Transcript - Adam Kingl - How can we become more adaptable?

Fri, 04/05 16:11PM · 34mins

Transcript

Ross G 00:07
Hello, you're listening to the Future Talent Learning podcast developed to help you build your leadership and management skills. I'm Ross Garner.

Nathalie 00:14
And I'm Nathalie Nahai.

Ross G 00:16
This week we're asking, how can I become more adaptable? What do we mean by adaptability? What personal habits can we adopt that will help us? To dig into these questions, we're joined by author, speaker, and educator Adam Kingall.

Ross G 00:29
Adam teaches business skills around the world, regularly appears in the press, and is the author of Next Generation Leadership. Hi Adam, welcome to the show. Thank you very much, thanks for having me.

Ross G 00:38
It's good to have you. I wonder if you could kick us off by describing what we mean by behaving in an adaptable way. I'm putting quote marks around adaptable.

Adam 00:47
Sure, absolutely. And I like the phrase adaptable actually, because Agile often has connotations, which you see more often in like software design, etc. So an adaptable person or organisation is that which can pivot from the past to the future with dexterity.

Adam 01:08
We know that we are creatures of habit, and yet we know that the world is changing faster than we can keep up. And so adaptability, that ability to reflexively, autonomically change your behaviors, your habit, your business model, your processes in a way that doesn't feel like a poorly drawn out top down third world dictator military campaign is surely a good thing for any organisation to master.

Ross G 01:43
your issue with the word agility? Because what you described there, so it's not top down, we want everyone to be able to adapt to changing circumstances. In fact, you need everyone to adapt because things change so quickly that it can't be top down.

Ross G 01:56
That is what most people use the word agility in a business context for. So what's your issue with that?

Adam 02:02
Of course, I don't take issue with the word Agile per se, but some people, particularly who come from a software development background or games development background, they have a whole suite of processes, including Six Sigma, among other things, that that just implies.

Adam 02:19
Of course, I mean something much more broad, much more general, and that is simply the ability to reflexively pivot, change, and adapt personally or organisationally in a manner which suits this volatile world.

Nathalie 02:35
So I have a question there with the adaptability. One thing that I've noticed where people might call it adaptability, but actually it can be more of a sense of reactivity, especially in social media is when you see businesses, for instance,

clamoring to have some kind of response when a crisis occurs or when someone calls out a business for bad practice and there's like a social movement, and then they'll try and reflectively respond to the crisis at hand without having done the actual legwork of creating a more adaptable system, organisation, supply chain, business ecosystem, et cetera.

Nathalie 03:09
What are your thoughts about how we think of adaptability and what's the key difference between adaptability and being reactive?

Adam 03:17
Yeah, that's a huge difference. You're absolutely right. When you see companies acting reactively, what they're really doing is they're implementing a communications campaign. That's crisis management.

Adam 03:29
That's how we message this. And I'm not saying that that's completely wrong. I mean, particularly those organisations that are pretty good at it are radically honest instead of trying to create some kind of spin.

Adam 03:44
So for example, I remember there was an... And this doesn't at all color this organisation in a bad light. There was an example of Heineken that where social media for a while was filled with images of this horrific site of a dog fighting arena, I think somewhere in Southeast Asia.

Adam 04:03
And there were Heineken banners around the arena. And Heineken immediately jumped on that and said, we do not endorse dog fighting. What happened is that there was a previous event that Heineken was sponsoring in that venue.

Adam 04:18
And then when they put in the dog fighting, they didn't take down the Heineken banners. And so Heineken immediately leapt as they should, because they know that in these cases, oftentimes of the essence, if you really want to make sure that this doesn't blow out of control and all you're doing is trying to correct people's opinion to the truth in this case, but you have to be completely transparent, completely honest.

Adam 04:44
An example of organisations that don't do that is BP, for example, right after the Gulf disaster, they hemmed and they hawed and they made excuses and their CEO wanted his life back, et cetera, et cetera.

