

E-Culture: Voices from the Survey

Much public discussion of the Internet has focused primarily on one loud issue - the dramatic rise of pure Internet companies and then their equally dramatic fall in market value. But while dot-com booms and busts make a great deal of noise, countless other businesses are quietly incorporating the Web into their operations. To observe the real changes wrought by the Web, my global project at Harvard Business School surveyed 785 companies and other entities, with help from WorldLink and Inc. magazines.

The survey examined attitudes (generally positive), uses (varying), barriers (many), and the rise of a new way of operating that I call e-culture. The best organizations already embrace this flexible, change-oriented culture of tomorrow, whether or not they have a dot in their names. Revolutionaries Outnumber Conservatives

Let's start with what the survey tells us about attitudes — who desires or detests the Web, — as reflected in degrees of agreement with five broad statements. Overall, Web enthusiasts outnumber skeptics, but while the Internet is seen as very important for everyone, the future of Internet-only companies is in doubt.

1. Revolution?

“The Internet will completely transform every aspect of business in the foreseeable future.”

A solid 75% strongly agree or agree with this statement; only 9% disagree. The rest are in the middle, expressing neither agreement nor disagreement, but there are fewer fence-sitters on this issue than on any other. Government and non-profit organization representatives are much more likely to strongly agree, perhaps a sign that government officials and NGO leaders see the importance of the Internet to their countries' future. They are followed in their enthusiasm for revolution by publicly traded corporations, which tend, on the average, to be larger than the “closely held” cluster, and which, by definition, must respond to the pressure of global capital markets. There are no country differences in revolutionary beliefs, and enthusiasts are found among the oldest as well as the youngest respondents. They declare:

- “I believe the true value of the Net will exceed even the radical predictions now taking hold in the media.”
- “We are counting on the fact that the Internet is changing business. We DO expect to change the world.”
- “The Internet is the most positive thing that has ever happened in the technology field. This new technology will completely change the way we do business.”
- “Eventually our industry (construction) will see the light. Those companies that work with the technology now will be ahead in the future.”

2. Competitive necessity at any cost?

“It is important for every company in my industry to have a web presence and be actively engaged in e-commerce even if they do not make money doing it.”

Rosabeth Moss Kanter
The Class of 1960 Professor of
Business Administration
Harvard Business School

Rosabeth
MOSS
KANter

Overall, 63% strongly agree or agree; 18% disagree. Advocates and zealots were more likely to respond to the survey, but it is still striking that so many leaders endorse expenditures without requiring a return. Fewer than 20% are fence-sitters.

Agreement is even stronger among the publicly traded corporations, at statistically significant levels. Similarly, the more international the company, the more likely is strong agreement (also statistically significant). This can reflect the cosmopolitanism of international companies but also their larger size and greater likelihood of exposure to global supply chains and global capital markets. Clearly, larger public companies feel pressure to invest in the Internet regardless of ability to show immediate earnings, but our interviews indicate that this issue of long-term investment versus short-term earnings creates constant tension within the company. To many, the Web is now just another factor of business and thus a cost to be borne, like advertising expenditures. As one CEO wrote on his survey, "Failure to use the Internet may have a greater negative impact on the performance of the company than having a presence contributes to performance." European and Latin American respondents are much more likely to agree strongly with the necessity to invest - perhaps because only true believers responded to the survey, or because they see this as the best way to compete with North American companies. A high-ranking executive at an industrial goods manufacturer in India said flatly, "Companies must become web-centric to survive."

3. Just another tool?

"The Internet is not really that different from any other business tool; it should not change enduring wisdom about how companies should operate and how leaders should behave."

Overall, 30% agree; 56% disagree. This question starts to get at who sees the necessity for deep, systemic change, in contrast to narrow, ad hoc approaches to using the Web.

The closely held corporations, professional partnerships, and joint ventures are most likely to agree with the "no change" point of view. Publicly held corporations are most likely to disagree with the "no change" statement, at statistically significant levels. Larger, publicly traded companies exposed to global competition and capital markets are the most likely to understand that the Internet calls for significant departures from their traditional methods of operation. This is confirmed by a glance at other cuts through the data.

Companies domestic in scope are much more likely to see this as just another tool that doesn't require much change on the part of the company; companies international in scope are more likely to strongly disagree, thus indicating that major change is necessary (a statistically significant difference). Asians are much more likely to agree with the "no change" point of view, which some interviewees explain in terms of low labor costs, which makes it less necessary to replace human-mediated processes with e-business processes. Europeans (with high labor costs) are more likely to disagree and see the need for major changes in thinking (a statistically significant finding). The Internet craze has already hit Europe, but it is only starting to penetrate Asia, despite centers of technology excellence in India, Singapore, Taiwan, and the Philippines.

