

Our Thoughts on: The (Actual) Future of Work

PREPARED BY
TEAM SOBOL
[@TeamSobol](#)



[HTTPS://SOBOL.IO](https://sobol.io)

About Sobol.io

MISSION

Accelerate the business transition to decentralized and humanistic work.

VISION

Near-Term: **Teams are the Future of Work**

Long-Term: **The Future of Work is Play**

VALUES

HUMANISTIC

MESHY

EVOLUTION MINDSET

PRAGMATIC AND SCRAPPY (JUGAAD)

HIGH STANDARDS



Notes Before Reading

#1

We write with a healthy amount of dry sarcasm (not that the sarcasm is good for you, just that we use it in abundant quantities). If you think something might be a joke, or a half-joke/half-truth, it probably is just that. We take our work seriously, not ourselves. There's significant amounts of negativity on the internet and in the world, so we choose to smile and laugh whenever we can. We're also proponents of CTFO. So, if you find yourself offended...you know what to do. If you're a bot, as we assume 95% of the internet is, we hope you gain the sentence to CTFO.

#2

These are the current thoughts of the Sobol co-founders on the Future of Work. We believe the ability to change one's mind is a valuable and necessary component of achieving a growth mindset. A growth mindset allows us to "get better" with age as we gather experience and information. We might change our minds about things we have written. In fact, we hope we do. We live in exponential times. The future will be ever changing. Therefore, so too, will the Future of Work.

#3

One could easily replace all instances of the word "Teams" in this document with "DAOs". However, we believe the word DAO is just an "acronymed" version of our definition of a Team.

What is the Future of Work?

Good question. If you're asking, you've come to the right place.

TEAMS ARE THE FUTURE OF WORK.

There, we said it. You can probably stop reading if you want. (We hope you don't).

Actually, that's more like the base assumption necessary to understand everything else we write. Teams (with a capital 'T') are the future of work.

You might be thinking, "I work on a 'team', but I most certainly don't feel like I'm part of the Future of Work." And your thoughts are valid. But while you "work" on a "team" (lower case 't') you hold an individual title, get evaluated as an individual by another individual (usually called a "manager"), get promoted and receive bonuses as an individual, yet probably feel that, as an individual, you have very little control of your day-to-day responsibilities.

Hell, we'd even venture that you feel you need to compete with members of your "team" for recognition, promotion, compensation, etc. etc. So, you clearly aren't on a Team in the Future of Work sense. Teams work together to accomplish goals. If you secretly (or not secretly) recognize you are in competition with your "teammates," we're pretty sure you and your organization aren't aware of the definition of a Team.

Think about it: Do players on sports Teams have any incentive but to work together? Every sports Team wants to win the championship. Championships aren't zero-sum for members of that sports Team. There is no runner-up award for the World Cup. All players work together for a common purpose. Yeah, sure, some players might not pass the ball, but do you know what we call those people? Bad Team players!

So, odds are you don't actually work on a Team. You most likely have co-workers who you sometimes collaborate with (and sit next to in meetings and video calls). And we're not saying those collaborations don't bear fruit. We're just saying Teams are the Future of Work, and you probably don't work on a Team. If anything, you are bundled with a bunch of other people on an org-chart and your company refers to this as a team.

Now that we've started our journey with our base assumption, Teams are the Future of Work, we can further expand on the Future of Work with five phrases (we go in-depth into each in the next sections):

- 1 TEAMS AND ROLES INSTEAD OF HIERARCHY AND TITLES.**
- 2 VALUE GIVEN TO VALUE CREATORS.
(AS OPPOSED TO PEOPLE WITH TITLES, TENURE, EXTROVERSION,
OR DEFT POLITICAL SKILLS).**
- 3 WORK ON WHAT YOU AND YOUR TEAM BELIEVE IS VALUABLE
(AND FROM WHERE YOU WANT, WHEN YOU WANT, IF YOUR JOB
ALLOWS FOR IT)**
- 4 SENSE AND RESPOND INSTEAD OF TRYING (AND FAILING)
TO PREDICT THE FUTURE**
- 5 BE YOURSELF AND BE PRAGMATIC.**

And, just to avoid confusion, these are some things we don't define as the Future of Work:

- Free lunch
- Jeans on Friday
- Pool table in the office
- Using Slack
- Dreams of an IPO

You might be thinking: "So, are you all talking about Holocracy, Sociocracy, Technocracy, Teal etc. etc.?"