Adam 04:54
And they are still suffering from that because they didn't immediately pivot toward radical honesty. You could see them desperately trying to tap dance their way through it, instead of saying, throwing your hands up, that was our bad, that was awful.

Adam 05:13
We have to radically redesign how we do things, where our priorities are, et cetera. And even to this day, if you look, do Google search of BP, you see all kinds of poor things about them. I think they are making progress.

Adam 05:28
And I do think that in many ways, they are a really good British company, but they have their moments. So that's completely different from an organisation which, in its DNA, has adaptability. Like if they see a trend in the market, they can immediately seize that.

Adam 05:47
And you spoke to one of the themes around that. Some of it has to do with empowering your people, so that particularly frontline employees, if they notice a trend, they have the authority to try to take advantage of that trend, instead of strategies that have to whiz up and down the organisation's communications chain before you get permission to even use blue paper instead of white paper, et cetera, et cetera.

Ross G 06:14
I think that is how it works in a traditional organisation is you identify an opportunity and you might put together a business case of some kind, which would require input from lots of different teams and departments.

Ross G 06:26

So it takes a really long time. And then if you can find sort of a senior level sponsor to take that to the board, well, you need to wait for the next board meeting. And then it's one of 50 other things that are going to get discussed then and it takes a really long time.

Ross G 06:38

So it's just impossible to be adaptable if you're going to work with that kind of model. Yes.

Adam 06:43

Yeah, that's right. We also know that some of the biggest successful change initiatives just were not top down. Were not so-called board approved, quote unquote. The biggest organisation in this country is probably the NHS.

Adam 07:02

And some of the biggest change programs in the NHS happened through GPs posting ideas for how to improve patient care, for example, on their intranet. And then other people, if they like the idea, they can adopt it.

Adam 07:15

And before you know it, it becomes a widespread practice. So that's organic change. The funny thing is, it feels like that will take a longer amount of time. But in fact, it's much faster than to try to percolate formally change through a literally million-plus employee organisation.

Nathalie 07:38

And it sounds to me also that if we're thinking about adaptability in a broader sense, the resilience of an ecosystem is only made possible by the agency in collaboration of specific nodes within it.

Nathalie 07:49

So I think if you're talking about that, it's almost like a post-heroic leadership model where you don't have an authoritarian top-down, like you said, with a board meeting sort of approach. Obviously there needs to be direction leadership, but I think there's also that question around agency, collaboration, giving people enough autonomy to be able to make decisions that are aligned with, and linking to our other conversation on purpose, that are aligned with the purpose and mission of the organisation so that they're able to make decisions in a way that is aligned with the overarching goal of the organisation, so to have that kind of possibility.

Nathalie 08:23

But then how do you manage to do that when it means a huge amount of trust being placed in the hands of people that maybe you don't have such a large degree of control over in the traditional sense?

Adam 08:36

Oh boy, I love the question and you talked about so many big themes here. So let's start with that last question first. I would ask, because I get that question a lot, like how can I trust people? I would ask, well, if you don't trust them, why did you hire them in the first place?

Adam 08:51

Why do we go to all these vetting procedures, interviews, background checks, references, and then we hire them and then we have such a low amount of trust in these people? So either you did do your recruitment job correctly and therefore you should trust these people, or you got to look at your hiring procedures if it's insufficient to be able to trust.

Adam 09:15

I don't think we sufficiently trust our people because most organisations do do a great job in terms of the recruitment process and then they assume that everyone's out to sabotage the organisation. So that's first.

Adam 09:29

But second is, as I said, we're talking about changing the DNA of the organisation and I know that's some hard work that has to happen. So it's not simply, we can't simply command organisations to be more adaptable.

Adam 09:42

Like that doesn't work. You all need to adapt faster and then somehow they'll do it. So there are two things that have to

happen. And Nathalie, you spoke to both of them. One is the architecture of the organisation probably has to change.