It is likely that responses to this question reflect degree of experience with the Internet. Those who think it doesn't really change much organizational behavior are unlikely to

have done much with it yet. Those who are trying to do more with e-commerce and e-business find that they must rethink many traditional organizational assumptions.

4. Bricks versus clicks? “Established ‘bricks and mortar’ companies with strong brands still have the advantage and will ultimately win in competition against pure Internet companies.”

Overall, 38% strongly agree or agree; 32% disagree; and almost the same percentage are smack in the middle. Clearly, this is an area of mixed views and a great deal of uncertainty. This is where the battles of the future will be fought. But the smallest companies and the closely held cluster are still the least convinced about change; 40% of them pick the bricks. There are no real differences among regions in responses to this issue. And there are no discernable differences between pure Internet units and others; they are just as uncertain as the rest of the respondents and just as likely to spread their bets among BAMs, Internet pure plays, and hybrids.

We posed the question as either/or, but it is clear that hybrid bricks and clicks models are favored, even by revolutionaries. One said: “The Internet is where everything will be moving. So much drudgery can be eliminated by purchasing or researching online. But bricks and mortar will not disappear, because shopping is a social event, and we like to touch and feel some things before buying them.” Companies that combine physical and virtual channels are the likely winners.

5. Must a generation die off?

“The Internet and e-commerce will not really take hold until the old generation of corporate leaders gives way to a new generation of young entrepreneurs.”

Only 18% strongly agree or agree; 65% disagree. This could reflect confidence that established companies and mature leaders can change, or it could reflect a view that the advent of e-business is so far along regardless that it does not require that much future change. We heard both points of view reflected in interviews.

There are no real differences among types of companies, their international scope, or their headquarters region. Age of respondents also make no difference. There is a tendency for respondents from pure Internet units to be more likely to agree that the old generation needs to go, as a quarter of them agree with generational replacement. And this is one question on which the smallest companies in general weigh in for change: 22% of those with under 100 employees feel the old generation must be replaced by entrepreneurs. But this has less to do with age of the person than age of the company, many felt, expressing sentiments like this: “My company is a dinosaur in a world that requires and rewards nimble, quick-flying birds. I think the Internet requires a higher speed of understanding, prioritizing, organizing, and acting.”

The Great Equalizer?: Uses of the Web

Web enthusiasts see the Internet offering vast potential for local companies to compete with global giants on a level playing field. Respondents said:

- [leader of a Middle Eastern technology services company] “The Internet breaks down regionality, allowing us to compete on a par with all others. We can bring

together multicultural creativity at a lower cost than the West and make full use of the sleepless Internet market.”

- [top executive in a European luxury goods dotcom] “I believe that the Internet is the greatest equalizer of our age. Never has there been greater opportunity for so many for so little. While we eagerly embraces the Internet, there is no doubt it will also lead to great carnage for most distribution chains.”
- [founder of an American custom furniture company] “The Internet has been a blast! We are VERY excited about its potential for growing our business and changing the way people purchase our product, which has been very locally based.”
- [CEO of a 30-year-old Australian retailer] “The Internet has turned our business from a one city retail operation, into a national business.”
- [founder of a Texas home maintenance contracting service] “The Internet can make a small company like mine look just as big as the competitors I’m going after.”

The doubters, in contrast, challenge Internet hype, commenting that the Web is “way overrated; a mantra similar to a religion” or “I’m sick of the hype and business models which are so obviously flawed (like online grocers).” Only a tiny percentage of all respondents (4 percent) feel the Web is an irrelevant waste of time or money. They cite legal requirements (e.g., can’t advertise), products or services that are “emotional purchases,” or the need to build personal trust. Still, for every one of the arguments doubters cite to justify staying off the Web, active users show how technology augments, not replaces, traditional business relationships.

The e-culture survey asked respondents about the importance to their company of 11 possible uses of the Web. One enthusiast wrote at the end of the list: “I would have liked to mark a category of ‘duh.’ Why would we NOT use the Internet to do these things?” - echoing our finding that the faster-moving pacesetters get more benefits. We used a crude proxy for effectiveness: self-reports of whether the unit is better or worse than competitors in deriving benefits from Internet use. The sample is split between self-reported “better” (350) and self-reported “worse” (115), with the rest in the middle as “neither better nor worse,” so comparisons are illuminating. The self-nominated “better” companies are much more likely to report growth in profits, revenues, and market share, attributing some of this growth to the Internet.

