MACQUARIE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

MGSM WORKING PAPERS IN MANAGEMENT

**The Reflective Practice of Managers and Leaders:
The Cases of Steve Waugh and Andrew Grove**

Steven Segal

**Macquarie Graduate School of Management
MGSM WP 2006-7
July 2006**

MGSM WP 2006-6

Title: The Reflective Practice of Managers and Leaders: The Cases of Steve Waugh and Andrew Grove

* Corresponding Author

Dr Steven Segal
Macquarie Graduate School of Management
Macquarie University NSW 2109, Australia

Phone: +61 2 9850 9907
Fax: +61 2 9850 9019
Email: steven.segal@mgsm.edu.au

The Reflective Practice of Managers and Leaders: The Cases of Steve Waugh and Andrew Grove

Abstract

This paper uses the leadership and management experiences of Steve Waugh and Andrew Grove to highlight the value of existential reflection for the development of a manager's professional practice. Through the use of the two examples it demonstrates how existential experiences of estrangement form the basis for experiential practices of management education. It shows how such experiences of estrangement are opportunities for reflecting on taken for granted management practices and how such experiences open up the possibility for new practices or ways of managing. Existential reflection is crucial for managers who are trapped in one way of doing things and need to develop a new set of management practices. What distinguishes existential forms from other forms of reflection is that it uses moments of estrangement as opportunities to step back and put practice in perspective. Used appropriately existential forms of reflection are valuable tools of management education.

Key words:
Existential; management, leadership, practice, reflection, estrangement, education, awareness

The Reflective Practice of Managers and Leaders: The Cases of Steve Waugh and Andrew Grove

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate the value of existential philosophy for management education by showing that existential reflection is central to management practice. It will show how existential reflection offers managers the opportunity to develop a greater awareness of their own practices and how existential forms of reflection can help managers who experience themselves as stuck in their existing routines to open up the possibility for new sets of management practices. Furthermore, implicit in the paper is the view that management educators can use existential experiences as opportunities for management education. For by tuning into the existential experiences of management students management educators are tuning into the emotional dimensions in which management students are asking questions of their own practices in an emotionally vital and dynamic way.

The paper will be divided into two sections. In the first section I will use the experiences of Steve Waugh, the ex captain of the Australian cricket team to bring out the significance of existential questioning for leadership and in the second section I will focus on the experience of Andrew Grove, ex CEO of Intel to highlight the significance of existential questioning for leaders and managers in a corporate context.

I

Existential questioning is a certain form of questioning. It is questioning under conditions of estrangement; questioning under conditions where a person can no longer take the common sense or habitual ways of doing things for granted. (Segal 1995) In this sense existential questioning, unlike "disengaged rational reflection" (Taylor 1993: 235), is a questioning in the context of action. Existential questioning occurs where we can no longer go on with our everyday ways of doing things. The disruption in our everyday way of doing things is the spring board for reflection in the context of action. We reflect because we become perplexed with our own practices. We need to understand the relationship between our everyday way of doing things and perplexity to understand the existential form of questioning.

In a move away from traditional philosophy and science, existential philosophers hold that the human beings primary relation to the world is not one of thinking about the world but one of acting in the world. (Heidegger 1985) This is expressed in various ways by different existentialists. Jean Paul Sartre, for example, claims that we become who we are not by abstract deliberation but by being engaged in the world. Only as we act do we become. Thus he says that there is no such thing as a heroic or cowardly personality. We become heroic or cowardly through the actions that we perform: "There is no such thing as a cowardly temperament...What people feel obscurely, and with horror, is that the coward as we present him is guilty of being a coward. What people would prefer would be to be born either a coward or a hero." (1975:43)

Similarly we become the kinds of managers that we are not by abstract thought about the concept of management but by the way in which we engage in the process of management. Tony Watson has referred to this as the sink or swim approach to management. It is by being thrown in at the deep end that we learn to become managers; that both our identities, practices and philosophies of management develop – in fact Donald Schon argue that professional knowledge in general is developed by the ways in which we act in situations. We develop a sense of know how through our action. As Schon says: "I begin with the assumption that competent practitioners usually know more than they can say. They exhibit a kind of knowing-in-practice, most of which is tacit." (1987: 8)

From Sartre's perspective action has a particular dynamic. It is not simply by being present in a passive way in a situation that we become who we are, that is, it is not through a passive process of responding to stimuli that we become who we are. Central to action are the notions of choice, commitment and responsibility in a situation. We become who we are through the kinds of choices that we make: ""In life, a man commits himself, draws his own portrait, and there is nothing but that portrait. … Man makes himself; he is not found ready-made; he makes himself by the choice of his morality … We define man only in relation to his commitments." (1975:42)

