Dc motor questions and answers

In a deep interview, we asked Collins about the implications of his research and ideas for the economy, the stock market, and the nature of executive leadership. The good-scale companies you write about all achieved incredible stock market results over a 15-year period. But today, the stock market is down. Does that mean we won't see any good companies for great today? First, I want to correct great misconceptions. The stock market is not down. How does the stock market look relative to 1985? The stock market is not down. How does it look relative to 1990? The stock market is not down. The market is irrational than whack - we don't have a stock market; we have a speculative casino. New non-economic technology bubbles - there is a new economy that has been many years at a deeper level. But the cruel fact is that the companies that are at the top of the tech bubble do not have results. You cannot make zero profits and claim that you have results. In the case of companies that have great results before bubble bursts, they are in a period of down now, but so what? The bottom line on a company like Cisco, we don't know the answer anymore. It can be that the companies are only within 6- to 12 months very difficult. Let me use analogy. Let's say you have a great basketball dynasty like the UCLA Bruins under John Wooden. This is the team that will win 10 NCAA tournaments in 12 years. They are a team that goes from good to great. But in 1970, they lost three games. Does that mean that we will write them and say they are not a great team? We need to look at it over a longer period of time. The same goes for companies trapped in the bubble. It's too short of a period of time. It will take more time to tell which companies are in trouble now only going through a short period of time and will have the resilience to return. But to many businessmen, the current slowdown is a sign of the death of a new economy. This is one of the most beautiful times in history. Two or three years ago, what were the main complaints we heard? It's very difficult to get a good person! Whine, whine, whine! Today, we have the biggest chance we'll have for decades to snag a load of boats - not busloads, but boat loads - great people. And great companies always start with whom, not what. We can finally get to the right side of Packard Law. Packard Law is like a physics law for large companies. say that no company can be or stay great if it allows its earnings growth rate to exceed its growth in getting the right people in a sustainable way. It is one of the timeless truths that go beyond technology and the economy. Now, instead of trying to raise capital, we can accumulate people. If I run a company today, I'll have a Priority above all else: to acquire as many of the best people as I can. I'll put everything out if I can afford it - buildings, new projects, R&D - to fill my bus. Because things are coming back. Flywheel I'll start turning. And the biggest single constraint on the growth and success of my organization is not a market, not a technology, not an opportunity, not a stock market. If you want to be a great company, the single biggest limitation on your ability to grow is the ability to get and hang to enough of the right people. This is also a good time to force yourself to look back. When you break Packard Law, you might let a lot of people wrong on the bus. This is a good time to get them. In fact, it's a little easier to do it now. We can blame him in the circumstances. What else would you do to take advantage of this reassessment period? This is also a good time to ask yourself some really hard questions. In times of irrational prosperity, where the market will give you money whether you deliver or not, many companies don't answer any questions in three circles (What can we be the best in the world? What economic denominators are best driving our economic engines? And what are our core people very enthusiastic?). They don't have the concept of what they can do better than any other company in a sustainable world, they don't have a profit denominator, and the only thing they have the passion for releasing companies. Now we can no longer live in that fantasy land. We need to look hard at all the things we do and put them all in for a three-circle test. Anything that fails testing we have to stop doing - today. I see a lot of companies that find themselves with a lot of capital. So they stroll into all kinds of acquisitions or new ventures or new directions, simply because they can. But they are not necessarily suitable in three circles. Today, the job is for them to be prudent. Those who explain their three circles will come out of this just fine. Those who did not deserve to die. Today's CEO finds themselves with little time to prove their worth. What advice would you give to the CEO in the hot seat? If I'm a CEO in the hot seat taking over the company I want to move from good to great, here's what I did. I'm going to take a good stock chart to great, and I'll put it in front of my director. I would say, We're on the left This. We want to be on the right side of the curve. Senior? If that's what we all want, we know what it's going to take to get it. You cannot continue lunch from CEO to 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 directors are stupid. Mostly are intelligent, but they operate out of ignorance rather than a lack of good intentions. We need to hit them over the head with empirical results. Our job is to beat the market in a sustainable way over time. We need to think about the share price in five years. And we need to start doing all the things that will be taken to get that changed flywheel. Finally, if I'm CEO, I want the board to give me the following assurance: However my long or short period as CEO might be, whoever you choose as a substitute I have to take that flywheel in the middle and keep pushing in a consistent direction. I can only get the flywheel turned on 16 RPMs. But my successor needs to take it to 100 RPMs. His successor has to take him to 500 RPM, and his successor to 1,000 RPM. It's not about me as a CEO – it's about commitment to a consistent program. We're not going to do Doom Loop.The CEO who takes their company from goodness to great is largely anonymous - a far cry from the celebrity CEO we read about. Is that an accident? Or does it cause and effect? I believe it's more to cause and impact than an accident. There is something directly related between the absence of celebrities and the presence of good results. Why? First, when you have a celebrity, the company turns into a genius with 1,000 followers. It provokes a