**Episode #42**

**Speaker 1** [00:00:01] Welcome to the Cabrera Lab Podcast.

**Speaker 2** [00:00:05] Hey! Hello. How are ya? Awesome. Back in the studio.

**Speaker 1** [00:00:10] stupendous.

**Speaker 2** [00:00:11] Stupend awesome, you always coin them.

**Speaker 1** [00:00:13] and awesome.

**Speaker 2** [00:00:14] the most fun new terms.

**Speaker 1** [00:00:16] portmanteau of stupendous and awesome. Stupend awesome. I don't know. It could be stupid and awesome

**Speaker 2** [00:00:21] Yeah, that's the other day I was just thinking it may not be a good thing.

**Speaker 1** [00:00:24] Let's probably.

**Speaker 2** [00:00:25] That also holds true, maybe. Not really.

**Speaker 1** [00:00:28] They're all kind of stupid if you really take it in.

**Speaker 2** [00:00:31] I think the smart ones of us reals were all a little stupid.

**Speaker 1** [00:00:34] Yeah, the smarter you get, the more you realize you're kind of stupid, like just the number of stupid things that we do. The more you know, the the more know you don't know.

**Speaker 2** [00:00:44] Hopefully because I have met a few people who the older they get the more they the more everything and they're right a few

**Speaker 3** [00:00:52] Yeah, that's true.

**Speaker 2** [00:00:54] I've gotten a few emails from some of our good friends who are working in different types of organizations and everyone's sort of gearing up like, hey, we're going to hit 2025 with the ground, you know, hit the ground running. And it made me think about, you now, we haven't really talked a lot about what it means to be sort of systemy inside of organizations, what it means to become an adaptive leader, how you can use kind of the things we talk about all the time. In these other contexts, because we talk a lot about our own selves and our one-to-one relationships, but we should talk about, you know, the bigger picture.

**Speaker 1** [00:01:33] Yeah, I mean that's a big part of our work, big part of our research, the organizational side of things. You know, if you think about thinking more systemically, the reason we do that is because as individuals, we live in systems. And so if you don't think systemically you're not thinking in a way that's kind of in alignment with the systems that you're in. And if you then put an individual in a system, which we call an organization. and it's your job to not only manage the individual or manage oneself inside that organization, but to manage the system, the organization, then that becomes kind of systems on systems, right? So it's all the same stuff. It's just applied to organizational level stuff. Right? Yes. I think the first thing probably you have to do. make a distinction and is, is not list, you know, what it is and is not an organization. Because I think generally speaking, we think of organizations as nouns, as things like Acme Corp. Right? Are, you, know, some corporation, some, some company, some nonprofit, some whatever. An organization is both a noun and a verb. Organization to organize, right? the whole reason that we even form organizations in the first place is because we can't do it alone, right? Right, we need other people. We need other.

**Speaker 2** [00:03:07] We got to figure that out.

**Speaker 1** [00:03:07] You can't do what you're trying to do alone. Because if you could, you would just do it alone. It'd be very efficient. It'd so much more efficient, right? So the whole point is we can't do some of these things alone, and so we have to do it together. We have to organize. We have organize in the case of people and technologies. Sometimes we call them socio-technical systems, social and technical because you're organizing some kind of technology, which could be machines, or it could be what we think of as technology, like electronic type technology, and humans, right? So we're organizing those things for some common goal or purpose or something like that. And so, yeah, first and foremost is not seeing it just as the static noun, but as this very dynamic verb. To organize and how are we going to organize is essentially how are we going design, how are going to build the organization.

