

# BUSINESS ALIGNMENT MANIFESTO

*A Declaration for Leaders Who Demand Certainty,  
Not Just Confidence*



**Jorge LoebI**

Founder & CEO

**Revolving Change**

[revolvingchange.com](http://revolvingchange.com)

Revision 11

***The leadership team believes it is aligned. So did the leadership teams at Wells Fargo, Boeing, Kodak, and Sears — right up until the moment they weren't. What would it take to know the difference?***

*Every leader in this document believed they were seeing their organization clearly. None of them knew they were not. Not because they lacked intelligence or commitment — but because no one had given them the instrument to see what was actually there.*

---

*Most organizations seldom fail dramatically. They erode quietly — through hidden misalignments, unchallenged assumptions, and human variables that no one is measuring. This is not a technology problem. It is not a strategy problem. It is a human problem. And human problems require human solutions.*

---

# CONTENTS

---

1. We Believe The Greatest Threat to Any Organization Is What It Cannot See
2. We Believe Alignment Is Not an Ideal — It Is a Survival Requirement
3. We Believe History Reveals the True Cost of Alignment Built on Fear
4. We Believe Culture, Gender, and Generation: The Silent Carriers of Misalignment
5. We Believe Misalignment Carries an Emotional Cost That Organizations Refuse to See
6. We Believe Misalignment Is the Most Misdiagnosed Condition in Organizational Life
7. We Believe Alignment Is Most Dangerous When It Is Faked
8. We Believe Misalignment Spans Every Dimension of the Organization
9. We Believe History Has Already Proven the Cost of Unmeasured Misalignment
10. We Believe What Cannot Be Measured Cannot Be Managed
11. We Believe Alignment, When It Is Real, Transforms Everything It Touches
12. We Believe AI Without Alignment Locks Misalignment Into Your System Permanently
13. We Believe Change Without a Diagnostic Foundation Is Expensive Guesswork
14. We Believe Lasting Results Require Addressing Root Causes, Not Symptoms
15. We Believe The Leaders Who Shape the Future Choose Certainty Over Confidence

## **Declaration**

References

---

## 1. WE BELIEVE THE GREATEST THREAT TO ANY ORGANIZATION IS WHAT IT CANNOT SEE

Not the competitor on the horizon. Not the regulation about to change. Not the market downturn. The greatest threat is often internal — invisible, unmeasured, and silently compounding.

It lives in the gap between what leaders believe is true and what is actually true. Between the alignment teams assume exists and the misalignment that is already costing them.

A 0.5% misalignment between just two executives can reduce organizational results by 15%. Not eventually. Now. Invisibly. And it will continue — until it is measured.<sup>[1]</sup>

This is not a theory. We have seen it in manufacturing plants, R&D divisions, post-acquisition crises, and high-performing C-Suites that were confident they were aligned. Confidence is not certainty. Certainty is the confidence that measurement delivers.

*The question is not whether misalignment exists in your organization. The question is whether you have chosen to see it.*

*That threat is not theoretical. And the standard for confronting it is not found in conference rooms or corporate strategy documents. It is found in the sky — where the cost of misalignment is measured in lives rather than market share.*

---

## 2. WE BELIEVE ALIGNMENT IS NOT AN IDEAL — IT IS A SURVIVAL REQUIREMENT

There is an organization where alignment is not aspirational. Where it is not a strategy session topic, not a values poster on a wall, not a concept to be explored at an offsite. In this organization, alignment is the difference between a perfect performance and a catastrophic one. Between going home at the end of the day and not.

That organization is the world famous United States Navy Blue Angels.

Six F/A-18 Super Hornets. Speeds between 300 and 700 miles per hour. Separation between aircraft: eighteen inches. No digital instruments maintaining position. No automation holding the formation. Only eye-hand coordination, complete concentration, and total, unconditional alignment between every pilot on the team.<sup>[8]</sup>

Think about what that means. You are flying at the speed of a bullet. The wingtip of the aircraft beside you is less than two feet from yours. The ground is two hundred feet below. And the only thing standing between precision and catastrophe is the shared understanding — the total alignment — of six human beings who have trained for hundreds of hours to think, breathe, and respond as one.

This alignment does not happen by accident. It does not happen through good intentions or positive attitudes. It is built — deliberately, rigorously, and without compromise. Each pilot completes 120 training flights before a single public demonstration.<sup>10</sup> Training begins with aircraft ten to fifteen feet apart. Week by week, flight by flight, the gap closes — until the team is flying wing-overlap formation at velocities that leave no margin for anything other than absolute precision. There are no spare pilots. The Blue Angels carry no substitutes. Because alignment cannot be assumed. It cannot be improvised. It must be developed, practiced, measured, and verified — every single time.

After every flight — every practice, every demonstration, every training session — the team gathers for a debrief. Rank disappears. Title disappears. The commanding officer and the newest pilot speak with the same voice and the same standard. Each member calls out what they personally did wrong. Not what someone else could have done better. What they did wrong. The debrief is not a performance review. It is a precision instrument for identifying misalignment before it compounds. Before the next flight. Before the margin closes further.

This is the culture of alignment at its highest expression: total commitment to seeing clearly, naming the truth without ego, and correcting before the cost becomes irreversible.

