody at other stages, certainly S-5, could say the same or similar thing. What matters is the **context** in which something is said, and the **emphasis** that is falling on what is highlighted by the speaker. All of this can be mastered in due time with extended practice.

Let's start with some illustrations such as we use in this book (except at the end where we use actual interview texts). Let me explain why illustrations are different from real interviews.

Developmental Illustrations are texts composed to highlight a particular adult stage. They are contrived to make a point. Typically, they fall into a particular range of levels. (I use the term "levels" to indicate that there are "intermediate" stages between "main" stages).

By contrast, in a real-life developmental interview, you are initially without any signposts. You don't know where the speaker is "coming from." The origin of what has been composed by the speaker is unknown to you (nor to the speaker). Although what you hear or read is composed in some way, you initially don't know what the range of levels is that is being expressed. As a consequence, you don't immediately know *what stage to listen for*. There are no visible or audible markers, only inferred ones.

You have to determine a possible range by hypothesis formulation, and within some postulated range have to find out exactly *what levels* are part of the client's *present meaning making range*. In a real interview **context** becomes all-important, and nothing is highlighted for you in advance. You are the sole arbiter in defining a range of levels on which to "score" (evaluate) an interview. How does this become possible?

The main reason why doing this is entirely possible, is that people live at a particular Center of Gravity. Although they live at more than a single level, such as a lower and a higher one, they are typically *not* spread out over 10 levels or so. If they were, they might be considered as mentally ill. For this reason, anybody able to postulate a Center of Gravity below and above which a person may be making meaning of the world typically succeeds in identifying the *range* of levels within which the speaker can be said presently to function developmentally.

Playing "devil's advocate" is an additional requirement of developmental listening. We 'reasoning beings' utilize *satisficing* - which entails that we don't really search for all possible alternatives but instead make an assumption that comes easy to us, and then go with that. Under these circumstances, we lose track of the critical voice in us that says: "Couldn't it rather be stage x?" But that is exactly what we have to learn to ask ourselves, and playing "devil's advocate" enables us to consider those sorts of alternatives.

In a small group, this happens naturally (and groups are therefore the preferred *context* in which to learn developmental scoring). Somebody other than you will question your hypothesis and say: "but I think it's rather Y, and here is why!"

This then leads to a process of justifying one's *hypothesis*, which is best provoked through becoming critical of oneself.

By *internalizing* the critical voices of the group, one starts to learn to make better assumptions and formulate better hypotheses.

Let's now look at some illustrations of *levels*, to get a better grasp of the matter, keeping in mind that these are contrived examples (illustrations) meant to make a point.

Levels

EXAMPLE 1a (adapted from Lahey et al. 1988, 94) [SOI]: **Level S-2**

The client has been speaking about being new in the company, and trying to find her way in the new, unknown environment. She has been speaking of a number of colleagues, particularly of S. with whom she seems to have closely associated herself:

Client: I'm really sad that my colleague lied to me regarding his salary raise.

Now I can never be sure whether he's telling me the truth. Like if you know a person has lied to someone else or to you before, then you know you just can't count on them.

Interviewer: What do you mean by "count on them?"

Client: You need to know who the people are that you can turn to when you need truthful information or help.

Interviewer: Like what kind of help are you thinking of?

Client: Like if you're new to a workplace and working very hard to get to know the cultural climate, and you don't know whether it would make any difference whether you work hard or not, you need to know who you can ask to give you the right answer.

You need to know whether the person you are asking will tell you the truth.

Disregarding, for the moment, the procedure of the interviewer:

What is this client saying that could be of interest in determining the *range* of adult levels *within which* she *makes meaning* of her social environment, – not to mention ethical issues like standards of work excellence, and notions of truth she is holding?

Apparently, the client is not too sure a footing in her new environment.

She is *dependent on other people* for knowing how to behave properly, how much effort to invest, etc. She is concerned about something she calls "truth," which seems to be either black or white ("*the truth*").

Moreover, this "truth" is identical with what is *perceived* by her as being helpful to herself, and is thus of very limited generality.

