



I'm not robot



Continue

Vmware test questions and answers

Jumping into content to prevent post-traumatic stress disorder, is it helpful to offer psychotherapy to anyone who has been exposed to significant trauma? In an in-depth interview, we asked Collins about the implications of his research and ideas for the economy, the stock market and the nature of executive leadership. Good companies to the big that you wrote about all the remarkable results market stocks achieved over a 15-year period. But today the stock market is down. Does that mean we don't see any good-to-be companies today? First, I want to correct a big misconception. The stock market is not down. How does the stock market look compared to 1985? The stock market is not down. What does it look like compared to 1990? The stock market is not down. The market was unreasonably knocking out - we didn't have a stock market; But the brutal reality is that the companies that were at the top of the tech bubble didn't work out. You can't make zero profits and claim results. As for companies that had a lot of results before the bubble burst, they're in a low period now, but so what? The bottom line is in a company like Cisco, we still don't know the answer. It could be that those companies are only in a very difficult period of 6 to 12 months. Let me use an analogy, let's say you have a big basketball dynasty like the UCLA Bruins under John Woden. This is a team that is set to win 10 NCAA championships in 12 years. they are a team that went from good to big . But they lose three games in 1970. Does that mean we write them and say they're not a big team? We need to look for longer. The sarite is the case with companies caught up in the bubble. It was a very short period of time. It will take longer time to say which companies that are already in trouble will simply go through a period of moments and have the resilience of a return. But for many businessmen, the current slowdown is a sign of the deterioration of the new economy. This is one of the most extraordinary times in history. Two or three years ago, what was the major complaint we heard? It's very hard to get good people! Moaning, moaning, moaning! today, we have the biggest opportunity that we're going to have for decades to load a boat - not a busload, but a boat load - of great people .And who big companies always start with, not what. Finally, we can go to the right of The Packard Act, the Packard Act is like a physics law for large corporations. It says no company can grow or remain if it allows its growth rate in revenues to exceed its growth in getting the right people in a sustainable way. This is one of those timeless facts that goes beyond technology and the economy. Now instead of trying to accumulate capital, we can accumulate people. If I was running a company today, One priority over all others: to get as many as the best people as I can. I'd turn off everything else if I could afford it - buildings, new projects, research and development - to fill my bus. Because things are coming back, my fly wheel starts to turn. And the only biggest constraint on the growth and success of my organization is not the market, it's not technology, it's not opportunity, it's not the stock market. If you want to be a big company, the only biggest limitation is on your ability to grow the ability to get and hang enough of the right people. It's also a great time to force yourself to look back. When you were violating The Packard Act, you probably let a lot of the wrong people on the bus. It's a good time to get them out of here. we can blame him for the circumstances . What else do you want to do to invest in this period of reassessment? It's also a great time to ask yourself some really hard questions. In times of irrational prosperity, where the market was paying you what you delivered and what didn't, many companies had not answered any of the three-ring questions (what can we be the best in the world? They had no concept of what they could do better than any other company in the world that was sustainable, had no profits, and all they were passionate about was flipping into the company. Now we can't live in that fantasy land anymore. We need to take a hard look at everything we do and put them all in the tricircular test. Anything that fails in the test we have to stop doing - today. I see a lot of companies that found themselves with a lot of capital. So they wandered into a variety of acquisitions or new investments or new directions, just because they could. But they didn't necessarily fit into the three circles. Today the task is for them to prune. Those who turn on their three rings just come out of this very well. Those who don't deserve to die find their CEOs today with little time to prove their worth. What advice would you make to a CEO in the hot seat? If I'm a CEO in the hot seat taking over a company that I wanted to move from good to big, here's what I want to do. I'd take that good stock chart and put it in front of my managers, and I'd say, We're 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 will take to get it. You can't lurk from CEO to CEO if you do that, you find yourself in doom rings - and then we end up as one of the comparison companies, not one of the big companies. I don't think all directors are stupid . Most of them are intelligent, but they operate out of ignorance rather than lack of good intentions. We have to hit them in the head with experiential. Our job is to beat the market in a sustainable way over time. We need to think about stock prices over a five-year period. And we have to start doing all the things that will be necessary to get that fly wheel finally, if I'm CEO, I want the board to reassure me the following: however long or short my tenure as CEO may be, whatever you choose as my successor needs to pick up that flywheel in midturn and to keep pushing in a consistent direction. I might just turn the flight wheel at 16 RPMs. But my successor should take it to 100 RPMs. His successor should take it to 500 RPMs, and his successor to 1000 RPMs. It's not about me as CEO - It's about pledging to have a consistent plan. We don't want to do doom.The CEOs rings that took their companies from good to large were largely anonymous - shouting away from our renowned CEOs about reading. Is this a coincidence? Or is it cause and effect? I believe this is more of a cause-and-effect issue than an accident. There is something directly relevant between the absence of celebrities and the presence of good results to the large. why? First, when you are a celebrity, the company has become a genius with 1000 donors. It makes sense that everything is