*(The United States Air Force Thunderbirds are equally extraordinary — seventy years of precision flight that speak for themselves.)*

The same principle plays out at ground level, at speeds no aircraft can match in precision of execution. In Formula 1, a pit stop lasts between two and three seconds. Twenty people. Tires changed, fuel managed, adjustments made — in less time than it takes to read this sentence. No one speaks. No one directs in the moment. Every person knows exactly what they are responsible for, exactly when, and exactly how it connects to every other person on the crew. The alignment was built before the car arrived. It was practiced thousands of times. It was measured, debriefed, and refined until it became instinct.

(I have watched this personally many times — and it never loses its power.)

When the car leaves the pit lane in 2.4 seconds, that is not speed. That is alignment made visible.

Now bring this back to your organization.

Your team is not flying jets at eighteen inches of separation. No one will die if your executive leadership is misaligned. The consequences are not immediate. They are measured in different units: in market share, in strategic execution, in employee attrition, in wasted capital, in compounding decisions made by people who are not actually pointed in the same direction.

But the principle is identical. In the air, on the track, or in the boardroom: when alignment is total, performance is extraordinary. When it breaks — when it is assumed

rather than measured, performed rather than real — everything the team has built is at risk.

*The Blue Angels do not hope for alignment. They measure it, verify it, and correct it before every flight. That is the standard. Not confidence. Certainty — earned through measurement and proven every time.*

*The Blue Angels demonstrate what genuine alignment produces at its highest expression. But before we can build what they built, we must understand what we are fighting against — a legacy of forced conformity so deep and so old that most organizations can no longer distinguish it from genuine agreement.*

---

### **3. WE BELIEVE HISTORY REVEALS THE TRUE COST OF ALIGNMENT BUILT ON FEAR**

The history of human civilization is, in large part, the history of forced alignment. Empires, dynasties, and ideological regimes built on the same promise: that unity could be commanded — that conformity, extracted through authority, hierarchy, and fear, was the same as genuine shared purpose.

**It was not. It never has been.**

Under every system that ruled through fear — from the absolute monarchies of early Europe to the totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century — the same pattern played out. Dissenting views were silenced. Independent thought was punished. People nodded, conformed, and performed alignment — while privately holding entirely different beliefs, values, and convictions. The surface looked unified. Beneath it, true divergence compounded, invisible and unmeasured, until it could no longer be contained.

In 1961, psychologist Stanley Milgram designed an experiment to understand how ordinary people could participate in atrocities. His findings were disturbing in their clarity. Sixty-five percent of participants administered what they believed were potentially lethal electric shocks to another human being, simply because an authority figure told them to.<sup>[2][3]</sup> They did not believe it was right. Many showed visible signs of distress — trembling, sweating, protesting — and continued anyway. Not because they agreed. Because authority demanded compliance, and compliance had become indistinguishable from conviction.

Over centuries, this dynamic desensitized the very meaning of alignment. When alignment became a survival requirement, it stopped reflecting shared beliefs and became political performance. Values blended with self-preservation. Convictions were replaced by calculation.

**This is the legacy organizations inherit.** Centuries of fear-based conformity have conditioned human behavior so deeply that most people, in most hierarchies, will

perform alignment whether they feel it or not. Organizations that do not measure alignment cannot distinguish between the two. They see the performance and call it alignment. Beneath it, the misalignment they cannot see is already compounding.

*The inheritance is real. The conditioning is deep. And only organizations that measure alignment precisely — with external, objective tools rather than internal surveys — can distinguish what is genuine from what is performed.*

*That inheritance did not remain in the halls of empires or the records of political history. It transferred — quietly, invisibly, and without examination — into the very structure of the organizations we lead today.*

---

#### **4. WE BELIEVE CULTURE, GENDER, AND GENERATION ARE THE SILENT CARRIERS OF MISALIGNMENT**

These behaviors and principles did not originate in the workplace. They arrived there pre-installed — transferred directly from the social and family structures that preceded modern organizations. For most of human history, the expectation that women defer, that the young obey, that those outside the dominant culture conform, was not a policy. It was simply the order of things. It required no justification because it had never been questioned.

When family businesses formed, they did not import these dynamics deliberately. They inherited them invisibly, as the natural extension of the household into the enterprise. And as those businesses grew — as professional organizations emerged from family structures and industrial ones, as multinationals extended across cultures and continents — the dynamics came with them. Legitimized by tradition. Normalized by familiarity. And therefore never identified as a variable worth measuring.

It was not negligence. It was blindness built into the foundation. The way things were had no reason to become the way things were examined.

In certain cultures, alignment is not built — it is assumed. It is expected as a matter of hierarchy, social obligation, and tradition, regardless of whether a shared foundation of beliefs and values actually exists beneath the surface. The performance of alignment, in these contexts, is not merely tolerated. It is required. Dissent is not simply unwelcome — it is socially and professionally punishable. And so the organization produces, reliably and efficiently, the appearance of unity — while the actual misalignment beneath it deepens in silence, never named, never surfaced, and never measured.

Women and younger generations have occupied, for most of organizational history, exactly this position. Expected to adjust. Expected to absorb. Expected to perform alignment with a culture, a hierarchy, and a set of priorities they did not design and were rarely asked to question. Their silence was not agreement. It was adaptation — the rational response of people who had learned, through repeated and often painful experience, that the cost of candor outweighed the benefit.