Her notion seems to be that you either lie or you don't, and that "truth" is an absolute.

In this context, "counting on" is still another absolute indicating *absolute dependency on somebody* for survival.

Anyone who has lied to you or somebody else is therefore by definition a "liar," period.

So far, our comments have been strictly content oriented.

So, how can we shed some light on the stage this client is *presently* speaking from?

To illuminate the underlying structure, we could rewrite this illustration with totally different content, nevertheless retaining the structure.

This would show that *content is not really what matters*, and would show ourselves that we should begin to see content for just what it is: content.

For instance, we could substitute the following content (in example 1b below) for the one above without moving away from the focus of the illustration.

EXAMPLE 1b (adapted from Lahey et al. 1988, 94) [SOI]: **Level S-2**

Client: I'm truly sad that my friend lied to me about why he has avoided me in recent days. Now I can never be sure whether he's telling me the truth. Because if you know a person has lied to someone else or to you before, then you know you just can't count on them.

Interviewer: What do you mean by "count on them?"

Client: You need to know who the people are that you can turn to when you need truthful information or help.

Interviewer: Like what kind of help are you thinking of?

Client: Like if you're doing your best to be liked by others by being on your best behavior, and you don't know whether your efforts make any difference at all in how they view you, then it is helpful to be able to ask them about the truth, so you henceforth know what not to do or to avoid.

You need to know whether that person will tell you the truth about yourself.

While the content details above are somewhat different, they concern human relationships, as previously, and the perceived requirement to be able to count on somebody to tell the truth so as to arrange one's behavior accordingly. Clearly, the need to be able to count on somebody is a fundamental issue in both illustrations. In both S-2 examples we perceive:

- The same focus on one's own needs and desires and their instantaneous gratification.
- The same fixation on one's own perspective, with the inability to take another person's perspective, especially on oneself
- The same indifference to what others think, feel, and experience.
- The same inability to be influenced, in one's own thinking and feeling, by others thinking and behavior.
- The same rigid understanding of "truth" (restricted to "my needs").
- The same ignorance about the self's position in the social world, and therefore the same cloying behavior.
- The same need to be able to use others as a resource in the case of a crisis.

Somewhere in this sameness lies the *structure* of the speaker's present meaning making process. Let's spell out this structure in positive terms for S-2:

1. I am defined by my needs and desires (as far as I know them).
2. I am ignorant of what others think and feel; as far as I am concerned, they are living in a different world ("two-world hypothesis").
3. I have no intention or capacity to penetrate others' world.
4. I therefore am dependent on others' absolute truthfulness which alone can save me in moments of crisis.
5. I need to be able to use others as instruments of my need gratification, either by exerting absolute control, or by adapting myself to what I perceive to be their motivation to help me out (preferably the former).

How does that fit with the entries for S-2 in Table 2-1? (See excerpt on next page)

Orientation	S-2
1. <i>View of Others</i>	Instruments of own need gratification
2. <i>Level of Self Insight</i>	Low
3. <i>Values</i>	Law of Jungle
4. <i>Needs</i>	Overriding all others' needs
5. <i>Need to Control</i>	Very High
6. <i>Communication</i>	Unilateral
7. <i>Organizational Orientation</i>	Careerist

Table 2.1: Parameters of acting from S-2

Acting from S-2

Many, if not all, orientations listed above appear in the two illustrations (Examples 1a and 1b). Why and how?

Extrapolating from the two examples, it seems that the values manifested therein signal a view of society where everyone is on his or her own, and the stronger will eat the weaker. In this kind of society, the Law of the Jungle reigns supreme.

In this terrifying situation, people's only recourse is to strive for *absolute control*. There is no other safety, since nobody tells the truth, and nobody can be counted on. In this case, communications will be unilateral, in the sense of "you are either for me or against me." There will be crusades, designated enemies, fear-based campaigns and wars, since the only thing that unites people is their common fear, risk, or crisis.

