A Simpler Way to Lead Organizations

Searching for

INTRODUCTION
emerging from quantum physics. This provided my first glimpse of a new way of perceiving the world, one that comprehended its processes of change and patterns of connections.

I don't think it accidental that I was introduced to a new way of seeing at 37,000 feet. The altitude only reinforced the message that what was needed was a larger perspective, one that took in more of the whole of things. From that first book, I took off, seeking out as many new science books as I could find in biology, evolution, chaos theory, and quantum physics. Discoveries and theories of new science called me away from the details of my own field of management inquiry and up to a vision of the inherent orderliness of the universe, of creative processes and dynamic, continuous change that still maintained order. This was a world where order and change, autonomy and control were not the great opposites that we had thought them to be. It was a world where change and constant creation signalled new ways of maintaining order and structure.

I don't believe I could have grasped these ideas if I had stayed on the ground.

During the last fifteen to twenty years, books that translate new science findings for lay readers have proliferated, some more reputable and scientific than others. Of the many I read, some were too challenging, some were too bizarre, but others contained images and information that were breathtaking. I became aware that I was wandering in a realm that created new visions of freedom and possibility, giving me new ways to think about my work. I couldn't always draw immediate corollaries between science and my dilemmas, but I noticed myself developing a new serenity in response to the questions that surrounded me. I was reading of chaos that contained order; of information as the primal, creative force; of systems that, by design, fell apart so they could renew themselves; and of invisible forces that structured space and held complex things together. These were compelling, evocative ideas, and they gave me hope, even if they did not reveal immediate solutions.

Somewhere—I knew then and believe even more firmly now—there is a simpler way to lead organizations, one that requires less effort and produces less stress than the current practices. For me, this new knowledge is only beginning to crystallize into applications, but I no longer believe that organizations are inherently unmanageable in our world of constant flux and unpredictability. Rather, I believe our present ways of understanding organizations are skewed, and that the longer we remain entrenched in our ways, the farther we move from those wonderful breakthroughs in understanding that the world of science calls "elegant." The layers of complexity, the sense of things being beyond our control and out of control, are but signals of our failure to understand a deeper reality of organizational life, and of life in general.

We are all searching for this simplicity. In many different disciplines, we live today with questions for which our expertise provides no answers. At the turn of the century, physicists faced the same unnerving confusion. There is a frequently told story about Niels Bohr and Werner Heisenberg, two founders of quantum theory. This version is from The Turning Point:

In the twentieth century, physicists faced, for the first time, a serious challenge to their ability to understand the universe. Every time they asked nature a question in an atomic experiment, nature answered with a paradox, and the more they tried to clarify the situation, the sharper the paradoxes became. In their struggle to grasp this new reality, scientists became painfully aware that their basic concepts, their
major in biology, but my initial encounters with advanced chemistry ended that
career, and I turned to the greater ambiguity of the social sciences. Like many
social scientists, I am at heart a lapsed scientist, still hoping that the world will
yield up its secrets to me in predictable formulations.

But my focus on science is more than a personal interest. Each of us lives and
works in organizations designed from Newtonian images of the universe. We
manage by separating things into parts, we believe that influence occurs as a
direct result of force exerted from one person to another, we engage in complex
planning for a world that we keep expecting to be predictable, and we search
continually for better methods of objectively perceiving the world. These
assumptions, as I explain in chapter 2, come to us from seventeenth-century
physics, from Newtonian mechanics. They are the base from which we design and
manage organizations, and from which we do research in all of the social sciences.
Intentionally or not, we work from a world view that has been derived from the
natural sciences.

But the science has changed. If we are to continue to draw from the sciences
to create and manage organizations, to design research, and to formulate
hypotheses about organizational design, planning, economics, human nature, and
change processes (the list can be much longer), then we need to at least ground
our work in the science of our times. We need to stop seeking after the universe
of the seventeenth century and begin to explore what has become known to us in
the twentieth century. We need to expand our search for the principles of
organization to include what is presently known about the universe.