This dynamic is not confined to any single industry or geography. It is structural. A senior female leader and a male peer can participate in the same leadership meeting, receive the same information, and experience entirely different organizational realities — shaped by different histories of being heard, different consequences for speaking, and different calculations about what is safe to say. A younger team member and a veteran colleague can share the same stated values and hold entirely different beliefs about what those values mean in practice. Neither is wrong. Both are unaware of the gap between them. And the organization, having never measured it, does not know it exists.

These are not diversity issues in the conventional sense. They are alignment variables — sources of measurable misalignment that fly beneath the radar of dashboards, performance reviews, and culture surveys that were never designed to see them. Their cost is real: in suppressed insight, in decisions made without the full picture, in the compounding erosion of trust between people who believe they are aligned and are not.

And in most organizations, the cost remains invisible. The way things were has no reason to become the way things are examined — unless someone decides to measure it.

**This is precisely what Revolving Change does.** We illuminate what others cannot see. We measure what others leave to assumption. We build the foundation that allows women, younger generations, and those from different cultural frames to contribute what they actually know — because the organization has finally been built on genuine shared alignment rather than performed conformity.

*Culture, gender, and generation are not separate from the alignment problem. They are among its deepest roots — and among the most consistently ignored. The cost remains invisible in most organizations. That is what we are changing.*

*The legacy of forced conformity — cultural, hierarchical, generational, and gendered — is not merely historical. It lives in your organization today, in the people who nod in agreement while privately holding entirely different beliefs. And it exacts a cost that most organizations refuse to name.*

---

## **5. WE BELIEVE MISALIGNMENT CARRIES AN EMOTIONAL COST THAT ORGANIZATIONS REFUSE TO SEE**

Silent alignment is not neutral. It is not passive. It is not simply the absence of disagreement.

When people are required to accommodate, to fit in, to suppress their genuine beliefs in order to survive within a hierarchy, they do not do so without cost. They carry that cost inside them — invisibly, continuously, and at a compounding toll on their psychological and emotional wellbeing. The research is unambiguous: forced silence generates anxiety, resentment, cynicism, disengagement, and burnout. These are not soft metrics.

They are the measurable human consequences of misalignment that has nowhere to go.

Employees who witness a gap between what leadership declares and what the organization actually practices — between stated values and lived reality — do not simply accept the contradiction and move on. They experience cognitive dissonance: the sustained psychological discomfort of holding beliefs that conflict with what they are required to enact. They smile in meetings and seethe in private. They execute directives they oppose. They suppress the concern, the observation, the dissenting view — not because they have no values, but because experience has taught them, often painfully, that expressing those values carries consequences.

Over time, this suppression becomes its own kind of damage. Research by Harvard Business School professor Amy Edmondson<sup>[4]</sup> shows that new employees who enter organizations optimistic and eager to contribute progressively lose the psychological safety to speak up — not because conditions improve, but because they learn, through repeated signals, that the cost of candor outweighs the benefit. Silence becomes a survival strategy. And organizational silence — the collective withdrawal of honest input from the people closest to the work — destroys the organization's ability to learn, correct, and improve.

The emotional inventory of suppressed misalignment is documented: anxiety and stress from operating in contradiction with one's values. Resentment that accumulates as divergent priorities go unaddressed. Cynicism that sets in when declared values are consistently contradicted by organizational behavior. Disengagement — the rational withdrawal of discretionary effort from a system that does not feel safe, honest, or worth the investment. And burnout: the exhaustion that results not merely from workload, but from the sustained emotional labor of performing alignment one does not feel.

These emotional consequences compound in silence for a reason. Misalignment, when it originates at the leadership level, is the category of organizational problem least likely to be reported, acknowledged, or addressed. Research shows that 95% of leaders believe themselves to be self-aware; studies indicate that fewer than 15% actually are.<sup>[5]</sup> The higher the position, the fewer people willing to hold up an honest mirror. Power creates an echo chamber. And in that echo chamber, the misalignment beneath the surface goes unnamed — because naming it would reflect poorly on those responsible for it.

This is the most dangerous dynamic in any organization: a leadership team that is the source of misalignment and simultaneously the least equipped to see it. The people who could surface it have learned not to. The leaders who should address it are insulated from the truth. And the misalignment — along with its full emotional and operational cost — continues to compound, unseen.

**This is precisely why measurement must be external, objective, and ongoing.** Not a survey that leadership designs and interprets. Not a culture initiative that leadership champions and declares successful. Precision measurement that bypasses the echo chamber entirely — and delivers the truth that leadership cannot give itself.

*What the organization refuses to see does not disappear. It accumulates — in the people it employs, in the culture it produces, and eventually, in the results it can no longer deliver.*

*That accumulated cost does not stay hidden forever. Eventually it surfaces. But when it does, what the organization sees is almost never the misalignment. It sees something else entirely.*

---

## **6. WE BELIEVE MISALIGNMENT IS THE MOST MISDIAGNOSED CONDITION IN ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE**

When misalignment surfaces, it rarely announces itself by name. It shows up wearing other people's names. It is called a bad attitude. A lack of commitment. A personality conflict. Friction. Resistance to change. Insubordination. Demotivation. Disloyalty.

And so the organization responds to the name it has given the problem — not to the problem itself. The employee is counseled for attitude. Managed for performance. Labeled as difficult, uncooperative, or not a culture fit. A Performance Improvement Plan is drafted. An HR file is opened. In some cases, the employee is removed entirely. And the leaders responsible for the condition that produced the behavior look on, satisfied that the symptom has been addressed.

