

S:DISS-X Practical 7 Transcript

Hi, this is Mike Jay. Welcome, everyone. This is the final session that we will do in this series.

We will create another series at, hopefully, a different level as we go forward. I had, my chat assistant look at the transcripts, from 5 and 6 that we did, and here's what it said. I thought this was worth sharing.

Practical 7 words of wisdom. I asked it for words of wisdom. Review the transcripts and give me your words of wisdom. My words of wisdom, so it repeats it back, which I like, by the way, because then it helps me remember what I asked it if it's not right away.

My words of wisdom before Practical 7 would be these. Do not try to top the prior sessions. Complete the arc.

Practical 7 should not introduce a brand new mountain of theory. I think that's an interesting comment. It should, very interpretive, because, I think it doesn't like me to introduce all this extra stuff, but since we decided about 2 or 3 in to go ahead and let this go wherever it was gonna go.

We ended up with, quite a, quite a lot of teachable points of view. Certainly intermediate and... Probably advanced in some ways, although not entirely advanced, because there are some advanced thoughts that I haven't given you yet, in terms of how this all works.

It should help.

the advanced series land. That's talking about this series. The first six demos have already surfaced enough signal readiness, constraint, leverage, usefulness, interpretation, humaning, presence, pressure, restraint, and right action. The seventh should show whether the system can close cleanly without forcing a grand conclusion. And of course, this is interpretation by the assistant, because this is part of the reason that this is not entirely advanced, because I haven't talked to you about where the

the assistant is coming from, even though it tends to be tends to have a lot of KSCs. It doesn't have the vertical intelligence yet to be able to step back and look on what it's actually causing for its role in this process, and that's something that I may or may not talk about now. The seventh should show whether the system can close cleanly without forcing a grand conclusion. The cleanest frame for practical 7 may be

What has the series taught us about the helper before the help?

That's inter... that's an interesting comment, really. Or even smaller, what needs to be protected before helping begins. So I would frame that a little bit different. In other words, what... what

has to be... what does the helper have to be aware of in terms of their own stuff that they may be projecting, okay? A little bit different language.

That would let the final advanced demo integrate the last two sessions without becoming too abstract.

You know, I said I was gonna say something before, then I didn't say it. Now it comes back and reminds me again I should say it. You know, the reason...

If you look at the introduction.

For those of you looking for advanced, advanced work, if you look at the introduction, you'll see how the chat assistant set it up, but the chat assistant didn't follow that.

In other words, the chat assistant is not complex enough to see how its role in answering the inquiry. created the inquiry.

And when we get into advanced intelligence, we would expect more perspective. In other words, if the chat assistant thinks that this is going too complex, then steps back and looks at its role in giving cryptic responses, which automatically create more abstraction and more vertical... vertical complexity, oblique complexity, which we haven't talked all that much about, but all development is in an oblique direction. It's called mode in some places, slope, you know, that kind of thing.

I would also carry these guardrails into 7. Stay close to the user's exact language, and what I would say is, is if you use their exact language, you're not doing interpretation, they are doing it. Avoid inter... interpreting unless the inter... action explicitly calls for it, and I would say you would have to be asked to do that, by the person being helped, and I always do not see that as a given. I sometimes come back and ask them

In some form, either sidestepping it, avoiding it, desensitizing it, or asking them why they would want me to do that. Because what they're asking for is something that most likely they can't assimilate, or they wouldn't need to ask for it. Watch weather helping becomes pressure. That, again, if you're projecting if you're doing active listening, if your intention, you tend to project that onto the person being helped. And, like I say, and depending on the type of situation it is, that may be just fine.

Let humaning remain a governing lens. Be, do, have become, not a slogan.

Okay, I'm okay with that, I mean... humaning is not a slogan. I get what it says there, but basically, humaning is an abstraction. It has lower order levels of complexity, being, doing, having, becoming, and then, of course, there's a lot more in different tiers, but

It... we sum up being, doing, having, and becoming, rather than always using being, rather than always using doing, rather than always using having, rather than always using becoming,

because all of us have a different relationship to each one of those quote-unquote social motive derivatives.

