I'm not robot

reCAPTCHA

Continue

The pardoner's tale question answers

This credit union updates its online bank website, so a fish pilot with accounts has its latest entire family account. The new feature was safety questions, says Fish. I didn't like the three that gave up, so I did the drop-down to see more questions. I chose my three new questions and wrote the answers to the husband knew what they were. But the first time he's trying it, he's tingling the password. Fish went through the whole process to recreate the account setup. The next time she tries, fish must go through the whole process again - but this time she printed out screen capture of the questions she chose, and write the answers about them. To make sure it doesn't happen a third time, fish walk it through the process of the connection. But when they get into the safe question, the one that pops up isn't one of the new-picked fish. I chose questions I knew he could answer, Fish says. I bypass the question about what my high school has graduated from, but have it been, waiting for an answer. On my last try at three-try-or-you're locked-out scenarios, I remember that was the first question of the three original choices. So I supplied the answer I used for the first question: 'Where were you born?' Bingo, I was in. This is ridiculous, think fish. It puts in a call to repeal the same customer service that has already reinciliated the account password twice. The rep tells Fish that a whole lot of people are getting locked up on security questions. Can I talk to the programmed? fish asks. I can't transfer you, rep says. OK, write this down and give it to the IT department, Fish says. Tell them that while they let users choose new questions, they will record their answers but keep the original default questions as first introduced. I also asked where to send my bill to solve consultation problems, but never heard back from them, says Fish. But now we have a way of making safety questions unbreakable by danger. For example, for the question 'Where were you born?' We are clear in the year of the birth of the account as the answer. Answer Sharky's call for the true height of IT life! Send me your story in sharky@computerworld.com. You're going to make a snazzy Shark shirt every time I use one. Comment on today's story in the Google+ community, and it's thousands of great old stories at Sharkives.Get your daily dose of out-takes at the IT Theater of the Absurd delivered directly to your Inbox. Subscribe now to Shark's Daily Newsletter. Copyright © 2017 IDG Communications, Inc. in an in-depth interview, we asked Collins about his research implications and ideas for the economy, stock market, and the very nature of executive leadership. The good-to-great companies that you wrote about all achieved stock-remarkable results over a 15-year period. But today, the stock market is down. Is this we won't see any good-to-great company today? First, I want to correct a major misconception. The stock market isn't down. How does the stock market look relative to 1985? The stock market isn't down. How does it look relative in 1990? The stock market isn't down. The market was irrationally out of whack - we didn't have a stock market; we had a spectacular casino. The technology bubble wasn't the new economy – there's a new economy that has gone for years to a deeper level. But the brutal reality is that the companies that were at the top of the tech bubble didn't result. You cannot make zero profits and claim that you have results. In the case of companies that had huge results before the bubble clash, they're in a down period right now, but so what? The bottom line on a company like Cisco is, we don't know the answer yet. It might be that these companies are just in a very difficult 6- to 12-month period. Let me use an analogy. Let's say that you have a big basketball dynastil as the Bruins are UCLA under John Wooden. This is a team that will win 10 NCAA championships in 12 years. They're a team that went from good to great. But in 1970, they lost three games. This means that we'll write them off and tell them they're not a great team? We have to look over a period of time again. The same is also true of companies that took in the bubble. It was too short of a period of time. It will take more time to tell which companies are in trouble now they are simply going through a momentary period and will have resilience in back. But in a lot of businesspeople, the current slows are a sign of the resignation of the new economy. This is one of the most wonderful times in history. Two or three years, what was the biggest complaint that we heard? It's so hard to find good people! Wine, wine, wine! Today, we had the greatest opportunity that we will have for decades cooked a boat - not a biload, but a boat - of great people. And big companies always start with whom, not that. We can finally get to the right side of packard law. Packard's law is such a physical law for big companies. He says no company can become or remain strong if it allows its growth rates to profit in excess of its growth in finding the right person in a sustainable way. It's one of those long truths beyond technology and economics. Now instead of trying to accumulate capital, we can accumulate people. If I were to run a company today, I would have a priority above everyone else: get as many of the best people as I could. I would put in everything else if I could