Adam 09:56
organisations have too many layers, too many decision points, and they're too pyramidal. And that organisational structure, we have inherited literally from the Roman legions. And today we still think that's how every kind of social organisation has to occur.

Adam 10:13
Very successful.

Ross G 10:14
long time. It worked. Not indefinitely, but for a long

Adam 10:17
It was, and it worked extremely well in the Industrial Revolution, where you didn't want people to think. You wanted everyone to simply be a pair of hands as a cog in the factory floor, which is why it's most profound proponent of so-called scientific management in the heyday of the Industrial Revolution.

Adam 10:35
Henry Ford once lamented, why is it every time I hire a pair of hands, a brain comes attached? And isn't it funny, though, that even though now we've exceeded that era and we're now post-Nirvana of the Industrial Revolution, we still haven't changed our management model in any significant way.

Adam 10:54
We still architect our organisations and engineer performance as if we were all still running black boot factories in circa 1880. So that's one. And then the second piece that has to happen is we have to redefine what it means to manage.

Adam 11:16
If I manage people, what does that mean I actually do in relation to my direct reports? If you open a thesaurus in almost any language on the planet and you look up the verb, whatever the verb is in that language for to manage, generally in a thesaurus, the synonyms that you'll see, the synonyms are an order of commonality, right?

Adam 11:38
So the first synonym is the most common synonym. What do you think? What do you think is the most common synonym you would see in almost any thesaurus on the planet when you look up to manage direct?

Adam 11:47
Very close. Yep. Ross. organise. Close. To control.

Nathalie 11:52
Oh, there we have it.

Adam 11:53
Right. So so there's a whole set of assumptions we have when we say I am a manager that we probably don't even think hard about. Right. So that means I have to control people, which goes back to your point, why don't we trust people?

Adam 12:03
Maybe we do trust them. And yet we still default to these ideas. I have to understand every minutiae that my people are doing at every moment of the day. Otherwise, I'm not managing. What if we redefine management as to build in relevance, right, to help our people be more relevant, i .e.

Adam 12:19
more powerful, more effective, et cetera, in the organisation? Why can't we manage our company so that we are more relevant for our customers instead of this high degree of of of controlism as our governing assumption?

Adam 12:35
If we can't crack that, then those organisations that that can't will not be able to adapt. I can tell you that right now, not to any sufficient degree.

Ross G 12:46

Let's pivot then to the role of leaders and managers here, because that's really the audience of this podcast. And I want to go back to your NHS example, because I think I would posit that it is atypical.

Ross G 12:57

So you suggested that a GP would post a new idea on the internet, and that would spread through the organisation. And people would adopt it, because it's a good idea. Certainly the people that I know that work in the NHS feel like it's a constant tilting at windmills exercise, and it's impossible to get anything changed.

Ross G 13:12

But the way that you describe the role of managers in that system sounds like what you would be doing is creating the conditions for that to happen more frequently. And that would be the big part of your role.

Adam 13:22

Yeah, that's exactly right. And look, I'm not assuming that the NHS is now perfect, right? But that's one example, a shining example of how the NHS did manage to create fast radical change amidst being a huge, obviously bureaucratic organisation in many ways it has to be because of the industry in which it operates.

Adam 13:42

So what I'm saying really is even in those types of organisations, large, public, heavily regulated industries, you can still have dramatic adaptability, but it didn't come top down.

Ross G 13:56

Right, sure. And so then the role of the manager in that, how do you encourage more of that?

Adam 14:02

Yeah, well, I think they're so for the individual leader or employee, for that matter, I think we have to we have to think about what are the habits that would allow one to make adaptability part and parcel of your job of your everyday life?

Adam 14:17

Because if we don't make it a habit, it will always feel forced, it will always feel hard, it will always feel like, you know, I just I just don't have time because it's not part of my day job. So how do you make adaptability part of the day job?

Adam 14:27

So when thinking about, well, what are what are the habits, I think there are many that you could try, but I think I have I have I have three big ones and they are experimentation, openness and slack.