**Speaker 2** [00:04:14] Well, what's interesting is, you know, we've talked a lot in previous episodes about sometimes when we want things to change, we realize it's because we're sort of stuck in a mental model or an old

**Speaker 1** [00:04:25] Can I interrupt for a second? Of course. Because you said something really important and adapt and change as we go. Yeah. But the irony is that's not how most people build organizations. You think that way because we think in terms of adaptive organizations, organizations and people who have the ability to adapt. But a lot of the ways that we build organizations, the way we design organizations, the way organize organizations, a lot the way that we do it is we just organize it as if it's a one time thing. And we don't organize it in such a way that it is capable of adaptation and change. And so it doesn't really adapt. It's not one of its primary. sort of abilities is to adapt to the marketplace or to whatever situation that it's in.

**Speaker 2** [00:05:21] But that's because what you started with is we think of an organization as a static thing. We don't think of it as a thing that's made up of a lot of interconnected dynamics inside of it that has some, what would you say, some life to it, some actual life to, which means it can, with some thought, become a thing, that moves and changes and adapts. You know, you think about those posters where there's like a shark made up of lots of little fish.

**Speaker 3** [00:05:51] Yes, yes.

**Speaker 2** [00:05:52] And you've got like all these little fish, but together they're one big shark-like shaped organism that can move.

**Speaker 1** [00:05:59] Yeah, and that was taken, those posters were taken from the science of complexity and the fact that you have these little agents that are sort of create this emergent property. So these little fish create the emergent of a big fish, a big scary shark fish.

**Speaker 2** [00:06:15] So when you say that, when you see the emergent property, what you mean is the tiny choices that every one of those fish are making, when you add it all up collectively, that's what's making it, the emergen property is the fish, the bigger thing is moving.

**Speaker 1** [00:06:29] Yeah, and so you want to understand first and foremost that organization is not just a noun, it's a verb, and to organize is one of the most important concepts in all of science, I think. I mean, how things are organized is absolutely critical to how they behave, right? How information is organized is critical to what it means, how people and technologies are organized is critical to how they behave. So the organization, ironically, the verb of organizing is kind of the crux of it. It's not the noun of an organization. That's the easy part. You can set up an organization, an identity, for $200 online. That doesn't mean you have an organization And in many ways, you know, you can put a. a bunch of people in an office space, and that doesn't mean you have an organization. That means you have a group of people working in the same space, but they're not organized in any substantive way. They're not a team. There's a big difference between a group and a team, and there's a difference between people that are all getting paid from the same bank account and an organization that as a common vision and mission and things like that.

**Speaker 2** [00:07:56] Okay, so that means by implication that when you say a group of people versus a team, what you just implied is a team has some set of shared mental models or goals or ideas.

**Speaker 1** [00:08:09] That's literally the big difference. The big difference is if we, in previous podcasts we've talked about M equals I O, mental models are equal to information and the way that it's organized. So the way we organize information, I O. The way we organized O, information, I leads to mental models or meaning, M, right? And the only difference, is now we apply that at a group level. So that's at a psychological level, the way you make meaning. Well, at the group level, the group's doing the same thing. We're just going to the sociological level, right? Yes. Diads or above. And we're looking at how does the group organize information, right. Yes. And how do they share the organization and the information. And the more they share the organization and the information of the way the information's organized the more the share the same mental models. The more they act as a team.

**Speaker 2** [00:09:18] Meaning they're all sort of on the same page. They know where they're headed. They know what they need to do. They have a sense of one another's roles and all of that. Interesting. Well, so what's interesting about that is, and we've talked about this a lot with our friends in different places, is then if you want to change your outcomes, like the outcomes of what you're doing, your work or your organizational efforts. you actually don't work at the effort, I'm sorry, at the outcome level, you work somewhere in the inputs, right, and the dynamics of all the parts and pieces that are acting together that are leading to that outcome.

**Speaker 1** [00:09:59] Yeah. And again, we don't want to jump too far forward in terms of where people are at because most organizations are managing outcomes. Yes. Or attempting to manage outcomes, right? And that's a huge mistake because an outcome already happened, right? It's like managing the score of a football game rather than the yards.

**Speaker 3** [00:10:27] Yes, right.

**Speaker 1** [00:10:27] Right, you want to manage the yards that you're getting, right? The movement of the football forward. You don't want to manager the score. The score is an emergent property of the yards.