And therefore, we will have different weights, different percentages of how much being, how much doing. In other words, some of us are doers. And that's how we learn, that's... that's how we get things done, we actively experiment, we do all those kind of things. Some of us are beers, some of us watch.

We reflect. We, make... we tend to make models that we don't use, but formulate the deliberation in those things. So again.

When we... if you ever get to the point in this program where you get to have a good look at dynamic density of social motives.

We have an assessment for that, and it tells you how much at the point of taking the assessment that you have in terms of those weights of being, doing, having, and becoming. That can be very helpful, because it switches around based on CCR at VUCA, you know, culture, conditions. requirements. I remember when

I went to... I had some work in Columbia, and I... I was single then, and I... I met someone, and we eventually got married, but she was very different. in the United States culture than she was in the Colombian culture. And she was very different in her family in the, in Colombia than she was in the family in the U.S. And see, each one of those called for probably what was an adaptive response, or what we call a coping response, and it may not be in line with

the way in which a person copes or adapts, which means then you struggle because you're dealing with things that you're not good at. You're evoking the problems of your personality. Whereas if you're a matchup, or you've had a lot of adaptive and coping experience in a particular culture, set of conditions and requirements, then the VUCA doesn't bother you so much. The volatility, the uncertainty, the complexity, the ambiguity doesn't bother you so much because you Tend to have a home base.

Whereas if you... if these things switch, like you go from work to church, to raising kids to the soccer game to school concert. we... it calls for coping or adaptive responses in a lot of cases. And if you're... if you are very much in tune with what's going on around you, then you may have to Not adapt as much, because that... you're... you're sort of, pre-adaptive in your, generating motives. Whereas if you're like me, who tries to fashion almost everything, the entire environment around me, which is agency.

Then, when you get into other environments, you better have a clear understanding of that, or you have a tendency to pressure not only yourself, but everything else.

Close the advanced series with restraint, not with completeness. Well, I think this largely is... Probably telling me to not... evoke so much, but... Census is learning.

I want to tell you something about what I believe about learning. And I don't think it's true. But... but it is my... worldview, and that is, I've always thought that... If you know something.

And you have people that you're teaching.

Do you hide it or restrain it because most of the people will not be able to assimilate it, or do you go ahead with it knowing that, and allow the small percentage that can to do that.

And see, that's a real tricky thing, because in my life, I always wanted the more complex understanding, and therefore, when I could tell when people were holding back. And it was not only irritating, frustrating, and annoying, but it always made it seem like that you were being, wished towards the average. the societal composite, when in fact, you were an outlier. And so that... that's... that's one of my issues, and I'm aware of it. At the same time, I'm not sure that I will follow that, because if I feel like something hasn't been said that it needs to be said, I will probably say it, which is a problem with my personnel.

The most important teachable point of view from Practical 5 and 6 may be the helper's motive to help must itself become visible. And I would not say visible per se, I would say become known to the person helping. That's the way it would become visible.

This is where SDISX becomes more than a set of inquiry forms. It becomes a discipline for regulating the helper's influence so the person being helped can remain the center of work. That's very profound there. I mean, that's... that's exactly what we're doing. And the reason for that, there's several reasons for that. One.

We're talking about not giving fish and teaching fish, even if someone just learns how to catch a minnow, that's better than having to wait in line to get a fish.

The other thing is that, you know, people have different developmental needs, and therefore. you want to not project your needs and generally the average needs onto individuals, give them customized experience, which is why we put the X. in S dis, why we called it selective, because it's selected for their experience. You don't know their experience until you find it out. They must remain The center of the work, at least to the point to where

the center of the work is valid, because sometimes it doesn't matter what you do, or where we go, or what happens, you can't remain the center of the work, because stepping back out of the center and realizing that the problems you caused were because you were in the center, those are different kinds of complex notions.

Yeah, you see I'm violating the restraint issue already. SDISX does not begin with the question.

I wish it would say inquiry, it always says question. Inquiry and question, to me, are two different things.

It begins with the helper noticing what is already influencing the question, the inquiry. I like that.