An example of this is the ex captain of the Australian cricket team Steve Waugh. When he became captain of the Australian cricket team, he was overwhelmed by the honour of the position and in some ways felt unsure as to whether he was up to the task. The way that he dealt with the anxiety of not feeling up to dealing with the task was by playing the role of being the captain. He tried to be like a number of the previous captains of Australia, imitating their way of doing things by reading up about them and trying to follow the "manual" on what it meant to be a captain. However, the more he tried to be a captain, the less in tune he was with the immediacy of the situation. He found that he lost his spontaneity; his intuition and sense of himself as a captain. As one commentator puts it: "Waugh did what others before him had done. He listened – to former players, captains and commentators. He took advice from anyone who was willing to give it – and there were many. He collated it all in his head and the result was, well, uninspiring. Ian Chappell recalls, Waugh captained the side in a conservative fashion, and that is not the style best suited to Australian cricketers."(Stewart 2001)

In Sartrian terms he was in "bad faith." Bad faith, for Sartre, is a certain kind of response to anxiety or the uncertainty of an unfamiliar situation. In bad faith we attempt to avoid the risks entailed in expressing ourselves by identifying with the role that we are playing. We hide ourselves in or role. Steve Waugh is not the only leader who in the uncertainty of an unfamiliar situation hid himself in his role. Jack Welch writes of a similar kind of experience of bad faith when he became vice chairman of GE: "At one of my earliest board meetings in San Francisco shortly after being named vice chairman, I showed up in a perfectly pressed suit, with a starched white shirt and a crisp red tie. I chose my words carefully. I wanted to show the board members that I was older and more mature than

either my 43 years or reputation. I guess I wanted to look and act like a typical GE vice chairman." (2001: xiv)

But he goes on to say that this strategy of coping with the uncertainty of the unfamiliar by playing the role did not work: " Paul Austin, a longtime GE director and chairman of the Coca-Cola Co., came up to me at the cocktail party after the meeting. 'Jack' he said, touching my suite, 'this isn't you. You looked a lot better when you were just being yourself.' Thank God Austin realized I was playing a role – and cared enough to tell me. Trying to be somebody I wasn't could have been a disaster for me." (2001: xiv)

His "bad faith" is to be found in his desire to "look and act like a typical vice chairman" rather than being himself. The more he played at being a vice chairman, the less the spontaneity of his self could emerge and indeed the less attuned he was to the situation. The notion of bad faith is not a moral but a psychological category indicating a state of being emotionally and existentially withdrawn from a situation in which a person is in and thus not alive and present to the possibilities inherent in a situation. In a situation of bad faith a person is either frozen in their role or frozen in a state of emotional detachment but in both cases they have lost their capacity for situationally appropriate responding. They have lost their "responding-ability." They are not "there" in what they are doing but are withdrawing. (Sartre 1976: 54, 55) Steve Waugh describes the experience of feeling distant from his own team and function as a captain: "I could see not only my strength as a leader fading by my absence, but also a team that was losing focus and direction." (Border A 2000, p204).

Presences of mind is vital to being a captain who needs to be able to trust his judgment in situation. The issue came to a head for Steve Waugh when on a tour of Sri Lanka he broke his nose in a game. In the moment of disruption he became aware of the fact that he had been playing the role of being a captain. For until this point he was not aware that he had been playing the role of being a captain. Paradoxically, he had been too absorbed in playing the role of being a captain to be aware that he was playing the role of being a captain: I was sitting in the hospital with my nose smashed everywhere thinking `Jeez, if I never play a Test again, I haven't done what I wanted to do as captain. I haven't really got stuck in and led from the front the way I'd like to have led. I've sort of been a prisoner to other people and other ideas rather than going for it myself." (Stewart 2001)

 Putting this in Sartre's terms: After breaking his nose, he became aware of himself as playing role of being a captain. Paradoxically, it can be said that whilst he was playing the role of being a captain, he was not aware of himself as playing the role of being a captain. He was again paradoxically; too busy playing the role to see that he was playing the role. It was only when through breaking his nose he was jolted out of his practice of playing the role that he came to see that he was playing the role. And it was only when he came to see that he was playing the role of being a captain that he could move beyond playing a role to a new possibility; to the possibility of trusting himself. He became a different kind of captain; one who led from his own intuitive understanding. As he puts it: "I decided to go on my gut instincts, to believe in my ability and go with that. I wanted to be loyal to myself and follow my own instincts rather than someone else's … that takes a while to work out." (Stewart 2001)Waugh's resolve was the point of departure for

someone who is now recognised as one of the greatest captains in Australian cricket. In fact he has recently been recognised as the Australian of the year.