**The misalignment — untouched, unmeasured, unnamed — remains.**

This is the most expensive misdiagnosis in organizational life. Not because it leads to one bad outcome, but because it reliably produces a cascade of them. The employee who was labeled difficult was, in many cases, the person closest to the truth. The one whose values were most intact. The one who could not perform alignment they did not feel. And so the organization mistakes authentic values for a behavioral problem — and systematically removes the people most likely to have told it what it needed to hear.

What remains, over time, is a workforce selected for compliance. People who have learned not to surface what they see. People who have mastered the performance of alignment so thoroughly that no one — not their managers, not their peers, not the leaders who set the conditions — can any longer distinguish it from the real thing. The culture has not improved. It has been curated for silence.

Culture is not what the organization declares. It is what the organization actually rewards, tolerates, and normalizes day after day.<sup>[16]</sup> When misalignment is normalized, culture corrodes from within. Loyalty erodes. Trust dissolves. The discretionary effort that high-performing employees once gave freely is quietly withdrawn — not in a single act of resignation, but in thousands of invisible daily decisions to do less, care less, invest less.

Employees who are living misalignment do not deliver exceptional customer experiences. They cannot. The emotional labor of suppressing misalignment consumes the very discretionary capacity that customer loyalty depends on. Service quality

declines. Response times slow. Errors increase. The customer-facing edge of the organization begins to fray. And customers notice before the organization does.

But the most irreversible cost is found in the people who leave. Not every employee who experiences misalignment stays to perform it. The most capable, the most values-driven, the ones with the most options — leave. They rarely name misalignment as the reason. Beneath their explanations is a simpler truth: they could not sustain the emotional cost of working in a system whose stated values and actual values had come apart.

These are not marginal losses. They are often the people who cared most, produced most, and held the institutional knowledge that cannot be documented in a job description. Their departure is rarely treated with the urgency it deserves. The organization posts the role. It makes the hire. And it has no idea what it has lost — because it never had the tools to measure what it had.<sup>[15][17]</sup>

Replacing a senior employee costs between one and two times their annual salary.<sup>[15]</sup> But the financial cost is the least of it. The networks are gone. The client relationships are gone. The tacit knowledge, the earned judgment, the organizational memory — gone. And what arrives in their place is someone who must be built from the beginning, in a culture that is still producing the conditions that caused the departure.

*The misdiagnosis will continue, and the misalignment will compound, until the organization names what it is actually looking at — and decides to measure it.*

*The cascade of misdiagnosis begins from a false premise: that what is being observed is a people problem, a performance problem, or a personality problem. It is none of those things. It is alignment that was never real.*

---

## 7. WE BELIEVE ALIGNMENT IS MOST DANGEROUS WHEN IT IS FAKED

People pretend to be aligned. They accommodate. They fit in. They comply out of fear, hierarchy, or cultural pressure. They nod in meetings while holding entirely different beliefs, values, and priorities. And in doing so, they create the most dangerous condition in any organization: the illusion of alignment.

Faked alignment does not stay contained. It grows. It compounds. It spreads exponentially — through decisions, through diverging priorities, through values that are assumed to be shared but are not. What begins as a small, invisible gap silently accelerates until it reaches critical mass. When it does, it does not reveal itself gradually. It explodes — with catastrophic consequences for strategy, performance, and results.

True alignment is not obedience. It is not accommodation. It is not the appearance of agreement. True alignment is built on a shared foundation — the same beliefs, the same values, the same core principles. With that foundation in place, people can

disagree, debate, and confront — and still solve problems together. Without it, alignment is weak, fragile, or entirely absent.

**When alignment is faked, the misalignment is real. And it is costing you.**

*Real alignment cannot be declared. It cannot be assumed. It must be built on a shared foundation of beliefs, values, and principles — and that foundation must be measured to be trusted.*

*Faked alignment is not confined to the leadership suite. It spreads — through every connection in the organizational network — wherever alignment is assumed rather than measured.*

---

## **8. WE BELIEVE MISALIGNMENT SPANS EVERY DIMENSION OF THE ORGANIZATION**

Alignment is not only a leadership problem. It exists — or fails to exist — at every level and between every connection in the organization: within teams, between teams, across departments, between production locations, between your organization and your tier-one suppliers, between your organization and your customers.

Misalignment anywhere in this network creates failure everywhere. No part of the system is immune. And no part of the system can perform at its potential when misalignment is present and unmeasured.

*In a system this interconnected, unmeasured misalignment anywhere is unmeasured misalignment everywhere.*

*This is not a theoretical framework. The organizations that have paid the highest price for unmeasured misalignment did not fail because they lacked strategy, capital, or talent. They failed because what was happening at every level of their organizations was invisible to the people at the top.*

---

## 9. WE BELIEVE HISTORY HAS ALREADY PROVEN THE COST OF UNMEASURED MISALIGNMENT

These are not case studies. They are scenes. Walk into them. Feel what it was like to be there — to be the leader who believed, the employee who knew, the organization that compounded in silence until it could not be saved.

