companies that overlook this stage.”2 Think about that. Those who attempt to effect change by concentrating on changing mindsets are four times more likely to succeed than those who focus only on changing behavior.

With these findings in mind, consider two different performance-improvement approaches. In the first approach, a person or organization attempts to push behavior change while neglecting mindset change, as shown in diagram 2 on the next page.

If a person or company tries to get people to adopt new behaviors that aren’t supported by their underlying mindsets, how successful do you think such a change effort will be?

In response to this question, one executive we were meeting with said, “Some leaders, through charisma, willpower, or constant micromanaging, may be able to drive this kind of change in
the short term, even without an accompanying degree of mindset change. But in my experience, it won’t last. When that leader leaves, if not sooner, things will snap back to where they were.”

Others in the meeting agreed. “Without a change in the prevailing mindset in an organization,” one of them said, “behavior-change efforts tend to be resisted. While ‘compliant’ behavior by employees might be achievable, at least to some degree, ‘committed’ behavior won’t happen without a change in mindset. And it’s committed behavior that makes the biggest difference.”

Is the same thing true in your experience? In your work life and in your home life, what have you noticed happens (or doesn’t happen) when people try to push behavior change in a culture where the mindset remains unchanged?
Contrast the behavior-push approach with an approach that includes a focus on mindset change. Diagram 3 shows the approach Chip initiated within his SWAT squad when he started working on mindset change.

A focus on mindset change among Chip’s team members led to dramatic improvements in their behaviors and results. As their story illustrates, when you sufficiently improve the mindset—either of an individual or of an organization—you no longer have to specify everything each team member is supposed to do (the way those who operate from a behavioral model often assume). As the mindset changes, so does the behavior, *without having to prescribe the change*. And where certain behaviors still need to be stipulated, the suggestions won’t be systematically resisted.
things necessarily attach to the one who is the leader. His responsibilities, obligations, opportunities, and rewards are unique to his leader-self. The Isolated Leader also believes in his own ability to ascertain the truth about the objects on his team. The division between himself and others gives him a vantage point from which to observe and, he believes, comprehend them. Circumscribing them as objects, they seem contained and manageable.

The Together Leader sees an entirely different world. She understands that she occupies the leadership seat at this point in
Over this period, they doubled the business at a time experts thought it couldn’t grow more than 5 percent.

Let’s examine some key differences between the way Louise’s team initially tried to tackle the challenge of cutting $100 million and how they later were able to accomplish their goal. Diagram 5 shows these differences.

The team had a collective target result. They needed to cut $100 million in costs. In the beginning, they were understandably concerned about their own futures with the company. All were strongly motivated to preserve their own positions and status in the organization. With this mindset, they could consider only those options that would advance their own agendas. We illustrate this by pointing the behavior triangle at the person. We call this way of operating an *inward mindset*. 
Two Mindsets

at higher than 5 on this continuum, with most rating them at somewhere between 2 and 4.

It probably won’t surprise you that people almost universally rate themselves much higher (i.e., as more outward) on this continuum than they rate their colleagues and organizations. This is corroborated by results of a mindset assessment we use with companies. When we average the results across industries, people rate their colleagues at 4.6 on the continuum and themselves at 6.8. Think about what this means: on average, all employees in an organization think they are nearly 50 percent better — more collaborative and less blameworthy — than their coworkers. So what happens when problems arise? Those who think they are 7s look around and wait for all the 4s to change. The trouble is, all those 4s think they, too, are 7s! So everyone waits — and blames. This is a manifestation of the problem of self-deception that we wrote about in Leadership and Self-Deception.

Whatever the scores are, the objective is to move individuals and organizations further to the right on the mindset continuum.
In contrast, a person whose mindset is inward sees others as objects, so their needs, objectives, and challenges don’t really matter. The triangle on the inward-mindset diagram is turned inward to signify the self-focused nature of the objectives and behaviors of one whose mindset is inward.

The words outward and inward are helpful terms for capturing the core idea of an others-inclusive way of seeing and engaging with people as opposed to a self-centered way of seeing and engaging with people. However, the terms can create misunderstanding in a couple of ways. First of all, we are not speaking of personality types, such as extroverted and introverted people.
7. THE LURE OF INWARDNESS

In the prior chapter, we discussed how people who choose to dismiss the needs and objectives of others end up searching for ways to justify that choice. Within organizations, every person who is burning time and energy seeking justification is doing so at the expense of the contribution he or she could be making to the overall results of the company. The energy-draining, time-wasting, silo-creating effect of this justification seeking is one of the most debilitating of organizational problems.