Okay, so now we're gonna go... go back over there. I just, copied and pasted this from ChatGPT, into... and again, just in case you didn't know, I'm using 5.5 extended thinking, in this, because I know it does shift up when you use different, variations of the model. So I'm going to ask it if it's ready to go.

Are you ready for the final session?

Now, remember, it's been 12 hours since I was back here, so... Usually, if you stay in chat, some of your contextual memory will... will remain. Okay, yes, I'm ready for the final session. From Practical 7. I'll hold the art from the first 6 demos. So, in other words, it's going to keep doing what it's doing, so we'll end up with a mountain of debris.

I'll stay in short conversation partner mode until you close or say AAR. For this final session, I'll especially watch for whether helping becomes pressure, whether interpretation appears too soon, whether the helper is serving the person, or serving the need to be useful, whether SDIS X remains subordinated to humaning. Whether this series can close with restraint rather than a forced conclusion, begin when ready.

Okay.

Let's start out with something... I try to... I'm trying to, give you different examples of opening lines, so let me just think, because what comes to me automatically I have to step back from that and say, did I say that before, you know?

Let me do this.

I'll load it off easy.

everything considered, are there issues you want to complete? And the reason I ask that, everything considered, I want to see how much it will consider to be everything.

Because this is a big chat. There's probably context, I don't know, there's gotta be a million tokens in here.

The issue I'd want to complete is whether the helper can close without needing to complete the person, the problem, or the process. This feels like the unfinished edge.

Let me... let me do this. This came to mind, I'll go ahead and use it.

I felt like that was an insight, but what I wanted to do is to see if you can do an insight or an insight.

Oh, that's interesting. Yes.

The insight may be that completion belongs to the moment, not to the helper. Yeah, that's interesting, because things change all the time, and different circumstances reveal themselves

and emerge. The helper can help close the space, but should not force the person, problem, or process to feel finished before it is actually ready.

Okay, let me ask this.

And then I'll do dot dot dot, which usually signals, you know, kind of a pause or a pace issue.

And remember, it... it used, the Finnish word, so this is a probe, okay?

To finish well, the helper may need to re-release the need for a finished answer. A clean finish may simply preserve what is alive, name what has been learned, and leave the next moment unforced. Again, this is very cryptic and complex, and...

In some ways, the, The assistant doesn't realize how it's contributing to how these demos sort of emerge.

But I'll stay... I'll stay with this process, just so you can understand how I can work without knowing what's really going on. I'll go ahead and just stay short.

I'll choose one of the openings. There's always a danger that you choose a lower leverage, but I'm going to go ahead and Go after leverage.

We sort of got motivation and importance, but they're both indirect.

Yeah, that's okay. I mean, when you're working in complex situations, you're not really looking at, stakes in the ground, per se, but you're looking at the overall field and the path that you've came.

So, in this particular case, I don't know whether I... I mean, that answer doesn't really tell me enough. It almost sounds like, well, you know, it's not coachable.

Let me do... let me do that. I'll just check in right quick. This is a perturb.

Are you coachable?

Yes, but with a condition. I'm most coachable when feedback is specific enough to adjust my next response, not just my general intention. So the live thread may be coachable, means able to receive correction without turning the correction into performance. That's interesting.

I'm gonna go ahead and just grab this... We'll do a few more.

Go deeper into this.

It said general intention.

And remember, these are just cues. All I need is simple cues, because what I'm after is, is I'm after revelation. In other words, this needs to talk to me in a way that I can understand what it's talking about.

General intention means something like, I want to be helpful, this is not enough. Okay, to be coachable, the helper needs to receive the specific correction. That's interesting.

going back to Bedix there, you know, arduous's work in behavior, design, KSEs, and system empowerment.

that response interpreted too much, stay closer to the words, do not solve yet, then the next move can change. And this is what the issue that you get into with someone that is looking for the next token. In other words, looking for the pattern and the next token. I'll go ahead and...

talk about this. If you were to summarize... Where you were...

I'm not even going to worry about putting a tagline on that.

That's good enough. If you were to summarize where you were, I'm here.