### **Wells Fargo. (Today one of the largest banks in the world.)**

It is 2013. You are a branch manager at Wells Fargo. You arrive at your desk before 7 a.m. On your screen is the daily scorecard — the number your team must hit. Products per customer. Accounts opened. Cross-sales completed. The targets were set at the top. They were not negotiated. They were not questioned. They were declared.<sup>[6]</sup>

You know what is happening. You have known for a long time. The targets are not achievable by legitimate means, and your team knows it too. You have watched new accounts appear in the system — accounts that customers never asked for, never knew existed. You have said nothing. Not because you have no values. Because the cost of saying something is too high. You have a mortgage. You have a family. You have a performance review next month. And you have learned, through repeated signals and quiet warnings, that the people above you do not want to hear what you know.

So you smile in the morning meeting. You read the targets aloud. You watch your team nod. And you all perform alignment around a set of objectives that will eventually produce 3.5 million fraudulent accounts, \$3.7 billion in fines, two CEO resignations, and a Federal Reserve asset cap that will cripple the bank for years.<sup>[6][7]</sup> The misalignment between what leadership declared and what the organization was actually doing was not a secret at the ground level. It was simply unmeasured at the top. And because it was unmeasured, it was unmanaged. And because it was unmanaged, it compounded.

**Until it exploded.**

### **Boeing 737 MAX.**

It is 2015. You are an engineer at Boeing. You have spent twenty years believing in this company. You have run the numbers on the MCAS system. You do not like what you see.<sup>[10][11]</sup>

You write up your concern. You send it up. You wait. The response, when it comes, is not a solution. It is a reframing. The timeline has been compressed. The financial targets are immovable. The culture that once asked first ‘is this safe?’ and then ‘does this work?’ has, over decades, slowly, invisibly, inverted those priorities. Engineering excellence has been subordinated to schedule and cost. You know this. Your colleagues know this. But the people at the top — they do not know it. Or they do not want to.

On October 29, 2018, Lion Air Flight 610 departs Jakarta. Twelve minutes later, 189 people are dead. On March 10, 2019, Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 departs Addis

Ababa. Six minutes later, 157 more are gone.<sup>[10][11]</sup> The investigation traces the root cause not to a sudden failure, but to a cultural drift building for more than twenty-five years — invisible, unmeasured, and unmanaged at the leadership level, while the people closest to the work had been trying to surface it.

The misalignment was not sudden. It was quiet. It compounded in the dark. And then 346 people paid the price for it.

### **Kodak. (Still exists today — reinvented as a fraction of what it was.)**

It is 1981. You are Steve Sasson, and you invented the digital camera six years ago in Kodak's own laboratories.<sup>[12][13]</sup> You presented it to leadership. You explained what it meant. You told them what was coming.

They were not hostile. They were something worse. They were confident. Confident in film. Confident in their 90% share of the American photography market. Confident in the model that had made Kodak one of the most valuable companies in the world. And without alignment between what the engineers knew and what leadership was willing to hear, even the breakthrough that could have saved the company remained dormant.

By 2012, Kodak — which had once commanded 145,000 employees and a \$31 billion market capitalization — filed for bankruptcy.<sup>[12]</sup> The digital imaging patents were sold for approximately \$525 million — a fraction of what they could have been worth to the company that invented them.<sup>[12]</sup>

The misalignment between what the engineers knew and what leadership was willing to hear was total. It was not measured. It was not managed. It compounded quietly for thirty years.

### **WeWork.**

It is 2018. You are a senior manager at WeWork. You believe in this. You joined because the mission felt real — a new way to work, a global community, a company that was genuinely changing something. The energy in every office is extraordinary. The growth is intoxicating. You are expanding into new cities every month.

You also know, at some level you have not yet allowed yourself to examine, that the numbers do not add up. The spaces fill, then empty. The membership churn is higher than anyone discusses openly. The long-term lease obligations are growing faster than the short-term revenue they are supposed to generate. You have raised this — carefully, obliquely — in a meeting. The response was enthusiasm. More cities. More growth. More vision.

The gap between what the organization declared itself to be and what it actually was had no name inside WeWork. It was not measured. It was not managed. It was performed — in pitch decks, in all-hands meetings, in a \$47 billion valuation that reflected a story, not a foundation.

When the IPO prospectus forced the numbers into the open in 2019, the gap was finally visible — and it was catastrophic. The valuation collapsed. The founder was removed.

Over \$22 billion in investment evaporated. And on November 6, 2023, WeWork filed for bankruptcy with \$18.6 billion in debt.

The misalignment was not sudden. It had been building, unexamined and unmeasured, for years. The people inside it were not fraudsters. They were believers — in a story that no one had been given the instrument to test against reality.

**In every case, confidence was absolute. And in every case, confidence was catastrophically wrong.**

**Certainty requires measurement. And measurement was absent.**

*In every case, the measurement that could have changed everything was absent. That absence was not inevitable. It was a choice — even when no one recognized it as one.*

*The cost has been established. By the companies that paid it. By the employees who carried it. By the customers who felt it. What remains is the question every leader must now answer: will you measure — or will you assume?*

---

## 10. WE BELIEVE WHAT CANNOT BE MEASURED CANNOT BE MANAGED

For decades, alignment was treated as intangible — something leaders sensed, assumed, or hoped existed. It was not measured because no tool existed to measure it. And because it was not measured, it was not managed. Problems surfaced only after they had already compounded to crisis level.

Corporate Dynamic Profiler™ changed that. Alignment is not intangible. It was simply unmeasured. There is a profound difference.