Although Sartre does not refer to such an experience in these terms, the existential philosopher Martin Heidegger calls this an experience of authenticity. (1985:232)The experience of authenticity is described by Heidegger as an individualizing experience. It is one in which a person becomes present in situation, spontaneous and open to the possibilities in a situation by shaking off doing things in a particular way because one is "supposed" to or "expected" to do them in that way. Such an experience is individualizing because in it a person cannot rely on anything other than themselves. Machiavelli in his analysis of the relationship between David and Goliath describes the situation of authenticity most vividly: "When David offered himself to Saul to go forth and fight Goliath, Saul armed him with his own armour, which David as soon as he had put it on, rejected, saying that with these untried arms he could not prevail, and that he chose rather to meet his enemy with only his sling and sword. In a word, the armor of others is too wide, or too straight for us; it falls off us, it impedes us, or weighs us down." (1908:13)

So too with with Steve Waugh: by shaking off the armour of previous Australian cricket captains, he was able to develop his own armour and by developing his own armour he was able to "smite" his enemy which included being able to read the game in the contingency of the situation and being able to respond in the context of action. He was existentially present and alive to the opportunities and possibilities present in each situation. He was not in a state of existential detachment or withdrawal such that he first needed to consult his manual before he could act.

The example of Waugh allows us to see that from the existential perspective, it is in the context of relationship that we become who we are; whether this be leaders or managers; that it is a particular attitude in relationship that is important, that is the choices and commitments in the face of uncertainty are crucial for the development of our judgment or situational appreciation and that it is the disruption of our experience or relationship that our experience becomes open for reflection. For it is in the disruption of our experiences that we begin to see our experiences for the first time. For the most part we are absorbed in our experiences rather than attuned to our experiences. Existential reflection is the process of being estranged from our experiences in such a way that we step back from them and become reflectively aware of them.

An existential thinker who has developed the theme of relationship is Kierkegaard. Indeed, so frustrated was Kierkegaard with the disengaged rationality of Hegel, that he came to argue that there is no truth to be found in abstract speak but that all truth depends on the set of relationships that we are in; that something becomes true only as we enter into relationship with it and that it is our relationship that shapes what we see in the first place. In some ways this is a theme that has been taken up in quantum physics which maintains that an atom is seen as a wave or particle depending on the type of relationship we have to it. So too for Kierkegaard, the existence of God is not a matter of objective truth but a matter of relational commitment. Similarly the way I experience another

person depends on my relationship to them. As my relationship changes so my understanding of the other changes.

Part of the notion of relational truth for Kierkegaard is that it involves a leap into the unknown; a leap which requires what Kierkegaard called faith. It would be incorrect to understand faith as being blind for Kierkegaard. Although it is not based on objective knowledge, it is grounded in an inward certainty in the face of objective uncertainty. This is quite clearly evidenced in the case of Steve Waugh. When he had given up trying to captain the Australian cricket team by the textbook, Waugh did not have at his disposal an objective concept or image of what it meant to be a captain. Indeed he did not have a well developed and detailed linguistic representation of what it meant to be a captain. Rather he had his "gut instinct." He trusted his intuition – and he trusted it in the context of objective uncertainty. He did not first know what he was going to do and then do it. On the contrary, it was only as he did that his knowledge emerged.

In Kierkegaard's terms, Waugh had faith in himself and through acting in terms of his faith he came to develop as a captain and he began to develop a concept of what it meant to be a captain. Here we see a central existential theme, that is, that both our identity and our concept of what we are doing develops in the context of action. It is not by pure thought that our thought – our philosophy of being a captain, a manager, a leader develops. It is in the context of our actions that our philosophy develops.

I would like to sum up the existential positioning terms of the philosophy of martin Heidegger. For Heidegger the human being discovers its world not firstly through thought but by being involved in the world. To continue the cricket analogy, it is not by thinking about a cricket bat that we develop an understanding of a cricket bat but it is by using it. It is not by analysing a ball that e develop a sense of bowling, it is by bowling that we develop a feel for the ball. No amount of abstract thought will ever convey the feeling of bowling a ball – and the feeling of bowling a ball cannot be captured in a disengaged cognitive way. Similarly from a Heideggerian perspective we develop an understanding of "mother" or father" brother or sister not by first thinking about the concepts of these beings but it is by standing in relationship that we develop a sense of these beings. Once we have developed a sense of them through our involvements, we may turn to a dictionary to clarify their meanings and gain a precise definition but no amount of starring a dictionary in abstraction is going to give us a sense of them.