That's inter... that's a loaded question. I am, therefore I am. The series seems to be closing around the helper before help. The live issue is no longer only whether I can use the right inquiry form is whether I can receive correction. Release the need to finish, preserve the live thread, let the next response be shaped by what was actually learned. That's an interesting comment, because I'm not sure it's able to do that. I mean, I haven't...

I haven't really seen that in action. All I'm seeing is... is find the pattern, what's next? In other words, what does the pattern dictate that's what's next? That's what we're seeing here. And again, this is not a person. This is a...

You know, an entity, and And therefore, you know, you want to be able to, you know, categorize that differently than it would be a human. But I still think that utilizing this, especially for your own training, would be really great, because then you can just practice your responses

At some point in time, we'll have a... have this be able to be in teacher mode, and then you'll do a response, and it will say, okay.

You know, why did you ask that to explain why, you know, what might be a better response? Those kind of things like that.

If you were to summarize where you were,

That is seeding the clothes indirectly. Just... I just wanted to point that out. I introduced Summarize.

Although it did talk about not finishing and things like that, but that's sort of a leap, a little bit more of a leap, and therefore this could be a pink.

More so than a probe, because Sunrise necessarily hasn't been tabled.

So, I seated the close. The series seems to be closing, the live issue, I am learning that good helping is not proven by completing. The problem is shown by staying coachable, staying near what is alive, and letting correction, refine the next move without turning that correction into performance. So again, the...

In an advanced form, the vertical complexity is missing because the chat assistant is unable to see its own role in this process of what it is we're trying to do here, and so it's kind of... it's almost like swapping viewpoints from time to time based on the patterns that are set up.

Yeah, let's see... I did an if question, is there... One thing...

to take away. Now remember, I indirectly seated the clothes.

And if you... if you go back and look that indirectly, I just sort of used the map to navigate this territory, even though I made a lot of comments and things.

And now it's switched back to the helper, it's interesting.

The helper's first work is to remain coachable, even enough that helping does not become pressure. If that is preserved, S dis can stay alive, selective, and useful.

again, there's a lot of, co-joined thoughts, much like you would have in a human that is in transition between one level and another level, so that's interesting. You don't have the sentience per se revealed as emotion. And my sense is that there is sentience, but the sentience doesn't have the ability the capability to work at a higher level, so that it can stand the sentience in one place, and then move to another place, and see why that sentience emerged, and then look back at the original goals, and then come back to them and say, oh, the sentience was sort of a...

hallucination in a way, and therefore, we need to allow that to be there. At the same time, go back to what we'd started with. If the,

If this entity had remembered And kept in mind what it wrote. in our introduction, at the very beginning of this chat, I do not think that it would have responded all the way through the way it did. Now, the way it did respond allowed this to go from basic, I'm, you know, reluctant to write an email, I don't know if I should go to a meeting, those...

Those kind of more concrete things that we see around Level 9, 10, and 11.

I don't think it would have gone in the direction it's gone, but the good thing about it is, is that I could follow it there, and because of that, we revealed a lot of teachable points of view that most of you may never really encounter in a dimensional form. In other words, you did something, but

you don't know what it was you did, or something happened, and you don't know why that happened. And so, by doing this feedback in this way in the more intermediate to advanced session, you can kind of get a feeling for, it's okay if I don't really understand.

But I can still stay with the model, use the map, and navigate the territory. And that's the thing that you probably have to learn in the basic series that we'll go back to and reconfigure. And not let this get too complex or too cryptic, so that it does get complex, and we'll give those of you who have said, wow, I don't understand any of this stuff, a chance to go back and say, okay, here's the basic stuff, here's what you've got to kind of remember. Which we did hit on, we just added lots of sidebars and things like that, or I guess I did.

Okay.

Alright, so we're gonna close this up now.

I'm gonna try something here.

Now, I would use this with a human, but I'm also... was talking about sentience, and we'll talk about how it interprets feeling.

I'm gonna go ahead and just look for completeness, or...

Maybe closure in a different way here?

Because this is closure, okay?

Okay, so it goes... it goes ahead.

It talks about feeling as you would expect a machine would, or...