Corporate Dynamic Profiler™ makes alignment a measurable KPI — quantifiably, on an ongoing basis, at the level where misalignment does the most damage. Not a one-time survey. Not a subjective assessment. Precision measurement that adapts as conditions change, as teams evolve, and as the stakes rise.<sup>[1]</sup>

Think of it as a medical checkup. You do not wait until you are critically ill to see a doctor. You schedule regular checkups. You run blood work. If something shows up, you treat it — then you retest to confirm the treatment worked. The same logic applies to organizational alignment.

When alignment is strong, annual measurement may suffice. When issues are identified, frequency increases — half-yearly, quarterly, or more — until interventions are proven effective and results are confirmed. When an organization is in crisis, high-frequency monitoring tracks recovery at every stage. Alignment becomes a living metric, not a one-time snapshot.

*Alignment was never intangible. It was simply unmeasured. The moment you choose to measure it, everything that follows becomes manageable.*

*The Corporate Dynamic Profiler™ makes alignment measurable. What that measurement makes possible is something no case study of failure can fully convey. It must be described differently — not as a cautionary tale, but as a destination.*

---

## **11. WE BELIEVE ALIGNMENT, WHEN IT IS REAL, TRANSFORMS EVERYTHING IT TOUCHES**

There is an organization you have not yet fully experienced. You may have glimpsed it — in a meeting where something felt qualitatively different, in a leadership conversation where trust was so present you barely noticed it, in a quarter where the numbers arrived not as relief but as confirmation of something you already knew. But you may not have built it deliberately, or understood precisely what was producing it.

This is what alignment — real alignment, measured alignment, alignment built on shared beliefs, values, and principles — produces when it is allowed to exist.

It is 2018. You are the CEO of a mid-size manufacturer. Eighteen months ago, your organization was in crisis. A post-acquisition integration had produced exactly what unmanaged integrations produce: two cultures in the same building, moving in different directions. Your leadership team spoke the same language and meant different things by every word.

You chose to measure.

Not to survey. Not to commission another culture initiative. Not to bring in a program. To measure — precisely, objectively, at every level of the organization where misalignment was costing you. And what the measurement revealed was not what you expected. The gaps were not where you thought they were. The alignment you were most confident about was, in several dimensions, the most fractured. The people you had labeled as ‘difficult’ were, in several cases, the most genuinely aligned to the organization’s stated values — and the most pained by the distance between those values and what was actually being rewarded.

That measurement became the foundation for everything that followed.

Not programs. Not retreats. Not initiatives with names and launch events. Targeted, diagnostic intervention — the kind that addresses root causes rather than symptoms, that measures results rather than activity, that proves its effectiveness before it moves on.

Eighteen months later, you are sitting in a leadership meeting that feels qualitatively different from any you have chaired before. The disagreements are real. The debate is pointed. But the people in the room are working from the same foundation — the same beliefs about what this organization is for, the same values about how it will operate, the same principles that govern every decision when the stakes are high. They disagree about tactics because they agree about purpose. And because they agree about purpose, every disagreement produces a better decision, not a deeper fissure.

On your production floor, something has changed. The people who work there are not performing engagement. They are operating within a culture they actually believe in — one whose stated values match what is actually being rewarded, recognized, and reinforced. The discretionary effort that was once withheld is now freely given. Not because anyone demanded it. Because the conditions are finally worth investing in.

Your operating results tell the same story in different units. Decisions made faster, because the leadership team is no longer managing hidden divergence. Capital deployed more precisely, because everyone understands the strategic priorities and believes in them. Customer satisfaction rising — not because you changed your service standards, but because the people delivering service are no longer carrying the weight of suppressed misalignment into every customer interaction.

Retention has changed. The people who were leaving — the capable ones, the values-driven ones, the ones with options — are staying. Not because you increased salaries or added benefits. Because the organization they are working in now reflects the values they came to serve. The gap between what was declared and what was lived has closed. And that closure, more than any compensation package, is what people with choices are unwilling to leave.

Organizations that measure alignment achieve 58% higher operating profits than those that do not.<sup>[2]</sup> That is not a one-time gain. It is a structural advantage that compounds — because aligned organizations make better decisions, retain better people, respond faster to change, and build the kind of culture that no competitor can replicate by copying a strategy or hiring away a product team.

**This is the destination. This is what measurement makes possible. And it begins with a single decision — the same decision every organization in this document failed to make until it was too late: to measure what others leave to assumption.**

*The failure cases are not the only story. They are the warning. The destination — the aligned organization that performs at its structural best — belongs to the leaders who choose certainty over confidence, and measurement over assumption.*

*That destination is achievable. The path to it is measurement. And what is at stake, as AI transforms every business process at unprecedented scale and speed, has never been higher.*

---

## **12. WE BELIEVE AI WITHOUT ALIGNMENT LOCKS MISALIGNMENT INTO YOUR SYSTEM PERMANENTLY**

Organizations see AI as a tool for progress — a way to automate processes, drive efficiency, and gain competitive advantage. And it can be all of those things. If alignment exists first.

But deploy AI into a misaligned organization, and you do not fix the misalignment. You automate it. You encode it into every process, every workflow, every decision the system makes. You scale it at a speed no human intervention can match. And you make it exponentially harder — and exponentially more expensive — to correct.

This is not a technology risk. It is a human risk, multiplied by technology. AI learns from the organization as it is — not as leadership believes it to be. It trains on the misaligned behaviors, the divergent priorities, the gaps between declared values and actual practice. Then it scales those patterns with precision, speed, and consistency that no human workforce could replicate.