Similarly, from the Heideggerain perspective we develop a sense of "manager" or "leader" not by thinking about the concepts of these phenomenon but by being in relationship to managers and leaders or by being managers and leaders. No amount of just starring at and re-reading the definition of manager, leader, mother or father is going to give us a sense of these concepts. In the same way we develop a sense of "organizing" from being involved in the activities of organising. No amount of staring at an organization is going to give us a sense of an organizing – mainly because there is in fact nothing to look at. There is no such "thing" as an organization. It does not have the ontological status of an object. It is, from the Heideggerian perspective through our

involvements; through our "being-in" the activity of organizing that we develop a sense of organizing.

For Heidegger the human being is not only involved in the world. There are occasions on which it stands back and puts its world into perspective. There are moments in which it comes to see itself as being involved in the world. It must be stressed that for Heidegger whilst we are involved in the world, we are not explicitly aware of the world in which we are involved. Our being involved in the world is a background factor whilst we are involved in the world. It is only when we are estranged from our involvements that they are fore grounded and thus that we become present to them. Estrangement from our involvements is the crucial step in the act of reflection. To be estranged from our involvements is to be taken out of our involvements. In moments of estrangement we do not feel part of what we had historically been involved in. We see ourselves or our activities as though from a distance. An example of this would be a person who has historically been religious sitting in a church, mosque or synagogue, feeling weird and estranged from what had historically been a taken for granted commitment. Suddenly the familiar appears as being strange and unfamiliar. But it is precisely in the strangeness of what was once familiar that existential questioning emerges. Camus describes this as an experience of the absurd.

As Douglas-Mullen has stated this experience of reflection through estrangement from the familiar is not an aberration or abnormality butt is an essentially human possibility: "One feature peculiar to humans is the ability to detach ourselves from our lives and see ourselves as if we were `just one of them.' For some of us the thought of this comes more often and stays longer. This type of person is described as `reflective,' `self-conscious,' 'neurotic,' `ironic,' `pensive,' `deep' etc." (1981, p11)

Nelson Mandela gives a good example of such estrangement when he sat on a flight from Ethiopia: We put down briefly in Khartoum, where we changed to an Ethiopian Airways flight to Addis. Here I experienced a rather strange sensation. As I was boarding the plane I saw that the pilot was black. I had never seen a black pilot before, and the instant I did I had to quell my panic. How could a black man fly a plane? But a moment later I caught myself: I had fallen into the apartheid mind-set, thinking Africans were inferior and that flying was a white man's job. I sat back in my seat, and chided myself for such thoughts." (Mandela, 1995, p281)

In the context of the philosophical process what Mandela is saying is that he had a certain experience or perception of black men being unable to fly. However, instead of simply taking this belief for granted, he stood back from it and questioned it. The basis upon which he came to stand back and question it was a moment of disruption, or, as he puts it, an experience of a "strange sensation." This strange sensation was the disruptive mood which allowed him to question and then to free himself from his assumption. Without the experience of the "strange sensation" it is doubtful that he would have questioned the convention of black men being unable to fly. The strange sensation was the mood that alerted him to his own dis-ease. Perhaps what is crucial in the case of Mandela is that he

was highly attuned to the disruption, to the moment of a "strange sensation." And because he was attuned to it, he was able to ask the question that was begging him to ask.

It is important to emphasise the relationship between questioning and the mood of a "strange sensation." Mandela questioned his assumption because he experienced a "sensation" that invited him to question the assumption. Without this sensation of strangeness he would not have even noticed that there was a question to be asked. Rather he would not have even known that he had a prejudice. For by definition we do not simply notice our blind spots: we cannot even make an effort to see what we are blind to, for we do not know that we are blind to it. We need to be alerted to our blind spots. One way of being alerted is through the experience of strange sensations.

II

But, what it may be asked has this to do with the phenomenon of management in organisations? There are many examples in management literature that indicate that it is when managers are estranged from their practices as managers they begin to catch sight of their practices of managers, that they open up the possibility of questioning, reviewing and reformulating their view of management. This can be found in , amongst others the experience of managers and leaders like Andrew Grove, Ricardo Semler and Mort Meyerson -- all of whom used experiences of estrangement from their practices to examine their existing practices and open up new ways of being and concepts of management for themselves.