sense that the whole thing is really about the CEO. And that leads to a variety of problems - if the person goes or if the person turns out not to be a genius after all. On a deeper level, we found that for leaders to make something great, their ambition was to work and company prowess rather than for themselves. That doesn't mean that they don't have an ego. It does not mean that they do not have any self-needs. This means that at the point of the decision after the point of results - at a critical juncture when Option A will favor their ego and Choice B will favor the company and its work - the time and again the leaders choose Choice B. Celebrity Ceo, at the same point of decision, more likely to favor themselves and ego over the company and work. Like an anonymous CEO, most companies that transform from goodness to large are infinitable. What does that tell us? In fact, most people don't work in the most glamorous things in the world. They do real work - which means that most of the time they do a lot of droughts with just a few points of fun. Some people put on baked bread. Some built shops The real work of the economy will be done by the people who make the car, who sell properties, who run grocery stores and banks. So one of the great findings of this review is that you can be in a great company and do it in steel, in drugstores, in grocery stores. It simply doesn't happen that if you don't Valley, you're not cool. It doesn't matter where you are. So no one deserves to whin about their company, their industry, or the kind of business they have - ever again. Did the 11 companies that make the transformation benefit their anonymity? One of the great advantages that these companies have, nobody cursed! Kroger began his transition; Nucor began his transition; nobody expects much. They can be underlying and overdelivering. In fact, if I took over a company and tried to make it go from good to great, I would tell my vice president of communications that his job was to make the rest of the world think that we were always on the edge of the doom. During our review, we actually printed transcripts of the CEO's presentation to analysts by good companies and comparison companies. We read all those people. And it's interesting. Good people always talk about the challenges they face, the programs they build, the things they worry about. You go to a comparison company, they always hype themselves, they sell the future - but they never deliver results. If I am not a CEO, how is the lesson good to apply to me? A good concept to be great is to apply to any situation – as long as you can choose the people around you. That's the important thing. But basically, we really do - we have a lot of discretion over people in our lives, the people we decide to let our buses, either in our departments at work or in our private lives. But the basic message is this: Build your own flywheel. You can do it. You can start building momentum in something you have a responsibility. You can build a great department. You can build a great church community. You can take every good idea to be great and apply them to your own work or your own life. What do you teach you about changes in business in general? Is it basically a message to get back to the basics? Very rarely does significant changes ever lead to results in a sustainable way. That's one of the very important findings in the book. We started with 1,435 companies. And 11 companies did it. Let's just take a look at that fact for a while. The fact is, it doesn't happen frequently. why not? Because we don't know what we're doing! And because we don't know what we're doing, we launch into a variety of things that don't produce results. We ended up like a primitive bunch of dancing around the fire chanting on the moon. What I feel strong is that we need some science to understand what it really takes to change things. Is it back to the basics? No, it's forward to understand. Why go back to the basics of saying that CEOs need to be ambitious for their company and not for themselves? Why it goes back to the basics for doing who and and people question first and what and where is the second question? Since when does it go back to the basics for a company to start with such questions, why have we been inhaled for 100 years, and what cruel facts should we face? Why go back to the basics of saying that the stop list performs is more important than a to-do list? And because when it comes back to the basics to say that technology is just sprinting and not the creators of anything? I don't think those concepts go back to the basics. Because if they are, we should be able to come back in time and find that people use those ideas. People don't - that's why there are only 11 out of 1,435. So, no, it doesn't go back to the basics. It's forward to understand. What is your assessment of the new economy? We've seen a lot of changes, and we've seen a lot of backlash on change. How do you make sense of it all? The big changes that are happening around us make it the most exciting time in history for life. It's really fun. All these changes — changes in technology, globalization — they are cruel facts that must be integrated into whatever decision we make. The people at Walgreens don't ignore the Internet because they only focus on the basics. They face the cruel facts of the Internet and then ask, How does it fit into our three circles, and how can we use it to spin our flywheel faster? You never ignore the changes - you hit them head as cruel facts, or you come to them with a sense of happiness and excitement. This change, this new technology paves the way for you to overcome, becoming better as a company. All good companies take change and use them to their advantage, often happily. When the new pianos came along, Mozart didn't hang his music. He didn't say, There's this new pianos! Harpsichord was off the road, so I washed up as a composer! He thought, This is so cool! I can do it aloud with a forte piano! This is really messy! He keeps the discipline of great musical writing and, at the same time, embraces with great joy and excitement of pianos invention. With all the changes around us, we need to be just like Mozart. We maintain great discipline about our music, but at the same time, we embrace things that can allow us to make bigger music. Alan M. Webber (awebber@fastcompany.com) is the founding editor of Fast Company. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote essay Built to Flip in the March 2000 issue of Fast Company. Her new book, for The Great: Why Some Companies Make the Jump... And Others Don't, will be available in October. October. October.