In an organizational context, once somebody has enough power to dispense with the craving for others' truthfulness, s(he) can dictate the truth, and decide the Law of the Jungle in his or her own favor.

We are talking here about a developmental stage that society is rightfully apprehensive of, for the reason that there exists no notion of a civilized society in which conventions are in force. A community of interests, solidified by commonalities and implicit agreements between people does not seem to be in place. Communication is dictatorial (unilateral) and replaces consensus. These then, are the characteristics of S-2.

Looking now at the principal features of this stage, we find that people at S-2:

1. Can separate themselves from their perception, making a distinction between what something seems and what it is (this is the advance over S-1)
2. Have the ultimate concern of whether they will lose in others a source of help for themselves in a situation of danger or crisis
3. Take their own self-interest as a guide in the complex and dangerous social world regulated by laws of the jungle
4. Have no clue, either of their own self or that of others, and lack a theory of mind
5. Live in a split universe where everybody is separate from the other's knowing
6. Cannot see in others anything beyond the importance of their actions and their actions' consequences for their own life's security and well-being
7. Use others as instruments of their own survival.

If you think, as Thomas Hobbes did in the 17th century, that this scenario describes the origins of human society, you may be on the right track. We can think of society as a set of conventions made to escape from the laws of the jungle that, at S-2, reign supreme. Clearly, the speaker in the last two illustrations is not entirely part of civil society, or at least not yet.

Let's briefly summarize S-2:

- **Distribution:** About 10% of adults.
- **Advance over Stage 1:** A distinction can be made between what something seems and what it is. This requires the ability to separate oneself from one's perception (stage 1), of taking one's perceptions as object (S-2).
- **Essence of this stage:** As a self who is subject to my needs, wishes, and interests, I relate to another person in terms of possible consequences for my world view. I "know" you in terms of how helpful you can be to me, and am thus unable to consider your independent view as I am taking into account my own.
- **Instrumentalism:** The ultimate concern is with whether I will lose you as a source of support or help for myself. My own interest constitutes the ground from which I attend to your perspective.
- **Pervasive limitation:** A "split universe," where each individual's knowing is separate from that of others.

Movement toward Stage 3 (S-3)

Except for the 10% of the population which typically remain at Stage S-2, most people move beyond, thereby becoming more socialized and at ease with convention, at least on the surface. We can infer from the characteristics of S-2 what this move requires.

Here are some highlights:

- A person must be able to distance him/herself from being embedded in his/her own needs and interests.
- A person must begin to take a second perspective on things, that of others who are different from him/herself.
- Increasingly, the person must *internalize* other people's perspective, by "bringing them inside" (Lahey et al, 1988). [SOI]
- A person must begin to be influenced by that second perspective in his/her thoughts and feelings.
- A person must begin to act in recognition of others' needs and desires, acknowledging that others are taking their own peculiar perspective on other people, including the person him/herself. (We can call this a *theory of other minds*.)

Levels revisited

Let us pause and look back. In this chapter, we introduced the notion of listening based on the formulation of a *hypothesis* about a speaker's developmental stage. We referred to *stage* as *structure*, and explained in some detail the mental processes of *probing* for *structure*.

Below, let's return to this topic, by having another look at Example 1.

EXAMPLE 1a (adapted from Lahey et al. 1988, 94) [SOI] **Levels revisited**

The client has been speaking of being new in the company, and trying to find the way in the new, unknown environment. She has been speaking of a number of colleagues, particularly of S. with whom she seems to have closely associated herself:

Client: I'm really sad that my colleague lied to me regarding his salary raise. Now I can never be sure whether he's telling me the truth. Like if you know a person has lied to someone else or to you before, then you know you just can't count on them.

Interviewer: What do you mean by "count on them?"

Client: You need to know who the people are that you can turn to when you need truthful information or help.

Interviewer: Like what kind of help are you thinking of?

Client: Like if you're new to a workplace and working very hard to get to know the cultural climate, and you don't know whether it would make any difference in the company whether you work hard or not, you need to know who you can ask to give you the right answer.

You need to know whether the person you are asking will tell you the truth.