Andrew Grove's experiences in this context are articulated in his book <u>Only the Paranoid Survive.</u> In this book amongst other things he shows how it was a crisis at Intel that led him to become aware of his taken for granted practices of being a manager and develop a new concept of being a manager. The central event in Grove's reflective awareness of his management practice was a crisis at Intel generated by a threat from Japanese competitions. This crisis occurred in the early 1980's when Intel dominated the microchip market. It had taken years for Intel to build itself up to be the dominant player in the market. It was proud of itself, having put much effort into building itself up. As Grove says: "We worked day and night to design the chip … We worked as if our life depended on it, as in a way it did."

The emotional nature of Grove's language should be noted. Through the intense effort and commitment of employees at Intel, a way of doing things – the "Intel" way of doing things -- emerged. Intel was proud of its problem solving practices and of its practices of dialogue in which ferocious arguing whilst remaining friends developed. It was proud of its excellence in research practices. It also developed a strong identity and culture. In this culture "Intel stood for memories; conversely, memories meant (usually) Intel."(1996, 85) So deeply rooted were the practices of Intel that they had the character of what Grove calls "religious dogmas." (1996:90) They were imprinted in the very being of Intel. They gave Intel a sense of confidence and certainty in the world of microchips. Intel just new what it was doing. Its convictions allowed it to go from strength to strength, enabling it to focus on becoming more efficient and taking its culture for granted: "People were

pleading with us for more parts. … We were scrambling to build more capacity." (1996:88)

This was an exciting period for Intel. They were extremely goal focused – until it came to the Japanese who were able to produce better quality microchips in larger volumes and at less of the cost. This sent shock waves of fear through Intel. But in the early stages Intel dealt with the threat as a challenge to develop its own efficiencies. And so it attempted to deal with the competition on the basis of its cultural strengths. It relied on its practices of problem solving, research and dialogue to become more efficient in its production of microchips. However, the more efficient it became, so the more efficient became the Japanese competitors. Every time Intel improved, its competitors improved.
Not only did this frustrate Intel but it caused wide spread panic in Intel. For Intel tried everything that it new to deal with the threat, yet each effort resulted in failure: "We fought hard. We improved our quality and brought costs down but the Japanese producers fought back." (1996:87)

Senior management at Intel realised that they did not have the know-how to beat off their Japanese competitors. In fact they were quite stunned by the way in which Japanese know how surpassed theirs, As Grove says, the "quality levels attributed to Japanese memories were beyond what we thought were possible." (1996:85) They saw that the Japanese were, to use the words of Grove "taking over the world semiconductor market" and they saw this happening, to use Grove's expression "in front of our eyes."

In Socratic terms they were at this point experiencing a moment of "aporia." The word aporia comes from the Latin aporia which means to be without a path. For Intel the experience of the powerhouse of Japanese competition was one in which they felt that they had been knocked off their path. They had lost their way because they could no longer rely on their way of doing things. They could not rely on their way because they had seen in the Japanese a more effective way of doing things, one which they lacked both the know how and resources to match. They felt overwhelmed by the power of Japanese competition: "All this was very scary from the point of view of what we still thought of as a little company in Santa Clara, California." (1996:85)

Although they felt overwhelmed by the efficiencies of the Japanese, this did not stop them trying to compete with the Japanese. Indeed their primary response to the threat was to work harder. However, hard work was also no solution. For hard work in the absence of a clear direction is self defeating. Even though Intel could see that it did not have the means to compete with the Japanese, it would not give up "trying." Even in the face of failure they continued to try. But none of their trying helped them escape the threat to their existence: "During this time we worked hard without a clear notion of how things were ever going to get better. We had lost our bearings. We were wondering in the valley of death." (1996: 89) No matter how defiant Intel was or how intensively it believed in itself, it had lost its way. It was confused: "We had meetings and more meetings, bickering and arguments, resulting in nothing but conflicting proposals." (1996:88)

There came a point in Grove's struggle that he realised that he could not struggle any more, that struggling was futile. He contemplated both his own end at Intel and the death of Intel. Yet at that very moment he entered into a qualitatively different mindset. He moved away from a mindset of "trying" or "willing" to one of "resigned reflection." In this mindset he began to ask different kinds of questions about himself and Intel:" I remember a time in the middle of 1985, after this aimless wandering had been going on for almost a year. I was in my office with Intel's chairman and CEO, Gordon Moore, and we were discussing our quandary. Our mood was downbeat. **I looked out the window** at the Ferris wheel of the Great America amusement park revolving in the distance, then I turned back to Gordon and I asked, "If we got kicked out and the board brought in a new CEO, what do you think he would do?" Gordon answered without hesitation, "He would get us out of memories." I stared at him, numb, and then said, "why shouldn't you and I walk out the door, come back and do it ourselves?" (1996:89)