The only use which the competitively “worse” find more important than the competitively “better” is the simplest (and currently the most discredited): to post information on the Web-what is called “brochure-ware.” But the self-proclaimed “better” are much more likely than the “worse” to use the Internet to do more things that transform fundamental business processes[See Chart 1] The “better” companies view the Internet more broadly:

- [Media company executive] “We moved successfully a traditional print business are an almost pure Internet business. The Internet allows access to incredible breadth of market, has demanded speed that traditional print business could not dream of, and allows user contribution and interactivity that is now real time compared to across months in the old model. Our business will be paperless in 2 years.”

Rosabeth
MOSS
KANTER

- [Oriental rugs dealer] “We have been online for 6 years. We use the Internet to generate sales leads. We sell cheaper online because overhead is lower, but we are careful not to compete with our retail operation. When we computerized in 1993, the industry laughed. Now we are considered innovative, copied, and looked to for advice.”
- [Head of a Canadian entertainment company] “In the past few years a lot of our international clients found us over the Internet. Our future financial success will be because of it.”
- [CEO of a professional services firm] “The Web has helped us to recruit from all over the world. We’ve hired a Texan, a North Carolinian, and we really like a Romanian who applied. Now we can send clients work 24 hours a day.”

These uses of the Web, of course, require more than a stand-alone web-site; they require fundamental business change. One top executive commented, “I have been involved with this company for many years and can hardly grasp the changes WE are making, let alone the advances available we have not explored yet. The potential for the future is awesome.” Still, not everyone sees that potential. Some see mostly obstacles.

Barriers to Change

“The Internet has the power to change a whole lot of things a little, but only a few things a whole lot,” a survey respondent e-mailed us. “What we’re seeing is a general reluctance to take the leap of faith necessary to move more products and services onto the Web.” Companies say that the leap they must make is over a set of barriers.

We compared the obstacles experienced by 390 companies over 20 years old (call them “pre-Information Age”) and 395 Information Age companies founded since 1980. Newer companies face external barriers such as reluctant customers, inadequate technology, supplier resistance, or difficulties finding partners. But for older companies, the most significant barriers to e-culture change lie within their own organizations. [See Chart 2]

Success depends on top leadership’s view of the Internet’s importance and their willingness to invest in fundamental organizational change. If support at the top is lukewarm, then e-business is not given attention, and a legacy of internal rivalries can cause established units to resent and undermine new initiatives outside their silos. Consider these comments:

- (Financial services executive) “It starts with senior management ignorance of technology. This attitude has changed in the past two months; now there is an imposed urgency from above to do everything. But we have internal opposition from parts of the organization that are threatened by the Internet. The sales force is obviously not keen on deploying the Internet with channel partners which means reduced sales to them.”
- (Retail executive) “Because the Internet flattens the hierarchy, we have management that is uneasy with this change in focus and power that is leading to a team-based approach to work. Our company has been very hierarchical in its 50-year existence, and the sweeping changes that the Internet brings are unsettling to many. In addition, the company has had bad previous experiences with new technology, and is thus now more risk-averse.”

Internal and external barriers collide when newer companies are held back because older companies are too wedded to the past. “We are still behind in use of the Internet,” said the CEO of a Hawaiian company. “Some of that is due to our slow response, but it is also due to other vendors and suppliers not being there yet.” An Asian business-to-business Internet portal for the construction industry finds it hard to meet optimistic projections because large customers unwilling to move procurement activities to the Web, preferring to rely on personal relationships and the services of intermediaries who can advise them. This startup - part of a larger family conglomerate - had also expected banks, insurance companies, and others to sign on as partners, but here, too, it encountered resistance.

Ironically, technology companies can also resist change. “Although I work for a technology company, we have not utilized technology even a fraction of its value. It’s similar to being married to a doctor who is never around to treat the family illnesses,” a survey respondent commented. One high tech CEO whose engineers were reluctant to change found differences in the cultural mindset of the Internet world: “quick response time versus plan, execute, test, learn, revise, plan, execute, test. Our whole cycle used to be an annual cycle. Now it’s weeks. So rather than being intellectual and analytical, the skill is in being experimental, quick to discover trends and build on what’s working and kill off what’s not working. And that’s just a mindset change that is surprisingly deep-seated in individuals and in the culture of an organization.”