Not necessarily. Philosophically, we don't believe there is one "best" way to do something. Even with diet and exercise, research suggests, there is not one way to be healthy. Different genetics and microbiomes change the way individuals react to different foods and workouts. Similarly, there is not one right way to do the Future of Work.

However, there are broad ideas that are applicable to most people. Most humans benefit from some sort of exercise, just as most humans suffer from eating trans fats. Similarly, broad ideas exist to support Future of Work ideals such as "Teams are the future of work."

Put another way: Just as cells and microbes make humans unique, cultures and industries make organizations unique. A one size fits all approach doesn't make sense. That's why we built the Sobol platform to provide extreme flexibility and customization. We fit to your way of working, not the other way around.

Note: We find many of the aforementioned Future of Work methodologies useful. We've also met many of the founders of the movements. They are thoughtful, well-to-do people who add tremendous value to the world. As stated, we just don't believe in a "one approach to rule them all" for anything. We could never tell you a "right" way to do something. We can only tell you what's worked for us (after much trial and error) and dependent on where we were in our company lifecycle. We believe randomness plays an out-sized role in a companies success or lack thereof. We believe in calling a fraud a fraud, and we'd be frauds if we thought we could tell you how to win at randomness.

#1: Teams and roles instead of hierarchy and titles

When we get rid of:

- Managers
- Performance Reviews by a Manager
- Promotion Committees by Managers
- Strict hierarchy
- More managers
- Titles

We get:

- More informed decision-making
- Less (much less) politics
- Aligned and motivated Team members
- Less (much less) confusion about who is doing what
- Equitable value share
- Roles

There's quite a bit to break apart here, so let's start with the difference between "titles" and "Roles" and why "titles" (such as Manager) don't make sense on a Team.

First, we view "titles" primarily as ego-driven "words" created to "give you" as part of your compensation/promotion/dopamine hit package. Titles are not "real things" and don't provide clarity over one's responsibilities. A title like: Executive Senior Vice President of Business Development for Special Projects sounds important until you think 'WTF do they actually do?'

What we do at work, in reality, is roles. We take on numerous roles, usually across different parts of an organization. If you're competent, you'll be asked to adopt more and more roles. We are accountable for different results in these different roles. Some companies call an extra role, "20 percent time." How about we just call that another role, which is exactly what it is. Also, when you're in a Team, whether one that's centralized and distributed or flat and co-located, it's just much easier to hold yourself and others accountable to role-based goals. A title is "Associate" and a goal for being an Associate is...??? A role is "Product Designer" and an associated goal could be "Build low-fi mockup of v3.2 for team review by next Friday."

Roles -> role accountabilities -> what actually do -> less ego -> less politics -> Team cohesion

Titles -> negotiate during job offer -> ego-based -> don't tie to accountabilities -> performance feedback at manager discretion/bias -> more politics -> limited team cohesion

We've heard people say, "Well you need a title when you meet people external to the business." Do you really? Do you really think someone isn't going to "do business" with you because you're not a "Senior Manager" even though "Senior Manager" has no shared world context. If someone is good at what they do, and what they do provides value, our bet is they're going to be okay. If you have many roles, why not share the most relevant role with the person or people you're talking with? Or why not say, "My background is in X so I support Y and Z?" Or even, "Last week I worked on this and this week I'm working on this." That means something to people (and your parents). Being a "Vice President" at a bank could mean you do sales (investment banking) or sales (consumer banking) or sales (business loans) or sales (credit cards) or sales (digital assets) or sales (custody products) or sales (trading products) or sales (recruiting)...