The search for the lessons of new science is still in progress, really in its
infancy, but what I hope to convey in these pages is the pleasure of sensing those
first glimmers of a new way of thinking about the world and its organizations. The
light may be dim, but its potency grows as the door cracks wider and wider. Here
there are scientists who write about natural phenomena with a poetry and a
lucidity that speak to dilemmas we find in organizations. Here there are new
images and metaphors for thinking about our own organizational experiences.
This is a world of wonder and not knowing, where scientists are as awestruck by
what they see as were the early explorers who marvelled at new continents. In this
realm, there is a new kind of freedom, where it is more rewarding to explore than
to reach conclusions, more satisfying to wonder than to know, and more exciting
to search than to stay put.

This is not a book of conclusions, cases, or exemplary practices of excellent
companies. It is deliberately not that kind of book, for two reasons. First, I no
longer believe that organizations can be changed by imposing a model developed
elsewhere. So little transfers to, or even inspires, those trying to work at change in
their own organizations. Second, and much more important, the new physics
cogently explains that there is no objective reality out there waiting to reveal its
secrets. There are no recipes or formulae, no checklists or advice that describe
“reality.” There is only what we create through our engagement with others and
with events. Nothing really transfers; everything is always new and different and
unique to each of us.

This book attempts to be true to that new vision of reality, where ideas and
information are but half of what is required to evoke reality. The creative
possibilities of the ideas represented here depend on your engagement with
them. I have interpreted my task as presenting material to provoke and engage
you, knowing that your experience with these pages will produce different ideas.
different hopes, and different experiments than did mine. It is not important that we agree on one expert interpretation or one sure-fire application. That is not the nature of the universe in which we live. We inhabit a world that is always subjective and shaped by our interactions with it. Our world is impossible to pin down, constantly changing and infinitely more interesting than we ever imagined.

Though the outcomes to be gained from reading this book are unique to each reader, the ideas I have chosen to think about focus on the meta-issues that concern those of us who work in large organizations: What are the sources of order? How do we create organizational coherence, where activities correspond to purpose? How do we create structures that move with change, that are flexible and adaptive, even boundaryless, that enable rather than constrain? How do we simplify things without losing both control and differentiation? How do we resolve personal needs for freedom and autonomy with organizational needs for prediction and control?

The new science research referred to comes from the disciplines of physics, biology, and chemistry, and from theories of evolution and chaos that span several disciplines. Each chapter inquires into metaphorical links between certain scientific perspectives and organizational phenomena, but it may be useful first to say something in general about the directions of new science research.

Scientists in many different disciplines are questioning whether we can adequately explain how the world works by using the machine imagery created in the seventeenth century, most notably by Sir Isaac Newton. In the machine model, one must understand parts. Things can be taken apart, dissected literally or representationally (as we have done with business functions and academic disciplines), and then put back together without any significant loss. The assumption is that by comprehending the workings of each piece, the whole can be understood. The Newtonian model of the world is characterized by materialism and reductionism—a focus on things rather than relationships and a search, in physics, for the basic building blocks of matter.

In new science, the underlying currents are a movement toward holism, toward understanding the system as a system and giving primary value to the relationships that exist among seemingly discrete parts. Donella Meadows, a systems thinker, quotes an ancient Sufi teaching that captures this shift in focus: "You think because you understand one you must understand two, because one and one makes two. But you must also understand and" (1982, 23). When we view systems from this perspective, we enter an entirely new landscape of connections, of phenomena that cannot be reduced to simple cause and effect, and of the constant flux of dynamic processes.

Explorations into the subatomic world began early in this century, creating the dissonance described in Heisenberg’s story. In physics, therefore, the search for radically new models now has a long and somewhat strange tradition. The strangeness lies in the pattern of discovery that characterized many of the major discoveries in quantum mechanics. “A lucky guess based on shaky arguments and absurd ad hoc assumptions gives a formula that turns out to be right, though at first no one can see why on earth it should be” (March 1978, 3). I delight in that statement of scientific process. It gives me hope for an approach to discovery that can influence the methodical, incremental, linear work that leads to the plodding character of most social science research.