**Speaker 2** [00:10:37] I don't like that. That's a good one. I like that one. Yeah.

**Speaker 1** [00:10:41] the score is important, it's the most important thing. It's not to say that the score isn't important in a football game or any kind of game, the score's the the most important thing and in that sense, the vision of an organization is the most important thing but the vision is like a score, an emergent property of what the organization does. Yes. Right. So when we focus on what do we do to change the score? The answer isn't just score touchdowns, because there's a bunch of things that go into scoring touchdowns. First downs.

**Speaker 3** [00:11:16] Yeah.

**Speaker 1** [00:11:17] You know running forward. I am I know lots of people don't know football so that Whatever whatever the the the micro level things that you have to do

**Speaker 2** [00:11:29] like on the field.

**Speaker 1** [00:11:30] on the field. Those are the things that you have to manage in order to make the score be the emergent property that you want it to be.

**Speaker 2** [00:11:38] In other words, if you want to change the outcomes of what you're doing, you don't focus on the outcomes. You focus on what you doing on the ground level over time, which then increases the score, changes the outcome.

**Speaker 1** [00:11:52] Yeah, and again, it's not that the outcomes aren't important. The outcomes are the vision, the goal, the emergent property. You want your vision, you want your sight to be on the goal on those outcomes, right? You want to win the game. You want make it to the Super Bowl. You want whatever it is, win the gold medal. but the mission or the activity that you do is on the things that have to be done repeatedly to get there. Yes. And a lot of times people make a distinction error with those two things. They work on, they try to change outcomes instead of changing the inputs. Right. So think of outcomes as outputs. Yeah. So you've got this black box called your organization. Sometimes we call it black box thinking. You got this Black Box. Inside the black box, there's a lot of complexity going on, and a lot times we can't get a handle on all the complexity. It's quite complex. But we can look at the outputs there and then we can look at inputs and we can be like, when we do these inputs, we get those outputs and either we like those outputs or we don't like those output. So let's change some of the inputs. Now sometimes, no matter what, inputs you put in, you get the same outputs, then you have to change the system design, the structure of the system.

**Speaker 2** [00:13:18] We talk a lot about mental models. And we talk a a lot about recognizing that we have mental models, recognize that other people have mental model, right? That we're all building different meaning of the same stuff based on how we organize it. But if you take that to a leadership role or an organizational level, what you're talking about inside the box, a lot of the work of leaders is to get people to share the same mental models around where you want. the organization to go, where you want the efforts to lead to. Yes. But much like individuals, we get stuck in old mental models. We get stuck, and they hold us back from evolving our mental model about something, changing how we think about something. So it seems to me, one of the things you and I talk a lot about with organizational leaders, I think you call them sticky, faulty mental models of organizations. a lot of leaders when we first start. they have this sort of command and control, faulty mental model of how organizations should be. Let's talk a little bit about that.