afford it – building, new projects, R&D – complete my bus. Because things are going to come back. My steering will start to turn. And the single biggest constraint on growth and success of me not markets, not technology, not opportunities, not the stock market. If you want to be a big company, the largest single limit on your ability to grow is the ability to find and hang on enough of the right people. This is also a great time to force yourself to look back. When you've broke Packard's law, you probably left a lot of people wrong on the bus. This is a good time to get them off. In fact, it's a little easier to do that now. We can blame him on the circumstances. What else would you do to capitalize on that period of reevaluation? This is also a great time asking yourself some really hard questions. In a time of irrational prosperity, where the market would give you money if you delivered or not, a lot of companies didn't answer any of the questions in the three circles (What can we be the best in the world? What is the economic denominator that best drives our economic engine? And what basic people are we deeply passionate about?). They had no concept of what they could do better than any other company in the world that was sustainable, they had no denominator profits, and the only thing they had passion for would flip the company. Now we can no longer live in this fantasy country. We've got to take a hard look at all the things we're doing and put them all in the three-dry test. Anything that fails the test we must stop doing – today. I see a lot of companies that found themselves with a lot of capital. So they came up in all kinds of acquisition or new enterprises or new directions, simply because they could. But they didn't necessarily fit into the three circles. Today, the job is to run away. Those who clarify three circles will be out of this just fine. Those who don't deserve to die. Today's CEOs find themselves with little time to prove their worth. What advice would you give a CEO on the hot seat? If I was a CEO on the hot seat taking on a company that I wanted to move from good to great, here's what I'd do. I would take that good-to-big stock chart, and I would put it in front of my principal. I would say, We are on the left side of this curve. We want to be on the right side of the curve. Right? If that's what we all want, we know what it's going to take it. You can't keep lurching out the CEO for CEO. If you do, you'll find yourself in the Doom Loop – and then we'll end up as one of the comparison companies, not one of the great companies. I don't think all the directors are stupid. Most of them are smart, but they're operating out of ignorance rather than a lack of good intent. We need to hit them on the head and the results are empirized. Our job is to beat the market in a sustainable way over time. We need to reflect on the shares price over a five-year period. And we need to start doing all these things it will to get this steering turn. Finally, if I'm the CEO, I want the board to give me this assurance: However long or short my blood pressure as CEO can be, whoever you choose as successor I need to pick up that steering middle and keep pushing in a consistent direction. I can only find the steering turn of 16 RPMs. But my successor took it to 100 RPMs. Successor took it to 500 RPMs, and his successor to 1,000 RPMs. It's not about me as CEO – it's about a commitment to a consistent program. We won't make a Doom Loop.CEOs that took the companies out of the great good were largely anonymous – a far cry from the celebrity CEOs we read about. Is this an accident? Or is it causing and effect? I believe it's more a matter of cause and effect than an accident. There is something related directly between the absence of celebrities and the presence of good-to-great results. Why? First, when you have a celebrity, the company turns into one the engineering and 1,000 people are helping. It creates a sense that the whole thing is really about the CEO. And that leads to all kinds of problems – whether the person goes away or if the person turns out not to be an engineering after all. At a deeper level, we've found that for the leaders to do something big, ambitions to be for the greatness of the work with the company rather than for themselves. That doesn't mean they don't have a means. It doesn't mean they don't have any self-need. This means that at decision points after decision points – at the critical junctures when Choice A would favor the months and Choice B would favor the company with its work – time and again ideas to choose Choice B. Celebrity CEOs, at the same decision points, are most likely to favor self and average over companies and jobs. Like THE ANONYMOUS CEOs, most of the companies that made the transformation from good to large are unherald. What tells us? The truth is, most people aren't working in the most glamorous thing in the world. They're doing real work – which means that most of the time they're doing a carcass in a lot of drudgery with only a few points of excitement. Some people are wearing cooked bread. Some are building retail stores. Real jobs in the economy become done by people making cars, which sell real estate, who run stores and banks. So one of the great conclusions of this study is that you can be in a large company and be doing it in steel, in drugs, in grocery stores. It's simply not the case that if you're not in Silicon