Furthermore, failing up is real. It took us many years to grasp this concept. But we kept seeing it again and again and again and again. (We're starting to become concerned it is the norm in business). People who should not have gotten "titled-up" become Chief of something or other. Someone with the sociopathic qualities to get promoted above their capabilities gets the shiny new title that drives more ego. So, if we can all agree failing up is a huge problem in businesses, why would we care about titles? **A title doesn't even mean you are good at what you do!** Who wants to work for someone who is title-obsessed?

And, not trying (okay, actually trying) to beat this point to a pulp here, but you aren't a "Vice President of Systems Development." **Most likely you're a "Homo Sapien with a gender identity." You've got some cells, some microbes, bada-bing you're a mammal with two mammal parents.**

Okay, finally...If you think you need a title, we recommend you dive into what part of that need is reality-based or ego based. We've found it's 99% ego. And in the future world of humanistic and pragmatic work, ego acts only as a hindrance to Teams. Remember, titles are created from the fiction-making mind of homo sapien. Acquiring a title does not change your DNA or microbial count (although it might temporarily flood your brain with dopamine which might alter your microbial count).

All of this is to say that, when you move from a title-based system to a role-based one, accountabilities and responsibilities become much more clear not just to the individual owning a role, but to the organization as a whole. And alas, you don't even need that one person called a "manager."

Ah, managers, the supposed glue holding the team (lower case 't') together. All three of us have been managers at one time in our careers. And all three of us thought, "This is a really dumb title." Because we all, individually, came to the realization that our best employees were going to do their best work the quicker we got out of their way.

Some say, "Yeah, exactly, managers exist to help unblock employees." When we hear that we think, "That sounds like a pretty terrible job." Instead of fixing the actual systemic problem, companies default to paying someone to deal with the bureaucracy.

We've heard people cite a study from Google where Google employees studied workers at Google (other Google employees) to see if managers (at Google) were valuable. And get this: Google, in a study conducted by employees of Google, determined that managers (at Google) were valuable. One of us worked there and couldn't agree more: Managers at Google are valuable at Google. Duh!

When you work at a political, growth at all costs, inauthentic environment such as Google where your closest coworker will stab you in the back to get ahead, managers are valuable. In order for anything to get done you need someone to step-in and say, "Stop trying to do what you think is best for the company and start doing what I think is best for the company." And even then, what they're really saying is, "Stop trying to do what you think is best for the company and start doing what my boss and her boss said is best for the company." And even then, what they're really saying is, "Stop trying to do what you think is best for the company because you think it'll make you look good on your performance review even if it's not best for the company, and start doing what my boss and her boss said is best for the company."

Don't be Google and you won't have the problems necessary for "managers" to exist. Unfortunately, Google, for all their "smarts" extrapolated what works at Google to more than Google. This is some form of logical fallacy. We see fraud and we call fraud. The truth, as we've discovered, is that Teams don't need managers. And when you don't need managers or titles, you don't really need hierarchy.

As Sobol co-founders, we refuse to use terms like CEO, COO, CTO, etc. Why? Well obviously because they are titles. But also because it implies hierarchy. We take roles on Teams, act as mentors, provide input, and will act as arbiters on tough decisions. But nothing we do prevents others from bringing their best self to work, acting on the advice from others, and bringing value to the entire company.

We started with a discussion of roles because roles are what constitute a Team. (Yes, one person can have numerous roles on different teams (and most likely on the same team)). And role-based teams don't need hierarchy. Associates report to Directors because that is how the top-down command-and-control titles based system works. Roles can have accountability partners, but the need for hierarchy is loosened.

Teams that work together, transparently, based on role accountabilities focus on their work. Not side distractions of titling or politicking their manager to like them best.

Teams, after all, are the Future of Work.