Adam 14:41

So what I mean by that is experimentation, the ability to try new things in a low time, low risk, low cost manner in order to gain learning. And once you have the learning, then you have more confidence, less cost, less risk to actually do something different.

Adam 14:59

Experimenting in just the same way, for example, we might experiment in a lab, right? You might have a control group, you might have a little experiment group, and you do a stimulus, right? You test the hypothesis.

Adam 15:09

And if that and if your hypothesis, whether your hypothesis is proven or disproven, you now have more information. And that's how organisations I think should do should approach change with more confidence, right, gain information and do it in a way where you can do it quickly.

Adam 15:25

That's what the second and I'm happy to go back, obviously, to any of these. The second point is openness. What I mean by that is we have to increase the aperture of our perspective in order to really understand what our alternatives are.

Adam 15:37

And and that requires that we can't keep talking about how we have to change in the same bland boardrooms with the same people asking the same questions and expect different answers. So, you know, if we have a question about our market, talk

Adam 15:53
That's, you know, talk to your customers. That's what I mean by opening your perspective, because I think we, as we said in our earlier podcast on purpose, the problem with senior leaders is they're very detached from the marketplace.

Adam 16:05
They probably haven't spoken to customers in some cases, years or decades. And so their whole perspective of what the market wants comes from the organisation instead of the marketplace. If you're not sure, you know, how regulators would feel about an initiative, talk to the family and random people so that you get out of the barriers of your own or your organisation's assumptions.

Adam 16:32
So that's openness. The third is slack. And this goes back to the point of time. The biggest pushback that I hear when I talk to people about adaptability is, well, I just don't have time, no time to adapt.

Adam 16:43
Well, of course, that means you're dead in the water from the beginning. Right. A, you're just saying that isn't a big priority. You just rather not. Thank you very much. But two is, you know, it also speaks to how we we feel that we are slaves to our diaries instead of slaves to people requesting meetings of us and we don't proactively carve time out to think, to brainstorm, to blue sky, et cetera, to go outside into a different environment, to go talk to again, to talk to people outside of your cubicle, et cetera.

Adam 17:16
So I believe firmly that every leader needs to carve out regular time, whether that's every Friday afternoon, as I did when I was when I was an employee or, you know, every one day a week, as Google gives to many of their engineers, you know, they call it the 20 percent time one day a week to pursue a passion project, et cetera, because if you don't if you don't do that, of course, you're always going to feel that you're on the back foot.

Adam 17:43
You always are going to feel that you're responding too slowly.

Ross G 17:47
Yeah, I am. Just on the Google point, I had always been, because I've heard this for years, and Google has been around for a decent chunk of time now, the 20% time. I asked someone from Google if that exists, because it was starting to feel like one of those things that gets referenced so often that maybe it doesn't exist.

Ross G 17:59
And it does, he said, yes, absolutely. They're called 20% projects. It's not like you just have like a day a week that you can do stuff, you have to like, there's a process for it. But yeah, it absolutely does.

Ross G 18:08
So my like cynicism about that was misplaced. A lot of what you're talking about there, I know you didn't like using the word agile earlier on, but it actually does align very closely with documents like the agile manifesto.

Ross G 18:24
So things like, for example, if you're going to adapt to some change, that doesn't mean spending two years coming up with a new product, because you think it's a good idea. And then you launch it, and then you find out it wasn't a good idea, or someone else has got their first, someone's already doing it better, or someone else in the organisation is also working on it.

Ross G 18:43
It's about how quickly can we test this and find out whether it works or not.

Adam 18:48
Yeah, exactly. We know that, for example, if we look at the FMCG market, 80% of national rollouts of new products on grocery store shelves fail within one to two years, right? What that demonstrates is a lack of experimentation, right?

Adam 19:08

So these companies are actually increasing their risk. They're investing a hell of a lot of money and a hell of a lot of time in these big market rollouts without enough sufficient information. So why didn't you go out and talk to the market?