Counter-Hypotheses - rereading Example 1a

A listener might be tempted to formulate two different hypotheses

1. The client seems to be very dependent on her colleague for orienting herself in the new company environment. This dependency sounds to me as if the client is defining herself by the colleagues' expectations as to how effort is rewarded in the company.
The client seems to identify with her colleague, and indirectly with the work community as a whole. It is for this reason that the client is so dependent on being told the truth.
Therefore, I hypothesize that the client's stage is presently at or close to **S-3**, that is, she defines herself by others' expectations.
2. The client is speaking as if truth was highly important to her, defining her own integrity. Not being told the truth is so upsetting to the client because she thinks she cannot live and thrive in a climate in which truth is lacking.
Therefore, I hypothesize that the client's Center of Gravity is presently located around **S-4**, that is, she defines herself by her own strongly held values and moral integrity.

Playing Devil's Advocate regarding Counter-Hypothesis #1 (at or close to S-3)

Regarding our initial notion that the client speaking is presently at S-2:

(You can imagine this being done in a group discussion where members of the group collaboratively evaluate, or "score," a developmental interview).

While it is true that the speaker (client) seems to be very dependent on her colleague, and to a great extent identifies with him, we have to consider the kind of dependency that is being articulated by the speaker. We also have to take into account the kind of relationship the client entertains with her colleague.

As to the dependency expressed, it really centers on the client's need and desire to be safe, and to be helped out in situations of crisis. This dependency is not based on any kind of identification with the colleague as a person or as a representative of a larger group.

There is no evidence that the client has a way of even establishing dependency in the sense of S-3. She presently cannot take a perspective other than her own, and thus cannot be influenced in her thoughts and feelings either by her colleague as a person, or as a representative of the larger community.

Playing Devil's Advocate regarding Counter-Hypothesis #2 (S-4)

What about the second hypothesis that the client is speaking as a *self-authorer*, entirely acting from her own principles and values?

While it is correct that the client conveys an ardent desire for hearing the truth, what she calls truth is the expression of a personal (and possibly erroneous) view of how to operate within a workforce community. "Truth," as the term is here used, is also external to, or excludes, the colleague that is being addressed, since it is one-sidedly a matter of the speaker's own interest (for whom the colleague is an instrument).

There are no indications that the client has enough self insight to know whether speaking the truth is at the center of her own integrity, nor does the client seem to be able to formulate even an elementary theory of her own self (of what she stands for), except for her need to be helped in situations of risk or uncertainty. Therefore, the hypothesis that the client is speaking from S-4 is not persuasive. It is, in fact, contradicted by most of what is expressed by the speaker's discourse.

The above discussion of two counter-hypotheses is a good example of the internal process that occurs in a developmentally schooled listener. The listener is making inferences from what is heard, and is matching these inferences to his or her knowledge of what individual stages imply. The listener clearly separates content from structure, and is thinking exclusively in terms of structure (in this case - main stages).

As far as the listener is concerned, the client could be talking just about anything. By putting the content of what is said "into brackets", the listener focuses on how meaning is made by the speaker. This, in a nutshell, is what developmental listening is all about.

Having settled the counter-claims regarding our S-2 hypothesis, let's now return to the question of how to *probe* for the sake of formulating a correct hypothesis.

We have said that a lot of information is often missing when we listen for structure in clients' verbal material. As a consequence, we have to ascertain what exactly it is we do not understand about a client's meaning making relative to our stage hypothesis regarding the client.

Focusing the client's attention on what s(he) is saying, we'll want to compare what we hear with our initially formulated stage hypothesis.

For instance, if our hypothesis is that the client is speaking from an S-2 vantage point, we are discounting that there may be true S-3 dependency or S-4 integrity at play.

We could formulate the following *additional probes*, to be sure we follow a correct hypothesis in our listening.

EXAMPLE 1c (adapted from Lahey et al. 1988, 94) [SOI] **Additional probes**

Client: I'm really sad that my colleague lied to me regarding his salary raise.