**Speaker 1** [00:14:24] Yeah, so we call that, sometimes just to remember it better, we call that PCCU versus VMCL. So PCCU is plan, command, control, and utilize. PCCU, or plan, Command, Control, and Utilize is kind of the faulty traditional way of building and managing organizations and leading them, right? We plan, we're big on planning. We command, meaning we have a hierarchical structure where the top is the top, and then everything trickles down from the top. We love that structure, that hierarchical structure so much, we turn it on its side, and we do control processes. So we control processes the same way. There's this thing leads to this thing, leads to that this thing. And then we utilize, right? We kind of have this like. human grinder that we put the humans in and we squeeze them for, it's like a juicer, right? You take all the human juice and you use the human juice to utilize that juice to drive something, right, so it's a utilization paradigm, right. At a much lesser level, there's nothing wrong with planning. There's nothing wrong with, you know, hierarchies. There is nothing wrong with process, you know, awareness and nothing. terribly wrong with the utilization per se. As a master organizing tool, it's wrong-headed. And I say wrong- headed, not because of like in a judgy way. It's wrong headed because it's out of alignment with reality. That's why it's a wrong headed. It's not, I'm not judging it. Like it's not a disagreement, you know, if it worked, then I guess it would be in alignment with reality, but it's of alignment with the reality. So let me give you an example. When we plan, we often don't come anywhere near what we plan for, you know, as Mike Tyson says, everybody's got a plan till they get punched in the face, right? Command, as an example, is this this beautiful, eloquent, efficient hierarchy. Well, it doesn't work that way. There's all kinds of informal relationships and things like that, that that lead to the dynamics of the system. So if you're not aware of all those informal dynamics, alter an organization significantly and you think that it works in this simple tree-like structure, then you're kind of out of alignment with reality. Yes. If you do the same thing on it on the side and do process control, the same things applies there. And then utilize, well, what are you utilizing? You're mostly utilizing humans. Yeah. Well, how many humans do you know that wake up every morning and say, God, I can't wait to get utilized today? You know, like, I'm so excited to go to work and get utilized, right? Yeah. So you're just out of sync with what motivates people, how people are motivated, what's going to motivate them to give you their all. It's out of sink, it's out alignment with the reality of what you're trying to do.

**Speaker 2** [00:17:29] Right. Well, and I also think what struck me is when you said the utilization thing, it immediately, it has this flashback of Taylorism. Yes. I guess to me, that's the origin point.

**Speaker 1** [00:17:41] PCCU, Plan, Command, Control, and Utilize, is very much influenced by a Taylorism factory-based model. And Taylor was a famous scientific management guy, many in the 20s. Yeah.

**Speaker 2** [00:17:57] Early 1900s.

**Speaker 1** [00:17:58] early 1900s. He did some amazing things. He used to clock everything and he created the 21 pound shovel, which was the perfect optimal shovel amount for a guy. And you think, you know, this is so a guy can be shoveling all day long. What he missed, and it took 30, 40, 50 years of additional science and research to sort of catch on to this, is that if you hand a guy that 21-pound shovel. and he works all day like that, he hates it. Yeah. He's not motivated and he ends up having all kinds of, Burn out. Burn out and things like that. Now, at the time, they didn't care about that because they were just running through whoever was willing to work in the factory. The factory was, yeah. Right?

**Speaker 2** [00:18:47] Well, the other thing that's interesting about that is some people say the one sort of benefit of Taylorism was the idea of being more data-based, more scientific about management, with the exception of later on when Maslow and other people came along, we have to actually take care of the people we're managing. We have to take that perspective. But the idea being scientific about these kinds of processes.

**Speaker 1** [00:19:13] Which was Taylor's great contribution to management and leadership and organizations was that we could be scientific. But like you said, being scientific doesn't mean just what's the optimal shovel amount. Being scientific is also like, and if a guy does that all day long, five days a week, how's he going to feel about it at the end of the day, and how's that going to affect his work, and how is that going overall? What's that? Is that going to cause other people to want to work at that place? Yeah.

**Speaker 2** [00:19:45] but he also kind of locked us into this mechanistic.

**Speaker 1** [00:19:50] Absolutely.

**Speaker 2** [00:19:50] metaphor of organizations that I think still, even if we're not aware of it, still is part of how we think about it.