Adam 19:22
Why didn't you run a number of low cost, low time experiments so that you knew you were onto a good thing instead of convincing yourselves and then creating a plan probably composed of 200 plus pages and several pitches to ever more senior boards in the organisation, and then you do this big roll.

Adam 19:42
That's actually really risky. So I think the whole way in which organisations create big scaled projects is hugely risky, because it demonstrates actually that they're not adapting. They're taking actually big bets.

Adam 19:57
What they're doing is the equivalent of going to Vegas and before a card hits the blackjack table, putting a million dollars on the table. Well, you don't have a clue, right? But the more you get information, the better you'll do.

Adam 20:09
I mean, of course, I guess taken to its logical conclusion, my example just there means that you have to card count, but I'm not saying that. Don't come back to me on that. Well, Adam said so as they're being pulled away and arrested.

Adam 20:23
So yeah, I think you're absolutely right that organisations have this really kind of warped view about what it means to launch something new, which is actually more risky than less.

Nathalie 20:34
I'd love to ask something here about the DNA of the company and hiring practices, because one of the things that you've mentioned, which is so interesting, is around the openness to change and the openness to try new things.

Nathalie 20:45
And from a perspective of hiring, if you think about it through the lens of values, so the theory of basic human values, those like four macro values, openness to change is one of them, self-transcendence is another, conservation is another, and self-enhancement is yet another, so there's four macro ones.

Nathalie 21:00
What's interesting is that openness to change, which includes self-direction, stimulation and hedonism, is almost diametrically opposed to the value of conservation, which is around tradition, conformity and security.

Nathalie 21:14
So I'm wondering if you're a company that wants to become more adaptable, but you're hiring people whose values are around conservation and tradition and conformity and security, maybe there needs to be a longer, harder look at what values you're hiring for and then how to increase your intake of folks who might be dissimilar from you historically, but actually might give you that kind of more self-directed, open, sort of outward looking appreciation of change and transformation and agility.

Nathalie 21:43
Does that, maybe that's too much of a long-winded question, what your thoughts are around that.

Adam 21:48
No, it's a great question. You do have to hire people who actually have that openness to change, if you could ever hope to have that be a collective characteristic. The good news is that you can assess openness to change.

Adam 22:02
When psychologists created personality profiles, they finally landed on what they call the so-called big five. The key five characteristics that in any dictionary are the five most common ways in which we describe human beings, and one of them is openness to change.

Adam 22:21
It's exactly that. There are all kinds of assessments out there, one of which is the Neo, where you can assess this. Business

scholars also looked at the correlation of some of those big five characteristics to success in leadership.

Adam 22:37

If people are being measured more highly in openness to change on such personality assessments, they also tend to be, guess what, more effective leaders because they can store their organisations through change much more effectively instead of defaulting to conservatism.

Adam 22:59

What you've also spoken to, of course, is the need for neurodiversity in the organisation. It's a great point because a lot of organisations, when they say they have a diversity policy, what they're hiring for are important things, be it gender, be it religion, be it race, be it socioeconomic background, et cetera, but you also have to look at neurodiversity.

Adam 23:19

One of them is personality and making sure that you have different personalities in the organisation, rather than hiring so-called people who think like me, which unfortunately too often is our default, even if it's a tacit default.

Adam 23:36

The other issue then is once you get through the diversity hurdle is the inclusion hurdle. We talk about diversity and inclusion, right? Good old D &I. The problem is most organisations spend 99% of their time on the D and they kind of ignore the I.

Adam 23:48

There's a simple reason for that. D, diversity, you can improve through policy. organisations are very good at implementing policy. I, inclusion, is cultural and that takes time. What you're asking people to do is to change their views, their perspectives, their behaviors around helping to foster inclusion in their teams to make sure that you're actually getting the benefits of the diversity, not just hiring for it.