The quantum mechanical view of reality strikes against most of our notions of reality. Even to scientists, it is admittedly bizarre. But it is a world where
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to percolate in my own field of management theory. One way to see their effect is
to look at the problems that plague us most in organizations these days or, more
accurately, what we define as the problems. Leadership, an amorphous
phenomenon that has intrigued us since people began studying organizations, is
being examined now for its relational aspects. More and more studies focus on
followership, empowerment, and leader accessibility. And ethical and moral
questions are no longer fuzzy religious concepts but key elements in our
relationships with staff, suppliers, and stakeholders. If the physics of our universe
is revealing the primacy of relationships, is it any wonder that we are beginning to
reconfigure our ideas about management in relational terms?

In motivation theory, our attention is shifting from the enticement of external
rewards to the intrinsic motivators that spring from the work itself. We are
relocusing on the deep longings we have for community, meaning, dignity, and
love in our organizational lives. We are beginning to look at the strong emotions
that are part of being human, rather than segmenting ourselves (love is for home;
discipline is for work) or believing that we can confine workers into narrow roles,
as though they were cogs in the machinery of production. As we let go of the
machine models of work, we begin to step back and see ourselves in new ways, to
appreciate our wholeness, and to design organizations that honor and make use of
the totality of who we are.

The impact of vision, values, and culture occupies a great deal
of organizational attention. We see their effects on organizational vitality, even if we
can’t quite define why they are such potent forces. We now sense that some of the
best ways to create continuity of behavior are through the use of forces that we
can’t really see. Many scientists now work with the concept of fields—invisible
forces that structure space or behavior. I have come to understand organizational
vision as a field—a force of unseen connections that influences employees’
behavior—rather than as an evocative message about some desired future state.
Because of field theory, I believe I can better explain why vision is so necessary,
and this leads me to new activities to strengthen its influence.

Our concept of organizations is moving away from the mechanistic creations
that flourished in the age of bureaucracy. We have begun to speak in earnest of
more fluid, organic structures, even of boundaryless organizations. We are
beginning to recognize organizations as systems, construing them as “learning
organizations” and crediting them with some type of self-renewing capacity. These
are our first, tentative forays into a new appreciation for organizations. My own
experience suggests that we can forego the despair created by such common
organizational events as change, chaos, information overload, and cyclical
behaviors if we recognize that organizations are conscious entities, possessing
many of the properties of living systems.

Some believe that there is a danger in playing with science and abstracting its
metaphors because, after a certain amount of stretch, the metaphors lose their
relationship to the tight scientific theories that gave rise to them. But others
would argue that all of science is metaphor—a hopeful description of how to think
of a reality we can never fully know. I share the sentiments of physicist Frank
Oppenheimer who says: “If one has a new way of thinking, why not apply it
wherever one’s thought leads to? It is certainly entertaining to let oneself do so,
but it is also often very illuminating and capable of leading to new and deep insights” (in Cole 1985, 2).
Chapter 1

Discovering an Orderly World

It has taken us a long while to get here—a nine-mile hike up a gradual ascent over rocky paths. My horse, newly trained to pack equipment and still an amateur, has bumped against my back, bruised my heels, and finally, unavoidably, stepped on my toe, smashing it against the inside of my boot. But it's been worth it. Here are the American Buckies at their clichéd best. The stream where I sit soaking my feet glistens on for miles I can't see, into green grasses that bend to the wind. There are pine trees, mountains, hawks, and off at the far edge of the meadow a moose who sees us and moves to hide her great girth behind a four-inch-wide tree. The tree extends just to the edge of each eyeball. We laugh, but I suspect there's a lesson in it for all of us.

For months, I have been studying process structures—things that maintain form over time yet have no rigidity of structure. This stream that swirls around my feet is the most beautiful one I've encountered. Because it is vacation, I resist thinking too deeply about this stream; but as I relax into its flow, metaphors stir and gently whorl the surface.