As this quotation indicates, Grove and Moore were no longer "trying" to fight off their aimlessness. They had given up "trying." They accepted their lostness. Grove accepted the possibility of his own end at Intel. However, the moment they gave up a trying mentality, they entered a different mode of attunement; a reflective mode of attunement; one in which they stood outside of a dogmatic commitment to the habitual way of doing things at Intel. Their minds were now free to roam; to be responsive to other possibilities. Here Grove could pose a speculative "what if" question to himself and Gordon More about Intel, that is, he asks Moore and himself to answer the question: what if they were replaced by another CEO?

As indicated in the quotation, the way in which Moore answered this question renewed both Moore's and Grove's sense of hope. It opened up new sets of possibilities for them; one's that they could not imagine whilst in a "trying" mentality. They moved very quickly from a sense of resignation and despair to one of excitement. To be sure the excitement was mixed with much uncertainty. For they did not have a well-developed sense of the new journey that they were about to embark on. But, in the face of the unknown, they had openness to a new direction that they did not previously have. The combination of excitement and uncertainty was more hopeful than despair and resignation.

As part of their new attitude towards Intel, they began to see that Intel had already been moving in a new direction but because of their preoccupation with a "trying" mentality they had been blind to this new direction. At a grass roots level a shift had already begun to take place. Middle management, Grove notes, had for a long time been shifting production from microchips to microprocessors: ""By the time [senior management] made the decision to exit the memory business, only one out of eight silicon fabrication plants was producing memories. … Bit by bit [middle managers had been allocating] … our silicon wafer production capacities to those lines which were more profitable, like microprocessors…" (1996:97)

Paradoxically, the acknowledgement by Grove and Gordon Moore, the chairman of Intel, that they could not meet the threat posed by competition in terms of their historical

strengths did not lead to the demise of Intel but enabled Grove and Moore to begin to see Intel in a new way. The moment of acknowledging their lostness was also the moment in which they were able to see new possibilities. Their moment of greatest despair was also the occasion for much hope and a new way of being. They embarked on what Grove called a "new journey." On this new journey they began to see things in their organisation that they had taken for granted. They became more attuned to the mood of the organisation. They began to realise that as senior managers they had drifted away from the coalface of the organisations activities. They did not even know that they had drifted away. The threat of the Japanese highlighted for them that they had moved away. It made them stop and look at what in fact was occurring within Intel – and they saw how detached they had become from the various levels within Intel.

We could well articulate this as an experience in corporate therapy, a form of therapy in which an experience of fragmentation of the Intel "psyche" becomes the occasion for becoming attuned to the mood of the organisation and refocusing the technology, energy and mindset of the organisation. Indeed Grove in his post Intel crisis reflection urges senior management to learn how to listen to the fears and uncertainties emerging out of middle management. The process of listening to the fears of middle management is a therapeutic process – something that is quite foreign to the rationalist training of managers. And so what we begin to see is not only that Grove's perspective on Intel begins to change but his perspective on managing in an organisational context begins to change.

Why is it that an acknowledgement of their lostness became the basis for a new way of seeing Intel? This was because they were no longer dominated by their lostness. They were no longer "trying" to avoid their lostness and thus they were no longer motivated by their lostness. By accepting their lostness, they freed themselves from its hold over them. Once they were no longer motivated by a desperate need to escape their lostness, the sense of being lost, lost its grip on them. They could begin to see beyond the horizon of being lost. Putting this in terms that Heidegger borrows from the German poet Holderlin we may say that there where the danger is, so the saving power grows. Instead of avoiding the danger, we need to embrace it.

It was not Intel that they were killing but their old attitude towards Intel that was dying. They were freeing themselves from a historically powerful mindset. Instead of trying to meet the competition in terms of their historical mindset, they began to question the mindset in terms of which they had been habituated. The more they were able to question their habitual mindset, the more they were able to see new possibilities for Intel. Although Grove had no definite sense of the new direction for Intel, his mood was transformed from despair to an excitement mixed with a great deal of uncertainty and guilt.

Part of the process of moving from a "trying" to a "philosophical" attunement lay in both Moore's and Grove's ability to see Intel from the perspective of an other. Hence Grove's questioning in the above quotation, asking Moore how he thought a new CEO would see Intel. This shook them out of their habitual mindset and freed them to see in a new way.