Adam 24:17

The problem is often we hire for diversity and then we orient them out of it. We have onboarding sessions. I love that phrase, onboarding. It's like, get onboard, get with the program. We try to then monotonise people's approach to their job through their orientation instead of saying, well, how are we going to get the benefits of this diversity in the first place?

Adam 24:39

You have to encourage it. That's a long answer, but it was a profound question.

Nathalie 24:46

Great answer as well.

Ross G 24:47

So, I do want to keep going back to the managers because we talked about things that they can do to encourage adaptability within their organisation. So, experimentation, openness and slack time. These are things that managers can encourage and they could do that by talking about this with their teams and setting goals that align with that, I guess, organising work, but that feels very directive and authoritarian, but you know what I mean.

Ross G 25:09

Also, we brought up that they can think about this when they're recruiting and there's tests that they can do to recruit for different personality types. They can look for diversity of thought, I guess, and then encourage that when people come in the door.

Ross G 25:22

But they might still be operating in an environment where the organisation does not encourage any of that, that you can have all the ideas that you want. And I support that because I'm your manager, but they don't go any further than that because no one else is listening.

Ross G 25:33

So, I guess just to finish up the discussion, how do you navigate that environment?

Adam 25:39

Yeah. Well, part of it is leaders. I'm in Generation X. I've got a little silver in my hair. When I first joined the workforce, you became a manager through being an expert and through the virtue of your experience.

Adam 25:56
You gained wisdom and therefore you had the right to lead others as the best performing individual contributor in the team becomes the leader of that team. Unfortunately, maximising those technical skills are not the skills that we require to be leaders, right?

Adam 26:17
It's a totally different set of skills, which have actually, unfortunately, little to do with expertise or even sometimes experience. So, you know, many of us know the maxim from famous executive coach Marshall Goldsmith who said, we've got you here, we'll get you there.

Adam 26:34
And in this context, what I'm talking about is you could be the best engineer, the best accountant, the best software engineer on the planet. That doesn't mean you're necessarily going to be a good leader.

Adam 26:44
It's a different skill set. And the skills that are required today in this highly volatile environment probably mean you have to be less respectful of your own experience and acknowledge that you might not have the answers.

Adam 27:06
And therefore what you need are the habits, and we've talked about some of those, to get answers quickly and encourage your people to get those answers and to come back and share those with the team so that you can act and react faster than the competition.

Ross G 27:22
Andrew on senior leaders as well, I would think. You need to be in the way that you talk to your leadership team if they're saying, what's the answer to this question? You would need to become more comfortable saying, I don't know yet.

Ross G 27:34
But here's how we could find this out in a quick, relatively low risk way before we proceed any further. And that's hard. It is hard, yeah.

Adam 27:43
Yeah. And that's probably not how we observed leaders in the past. And so it's difficult to break that paradigm that the way I will be successful is to imitate or emulate the leaders who came before me.

Adam 27:54
Some of us were fortunate to have humble leaders. Many of us didn't. And so we have to recognise that maybe I've got to craft my own path.

Ross G 28:02
Great. All right, great. Let's wrap up. Nathalie, what will you be taking from this conversation?

Nathalie 28:09
So much, but one of the things that really struck me was the framing of diversity being a process issue in large part, obviously not in its entirety, but in large part, and inclusion being a cultural issue.

Nathalie 28:21
I really like that framing because it gives a much more nuanced look at how we can start to address these two issues, the latter of which often gets dismissed or given a bit of a back seat. So yeah, that really did change my thinking on how we think about diversity and inclusion and how to do those things better.

Nathalie 28:40
How about you Ross?

Ross G 28:41
So I had a question written down I was going to ask about, aren't we introducing more risk by experimenting and accepting

that sometimes these experiments are going to fail? And the reason I didn't ask it is because Adam answered it before I asked it, which is that it is more risky to spend two years piloting resources into something that you have no idea if it's going to work or not, than to try lots of things on a small scale before you, before you roll them out.

Ross G 29:04
So yeah, I thought that was a really interesting perspective. It wasn't something I'd thought about before in terms of risk. And Adam, what one idea would you like people to take from this conversation?