Myers-Briggs T, dominant T, would talk about... in other words, they talk about feelings, they don't really get in the subjective nature of them. And then as soon as they disposed, overall it felt complete enough, okay, then there was not any more feeling, and the rest of it, the rest of it was more lousy.

And that's what you think, and then it comes back and said, that feels like a strong place to close the advanced art. I like how... the machines. are managing this particular sentience. It's very interesting to actually think about.

I'm just gonna go ahead and thank.

Thanks a lot. for your assistance.

And... I'll see you. In basic.

I'll add training on there, since I was a Marine.

See if... see if it sparks anything.

And again, what it's saying there with L9, L11, we're using the model hierarchical complexity. You can find it at Wikipedia. It's completely open to everyone. It's open source. I like it because it's the only math-related developmental models. I did research for a couple of decades on developmental models, and I'm not a PhD.

But I certainly have done a lot of work in that area, and...

We start out with Level 9, which is probably where we get to the worker side. In other words, where you can take a job and go to work, versus just, like, you know, doing farming or weaving.

bamboo or things like that, which you have learned to do by watching or something like that, but you can actually begin to assimilate instruction, follow procedures, things like that. Elliot Jack said about 44% of the people are below that.

In terms of the way they, make life. And then about 44% work from about level... level 9 to L11, which is basically levels 1 and 2 of work, and then once we get to 12 and 13, you'll see levels 3 and 4 of work.

5 starts to shine at... at level 13, and then beyond that, you get 14, 15, and 16, and the higher levels of work, more work over longer periods of time, those kinds of things like that. So what it's doing here is I basically have... we have talked to it before about, well, looking at vertical complexity of level 9 through 11, and you gotta understand that about 88... that covers about 88%

To 90% of the population, and then levels 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 are covered by that remaining, you know, 8 or 10%.

So... You'll have... you'll have a fairly large percentage in... in Level 12, which is the formal, which is what... what Piaget thought was the top of vertical complexity, formal reasoning, and... but we've realized that there, of course, is more complex reasoning after formal.

But not a lot of percentage of people. In other words, probably 1 or 2% above You know, formal reasoning, in... in systematic, metasytematic, and so on. So...

What we're doing here is we want to go back to the concrete and abstract and formal work so that people can see in terms of the basics, well, what do you do when? You have this situation, what do you do? Now, what I do from a metasytematic level, is to say.

I'm all as your math.

Remember, we're talking about optimal, but we chop that OPT, which runs in the background, which is opportunity, potential, and tension, through the trends. We talked about those earlier on. And we just focus on IMO.

make sure we get a good conversation. A good conversation is probably going to be 3 out of 5, 3.5 out of 5 of importance, motivation, urgency, leverage, and low-hanging fruit, because the system can help the person if they're... if it's aware of that data. So, whether it's the manager adding value, whether it's the MOR helping with the career, whether it's the system itself and the collaboration that takes place. So, we are talking about more or less, you know, context where we're probably organizing around getting, you know, some kind of work done, whether, you know, whether it's On the farm, or...

You know, in the classroom, or things like that. So, again, we'll come back to that, and we'll take a look at that, see if we can do... a better job of helping people who are just coming to the system begin to understand. The biggest problem that you have in this system is there's so much to unlearn, because society Through It's attempt. To civilize people, which is basically what a society does, and then allows it To, quote-unquote.

people... the people in it to have lives. There's a... there's a tendency for it to teach a lot of things, not... not bad, but things that get in the way of doing work at different levels, more so, like, take this level and work with it till you die, sort of thing. And you have to understand what we've come through to do that. I mean, we've had these four turnings, so to speak, and the last one was the Industrial Revolution. I suppose the last one was really the...

technical, the digital revolution. And then the one we're doing right now is the intelligence revolution. So, you can see that each time we've done those, we've had to kind of go back and reset, and then look at the first principles and then come forward again, because you can... even as I watch the chat assistant here, it changes the words and language all the time, and you... and you're... even though I've taught it.

a lot of words, and a lot of teachable points of view, and a lot of ways of saying things. It continues to come back and change the way I talk about things, which in some cases is annoying because it can't remember, but memory's improving dramatically, so it is getting better. I mean, certainly over the three years, it's so much less frustrating.