We will, of course, dive into all this more in-depth. But please keep in mind:

- **Yes, Teams can/should have leaders.**
- Yes, Teams can have decision-makers.
- Yes, Teams can have mentors.
- Yes, Teams can even have some form of hierarchy if it works for the Team.

Again, there is no one “right-way” to Team. **We’re just saying if you’re gonna work on a team, work on a Team.** Get rid of titles, focus on roles (and accountabilities for those roles), and the strict hierarchy will naturally fall out of place.

#2: Value given to value creators (As opposed to people with titles, tenure, or deft political skills)

Let's first make one thing clear: Experience is valuable. One might even argue that experience is the most valuable trait someone can bring to an organization. Experience allows one to be a better mentor and leader. Experience shapes learnings in the way only "doing" can do.

Contrast that with someone given extraordinary value in the form of compensation simply because they stayed around (or managed to not be fired). The former is good, the latter is bad.

Now that we've gotten that point out of the way, let us ask you a question, "How much more valuable is an extrovert than an introvert?"

As you ponder that, read the following, typical story:

"I work for a consulting firm where we help onboard clients to Enterprise HR software. I'm a subject-matter expert in the software. I know what it can and cannot do. The sales reps who close the deal don't. I don't know if they [sales reps] purposefully lie about what the software can do to close the deal or not. But when I inform the client that what the sales rep said wasn't true, the client gets mad at me! And don't even get me started about how much more money the sales rep made from closing the deal. I'm the one who has to keep the client happy."

There are a few responses to this story we've noticed people hold:

1. That's not fair! Why should the sales rep make all the money?
2. Well, shouldn't that person just become a sales rep?
3. Yeah, sales people are that important. They deserve to make most of the money.

While we'd venture #3 is a point of view held by other sales reps, we don't dispute that value of high-quality sales people. #2 is silly. It's essentially saying, "Stop being an introvert. Just become an extrovert, it's easy!" As for #1, we're sure that engineers don't realize how much money sales people actually make. If engineers realized this, they'd stop coding.

Yes, we understand salespeople are the front lines. Yes, when done right, we enjoy "sales." But if one of us closes a deal we share that value with the team. This includes the engineers building the product and the success reps ensuring our value promise is being recognized by our customers.

This might be a short-term vs. long-term value differential. Yes, you might win the deal. But you might do a terrible job supporting the deal long-term. We'd rather win the long-game by building a strong product with the team to properly support (and enjoy supporting) a deal.

Our hypothesis is this: We will be able to hire the best talent across all functions once we gain a reputation for sharing value equally across all groups within Sobol. As a result, each functional group will achieve some form of peak performance relative to the industry. And the normal cynicism found at companies due to pay disparity will disappear just as strict hierarchy did when we got rid of titles.

Likewise, when you have clear roles and role accountabilities on a Team, and are compensated based on Team performance, having deft politicking skills won't be worth much. This point just naturally builds upon our previous points. Teams are the Future of Work. The first step in building a Team is to replace titles and hierarchy with Roles. Then, give value to value creators on those Teams.

#3: Work on what you and your team believe is valuable (when you want, and from where you want, if your job allows for it)

Let's first make one thing clear: It's not all about you (remember, we did away with ego-based titles). It's about working with your Team. And, as in healthy relationships, compromise will sometimes be necessary. Work will be necessary that nobody is "passionate" about. Hopefully, people are passionate about the company and find joy in completing work that is ultimately good for the company. But some individuals think the Future of Work is just about them working on whatever they want to work on (see Be Pragmatic in our next section). This clearly can't be the case for a business to succeed!

In a perfect world, everybody would work on projects that intersected with their passions and strengths. We don't live in a perfect world (Again, see Be Pragmatic in the next section). Hell, we love remote work, but there are clearly jobs where that isn't possible. We doubt we will be able to get our teeth cleaned via video anytime soon.