Finally, I ask directly: What is it that streams can teach me about organizations? I am attracted to the diversity I see, to these swirling combinations of mud, silt, grass, water, rocks. This stream has an impressive ability to adapt, to shift the configurations, to let the power balance move, to create new structures. But driving this adaptability, making it all happen, I think, is the water's need to

"One learns to hope that nature possesses an order that one may aspire to comprehend."

—C.N. Yang
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The process by which a person can recognize and acquire new information is a complex one that involves multiple stages and processes. This is known as the information processing model. The model suggests that information is initially encoded into a code that can be stored in a person's memory. This code is then retrieved and used to facilitate the completion of a task. The model also suggests that the process of information processing is influenced by a variety of factors, including the person's prior knowledge, the task at hand, and the environment in which the task is performed. The information processing model is a useful tool for understanding how people process information and how this process can be influenced by various factors.
It's important to note that in the process of formulating a model of which the three streams are: 1) symbolic 2) emotional 3) motoric. The streams are not a linear process but rather interconnected, forming a complex web of interactions. This model is useful for understanding the way in which different brain regions work together to influence behavior and decision-making. The three streams are not independent but rather interact with each other, forming a dynamic system that shapes the way we perceive and respond to the world around us.

Decision-making involves the interplay between these three streams, each playing a unique role in the process of making decisions. The symbolic stream is responsible for the representation of the problem, the emotional stream for the evaluation of the potential outcomes, and the motoric stream for the execution of the decision. By understanding the interplay between these streams, we can better understand the complexities of decision-making and develop more effective strategies for making informed choices.
Explain what you mean by the term "mutualism". Do you believe it is a good idea to control mutualism? Explain your answer.

People in our lives who are close to us are often our mentors. What do you think mentors can do for us in our personal and professional lives? How can we learn from our mentors effectively?

Explain the concept of "emotional intelligence". Why is it important in the workplace? How can individuals develop their emotional intelligence?

Discuss the role of technology in modern education. How has technology changed the way we learn? What are some potential drawbacks of relying too heavily on technology in the classroom?
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We have found that diverse and independent thinking, and the ability to generate new ideas, are essential for innovation. In organizations, we focus on innovation as a strategic and organizational issue.

Different parts of the brain seem to have different functions. People are often considered to be relatively passive, but in fact, the brain is quite active. The brain's activity is not limited to generating new ideas. It also helps individuals to learn and remember new information.

In the context of business strategy, there is a growing need for organizations to create a collaborative environment. Communication strategies need to be effective, and communication tools need to be used to enhance understanding.

We have begun to develop a new approach to business strategy. This approach is based on the idea that organizations can be more effective when they are collaborative and innovative. By focusing on collaboration and innovation, organizations can create new opportunities to enhance their performance and growth.

We have developed a new approach to business strategy. This approach is based on the idea that organizations can be more effective when they are collaborative and innovative. By focusing on collaboration and innovation, organizations can create new opportunities to enhance their performance and growth.
Neutron Organization in a Quantum Age
measurable…. somewhat ghostly and just beyond our grasp” (1990, 27). Capra sees it as “dynamic patterns continually changing into one another—the continuous dance of energy” (1983, 91). Others say that it is a place where “everything is interconnected like a vast network of interference patterns” (Lincoln 1985, 34). In 1930, astronomer James Jeans spoke of an image that, for me, aptly describes this new world: “The universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine” (in Capra 1983, 86).

When the world ceased to be a machine, when we began to recognize its dynamic, living qualities, many familiar aspects of it disappeared. In the work of quantum theorists, “things” have disappeared. Although some scientists still conduct an elusive search for the basic building blocks of matter, other physicists have abandoned this as a final, futile quest of reductionism. They gave up searching for things finite and discrete because, as they experimented to find elementary particles, they found “things” that changed form and properties as they responded to one another, and to the scientist observing them. “In place of the tiny billiard balls moved around by contact forces,” Zohar writes, “there are what amount to so many patterns of active relationship, electrons and photons, mesons and nucleons that tease us with their elusive double lives as they are now position, now momentum, now particles, now waves, now mass, now energy—and all in response to each other and to the environment” (1990, 98).