A New Mindset: Toward E-Culture

A mind-set change is at the heart of e-culture, and it distinguishes Web pacesetters from Web laggards. The biggest single differentiator of “the better” companies lies in responses to 12 survey questions about organizational style. The Web brings new requirements for business success: a constant search for innovation, improvising without waiting for a perfect plan; more alliances and partnerships, to tap the power of networks and connections; easy cooperation and smooth collaboration across all parts of the organization; and empowering people to try new things and value change. The head of a company identified as “close to pure Internet” wrote that the main differences from his team’s prior work lives are “speed, the need to create a broad range of alliances, and youth. It’s O.K. to question benefits and requirements of Internet applications, but actions cannot wait for all questions to be answered. We will inevitably make mistakes as we implement our Internet strategy.”

Those claiming that they are better or much better than the competition are much more likely to report, at statistically significant levels, that they have flexible, empowering, team-oriented organizations supportive of innovation. [See Chart 3] Indeed, that is the most striking single finding from the survey - that differences in organizational style are more important in e-business success than nation, industry, or company size. E-culture is an emerging global reality, and it requires change-ready and change-adept organizations. [See Sidebar 2]

The Virtual and the Human

The Internet is now an essential part of operating any organization, survey respondents told us, but it is not a replacement for good business judgement, financial discipline, and face-to-face relationships. Even enthusiasts and revolutionaries among survey

respondents are balanced in their assessment of the future. The Web is a powerful tool, they say, and it requires running their businesses differently, but it is only a tool. “I agree there are many changes to business rules with the advent of the e-world,” one said. “However, one thing holds true: you still have to be smart whatever the medium, whoever the customer.”

The Internet does not replace the personal touch, but it might augment it. Some survey respondents find that extensive Internet use enhances relationships with customers and employees. An professional services executive reports, “Some people say that e-mail reduces communication between people, but we find just the opposite is true. Internet use has improved relationships with our clients. They say things via e-mail that they never would have told us in a more formal setting. We become friends over the Internet, we learn about their son’s soccer game or a home remodeling project. We are more a part of their lives in our e-mail exchanges.” A transportation company uses the Internet extensively for all aspects of scheduling and logistics, including spotting trouble with a vehicle, monitoring weather and road conditions, and driver communication, gaining efficiency and safety, but “the advantages to our drivers and their families are just as great and have become one of our best recruiting and retention tools,” a leader commented.

Embracing e-culture involves commitment to change, but it builds on a foundation of enduring human experience. “No machine regardless of sophistication can fully replace the human,” a CEO proclaimed. “People need people and machines need people to be fully effective assets. The world now has more room for both to thrive.”

BIO

Rosabeth Moss Kanter is the Arbuckle Professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School and serves as an adviser to companies and governments worldwide. Among her 15 books are best-sellers such as *When Giants Learn to Dance*, *The Change Masters*, and *World Class*, and her just-published *Evolve! Succeeding in the Digital Culture of Tomorrow*.

(c) Copyright 2001 by Rosabeth Moss Kanter.

*Portions are drawn from *Evolve! Succeeding in the Digital Culture of Tomorrow* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2001, Appendix B). Thanks are due to Michelle Heskett, Daniel Galvin, John Buehler, and members of the e-culture research team at Harvard Business School.*

Rosabeth
MOSS
KANter

[Sidebar 1]

About the E-Culture Survey

The survey debuted at the 2000 annual meeting of the World Economic Forum, where participants could respond on the spot or through an online poll on the Harvard Business School website. Subsequently, hard copy questionnaires were mailed by Worldlink to large organizations and by Inc. magazine to small and emerging companies, including members of the Young Entrepreneurs Organization.

By mid-2000, we had received 785 completed questionnaires, nearly 300 of them online through the Harvard Business School website. The 116 survey items were designed to identify general trends and tendencies, but it also helped us find people willing to discuss their specific experiences through in-depth interviews. My e-culture project team augmented the survey with over 300 in-depth interviews in nearly 80 companies on three continents.