Adam 29:15
Well, I guess the main thing is that you have the confidence to recognise that you can craft your own path in terms of how you can be a better, more adaptable leader. As I say, we probably need to take some value out of experience and expertise as the main driver of the successful adaptable leader and think about how can I create simple things in my daily life that will train me, if you will, to embrace adaptability and make it part of my everyday.

Adam 29:48
Wonderful.

Ross G 29:53
And now let's move on to a regular feature one thing I've learned this week nothing would you like to go first?

Nathalie 30:00
Yes. So I was reading around some psychological stuff and came across an interesting new piece of research published in the journal, Nature and the Science of Sleep. And this particular paper was talking about how people who can frequently recall their dreams tend to be more creative and exhibit increased functional connectivity and key brain network.

Nathalie 30:19
I never remember my dreams. So I'm thinking, hang on, I don't remember. No, but I used to growing up and they were usually nightmares. I don't know what else says, but like now I'm like, Oh my God, does that mean I'm not creative?

Nathalie 30:29
But of course it doesn't because one could be very creative without remembering one's dreams and maybe you're just not getting to sleep early enough. And so you're missing out on the REM cycle anyway.

Nathalie 30:36
So it looks into the neurophysiological correlates of dreaming and its connection with creativity. So I thought that was an interesting tidbit that I did not know previously.

Ross G 30:45
Neurophysiological correlates, there's an expression that I'd never heard that just rolled off the tongue there, didn't it?

Nathalie 30:54
You can tell if you're reading too many papers, bit of a, bit of a nerd, sorry. How about you, Ross?

Ross G 31:00
So this week I saw on the QI Twitter feed, QI, so listeners in the UK, it's a programme and it stands for quite interesting, that the word Viking is a verb, not a noun. So old Norse warriors were not Vikings as a group, but rather they would go on a Viking.

Ross G 31:18
It was like a thing that they did. However, I decided to fact check this and it turns out this is a much more contentious issue than I would have expected. So there is a great Reddit thread on the myth or not that Viking is a verb.

Ross G 31:30
And much of that thread is people quoting old rune stones to one another and giving their interpretation of different translations. So it really feels like that's what the internet is for. I guess I have learned that most topics, even with the slightest amount of research become far more complicated than you would think.

Ross G 31:47
So I've got no idea if Viking is a noun or a verb.

Nathalie 31:50
Reddit thread. It's amazing.

Ross G 31:54
So Adam, what have you learned this week?

Adam 31:57
majority of human beings on this planet cannot lick their own elbow try it you can't nope nope

Ross G 32:08
on camera but Nathalie's just going for it.

Adam 32:11
Oh, dear listener, if only you had viewer viewer cam at this moment, like God, they don't.

Nathalie 32:17
All credibility completely gone.

Ross G 32:22
Oh, that's it. That's great, Adam. Thanks for sharing that bit of a bit of a strange one. Where can listeners find out more about you and your book?

Adam 32:32
Well, I've got a website, which is adamkingle .com, but also I've got a lot about adaptability in my book, Next Generation Leadership, which is available at all bookstores near you, audiobook, ebook, and hardback.

Nathalie 32:45
Amazing.

Adam 32:46
Did you do your own audiobook? You know, I didn't funny enough. I really would have loved to. But the publisher insisted that they get an actor to do it. And the actor had a southern U .S. accent. He was from Tennessee.

Adam 32:56
So I imagine there are thousands of readers out there in the world now who think that I'm from the Deep South.

Ross G 33:02
That's a shame. That's such a nice accent as well. Yes.

Nathalie 33:07
Nice draw.

Ross G 33:08
Well, thanks very much for chatting to us today. Thanks. That's it. That's all from us. You've been listening to the Future Talent Learning podcast with me, Ross Garner and lastly, our guest this week was Adam Kingham.

Ross G 33:20
Until next time, bye for now.