To fix it later requires dismantling the automation, rebuilding the processes from their foundation, and retraining the models on a new reality — one that should have existed before AI was introduced. The organization pays twice: once for the damage the misalignment caused while the AI was scaling it, and again for the cost of dismantling what was built on the wrong foundation. To correct.

This is not a new lesson. In the 1980s and 1990s, Business Process Reengineering and Total Quality Management promised transformation through process automation and optimization. In organization after organization, the result was the opposite: increased scrap, higher rework, lost productivity, and demoralized workforces. The processes had been automated. The misalignment beneath them had not been addressed. The dysfunction did not disappear — it was encoded into the new system and scaled. AI is the same dynamic at a speed and magnitude those decades could not have imagined.

*(I was there — and spent sweat and tears fixing exactly that.)*

Our position is clear: measure alignment before you automate. Make it a prerequisite — not an afterthought. Ensure that values, culture, priorities, and processes are genuinely aligned — not performed, not assumed, not declared from the top — before you hand them to AI for amplification at scale.

**Without alignment, AI does not solve your problems. It becomes the most powerful, most efficient, and most irreversible delivery mechanism for the wrong things.**

*The organizations that will lead the AI era are not those that deploy first. They are those that align first — and deploy with the certainty that only measurement can provide.*

*The imperative is clear: measure before you automate. And that principle applies equally to every other form of organizational intervention — because without diagnostic precision, every solution risks becoming the next source of compounding damage.*

---

### 13. WE BELIEVE CHANGE WITHOUT A DIAGNOSTIC FOUNDATION IS EXPENSIVE GUESSWORK

When execution stalls, leaders move fast. They restructure, retrain, replace. They attack symptoms with urgency and conviction. But what if the symptom is not the source? What if every short-term fix is generating the next problem — because the root cause has never been identified?

We have worked with organizations in compounding crisis — where every visible problem was the downstream consequence of a single unmeasured misalignment at the top. And we have worked with high-performing organizations that would never have known their blind spots existed — until they chose to look.

In both cases, measurement came first. Not programs. Not training. Not assumptions about what needs to be fixed. Diagnosis first. Then targeted, purposeful, measurable intervention. Implemented. Delivered. Measured again.

| *Diagnosis is not delay. It is the only path to intervention that actually works — and the only defense against fixing the wrong problem at compounding cost.*

*The diagnostic foundation is not a phase to pass through. It is the only viable starting point — because it is the only approach that addresses what is actually wrong, rather than what appears to be wrong.*

---

### 14. WE BELIEVE LASTING RESULTS REQUIRE ADDRESSING ROOT CAUSES, NOT SYMPTOMS

*Shelf reports. Templated programs. Off-the-shelf solutions applied to unique human systems. These are not solutions. They are the illusion of action.*

Revolving Change does not consult. We do not advise from a distance, deliver a report, and move on. We implement. We make change happen — measurably and with lasting effect. Every intervention we undertake is built from the diagnostic foundation up. No two organizations receive the same solution — because no two organizations have the same misalignment, the same attitudinal drivers, the same capability gaps.

The findings determine the path. The path delivers measurable results. We only work with leaders who are committed to change — not fearless, but clear-eyed about the risks, the impact, and the responsibility that transformation demands.

**That is not a marketing position. It is a commitment. Or we do not work together.**

| *The findings determine the path. The path is the only thing that delivers results that hold.*

*Everything before this point has described the problem, established the cost, named the solution, shown the destination, and defined the standard. What remains is the choice that only leaders can make.*

---

## **15. WE BELIEVE THE LEADERS WHO SHAPE THE FUTURE CHOOSE CERTAINTY OVER CONFIDENCE**

Confidence is available to everyone. It requires no data, no measurement, no evidence. It requires only belief.

Certainty is different. Certainty is earned. It comes from measuring what others leave to intuition, from seeing what others leave invisible, from managing what others assume cannot be managed.

Organizations that measure alignment achieve 58% higher operating profits than those that do not.<sup>[2]</sup> That is not a marginal advantage. That is a structural one — belonging to the leaders who decide to see clearly, build on a shared foundation, and act before the cost becomes catastrophic.

This is the work of Revolving Change. This is why Corporate Dynamic Profiler™ exists. And this is the standard we hold ourselves to — because anything less would betray the leaders who trust us with what matters most.

## THIS IS OUR DECLARATION.

*Measure what others leave to assumption.*

*See what others leave invisible.*

*Recognize the human cost of silence — and refuse to let it compound.*

*Name misalignment for what it is — and stop misdiagnosing it as attitude, conflict, or disloyalty.*

*Build alignment on shared beliefs, values, and principles — not obedience or accommodation.*

*Ensure alignment before you automate. It is a prerequisite — not an afterthought.*

*Implement solutions that deliver lasting, measurable results.*

*Or do not work together at all.*

---

*If what you have read here raises a question you have not been able to answer — that is exactly where this work begins.*

▶ **Stay current** — subscribe to the Change Business Memo, our monthly perspective on the forces shaping organizational performance [revolvingchange.com/resources/](https://revolvingchange.com/resources/)

▶ **Explore Corporate Dynamic Profiler™** — discover how Business Alignment becomes a measurable KPI, and what that makes possible for your organization [revolvingchange.com/corpdynapro/](https://revolvingchange.com/corpdynapro/)