We've found that the best people to make decisions about "what to do next" on a Team is the collective wisdom of the team. When the Team agrees on what to work on, everyone automatically sees the value. Then, it's a matter of deciding how everyone's roles play into actually doing the work.

Maybe we've made another assumption here: You are in a role because you enjoy that role. For example, most of the people we've met in product and design roles are passionate about product and design. If you are not passionate about your role we suggest the following: Do something you're passionate about!

Hesitant to do whatever it takes to switch roles/ career paths? We recommend the following steps:

1. Volunteer at a Hospice
2. Talk with those in the last days of their life
3. Be reminded of your own mortality

If you follow these steps we're fairly certain you'll be willing to do what it takes to switch roles. **Remember, it's not your companies fault if you don't enjoy the career path you've chosen.** Only you have the power to make the change you want to be in the world. (We could copy and paste these thoughts in the Be Pragmatic section, but we won't).

Let's gently switch topics from mortality to work schedules. There are a few night owls on Team Sobol. We are a grateful bunch because our circadian rhythms don't work on the 9 to 5 schedule. So why do companies force everyone to fit one schedule? Remember, at the beginning, when we said that cells and microbes make individuals unique. Well, individuals also have their own unique rhythms. Donnie, no matter how little sleep he gets the night before, is almost never tired before midnight. Bryan enjoys waking up before his kids for a clear head. Vic is cyclical. He works in fits and bursts over the course of a day. When we meet in person we force ourselves to hard charge on one schedule, but we are glad it's only temporary.

Finally, the Future of Work involves working from where you want, if that is something your job permits. There are some obvious benefits:

1. Access to a (much) larger applicant pool
2. Lower costs (no renting office space)
3. Happier employees who can travel (for leisure) and work

Commuting is usually unhealthy. It is unhealthy to the environment in the form of carbon spewed into the atmosphere to move a person from one place to another. It is unhealthy for a human body. Commuting, especially by car, is found to decrease happiness and overall health by increasing stress and sedentariness. Remote working rids one of the need to commute (of which one usually does at the same time as everyone else). While an increase in one's well-being is an expected benefit, the feelings of wellness as a result of remote work are usually much higher than one anticipates.

Again, we understand that our various dental hygienists (who we are pretty sure enjoy their jobs) need an office with that big chair, the bright light, and all those tools. And we're grateful for that setup! That's one of the reasons we put this last. But, if remote work works for your Team, then we suggest you give it a shot.

Note: These words were written two years before "COVID" entered the global lexicon and "Working From Home" was a widely accepted business practice.

We kept this section the same as when we originally wrote it to show that our ideas aren't actually that crazy! People who now love working from home were the same people that told us working from home could never work. Just imagine how they'll feel when titles and hierarchy start to disappear!

#4: Sense and Respond instead of trying (and failing) to predict the future

We've met leaders who've inspired us, mentors who've shaped us, and family members who've pushed us to be better. And do you know what they all had in common? They were all terrible at predicting the future!

Yes, as much as we admire and respect the courage and intellect of the aforementioned, every single one of them has been wrong about what would happen in the future. Some of them had previous predictions proved true, and were thus more emboldened about their future predictions...which turned out to be incorrect. Guess they were human after all.

We've read that our brains are pattern-recognition and prediction machines. It is therefore no surprise that human hubris and failure in predicting future events would be shared by everybody we've ever met, including ourselves. Our brains are excellent at making assumptions and filling in the blanks to help our day-to-day, but terrible with volatility, black swans, and prediction.

Knowing this, why the hell would we try (and fail) to predict the future of our business? Why would we plan out budgets twelve months from now, set revenue goals three years from now, and develop a product strategy that might become obsolete in four months?

No surprise, but we have some guesses. We think it's due to the wiring of the human brain and a legacy work mindset (probably created by management consultants) combined with the dumb expectations of traditional financial markets. Somehow founders seem to ignore the degree randomness plays in most aspects of business.