Valley, you're not cool. It doesn't matter where you are. So no one is allowed to wine on their company, their industry, or the type of business they're in – ever again. Are the 11 companies who made the transformation benefited by their anonymity? One of the big advantages that these companies were, nobody was Kroger began his transition; Nucor began his transition; no one was waiting for much. They could be subpromised and overdeliver. In fact, if I would have taken more than one company and trying to make it out of good things, I might have told the vice president of communications to me that his job was to make the entire world think we were always on the edge of doom. In the course of our study, we actually print out the transcript of the CEO presentations of analysts by good-to-large companies and the comparison companies. We read everyone. And he's knocking. Good-to-great people are always talking about the challenges they face, the programmes they're building, the things they're worried about. You go through the comparison comparisons, they're still banging themselves up, they're selling the future - but they're never delivering results. If I'm not a CEO, how do the good-to-great lessons apply to me? The good-to-great concepts are applicable in any situation – as long as you can pick the people around you. That's the crystal thing. But basically, we really do – we have a lot of discretion about the people in our lives, people we decided to leave on our bus, whether it's our department at work or in our personal lives. But the basic message is this: Build your own steering. You can do it. You can start building momentum into something for which you've got responsibility. You can build a large department. You can build a large church community. You can take each one of their good ideas-to-great and apply them to your own work or your own life. What did your study teach you about change in business in general? Is it essentially a message for the back of basics? Very rarely making significant changes ever lead to results in a sustainable way. This is one of the really important results in the book. We started with 1.435 companies. And 11 companies did it. Let's just look at this reality for a moment. The reality is, it doesn't happen very often. why not? Because we don't know what the heck we're doing! And because we don't know what we're doing, we launch in all sorts of things that don't produce results. We end up like a bunch of primitive dancers around the changing camp of the moon. What I feel strongly is that we need some science to understand what it really takes to change things. Is it back to basics? No, it's ahead for understanding. Why is it back to the basics to say that CEOs need to be ambitious for companies and not for themselves? Why is it back to basics to do who and who are the first question people and what and where are second questions? Since when he's turned to basics for a company to start with a question like, why have we sucked for 100 years, and what are the brutal facts that we have confronted? Why is it back to the basics to say that stop-making lists are more important than list-making? And since was it back to basics to say that technology is only an accelerator and not an creator of anything? I don't think these concepts go back to basics. Because if they are, we should be able to return in time and find that those who have used these ideas. People didn't - which is why there are only 11 out of 1,435. So no, it's not back to basics. It's advanced for understanding. What's your assessment of the new economy? We've seen a lot of changes, and we've seen a lot of backlash against the change. How do you make sense out of it all? The formidous changes that are taking place around us make it the most interesting time in history to be alive. It's really fun. All these changes – changes in technology, globalization – are brutal reality that must be integrated in whatever decisions we make. The people of Walgreens didn't ignore the internet because they focused solely on basics. They confronted the internet's brutal reality and then asked, how does it fit into our three circles, and how can we use it to turn our steering faster? You never ignore change – you hit them head-on as brutal reality, or you come into them with a great sense of sleep and excitement. The change, this new technology opens up a way for you to be your best, to be even better as a company. All the good-to-great companies have taken change and used them to their perks, often with great sleep. When the new piano came together, Mozart did not hang up his music. He did not say: There are these new pianos! The Harpsikod is out of the way, so I washed up as a composer! She thought, this is so cool! I can make it out loud with piano forte! This is really neat! He kept discipline in writing great music and, at the same time, embraced with great sleep and excitement of the piano inventions. With all the changes around us, we need to be just like Mozat. We keep a great discipline on our music, but at the same time, we embrace things that can allow us to do even greater music. Alan Webber (awebber@fastcompany.com) is a fast founder company editor. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote the essack built in Flip in March 2000 issue of Fast Company. His new book, Good Great: Why Some Companies Do the Leap... And others do not, they will be available in October. October.