Now I can never be sure whether he's telling me the truth. Like if you know a person has lied to someone else or to you before, then you know you just can't count on them.

Interviewer: What do you mean by "count on them?"

Client: You need to know who the people are that you can turn to when you need truthful information or help.

Interviewer: What is so vital for you in being able to turn to others for help when you are uncertain of how to proceed?

Client: Well, since I don't really know the culture of the company as of yet, and I want to invest just enough effort in my work but no more than I need to have as much free time as possible for my own pursuits, I really have to know how to proceed in this situation. So, I need his help.

Interviewer: Why do you think that your colleague knows more about that than you do?

Client: Well, he has been with the company much longer than I!

Interviewer: Have you asked your colleague how he feels about the degree of effort needed to succeed in this company?

Client: No. I didn't see a need for that.

Interviewer: Tell me a little more about why not working more than you absolutely have to is so important to you.

Client: Well, I am in this job really for my own sake, I don't really care what the company gets out of it as long as my own needs are satisfied. I have long been seeking a place to work where I could develop my own interests and buy things that I need for my recreational goals.

I have chosen the company for exactly that reason, and that is why I have to rely on being told the truth about the company.

You will have observed that the interviewer's questions always stay very close to the client's stream of consciousness. For instance, the interviewer is not asking questions out of the blue, questions that have nothing to do with what the client is presently focusing on. That is, the *interviewer supports the client's focus of attention*.

The interviewer is also not asking extraneous "Why?" questions (just out of curiosity), because doing so would most likely derail the client's present train of thought. (Clearly, the client could make up any number of answers to "Why?" questions that have nothing whatsoever to do with his or her own present mental process.)

This procedure, of *staying where the client is*, is one of the central tenets of developmental interviewing. In this way, developmental interviewing is very different from conventional (content-based) interviewing.

As we have said, it is focused on structure, not on content.

Let's conclude by highlighting some salient features of **developmental interviewing**:

- Developmental interviewing is *qualitative research* for the sake of determining the client's present mode of meaning making.
- Developmental interviewing is based on formulating *stage hypotheses*, and on *probing* for their verity in order to locate missing information about the *stage structure* of the client's discourse.

- Developmental interviewing is based on a conceptual framework that requires of the interviewer/listener to refrain from haphazard and gratuitous questioning of clients. Consequently, this kind of interviewing introduces a highly focused and structured consultant-client discourse where every question asked by the interviewer is rooted in probing for the sake of confirming or rejecting a developmental hypothesis.
- Developmental interviewing is about focusing the client's attention on his or her own internal mental process, in order to go beyond mere content to the roots of how this content is constructed by the client through language.
- Logistically, developmental interviewing precedes the intervention proper, whether it be coaching or some other intervention.
- Even beyond the purposes of the initial developmental interview, developmental thinking and listening pervade the process of:
 - *Giving feedback to clients,*
 - Formulating coaching plans,
 - Leading coaching conversations (as is shown throughout the book).

Orientation	S- 2 Instrumental	S-3 Other-dependent	S-4 Self-authoring	S-5 Self-aware
1. View of Others	Instruments of own need gratification	Needed to contribute to own self image	Collaborator, delegate, peer	Contributors to own integrity and balance
2. Level of Self-Insight	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
3. Values	Law of Jungle	Community	Self-determined	Humanity
4. Needs	Overriding all others' needs	Subordinate to community, work group	Flowing from striving for integrity	Viewed in connection with own obligations and limitations
5. Need to Control	Very High	Moderate	Low	Very low
6. Communication	Unilateral	Exchange 1:1	Dialogue	True Communication
7. Organizational Orientation	Careerist	Good Citizen	Manager	System's Leader

Table 2.2 [1.1]: Changing Orientations across Adult Stages S-2 to S-5

SUMMARY OF STAGE 2 (text by Steve Stewart)

S-2 is an "I" stage, characteristic of late teenage and early adulthood, although in our own culture, private sector profit concerns often drive many adults to revert to this stage, at least in their "world of work."