We find it comical that an organization's initial success will lead the founders to claim it's because, "We're geniuses!" But when things fall apart or goals aren't met it's because of "bad luck."

How about: "Randomness was at work in both the good and the bad." And likely, the initial success was due to the fact that the founders sensed an opportunity in the market and responded by starting the company."

Some other sentences we feel founders should say more often: We sensed the need to make changes to our product and we responded by building those features. We sensed the need to hire someone who was good at dev ops and we responded by hiring someone who was good at dev ops. We sensed the need to buy software to manage our contact lists and we responded by researching and buying the best software to manage our contact lists. We sensed the need to change our pricing and we responded by changing our pricing. We sensed the need to talk to our investors and we responded by scheduling a meeting with our investors.

Sensing and responding allows a team to react to change. Sensing and responding reduces tunnel vision. Sensing and responding allows one to "kill their darlings." Long-term planning drills like product strategy and yearly budgets disappear in favor of near-term responsiveness to the needs of customers and the market.

We believe people enjoy working at startups (or smaller companies) because the "startup feel" is really just the lack of long-range planning. Startups, by nature, sense and respond which leads to nimbleness which leads to more fun at work. As Teams become teams, someone will inevitably buy OKR software which kills the "sense and respond" atmosphere. **We're just gonna say it: OKRs and OKR software are bad, and OKRs still exist because OKR software sales is big business. Companies are successful despite using OKRs, not because of them.**

OKRS turn humans into metric hunters. Sensing and responding keeps the humanistic side of work alive. When talking to colleagues, we enjoy sensing how we and the other person are feeling and responding appropriately, instead of with a canned or pre-planned answer. This approach feels much more humanistic than the usual, inauthentic personas people display while "at the office."

We get the human desire to plan for and predict the future, When we started Sobol we set long-term goals. We stopped when we realized that if we had followed those goals we wouldn't have a product that customers wanted, and therefore wouldn't have had a company for very long. Sensing and responding allowed us to nimbly iterate on our product to solve organizational issues faced by our users. Which, no surprise, allows us to maintain that "start-up feel."

#5: Be yourself and be pragmatic

The Future of Work takes into account that you are an individual made of cells, microbes, and possibly other stuff scientists haven't discovered yet. You work on your schedule and, if your job permits, from where you want. So naturally, the concept of having a work alter ego separate from your "personal" one doesn't make a whole lotta sense. Even if you don't follow that logic, but subscribe to the hypothesis that you will do your best work when you can be yourself, then this idea requires little explanation.

Donnie writes about how inauthenticity at Google made him want to take a cold shower when coming home from work:

A not-infrequent occurrence at Google was the inbox notification that someone in the organization had a birthday or "googleversary." The few seconds between the initial email and the inevitable wave of 'reply-alls' were moments of confusion to someone unaccustomed to corporate behavior. The minutes and hours following would be 30+ emails of Googlers replying-all with creative responses such as Happy Birthday!" or "Congrats!"

Then, people would turn to each other and groan about getting all these replies and how the threads were clogging up their inboxes. Of course, just moments ago, these same colleagues had replied-all to the email thread with a gif and a cloying number of exclamation points. More rambling about the importance of getting to "Inbox Zero" would occur. Those who did achieve a few minutes with zero emails would celebrate as if they had successfully defended a dissertation in theoretical physics.

I asked my mentor why adult humans, at Google no less, would behave in such a silly, contradictory way. He responded, "Just play the game, man. I know it's ridiculous, but just play the game." This is when the shell of Google began to crack and my distaste of corporatism started to emerge.

One day, I received an email notifying me that a coworker, who happened to sit behind me, was celebrating a birthday. This coworker and I were friendly, so I wanted to give the appropriate, genuine, human response. Instead of succumbing to the Gmail notification, I walked over to his desk, put a hand on his shoulder, looked him in the eye, and said, "Happy Birthday, man." He responded, "Thanks, man." I went back to my seat.