Diagram 9 illustrates the inward mindset that is at the root of these workplace issues.
Notice that the triangles in this diagram are turned outward, as they are in the outward-mindset diagram (diagram 7). In contrast to the outward-mindset diagram, however, diagram 10 omits the needs, objectives, and challenges of others. Even though people or organizations operating with this style of inwardness feel as if they are doing things for others and not for themselves, they aren’t paying attention to the needs, objectives, and challenges of those they are supposedly doing things for. This raises the following question: If they aren’t alive to and interested in the needs, objectives, and challenges of those they are doing things for, for whom are they really doing them?

This is a question we at Arbinger had to ask ourselves. In a way, we found ourselves back in the green room again, facing
A person conceiving her work in the way illustrated in this diagram is alive to and interested in the needs, objectives, and challenges of each of the persons toward whom she has responsibility—toward her customers, direct reports, peers, and manager. The outwardly facing triangles show that her objectives and behaviors take these people’s needs, objectives, and challenges into account. As Captain Newson recommends, her focus is outward on something much larger than herself—on her essential contribution to the overall goals of the organization. And thinking of her role in this way requires her to focus on doing her work in a way that helps others to do theirs.

The power of this outward-mindset approach can be seen in the results of an innovative debt-collection agency that has built
9. THE OUTWARD-MINDSET PATTERN

In chapter 8 we introduced the outward-mindset way of thinking about one’s role and obligations at work (and elsewhere). A hallmark of this way of working is a focus on the needs, objectives, and challenges of those toward whom one has responsibility. Over the years, we have discovered that those who work with an outward mindset exhibit a particular pattern—a three-part approach that can be implemented to turn individuals, teams, and organizations outward.

DIAGRAM 12. THE OUTWARD-MINDSET PATTERN
After a few minutes, the walls were covered with diagrams that looked something like diagram 13.

All members of the various groups circulated around the room to see if they should add their own or others’ names to any of the diagrams or whether they should add any key needs, objectives, or challenges that weren’t yet listed. Everyone had free rein to amend any diagram.

Seeing themselves correctly in relation to others, the leaders were now positioned to begin seeing others more clearly than before. They only needed to start looking. We invited the teams to take turns at the front of the room. Everyone else was given

DIAGRAM 13. THE OUTWARD-MINDSET PROJECT
children wait for the same in their parents. Spouses wait on change in each other.

Everyone waits.

So nothing happens.

Ironically, the most important move in mindset work is to make the move one is waiting for the other to make. Diagram 14 illustrates this move.

The top of the diagram depicts two people—me and another—whose mindsets are mutually inward. Both of us have, in effect, turned our backs to the other’s needs and objectives. From this stance, each of us is waiting to be seen by the other. I want the other person to begin to see and consider me—my views, objectives, and needs. On some level I may
Here are some questions you can ask yourself as you utilize the outward-mindset-at-work framework for redefining your role in this way:

- **Toward your manager.** Do I have a clear understanding of my manager’s objectives? What can I do to learn about them? What do I need to do to make sure that I am holding myself accountable for my contribution to my manager’s results? Whom do I need to work with to ensure that I help my manager achieve those results?
had to resist the temptation to rethink the CSRs’ role for them. To be effective in their leadership, Rob and his team needed to help the customer service reps engage in the same process themselves—to take responsibility for rethinking their roles by using the outward-mindset pattern from chapter 9, which is reproduced in diagram 16.

Applying the outward-mindset pattern, the CSRs should learn about the objectives of those they impact, including the executive team. They would then be able to use their own creativity and initiative to determine what adjustments they should make to become more helpful in their role. They would then measure the impact of their efforts in each direction and on the organization as a whole.
One of the reasons the outward-mindset approach can be scaled so readily by people up, down, and across an organization is that outward-mindset work at the individual level mirrors the same work for a team and an entire organization or enterprise. Diagram 17 shows the same framework with enterprise-level categories in each of the four directions of the diagram.

Compare diagrams 16 and 17. Individual workers and the enterprise as a whole both have customers. Both have those they report to—a manager in the case of an individual, and a board, shareholders, or others for the enterprise. Both have peers or partners (at the enterprise level, partners might include suppliers). And all managers in an organization have those who report to them, just as an enterprise has responsibility for the workforce as a whole.