Persons on this stage are highly, if not totally, steeped in their own wants or needs. They are impulsive, seek immediate gratification for those needs and wants, pay little attention to what others say about them, but will vehemently deny feedback that is not concordant with their own rigid self-perception.

Above all else, they are interested in preserving the image they have established for themselves, regardless of how inaccurate it might be. When challenged, they can be very emotionally explosive and abusive to the feedback's source(s).

S(he) readily understands others' perspectives (or thinks s/he does), not out of empathy, but for the sake of knowing how to manipulate them to satisfy their own needs and ends.

They will follow socially established (Stage 3) community rules and conventions when beneficial to them, or as long as they believe they will not be caught or punished. (Keep in mind that they are at S-2). Thus, cheating, lying, deception, and falsification will be used, as necessary, to achieve self-set goals.

They can work effectively and productively, if working alone and if their objectives happen to be aligned with those of the organization.

In a leader role, they will tend to micro-manage, exploit others, create ill will and mistrust, and misunderstandings will abound within the team or work group. Unbridled "careerism" typifies this stage, for those individuals who manage to work their way into positions where they are given any degree of social authority.

Chapter 2 SUMMARY

In Chapter 2, I have introduced the reader to developmental listening and interviewing as discovery procedures for the sake of conducting an intervention.

It is probably clear to the reader that these procedures are the basis of process consultation.

I have shown why, and to some slight extent how, these procedures are used.

I have also introduced two examples of meaning making at S-2,

and have justified that and why they are indicative of S-2, rather than of S-3 or S-4.

Here is a short summary of what the reader has potentially learned in this chapter:

1. Developmental stages are expressed by people through their use of natural language.
2. Since people are subject to their present *Center of Gravity* (stage), and are moreover, centrally focused on contents of one kind or another, they are not aware of the fact that they are expressing their level of meaning making along with the content they focus on.
3. In order to substantiate a developmental hypothesis, the interviewer has to stay close to clients' train of thought as the medium in which structurally relevant information (stage) is being revealed.
4. Developmental interviewing is a discovery procedure that requires the ability to play devil's advocate regarding one's own hypotheses (an ability that is best learned as member of a group).
5. Developmental interviewing is a learnable art that is based on, first, formulating developmental hypotheses, and second, probing for missing information needed to confirm or reject them.
6. Developmental listening is the crux of developmental interviewing; it is the art of testing hypotheses regarding the other party's present developmental level.
7. Developmental listening is based on a strict distinction between content and structure, where 'content' is anything that can be substituted for by another, similar content.
8. Developmental listening is qualitative research in which the interviewer uses him- or herself as an instrument for understanding how the other party makes meaning of self and world.
9. Developmental listening, probing, and interviewing introduce into process consultation - with adults - a highly focused mode of conversation that eschews all haphazard questioning and commenting.
10. When developmental listening and probing is continued into interventions such as mediation, performance review, giving feedback, formulating coaching plans, and designing powerful conversations, clients are given the opportunity to reflect deeply on their own, hidden assumptions.

Chapter 2 PRACTICE REFLECTIONS

1. Considering the content of this chapter, what have you learned – directly or by extension - about one or more of the following topics:
 - Coaching
 - Mentoring
 - Mediation
 - Facilitation
 - Social work interviewing
 - Psychological interviewing
 - Hiring
 - Performance review
 - Performance management
 - Succession planning
 - Formulating ‘development’ programs
 - Career counseling
 - HR resources management?
2. How will you have to revise your theory of helping
- given what you now know about adult levels of development?
3. How do you think you can refine your active listening to clients
- given what you begun to learn about developmental listening?
4. What do you think are the difficulties in learning developmental interviewing?
5. In what way is developmental hypothesis testing different
from the kind of questions you are used to asking yourself about your clients?
6. How do you presently formulate hypotheses as to who your client is developmentally?
7. What does it tell you about yourself as a helper,
to realize that the client him- or herself can never be known directly,
but only with the aid of a model that you – unconsciously or consciously –
formulate in your mind?

Appendix A contains Exercises to aid your understanding.