Respondents were almost entirely top management representing 247 publicly traded corporations; 479 closely held corporations (including pre-public Internet companies), professional partnerships, and joint ventures - a cluster reflecting limited exposure to capital markets; and 51 government or non-profit organizations. There were 519 responses from organizations headquartered in North America, where the e-business wave began, and 160 from Europe, which quickly followed in Internet interest. The remainder were from Asia, Latin America, and the rest of the world. There were 308 responses from purely domestic companies (defined as producing in one country for use in that country); 185 from exporters (producing in one country for international use); 19 from off-shore producers (producing internationally for use in one country); and 252 from fully international companies in both production and markets. Over 100 respondents identified themselves as part of pure Internet units-including the dotcom unit within established offline companies.

This is not a random or representative sample; it consists of interested volunteers, nearly 72 percent of whom indicate that Internet responsibilities are part of their job. Thus, statistics are only suggestive.

[Chart 1]

Strategic Importance of Internet Uses

For self-reported “better than competitors” in deriving benefits from the Web (N=350) compared with self-reported “worse than competitors” (N=115), without the self-reported “neither better nor worse”

% of “better than Competitors”	% of “worse than Competitors”	Internet use strategically important to the organization
53%	40%	attract new kinds of customers not previously reached
50%	39%	sell products and services over the Internet to traditional customers
51%	46%	work with customers online (exchange data, track deliveries, modify designs, solve problems)
47%	39%	work with suppliers online (exchange data, track orders, modify designs, solve problems)
39%	33%	purchase online
44%	37%	conduct meetings or get work done over the Internet, across locations
42%	36%	get employee reactions & feedback online
40%	39%	deliver education and training online
40%	34%	allow tele-commuting

The only uses that are strategically important to the “worse” more often than to the “better” are:

55%	60%	provide news and information
48%	52%	advertise on the Internet

[Chart 2]

Barriers to E-Culture Change

All <i>N=785</i>	% of Respondents Org Over 20 Years <i>N=390</i>	% of Respondents Org Under 20 Years <i>N=395</i>	Barrier
38%	48%	27%	The unit does not have staff with adequate technical or web-specific skills.
7%	37%	37%	Customers and key markets do not want to change their behavior.
35%	33%	37%	There are more important projects that require existing resources and time.
34%	31%	36%	Technology and tools are inadequate, unavailable, or unreliable.
31%	29%	32%	It is hard to find the right partners to work with.
28%	27%	29%	Suppliers are not cooperative, or not ready for electronic business.
25%	29%	20%	Employees are not comfortable with change.
21%	30%	12%	Leaders are not sure where to begin; they don't understand how to make the right choices.
16%	22%	10%	Top executives do not personally use computers and are not personally familiar with the Internet.
15%	22%	9%	Rivalries or conflicts between internal divisions get in the way.
13%	15%	11%	It is hard to find capital for new investments.
12%	17%	7%	Managers fear loss of status or privileged positions.
10%	14%	6%	Employees fear loss of jobs; or unions and employee groups fear loss of membership.
10%	10%	10%	Government rules and regulations get in the way.
10%	12%	8%	The company is successful as it is; leaders see no need for change.
9%	10%	8%	The company had a bad previous experience with new technology.
4%	5%	2%	It is a waste of time or money; it is not relevant to the business.

[Chart 3]

Characteristics of E-Culture Pacesetters

Comparison of the organization style of self-reported “better than competitors” in deriving benefits from the Web (N=350) with self-reported “worse than competitors” (N=115), without the self-reported “neither better nor worse”

% of “better than Competitors”	% of “worse than Competitors”	Organizational Style Indicator
73%	63%	To get approval for an unforeseen or non-routine activity, an OK from just one or two people is usually enough (in contrast to needing to get many sign-offs or go through many levels).
70%	51%	Decisions about significant activities are made almost immediately (in contrast to taking a long time)
69%	47%	Departments work actively with other groups (in contrast to sticking to themselves).
66%	43%	Changes are considered a fact of life, and people take them in stride (in contrast to finding them disruptive and uncomfortable).
66%	46%	Ideas that are unusual, controversial, or “different” are strongly encouraged and well-received (in contrast to viewed with skepticism and resistance).
64%	50%	People shift their responsibilities in the course of a year (in contrast to staying with pre-planned tasks).
57%	35%	People can do anything not explicitly prohibited (in contrast to doing only what is explicitly permitted)
57%	35%	When the unit is considering a major strategic change, most people generally hear about it advance, so they have a chance to comment (in contrast to hearing at the same time as outsiders).
56%	48%	Steps and actions to do most jobs are left to the person’s judgment; results count (in contrast to being spelled out in great detail; procedures count).
44%	29%	Decisions are made by the person with the most knowledge (in contrast to the person with the highest rank).
39%	29%	The unit considers service to the community important enough to be organized on work time (in contrast to seeing it as just a nice thing for individuals to do on their own)
32%	20%	Conflict is seen as creative (in contrast to disruptive).