In the quantum world, relationships are not just interesting; to many physicists, they are all there is to reality. One physicist, Henry Stapp, describes elementary particles as, “in essence, a set of relationships that reach outward to other things” (in Capra 1983, 81). Particles come into being ephemerally, through interactions with other energy sources. We give names to each of these sources—physicists still identify neutrons, electrons, etc.—but they are “intermediate states in a network of interactions.” Physicists can plot the probability and results of the interactions, as in Feynmann and S Matrix (scattering matrix) diagrams, but no particle can be drawn independent from the others. What is important in these diagrams is the overall process by which elements meet and change; analyzing them for more individual detail is simply not possible (Zukav 1979, 248-50).

In organizations, we are at the edge of this new world of relationships, hoping the new charts are true; still fearing if we follow them, that we will fall off into nothing. A mariner, perched high in the crow’s nest, sometimes cries “Land ho” on faith. Knowing what to look for, knowing how land appears on the horizon, knowing how to tell clouds from land—still, sometimes, the call is an act of faith. Sighting a world of quantum organizations requires such faith. But as we become...
And in another form, the act of observation comes the property of the wave.

Interference properties of a wave are useful in the context of particles. Interference effects of electromagnetic waves can be used to observe properties of electromagnetic waves. For example, consider the interference pattern observed when light passes through two slits. The pattern shows constructive and destructive interference, which can be used to determine the wavelength of the light.

The wave can be observed under different conditions. For example, light can be observed in a dark room, where it is observed as a wave. Similarly, in a vacuum, light is observed as a wave, while in a medium such as water, light is observed as a wave. The properties of light depend on the medium in which it is observed.

In the case of electromagnetic waves, the properties of the wave can be observed using different techniques. For example, the properties of light can be observed using a spectroscope, which can be used to determine the wavelength of light. The spectroscope uses a grating to diffract light, which allows the image to be observed on a screen. The spectroscope can be used to determine the wavelength of light in a medium such as water, where light is observed as a wave.
packet to "collapse" into one aspect. Thus, one potential becomes enacted, while
the others instantly disappear. (Physicists who postulate the Many Worlds [or
parallel universes] theory say that no potentiality is lost. Each goes off, enacted, in
its own world. Worlds upon worlds come into being and exist simultaneously
[Wolf 1988].)

Without perception, the universe continues ... to generate an endless profusion of
possibilities. The effect of perception is immediate and dramatic: All of the wave
function representing the observed system collapses, except the one part, which
actualizes into reality. No one knows what causes a particular possibility to actualize
and the rest to vanish. The only law governing this is statistical. It is up to Chance."
(Zohar 1979, 79)

No longer, in this relational universe, can we study anything as separate from
ourselves. Our acts of observation are part of the process that brings forth the
manifestation of what we are observing (see chapter 4). Particles remain as fuzzy
bundles until they are observed. Only then do they become a thing. (At the
moment the wave packet collapses, quantum phenomena give way and Newtonian
physics reenters the picture.) John Archibald Wheeler, a noted physicist, states
that the ultimate constituent of all there is in the universe is the "eternal act of
observer-participancy." The universe, he says, is a participative universe (in Zohar
1990, 45). We do not, as some have suggested, create reality, but we are essential
to its coming forth. We evoke a potential that is already present. Because things
cannot exist as observable phenomena without us in the quantum world, the ideal
of scientific objectivity disappears.

Several years ago, organizational theorist Karl Weick called attention to
enactment in organizations—how we participate in the creation of organizational
realities. "The environment that the organization worries about is put there by the
organization," he observed, adding that if we acknowledge the role we play in this
creation, it changes the things we talk and argue about. If we create the
environment, how can we argue about its objective features, or about what's true
or false? Instead, Weick encouraged us to focus our concerns on issues of
effectiveness, on questions of what happened, and what actions might have served
us better. We could stop arguing about truth and get on with figuring what works
best (1979, 152, 168-69).