As we have already noted the experience of the gaze of the other is a condition for philosophical reflection, that form of reflection in which we come to question our habitual ways of doing things as a basis upon which to open up new ways of doing things.

The experience of Grove at Intel shows how difficult it can be to develop a "helicopter" perspective. For we are so locked into our habitual ways of seeing things that in the face of a threat to our way of doing things we tend to rely on them more rather than rise above them. We need to go beyond a trying mentality to develop a helicopter perspective. Going beyond a trying mentality often means embracing the anxiety of losing our path, the anxiety of not knowing where we are going. The human tends to resist this. Yet, as we see in the case of Grove, it is by accepting the loss of path that he is able to rise above the frenetic and frenzied but pointless "trying" attitude. The acceptance of the loss of path allows his mind to open up to new possibilities for Intel. And so paradoxically, it is by letting go of Intel rather than by "trying" to save it, that he allows for it to be saved!

Thus we begin to see how the threat posed by competitors shifted the attunement of Grove and Moore. It shifted their attunement from one of being aggressive like warriors, trying to beat the competition to one of philosophical reflection on the habitual but taken for granted conventions and assumptions behind Intel's functioning. First they attempted to meet the competition in terms of their strengths. When realising that they could not, they began to question the conventions of their own strengths. This form of questioning was not easy. It was like questioning the unquestionable. They were seen as and experienced themselves as traitors. But it was by being able to continue with this process of questioning that they were able to envisage Intel in a new light.

Not only did the crisis at Intel lead to the transformation of Intel, it also led Grove to rethink his understanding and practice of management. Whereas prior to the crisis, he had assumed a rational understanding of the theory and practice of management, through the crisis, he became acutely aware of the non-rational dimensions of management. This includes the role of judgment, intuition and emotion in being a manager. In times of crisis, he maintains that managers have got nothing more than their intuition and judgment on which to rely. Rather than analysis, they need to rely on their ability to read situations. This leads him to conclude that rather than seeing management as primarily a technical activity, it needs to be seen as an activity which involves the person as a whole, that being a manager presupposes being a well developed and well rounded person: "So, when your business gets into serious difficulties, in spite of the best attempts of business schools and management training courses to make you a rational analyzer of data, objective analysis will take second seat to personal and emotional reactions almost every time."

Underpinning sound judgment in management from Grove's perspective is a sense of what he calls "paranoia." Managers in order to thrive need to be paranoid. Of course he cannot mean this in the clinical sense of the word. For people who are paranoiac tend to project their own feelings onto others. They do not see or read other people well at all. Grove wants to convey the opposite, namely an acute ability to read situations. What he

is getting at through the idea of paranoia is that managers need to always be attuned to threats to the existence of the organisations, that being attuned to threats is the basis of being vigilant and that vigilance allows managers to be attuned to new opportunities and possibilities. They need to be able to discern different kinds of threats and real from imaginary threats. It is by being attuned to threats that they are able to anticipate and be attuned to changes in their environment.

 For Grove managers need to know how to worry correctly. It is his ability to worry that allows him to be attentive and attuned to what is occurring at the coalface of the organization. It is worry that prevents him from taking his own assumptions for granted. Worry is the basis of his curiosity: "I worry about products getting screwed up, and I worry about products getting introduced prematurely. I worry about factories not performing well, and I worry about having too many factories. I worry about hiring the right people, and I worry about morale slacking off. …" (1996:3)

Why is worry so important? It was Freud who over a century ago articulated for us the way in which fear and anxiety are states of heightened arousal in which we become more attentive to the situation in which we are. For Grove, it is his sense of worry that allows him to be constantly scanning his environment to see what is occurring: "It is fear that makes me scan … searching for problems: news of disgruntled customers, potential slippage's … Simply put, fear can be the opposite of complacency. Complacency often afflicts precisely those who have been the most successful." (1996: 118)

Of course not all worry is productive. It can be paralysing. Too much worry, as Freud and other psychotherapists can tell us, leads to a numbing of our attunement. This point is reiterated by Grove who says that an environment of excessive and uncontrolled fear will "cut off the flow of bad news from the periphery." And as we have seen too little worry leads to complacency. But he who knows how to worry correctly is alive to that which is taken for granted in the complacency of routine. To be able to worry appropriately is a virtue and a sign of practical intelligence. As Kierkeaard puts it: "Whoever has learned to be anxious in the right way has learned the ultimate." For who ever has learnt to be anxious in the right way is not bogged down by threats but always sees possibilities in them.