[Sidebar 2]

E-Culture is a Culture for Change

E-culture requires leaders smart enough to see opportunities when external forces change - new technological capabilities, industry upheavals, regulatory shifts - and to empower their people to act on them quickly.

Some leaders monitor external forces through listening posts - a satellite office in an up-and-coming location, an alliance with an innovative partner, investments in organizations creating the future. Reuters Greenhouse founder John Taysom began to see the need for (and potential of) new technology when posted in Bahrain, because of peculiarities of transmitting financial information (Reuters' mainstay). Then he put himself in the middle of Silicon Valley where, eventually, the Greenhouse invested in dozens of startups in strategic technologies. Soon Reuters CEO Peter Job in London agreed that an inside look at many innovative companies provides advance knowledge of changes on the horizon. This helped transform Reuters into an Internet-focused company.

Sensing the need for change requires first hand experience, not distilled, packaged, arms-length information. Sometimes entrepreneurs sense new appetites in the marketplace because they feel hungry themselves. Pierre Omidyar's concept for auction site eBay came was triggered by his girl friend's desire to swap Pez dispensers. The idea for Worldroom.com, an Internet service for hotels, came from traveling journalists who needed to download files and get local information. Max Jones, managing director of Kerry Logistics in Hong Kong, attributed his company's early lead as an e-commerce fulfillment house (ahead of Americans) to "jahp sahn," a Cantonese word that he translates as "to be forever mindful, watch the environment around you, and respond to it on the spot."

Companies already open to change enjoy a self-reinforcing cycle. They create conditions that make it easier for people to seek the next changes, because they have opened minds and broken through walls already. E-culture pacesetters produce more need-sensors because they encourage frequent, deep encounters with customers, competitors, and challengers.

IBM's CEO Louis V. Gerstner, Jr., spends a great deal of his time with customers, in their own environments. At Sun Microsystems, telephone calls to CEO Scott McNealy and President Ed Zander from a new kind of customer - Internet service providers (ISPs) - triggered changes that would turn ISPs into partners and open new markets for Sun. The change sequence can also begin with challenges to leaders' assumptions. William-Sonoma's CEO, Howard Lester, began his conversion to Internet fan when students at Berkeley's business school questioned his beliefs. Cisco Systems' John Chambers has a teenager in the office of the CEO for a similar challenge to orthodoxy. Tuning in to competitors helps, too - individual as well as organizational. One CEO initiated e-business change because he wanted to move his organization to the Web faster than Welch did.

We expect technology companies to be in the e-culture vanguard. For IBM, becoming

the world's largest e-business is enabled by use of its own technology for every business process, supported by a commitment to act as "one IBM." Cisco uses the Web to keep costs low and speed high, while integrating technology startups and leveraging a large partner network. But what about companies in older industries? Some people think that established organizations move too slowly, change too reluctantly. These skeptics believe that older organizations must give way to new, independent ventures - whether e-commerce spinoffs, "greenfield" sites, or totally new entities, such as charter schools in the U.S..

Yet, even older bricks and mortar companies can embrace e-culture. British supermarket chain Tesco was first mover to the Internet and a leading Web portal. Tesco's culture supports constant change. Its leaders are young, fast, and dynamic, and a flattered hierarchy allows their energy to permeate all the way down to the front lines in the form of "hungry 25-year-old store managers," a leader said. Store managers are given freedom to take risks (and are expected to perform), which results in Tesco's ability to change on a dime. Complacency is avoided by continually setting new targets. Tesco discovered early mistakes in online grocery sales - poor customer service, incomplete understanding of skill requirements, lack of incentives for cooperation across channels - corrected them, and moved on. A culture for change does not mean doing everything perfectly; it means doing everything quickly, learning from it, then doing it differently.

"You've got to be prepared to change the genetic code of the organization," said David Weymouth, CIO of Barclays Bank. Without fundamental system change, organizations will always revert to their basic pattern - like the default position on a computer program. A culture for change, the platform for e-culture, needs to be programmed into an organization's method of operating.

—Excerpted from *Evolve!: Succeeding in the Digital Culture of Tomorrow*, by Rosabeth Moss Kanter (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2001).

(c) Copyright 2000 by Rosabeth Moss Kanter

Rosabeth
MOSS
KANTER