**Speaker 1** [00:19:58] Yeah, it's the dominant way that we think about organizations. That's why I'm saying you really start to have to think about this as organization, the verb, the dynamic, or again, think of organization starts with organ or organic, right? It's very similar because it is a living, breathing thing. So if we can, the name of our book is flock, not clock, because the metaphor is think of your organization less like Taylor did. less like a clock, like a stopwatch, because it's really nothing like aclock. It's not a mechanical device. It has mechanical devices in it. That's the socio-technical part. But you overlay the social part and the psychological parts of an organization, and it changes the game. It makes it organic. Yes, so we need to shift. This episode is sponsored by Training Camp. the ultimate online spot for building the mental fitness that drives personal and professional change and success. At training camp, you'll have access to the science and practice of thinking with personalized thinking assessments, tiered training, and best of all, practice that improves skill. Go to CabreraLab.org to learn more. And now. Back to the episode. So we need to shift from a mechanical metaphor of organizations to more of an organic or life kind of metaphor of organizations. And that's why we say a flock, like a flock of birds, not like a clock. Right. And if you simply make that shift, I mean, later we get into the more technical things that that shift involves, shifting from one to the other. but if you make that simple shift of. life-like organic thing, flock, going from a mechanical thing to a clock, to a life- like organic thing. Yeah. Then one layer below that see that, well, the way we do this clock stuff is mostly PCCU, Plan, Command, Control, and Utilize. Right. Then the big question mark is, okay, well, how do we do the flock stuff?

**Speaker 2** [00:22:14] Meaning, how do you shift from this sort of traditional mechanistic thing to, so what does it look like when you shift to an organic, more biological, I would say adaptive breathing kind of thing?

**Speaker 1** [00:22:27] Yeah, so what it looks like is what we call VMCL. So instead of PCCU, we do VMCL, which is vision, mission, capacity learning. Before you get there, you kind of have to understand that when we move to a flock, like understanding of organizations, then you have to understand complex adaptive systems a little bit, which is what a flock is fundamentally. Yes. Which is that the agents, in the case of a flock the birds, are these little birds, and they have these rules of when they interact with each other that cause the flocking behavior. And so what we wanna know is what are the, we know what the birds are, the birds or your employees, and we wanna what are the rules that govern their behavior, and we want to design those rules in such a way that they do the floccing behavior in the way that brings about the goals. And if we do that right, we can have an organization that's very adaptive, that has the ability of adaptation.

**Speaker 2** [00:23:33] Right, and what you were saying earlier about the inputs, outputs, black box stuff, what you're saying is in order to change the outputs, you can focus in on the rules that the agents are following. You can even change the rules or recognize the rules, and then when you do that, you can get a different outcome. Is that right? Yes, that's right. Okay, so now we understand where our old sort of, we want to feel like we're in control. We want to feel like we can command and force the work processes to be exactly as we want them. We don't like to have that variability that you're saying exists in this organic, living, dynamic way of thinking about it.

**Speaker 1** [00:24:13] Yeah, a lot of it comes from that, believe it or not, a lot of that comes from the simple human desire that we're control freaks. We just love to be in control. We're all kind of control frecks a little bit, some of us more than others, but we love to being control, we love the feeling of control, and sometimes we love feeling of control more than the reality of control. Well, in the case of PCCU, we love the feeling it gives us. When we manage through and lead through PCCU it gives the feeling that we are in control of this organization. We got a plan, we got command, we've got control, and we're just utilizing things for optimality, right? That feels awesome, because you're like, I got this thing wired, right. The only problem is, it's like kind of sticking your head in the sand, and the only time that people are really deeply motivated to pull their head out of their Or the sand is is when the results are terrible

**Speaker 2** [00:25:22] Meaning they're not getting what they think they should.

**Speaker 1** [00:25:23] They're not getting what they want to get, right? And then usually people are like, geez, I really want this. I want this more than I want to be right. More than I wanna feel in control. And if you want that outcome more than you want to right, and if you that outcome more than you wanna feel and control, then you're ready. You're ready to start thinking about what would I do differently than PCCU, Plan, Command, Control, and Utilize. Because you keep saying this is the old way. But I assure you, it is old, but I assure it's the present way. Yes. It's the dominant way that most organizations are running today.