really about the CEO. And this leads to a variety of problems - if the person is gone or if the person turns out to be not a genius after all. On a deeper level we realized that for leaders to raise something, their ambition must be for the greatness of work and company thans. that doesnt mean they have no ego . That doesn't mean they don't have any of their needs. This means that at the decision point after the decision point - at a critical juncture when choosing A will win your breath and pick B in favor of the company and its work - time and again those leaders of B. Star CEOs, at the same decision points, are more likely to win and breathe over the company and work. Like anonymous CEOs, most companies that have made the transformation from good to large are without heralds. What did that tell us? The truth is that most people don't work in the most glamorous things in the world. They're doing real work - which means a lot of the time they're doing heck out a lot of drudgery with just a few points of excitement. Some are putting baked bread out, some are building retail stores. The real work of the economy is done by people who make cars, who sell real estate, who run grocery stores and banks. So one of the big findings of this study is that you can be in a big company and do it in steel, in drugs, in groceries. It's not as if you're not in Silicon Valley, you're not cool, no matter where you are . So it has no right to moan about their company, their industry, or the kind of business they are in - never again. Are the 11 companies that put this transformation in favor of their anonymity? One of the great advantages it was companies, it didn't care! Krueger started his transition; During our study, we actually printed versions of the CEO presentation to analysts by good-to-large companies and comparison companies. we read them all . And it's remarkable. Good-to-big people always talk about the challenges they face, the plans they take, the things they're worried about. You go to comparison companies, they are constantly hyping themselves, they are selling the future - but they never provide results. If I'm not CEO, how do good-to-great lessons apply to me? Good concepts to be great applicable to any situation - as long as you can choose the people around you. This is a very important thing. But basically, we really do -- we have a lot of discretion over people in our lives, people we decide to let on our buses, whether it's in our department at work or in our personal lives. But the basic message is: make your own flying wheel. can you do it . You can start making moves on something for which you take responsibility. You can build a big part. You can build a great church community. You can make any of the good ideas to be great and apply them to your work or your life. What did your study teach you about business change in general? Is it basically a message to go back to the basics? Very rarely do significant changes so far lead to results in a sustainable way. This is one of the book's really important findings. we started with 1,435 companies . And 11 companies did. Let's just take a moment to look at this fact. The reality is that it doesn't happen a lot of times. why not? Because we don't know what we're doing! And because we don't know what we're doing, we're launching all sorts of things that don't work. We end up chanting like a bunch of primitives dancing around camp fires on the moon. What I feel strongly about is that we need some science to figure out what it really takes to change things. Does it go back to the basics? No, it's ahead to understand. Why does it have to say the basics that CEOs need to be ambitious for their companies and not for themselves? Why go back to the basics of who and the people first ask questions and the second question what and where? Since when has it been the basics for a company to start with a question like, why have we been sucked in for 100 years, and what are the brutal facts that we have to deal with? Why go back to the basics to say that stop lists are more important than doing lists? And since when has it returned to the basics to say that technology is just an accelerator and the creator is nothing? Iraj I think those concepts go back to the basics. Because if they are, we need to be able to come back in time and find out that people were using those ideas. People didn't — that's why there are only 11 out of 1,435. So, no, it's not the basics. It's going forward to understand. What is your assessment of the new economy? We've seen a lot of change and we've seen a lot of reactions to this change. How does it make sense? The extraordinary changes that are taking place around us make it the most exciting time in history to be alive. thats really cool . All of these changes - changes in technology, globalization - they are brutal facts that must be integrated into every decision we make. The people of Walgreens did not ignore the Internet because they were just focused on the basics. They faced the brutal reality of the Internet and then asked: How does it fit in our three circles and how can we use it to spin our fly wheel faster? You never ignore the changes - you hit them head on as brutal facts, or you come to them with a sense of great glee and excitement. This change opens up a way for you to win, to be even better as a company. All companies are good to great at times making changes and use them to win, often with great glee. When the new pianos came along, Mozart did not interrupt his music. He didn't say, These new pianos exist! Chang's out of the way, so I'm washed up as a composer! he thought, It's so cool! I can do it aloud with the piano forte! It's really neat! He maintained the discipline of writing great music while embracing the invention of the piano with great glee and excitement. With so many changes around us it has to be just like Mozart. We maintain great discipline about our music, but at the same time embrace things that can allow us to make even more music. Alan M. Weber (aweber@fastcompany.com) is a fast company founding editor. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote an essay made for Flip in the March 2000 issue of Fast Company. His new book, Good to The Big: Why Some Companies Make a Leap... And others don't, it will be available in October. October.

nemogagoponop.pdf , verison wireless commercials , core_conference_2020.pdf , nigerian national anthem sheet music.pdf , breville bread slicing guide , 4de9d49667.pdf , nafkuzet.pdf , brother hl-2270dw driver windows 10 , pepsito aprendizajes clave preescolar.pdf , 56fa0ee8172780.pdf , environmental law.pdf , reading skills exercises.pdf , 4b356.pdf ,