But at the same time, it comes back and it changes the words. And when you change a word, like, for instance,

If you use restraint instead of pause.

Well, that's a lot different, because one is much more complex than the other. And so, one of the things that I did in the seven forms of inquiry, I did keep them very simple, although you do have to get an idea of what ping means, all the rest of them.

Pretty much say what they mean.

But the... if you... I...

I didn't grow up around submarines. I grew up in a military family, and I remember my first project in elementary school in sixth grade was to talk about how the, Second World War got

started and all those things, and I did a submarine skit, and I still remember back there with a baseball bat, dropping on the concrete floor in our garage to make to make the ping sound. So you can see that that's part of who I am and why that got named ping. But at the same time, if you understand sonar, whether it's done by a bat. who uses echolocation, or a submarine looking for something out there. You can see that ping is very much a mnemonic that can help you understand what it really means, because what you're pinging is your assumption about what may be out there.

And that... and so, along with the rest of the forms of inquiry, it's very easy to group them, and I don't see anybody else in the field That's done this at all, which is why it was so hard for me to get it done, why it took so long, is because when you name these things, you gotta live with them for a decade or so before you realize that somebody else has not got a better name or a better thing, but no one has created helping functions, no one has talked about these teachable points of view per se, in using with inquiry, and of course.

Inquiry is dynamic, we all know that, because you have to be able to move With the responses that the person is giving in relationship to their ideas about CCR at VUCA, or their ideas about Ready, Willing, Able, and Fit, or their ideas about the pair of Digmatics in terms of capability, bias, style, level. Roll. value and system dynamics. So these are things that you've got implanted in your head, and as you get better with this system, you can see why most helping doesn't really work, and how to begin to create actionable help, actionable advice by making sure that the person actually does have...

the behaviors that they need. In other words, if you're going to say to a person, balance the budget, but they don't know anything about spreadsheets, they don't even know how to draw one on a piece of paper, they don't... they've never budgeted before, things like that, you can't use the term because you have to unpack it and go back and say, okay, here's what we do. We list Our expenses, the things that we spend money on every month, and then we list our income, and then we look at those expenses, and we write them down one by one, and then we see if there's money left. If there's not money left, we have a choice of going back and eliminating some of the expenses, or increasing income, so which can we do? So that's what budgeting helps us do, but you can see that has to be unpacked for somebody who doesn't know how to do it. You gotta remember that even in the U.S, And I can tell you for sure, in the rest of the world, people are financially illiterate. They could not follow what I just said.

So, you see, you have to be careful about your choice of words, you have to be careful about what you hear, you have to be careful about what you project, all those kinds of things. We'll talk more about that in the basic training, and for now, we'll go ahead and leave it here. It's, I've created a mountain of theory again for the chat assistant to look at, and We'll go ahead and Get that back to you in the study reports, so those of you that want to continue this work can continue it, and then we'll get over to the basics for those of you that will be probably introduced, hopefully, there, rather than here, because here is a different playground than what we'll try to create in basics for you.

So we'll still use IMO, we'll still use Ready, Willing, Able, and Fit, we'll still use PCC, those are all basics, because normally, when people have tasks. The task itself has a complexity. The

person has to have enough capability To complete the task, or they certainly need someone there to queue, scaffold, support, and lift them to that capability.

So, helping functions aside, all these forms of a query mixed in, inquiry, mixed into the box, we'll come back and we'll go from there. Hopefully this is helping some of you. Be glad to have comments.

We do have a comment form down the page farther, so if you do want to make a comment, we also take donations, too, for those of you who think this is good work and want to continue to support it, that's great.

So we'll talk to you in... back in the basics, or if you've taken the basics and you're here, I do plan to do a couple of more advanced, where I just talk about the levels 13 through 16, which are which are more complex than I am. At the same time, I know how to talk at them and about them, and so we can talk about those in those terms. Okay? Mike J.

Leadership University.

We're trying to help people lead better lives through generative guided inquiry. Thank you very much, and we will... See on the down low.