**Speaker 2** [00:26:02] Yeah, and that's where they start. You're unhappy with what you're getting out of it. Then you kind of get to that place where, well, maybe everyone's like, well may I need to think differently about it? And so then the idea is, and frequently when we work with people, it's, OK, well let's first recognize that this is where you're at. And let's show you where you need to go, which is. And we should be clear that when you say it's organic, living, ability to adapt, Thanks for watching! That's more reality-based. Yes. This is not reality- based. This is trying to force a structure on reality that doesn't really match with reality, the PCCU.

**Speaker 1** [00:26:41] Yeah, let me give you an example. Your organization is gonna be adaptive whether you like it or not, which might seem like that contradicts what I was saying earlier, which is you're trying to build an organization to be adaptive. But because your organization has humans in it, it's gonna be adapted no matter what. The thing is it's going to adapt to your PCCU. So it's go to do things like, for example, quiet quitting, right? It's gonna to be like, I don't like being utilized. But I like the salary. So maybe what I'll do is I'll pretend that I'm OK with it and keep taking the salary, but maybe not work so much. Strategic. So that's adaptive, right? That's adaptive because humans are adaptive. So it's not like the veil of PCCU changes human nature. It doesn't. That's why it's working, because it's out of alignment with reality. So you get things like quiet quitting. Well, quiet quitting is just a silent protest. That's all it is. It's a silent, people don't want to be in jobs where they're quiet quitting. People want to in jobs that they're motivated by. That they're learning new things every day that they are passionate about. That's what people want. People don't wanna go to work every day and quiet quit. Quiet quitting sucks. This is a signal that they adapting to a situation that is unpleasant, that they don't like, right? And they're doing it in mass. Yes. It's not that... The humans are the humans are designed to be adaptive. They're designed to be adaptive, what we want them to do is be adapted towards the goals of the organization that's using adaptivity to accomplish what we want the team or the organization to accomplish. That's what being on a team is all about being in an organization is all about. And by the way, humans are genetically programmed to want to be on a team because we're social. Yeah. Humans are genetically programmed to want to be on a team, to want, to be passionate about what they're doing, and emotionally connected to what they are doing, right? Yeah. To feel like they're doing something important in the world. They want that. They want to go to work every day and be a part of something where they feel like they're learning individually and learning in groups. Humans want that? Yeah. PCCU is getting in the way. of human's natural drive to do the kinds of things that you absolutely want your organization to be doing. Learning every day, you know, learning, discovery, customer understanding, all that kind of stuff every day to get better. Getting better every day. Also a human trait, right? Being passionate about what you're doing. Being passionate and emotionally charged and goal oriented. and Working on a team. Yeah with others

**Speaker 2** [00:29:32] and maybe working on something cool, the cool outcome.

**Speaker 1** [00:29:35] with a cool outcome. Those are all things we wanna encourage. This is not encouraging that. This is causing that to go deep, go shadow. That's all shadow stuff. PCCU makes all that stuff go shadow

**Speaker 2** [00:29:49] When you take a more organic view of organizations and of the people in them, that is more... God, I don't want to say natural, but that's more real. Yeah. Right? It's more in alignment with how systems operate generally. Yes. Which means that you would be more successful, because you're already starting out in better alignment than over here.

**Speaker 1** [00:30:14] Yeah, I think I told the story a few podcasts back about when I took a little side tangent of being a river rafting guide and I was talking about how the old salty dog guides, they would pay attention to what the river's doing and they'd do less effort, less work and let the river do most of the work. Your organization is like a river. It's this incredibly powerful, dynamical force, this organic, dynamal force of socio-technical stuff. Yeah. That's what your organization is, whether you like it or not. Now you can be like the young guide and come in and try to control everything and feel like you're more powerful than the river, but at the end of the day, you're not. If you wanna be that salty dog guide and be like, hey, there's this amazing, powerful river. of energy that I can make kind of help me do what I want to do, you can get what you want. You can get the goals you want.

**Speaker 2** [00:31:20] All right, so it's.

**Speaker 1** [00:31:20] So it's understanding that system is the way to kind of understanding the flock-like behavior of your orc.