Grove believes that it is his ability to worry appropriately that allows him to see beyond the conventions of the day. It is worry that allows him to be attuned to new possibilities for Intel. For worry shakes him out of the complacency of conventions and encourages a reflective relationship to the situation we are in: ""If we fear that someday, any day, some development somewhere in our environment will change the rules of the game, our associates will sense and share that dread. They will be on the lookout. They will constantly be scanning their radar screens." (1996:117)

Grove came to see that strategic thinking requires not only analysis of data but a feeling for the organization. Feeling makes possible an attunement that cannot be attained through rational analysis of data: "But data are about the past. … By the time the data showed that the Japanese memory producers were becoming a major factor, we were in

the midst of a fight for our survival." (1996:117) In contrast to the rational analysis of data, their sense of worry had already alerted them to this fight. But, as we have seen, they denied the reality that was emerging through their worry.

This is not to say that there is no place for the analysis of data. Rather, as Grove puts it, "you have to know when to hold your data and when to fold them." (1996:117) A manager needs to be able to discern situations in which they need to be rational from situations in which it would be appropriate to operate in terms of business feel. They need to be able to respond accordingly.

In the context of the Intel crisis Grove also comes to question his assumptions about control in an organization and comes to argue that while the history of management has been about tight control, in times of crisis control can be an impediment to opening new possibilities and thus a source of blindness. Instead of control, managers need the resolve to be able to, as he puts it, let chaos reign. For chaos allows for experimentation and this allows for new opportunities: ""Loosen up the level of control that your organisation normally is accustomed to. Let people try different techniques, review different products, exploit different sales channels…" (1996:130)

In times of disruption managers need to become reflective, allowing for the questioning of habitual ways of doing things as the basis for opening up new ways of doing things. This means not that there is no terror or uncertainty but it does mean accepting it – going through it, seeing it as the basis for questioning habitual ways. It should be pointed out that Grove is not advocating allowing chaos to reign as an end in itself. Rather once chaos has allowed a new direction to emerge, it needs to be reigned in: "The time for experimentation is over. The time to issue marching orders – exquisitely clear marching orders – to the organisation is here. And the time to commit the resources of the corporation as well as your own resources – is upon you." (1996:153)

To conclude: The questioning of the habitual way of doing things at Intel threw Grove into an "existential crisis" in which he could not make sense of the reality which engulfed him. He was in what he called the "valley of death," a valley which he compares to crossing a desert in which he has lost his bearings. But it was precisely by accepting his loss of bearings that he began to open up a new way of Intel. Indeed it was by staying with his loss of bearings that he was able to see the limits of his old habitual style of management and open up the possibility of a new way of being a manager.

The experience of crisis as an opportunity to stand back from the everyday practices that have formed the taken for granted basis of our actions and to put them in perspective is a dimension of existential reflection. From the existential perspective we gain perspective by standing back from our everyday activities and it is through moments of being estranged from these activities that we get to stand back. But existential reflection is not only about reflecting on what has been. It is also about opening up new possibilities by questioning old habitual ways of doing things. In this sense existential reflections are occasions of creative destruction. As seen in the case of Andrew Grove such experiences

of existential reflection are vital for managers who are in the process of developing a perspective on their practices as managers.

Bibliography

Border A, Langer J, Warne S and Waugh S, (2000) *The Dominators: One of the Greatest Test Teams*, Sydney: Hodder

Douglas-Mullen J (1981) *Kierkegaard's Philosophy: Self-Deception and Cowardice in the Present Age* U.S.A.: A Mentor Book.

Grove, A. (1998) *Only the Paranoid Survive* Great Britain: Harper Collins Publishers

Heidegger M. *Being and Time* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Machiavelli (1908) *The Prince* translated by W. K. Marriott
http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince00.htm

Mandela N. (1995) Long *Walk To Freedom* Randburg: Macdonald Purnell

Sartre J.P. (1975) *Existentialism and Humanism* London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.

Sartre JP (1976) *Being and Nothingness* London: Metheun & Co.

Schon D (1987) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Josey Bass, San Francisco

Segal S (1995) "Meaning Crisis: Philosophical Counselling and Psychotherapy" in Lahav R. and Tillmans M. (ed) *Essays on Philosophical Counselling* University of America Press.

Stewart C. (2001) "Perfect Pitch", *The Australian Magazine* (June9-10).

Taylor C. (1993) "Engaged Agency and Background in Heidegger" in Guignon C. (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Welch, J. (2001) *Jack* London: Headline Book Publishing.