▶ **We would like you to share what this stirred.** Connect with Jorge Loebel. [linkedin.com/in/jorge-loebel-44412715/](https://linkedin.com/in/jorge-loebel-44412715/)

## Revolving Change

*Corporate Dynamic Profiler™ — Converting Alignment into a KPI*

*Transformational Human Engineering™ for Measurable, Lasting Change*

[revolvingchange.com](https://revolvingchange.com)

## REFERENCES

---

### ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT RESEARCH

- [1] Revolving Change (2026). Corporate Dynamic Profiler™: Research Findings and Methodology. Revolving Change, LLC. [revolvingchange.com](https://revolvingchange.com)

### PSYCHOLOGY & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

- [2] Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 371–378. doi:10.1037/h0040525
- [3] Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*. New York: HarperCollins.
- [4] Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- [5] Eurich, T. (2017). *Insight: The Surprising Truth About How Others See Us, How We See Ourselves, and Why the Answers Matter More Than We Think*. New York: Crown Business. [Research finding: 95% of people believe they are self-aware; only 10–15% actually meet the criteria.]

### CORPORATE CASE STUDIES

- [6] Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (2022, December 20). CFPB Orders Wells Fargo to Pay \$3.7 Billion for Widespread Mismanagement of Auto Loans, Mortgages, and Deposit Accounts. [consumerfinance.gov](https://consumerfinance.gov)
- [7] Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance (2020, February 14). Unprecedented Enforcement Actions Against Eight Former Wells Fargo Executives. [corpgov.law.harvard.edu](https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu)
- [8] United States Navy (2025). Blue Angels: Official Fact Sheet. Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL. [blueangels.navy.mil](https://blueangels.navy.mil)
- [9] National Transportation Safety Board (1982). Aircraft Accident Report: USAF Thunderbirds Diamond Formation, Indian Springs AFAF, Nevada, January 18, 1982. NTSB-AAR-82/09. [ntsb.gov](https://www.ntsb.gov)
- [10] George, B. (2020, February 9). Why Boeing's Problems with the 737 MAX Began More Than 25 Years Ago. Harvard Business School Working Knowledge. [hbs.edu/working-knowledge](https://hbs.edu/working-knowledge)
- [11] Larcker, D. F. & Tayan, B. (2024). Boeing 737 MAX: Organizational, Leadership, and Cultural Breakdowns. Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance; Stanford Graduate School of Business. [corpgov.law.harvard.edu](https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu)
- [12] Eastman Kodak Company (2012, January 19). Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Filing, United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of New York. [Peak market capitalization: \$31 billion (1997). Patent portfolio sale: approximately \$525 million (December 2012). Employees at peak: 145,000.] See also: Kodak. Wikipedia. [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kodak](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kodak); MIT Technology Review (2012, December 19). [technologyreview.com](https://technologyreview.com)
- [13] Mui, C. (2012, January 26). How Kodak Failed. *Forbes*. [forbes.com](https://forbes.com)

- [14] WeWork Inc. (2023, November 6). Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Filing, United States District Court, District of New Jersey. [Peak valuation: \$47 billion (January 2019). Total debt at filing: \$18.6 billion. Total investment raised: over \$22 billion.] See also: Hirsch, L. (2023, November 7). WeWork files for bankruptcy in a stunning downfall. NPR / OPB. [opb.org](https://www.opb.org)

## HUMAN RESOURCES & ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE RESEARCH

- [15] Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) (2022). The Real Costs of Recruitment and Employee Turnover. [shrm.org](https://www.shrm.org). [Overall replacement cost of a senior employee estimated at 90–200% of annual salary.]
- [16] Brown, T. (2025). A Misaligned Workplace Culture Creates Problems. LSA Global. [Isaglobal.com](https://www.isaglobal.com). [Culture accounts for 40% of the difference between high- and low-performing organizations across revenue growth, profitability, customer satisfaction, and employee engagement; aligned cultures boost productivity by up to 25%.]
- [17] Gallup (2024). 42% of Employee Turnover Is Preventable but Often Ignored. Gallup Workplace Research, July 2024. [gallup.com/workplace/646538/employee-turnover-preventable-often-ignored.aspx](https://www.gallup.com/workplace/646538/employee-turnover-preventable-often-ignored.aspx)

## FURTHER READING

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.

Eurich, T. (2018, January). What Self-Awareness Really Is (and How to Cultivate It). *Harvard Business Review*. [hbr.org](https://www.hbr.org)

Nilsen, Y. (2023). Cultural Alignment in Organizations: Impact and Strategies. *Journal of Organizational Culture Communications and Conflict*, 27(S5), 1–3.

Program on Negotiation, Harvard Law School (2024). Learning from Ethical Leadership Failures at Boeing. [pon.harvard.edu](https://pon.harvard.edu)

Revolving Change (2026). Corporate Dynamic Profiler™: Case Studies Q1 2026. [revolvingchange.com/corpdynapro](https://www.revolvingchange.com/corpdynapro)

FranklinCovey (2024). Managing Employee Turnover: Tips for Retention. [franklincovey.com](https://www.franklincovey.com)

## Revolving Change

*Corporate Dynamic Profiler™ — Converting Alignment into a KPI*  
*Transformational Human Engineering™ for Measurable, Lasting Change*  
[revolvingchange.com](https://www.revolvingchange.com)