**Speaker 2** [00:31:28] Yes and I think the more successful leaders know that. The more successful leaders understand the natural dynamics of their system or their organization and they leverage that understanding of it to get greater outcomes to get have different kinds of influence you know over the things that matter the shared vision the understanding of the mission understanding you know how to get learning in the or like I guess to me that's a huge advantage it's just the leader operating in that reality from the beginning, knowing that they're gonna get on that river and they're just gonna go with the flow and make the changes that they need to change that leverage the dynamics of the river to their advantage.

**Speaker 1** [00:32:10] Yeah, and remember the birds in the flock, they're self-organizing, there's no leader. We used to think 2500 years ago and for a long time, up until about the 80s or so, we used to believe that there was some A-type personality leader bird that was telling them all what to do. Of course, there is not enough time that they're so dynamical the way these things are flocking for there to be communication like that. So something else is going on. And what's going on is the simple rules underneath. The birds have these simple rules that they're using to not crash into each other and point the same direction and avoid prey and stuff like that. But those are self-organizing systems. They're leaderless. And think about that. If you were to describe the perfect organization, it would be one that, you know, kind of self-organized around the goal. in such a way that was good for the individuals and good for collective. Well, nature's already figured that out. Nature's had a lot of years to figure that out and it's already figure it out. All we have to do is listen and pay attention and let nature teach us how to do it because nature organizes much bigger organization. I'd love to hear like all these thousands of employees and trillions of dollars. You're like nature has you by a long shot. Billions of employees, you know, like organisms that are so much bigger than you can imagine. And nature figured out how to make them work incredibly efficiently. So we like to like pat ourselves on the back of like, well, we have 100,000 employees.

**Speaker 2** [00:33:54] Which is a lot, but...

**Speaker 1** [00:33:55] Which is a lot, but I'm saying nature has organized much bigger organizations to do much bigger things. We should learn from nature, right? Just like the termites have built these mounds that are like skyscrapers that have air conditioning systems that take no power. They're all based on the way the thing is built. And now we're using those systems in the way that we architect. skyscrapers, high rises, right? We can learn a lot from the way nature organizes.

**Speaker 2** [00:34:31] But we have to take a minute and stop for a second. Because when you say leaderless, that the flocks are leaderless. What I think what that means is by implication, in an organic kind of flock-like vision of an organization, that means the job of the leader is to articulate the vision and to recognize and help set the simple rules.

**Speaker 1** [00:35:00] The mission, yeah.

**Speaker 2** [00:35:01] Each agent, which is a person or an employee, should be... So in other words, the leader's job is to help facilitate self-organization towards a common vision. And I think that means the biggest role is communicating the things that matter in terms of building shared mental models at the individual level. That's right. Right? And so the question is then, how do they do that? What do we do with it?

**Speaker 1** [00:35:25] Yeah. So what you said is exactly right. What a leader needs to do in an organization is build the vision, which is standing in the future and describing what you see for the present. Build the vision based on what we've discovered in research are five organizing principles. So there's five litmus tests to a good vision. Yeah. Then there's another six litmus test to a good mission. Thank you for watching! And so those litmus tests help us to design better visions and missions, because the ones we have today are terrible. The visions that we have today are, and the missions that we have today, are just these long paragraphs that are meaningless.

**Speaker 2** [00:36:06] And they're highly conflated.

**Speaker 1** [00:36:08] Well, vision and mission are conflated. Yeah, people don't even know the difference between them. They're very, very different. That's our next episode. Yeah, I think we should make January like organization and leadership month, right? We should just do a bunch of podcasts on organizations and leadership. Because a lot of what we've been talking about, we've being applying it to the individual. Yeah. but it applies. Equally and very dynamically to the organization and to teams and to leadership and what we call adaptive leadership

**Speaker 2** [00:36:41] You heard it here first.

**Speaker 1** [00:36:42] Four episodes. Four episodes

**Speaker 2** [00:36:44] on organizations, this will be number one.

**Speaker 1** [00:36:46] This will be the first one, which is really just probably like an intro to why we have to think differently about organizations. You know, just moving from a plan, command, control, and utilize mindset that's more like thinking about your organization like a noun or like a like a machine. Static thing. of vision, mission, capacity, learning kind of mindset, thinking about your organization, about like an organic thing, a living thing.