*Later that day, my mentor approached me. "Hey I noticed you didn't wish 'Alex' a Happy Birthday. We talked about this." I responded, "Actually, I did. I went over to his desk and said it in person." **My mentor responded, "It doesn't count if you say it in person!"***

Reading this, the story might seem a bit too 'on the nose.' Unfortunately, however, I assure you it happened. Corporate culture created an environment where my birthday wishes were not considered genuine unless they were included in a digital storm of reply-alls in an effort to seem "Googley." The human-to-human version was considered invalid, even detrimental, in the face of a forced, digital, corporate culture.

We believe that if you spend your work hours keeping tabs on responses to Happy Birthday emails, you are part of a sociopathic culture that prohibits you from being yourself. You will never do your best (or fulfilling) work.

If Be Yourself is a dig at “legacy” companies, Be Pragmatic is a dig at companies and individuals who live in La-la land. Look, we’re big fans of rallying the troops to accomplish a goal inside a reality distortion field. But we’d never push that reality distortion field onto broader society. We live in the world as it is, with the goal of making the world as it should be. Yes, we know, broad statement. But if we’re gonna succeed as a business and create dedicated employees and loyal customers, we need to have one foot firmly planted on Earth.

We’ve met Future of Work type individuals who, for all their quirks and charms, will never win hearts and minds. They don’t live in the world as it currently exists and, at best, will alienate large swaths of society. However, we believe we can slowly convert large swaths of society away from the dark side. We just need to start by acknowledging the way the world currently operates. We can Be Ourselves and Be Pragmatic.

We should mention: Members of the Sobol team hold a variety of political, social, and cultural views. We are not a group of homogenous thinkers. (A nerdy example: Our iOS vs. Android discussions get heated to the point where some of us need to step away from our computers). Yet, we all share similar viewpoints about the future of work and how our roles shape the mission and goals of the broader team. As such, we do not believe the “Future of Work” is limited to a niche sub-section of society.

Why is Now the time for the Future of Work?

Fast microprocessors, cheap data storage, and the wrapping of Earth in fiber optic cable has enabled instant, global communications for the masses. Processes that once required strict hierarchy (and something called a fax machine) to move information across and within teams are no longer necessary. But the way most companies organize remains unchanged.

Look up your favorite company of a certain size and you can most likely find their “org-chart.” That is, a graphic visualizing how information flows and who can make decisions.

Why hasn't organizational design changed to meet technological change? There isn't one answer. We hypothesize it's a few of the below reasons:

1. Outdated company governance bylaws
2. Fear of rocking the boat (aka keep it safe)
3. Managers/ executives lack of desire to give up “power”
4. Lack of trust in an organization
5. Misunderstandings of what Future of Work means

Why are we primed for a revolution in the Future of Work?

Again, we can only hypothesize it's a few of the below reasons:

1. Rise of a new generation of workers ready to work in a digital world
2. Understanding of the health and environmental destructiveness of commuting
3. Need to quickly iterate products in response to quick iteration of competitors
4. Growth of tools like Zoom, Slack, Sobol, Asana
5. Realization that one might not do their best work during "business hours" while being confined to an office like a caged animal (under the interrogation of fluorescent lights).

Put another way: Given that we have the tools to work from where we want, when we want, and as members of a Team, highly-skilled workers will demand a certain way of working to meet their needs.

Work has already changed significantly over the last generation. We're reminded of this every time we work wearing shorts, sandals, and t-shirts. We're reminded of this when most of our work happens behind a computer screen, and where our "presence" is measured less by time in a physical office and more by my time behind a screen. Clearly, aspects of the Future of Work have already taken hold in society.

Our point in all this is: we can change the way things are done if we want. Just about everything in "business" isn't a real thing. We can decide to do things differently. We can make a team a Team.

Thanks for reading!

If you're interested in continuing the conversation, reach us on
Twitter @TeamSobol

Spin up a Sobol instance for free at <https://sobol.io> and see how
your organization looks in the Future of Work!