Weick also suggested a new approach to organizational analysis. Acting should
precede planning, he said, because it is only through action and implementation
that we create the environment. Until we put the environment in place, how can
we formulate our thoughts and plans? In strategic planning, we act as though we
are responding to a demand from the environment; but, in fact, Weick argued, we
create the environment through our own strong intentions. Strategies should be
"just-in-time . . . supported by more investment in general knowledge, a large-
skill repertoire, the ability to do a quick study, trust in intuitions, and
sophistication in cutting losses" (1979, 223, 229). In other words, we should
concentrate on creating organizational wave packets, resources that continue to
expand in potential until needed.

Weick was describing a quantum world, although he used the term
enactment. The environment remains uncreated until we interact with it; there is
no describing it until we engage with it. Abstract planning divorced from action
becomes a cerebral activity of conjuring up a world that does not exist.
Interpersonal relationships are important in the workplace. Relationships and the way we interact with others are crucial in building and maintaining effective teams. Good interpersonal skills are essential for success in the workplace.

Even in organizations where formal power is distributed in a particular manner, interpersonal skills can play a significant role. For example, a team leader may have formal power due to their position, but their ability to communicate effectively and build trust with team members can often determine the success of the team's projects.

In many organizations, informal power can be just as important as formal power. Informal power is often based on personal influence, relationships, and networking. Interpersonal skills can help individuals build a strong network of contacts and establish credibility within the organization.

Interpersonal skills can also help individuals navigate conflicts and resolve issues more effectively. Good interpersonal skills can help individuals understand and empathize with the perspectives of others, which can lead to more productive discussions and better outcomes.

In conclusion, interpersonal relationships are a key component of effective leadership. Developing strong interpersonal skills can help individuals build strong relationships, influence others, and contribute to the success of their organizations.
When we try to measure how far our desires are met, we fail to observe our goals. Instead, we try to find a way to accept our condition and try to measure how far we can accept it. The same applies to our desires. When we try to measure how far our desires are met, we fail to observe our condition and try to measure how far we can accept it.

We can measure our desires by accepting them, but the goal is not to measure them. The goal is to find a way to accept our condition and try to measure how far we can accept it. We can measure our desires by accepting them, but the goal is not to measure them. The goal is to find a way to accept our condition and try to measure how far we can accept it.

Neuronization of consciousness

Understanding the neuronization of consciousness allows us to measure how far our desires are met. By accepting our condition and trying to measure how far we can accept it, we can better understand our desires and try to measure how far we can accept them. The goal is not to measure our desires, but to find a way to accept our condition and try to measure how far we can accept it.
I have come to expect that something awful occurs if I think up people's names, or mention that I know how to do the sinister thing. I'm not sure what's wrong, but it's like I'm speaking in a foreign language. I've noticed that when I'm talking, people tend to look at me strangely. I wonder if there's a connection between the way I speak and the things I think.
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Learning Organizations in a "Changing" Age

We frequently hear about the importance of being a "learning organization." This emphasis on learning and development is crucial in today's rapidly changing world. The ability to adapt and grow is essential for organizations to remain competitive and successful.

However, the concept of learning organizations goes beyond just individual development. It involves creating a culture where continuous learning is encouraged and valued. This means fostering an environment where employees feel comfortable sharing their knowledge and learning from others.

In a learning organization, leadership plays a critical role. Leaders must model the behavior they expect from others, setting a good example in terms of their own learning and development. They should encourage experimentation and risk-taking, recognizing that failure is part of the learning process.

Furthermore, effective communication is key. Leaders and managers must be transparent and open about their own learning journeys, sharing both successes and challenges. This helps to create a sense of trust and mutual respect, where everyone feels valued and supported.

One of the most important aspects of a learning organization is the willingness to embrace change. Change is inevitable, and it requires a mindset that is open to new ideas and approaches. Leaders must lead by example, demonstrating their own willingness to adapt and evolve.

In summary, learning organizations are those that prioritize development, foster a culture of continuous learning, and encourage a mindset that embraces change and innovation. These organizations are better equipped to navigate the challenges of today's world and are more likely to enjoy long-term success.