**Speaker 2** [00:37:18] Yeah, and I don't think we should shortchange that. That's a big thing.

**Speaker 1** [00:37:23] That's a huge thing.

**Speaker 2** [00:37:24] I mean, you think about the places we've been the most successful with some really big organizations. It all starts with this ship.

**Speaker 3** [00:37:32] this show.

**Speaker 2** [00:37:32] It all starts in not just this shift from mechanistic to organic, but also realizing that to change the outcome of the system, you have to work at the individual level. Those two things to me are the biggest framing lessons that people start with.

**Speaker 1** [00:37:51] Well, it's big enough that it's what we named our book on organizational leadership is is flock not clock. For this reason, because, you know, it literally stopped thinking of your organization like a clock. Yeah. And start thinking of it like a flock. Yeah. So flock, not clock, and if you can make that shift, then the question marks start happening. Oh, well, what do I do here? or what do I do? And then the, you know. What we'll do this month is answer some of those question marks, but if you never make that shift, you never have those question mark. You have all these answers over here, but they're all the wrong answers. They're all mechanical answers.

**Speaker 2** [00:38:30] I think it's important to tie it back to, we've been talking about mental models a lot, and this is nothing more than a mental model shift about how you think about organizations now to how you might want to change that mental model, evolve it to think differently.

**Speaker 1** [00:38:45] Absolutely. We're just doing is-is-not list with the organization. What is and is not an organization and what is and is not leadership and what it is and it's not management. What we'll get into with VMCL, VMCL makes it very clear what is it is not leadership and management, for example. A lot of people get confused about what is leadership and What is management? All right. VMCL clarifies that exactly what it is and what isn't and VMCL clarifies what a vision. is and what a mission is, which people conflate all the time. The research shows it's wildly conflated. People don't know the difference. People get confused about what taglines are versus visions and all kinds of stuff. And one of our favorite things, you've seen this a lot of times, we go into C-suites, the big companies, and we say, hey, do you have a vision and a mission? Oh yeah, yeah, we got one of those. And you go, well, what is it? And they go It's like a mumble. It's a collective mumble, right? And it's never quite the same and nobody quite knows what it is and it's usually like an entire paragraph. And then the CEO gets a little frustrated that I'm peppering them with questions and says, well, it's on the website. Bring up the website or it's out on the wall. Grab that frame. And the in websites. and they're not on walls and in frames. They're in the hearts and minds of people. And so if I can't go to the janitor and the VP and ask them what the vision and the mission is and get the same answer, and then ask them, pepper them with deeper questions about the vision of mission and have them tell me about it and have him get excited about it.

**Speaker 2** [00:40:34] And have them say the same thing.

**Speaker 1** [00:40:35] and have them say the same things and explain it the same way, then you don't have a vision and a mission. You just don't one. Right. You have a bunch of words in a frame on a wall on a website, but I can get you some Ipsum worm text for free for that.

**Speaker 2** [00:40:51] Well, and that goes back to feeling like you're in control. Exactly. You feel like you have.

**Speaker 1** [00:40:54] You feel like you have a vision but you don't. The way we design visions and missions is very, very unique and based on the research of how these things have failed.

**Speaker 2** [00:41:05] Well, so that's where we'll start next time.

**Speaker 1** [00:41:06] Yeah, we could start.

**Speaker 2** [00:41:07] Hint the ground running, the vision. vision.

**Speaker 1** [00:41:09] Next week's, I guess that's a wrap, yeah?

**Speaker 2** [00:41:11] I don't know.

**Speaker 1** [00:41:12] It's up to you. It's a wrap.