



I'm not robot



Continue

Baseball rules trivia questions and answers

I get a surprising number of questions that either (1) I can't answer without knowing much more detail than the reader gives, (2) the reader can answer as easily as I can, or (3) means asking SmarterTravel.com to do something we don't do. Below you will find answers to frequently asked questions. Reading the answers before you ask one of these questions will save you time, and help you find the answer on your own. Where are we going to go? I would need a 600-page book or an all-day discussion to answer this question in some sort of useful way. To be of any help at all, I would first know a lot about you: what kind of family or group you have, what your interests are, how much time you have, what your budget goals or limitations are, whether you want luxury or simplicity, whether you prefer bright light or loneliness, what kind of activities interest you, what kind of climate you prefer, whether your grandchildren or your dog will go with you, and on, and on, and on. Surprisingly, some readers who ask about where to go don't even say where they live and will begin their journey. Unfortunately, folks, the only way I can help is when submitting questions that are much more specific. If you are completely unsure of what you want to do, my best recommendations are that you (1) read lots of travel publications, (2) log on to lots of destination websites, and (3) find a good travel agent who is adept at dealing with issues like this. When are we going to visit? As with each question, the best time to visit question depends on how you define the best time: minimum prices, minimum crowds, widest range of activities, warmest/coldest/driest/wettest climate, and on, and on. From a cost point of view, the answer is almost always in the off-season, but it may not be what you really want. What's the fare? I get this probably more than anyone else, and it's a little surprising. If you get as far as AskEd & AnswerEd, you're obviously already on SmarterTravel.com. And right there, on our bright new website, top right, is our own fare-search gateway: you can search for airline tickets, hotels, car rentals, vacations and cruise prices. If you don't like our search system, there are dozens of others. Don't think we have secret ways to get on airline tickets inaccessible to you; We don't. We need to go through the same kind of searches you do. If you ask about a trip that the regular US-based search engines don't handle, a great place to try ETN, where you can submit a trip anywhere in the world and have ticket agents respond with their best deals. And if you start your trip in any other country, your best bet is to find a local discount travel agency, online or offline, in that country. Can you arrange my trip/sell me a ticket? No. SmarterTravel.com don't arrange travel or sell tickets. Any tickets. If you're just looking for schedule information, scroll over to the right to Travel Tools, where one of the options on the drop-down menu Flight schedules. Other Other include a hotel finder and links to vendors selling all kinds of trips. What are the requirements? Quite a few readers ask about different requirements and limitations, especially about air travel, but also about travel documents. One could answer almost all of these questions by simply googling the question. Here are places to look for some of your most common questions: Airline baggage limits: Each airline specifies its online baggage policy. Just log in to the airline's website and look for a link to luggage. If you don't see it in a drop-down menu, go to site search or sitemap. (By the way, when searching, the official term is baggage, not luggage. Luggage is what you buy in a store; when you put your stuff in it and take it on a trip, it becomes baggage.) Permitted items in carry-on baggage: The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) has a list of do's and does not make for carry-on baggage. Passport and visa requirements: The State Department's travel information website has one button for information on foreign travel by U.S. citizens and another for detailed passport information. The information button leads to detailed lists of visa requirements to enter any country in the world. Is it safe to visit? No one can answer whether you will be safe visiting any foreign country—or anywhere in the United States, for that matter. However, the State Department is compiling a comprehensive data bank on world countries, including warnings about locations to avoid and more general information about what visitors can expect. Click travel alerts from the State Department travel page for information about trouble spots, and consular information sheets for other locations. Where should I complain? Most travel providers list an address for complaints, or at least one contact us address, somewhere on their website. You can find them easily. And you can forget to make a big fuss by sending a registered, return-receipt letter, or Express Mail to the CEO—it will end up in the same complaint office. The US Department of Transportation (DOT) makes it even easier to make its complaints from the airline. Its website lists the current name, snail's address, phone and email address for the complaint offices of all major U.S. airlines. If you wish, you can submit a complaint to DOT. And DOT also provides comprehensive information about the rights you do and don't have as an air traveler. In an in-depth interview, we asked Collins about the implications of his research and ideas for the economy, the stock market, and the very nature of executive leadership. The good-to-great companies that you wrote about all achieved remarkable stock market results over a 15-year period. But today the stock market is down. Does that mean we won't see any good-to-good companies today? First, I would like to correct a major misconception. The stock market is not down. What does the stock market look like compared to 1985? The stock market is not down. How does it look until 1990? The stock market is not down. The market was irrationally out of whack — we didn't have a stock market; We had a speculative casino. The tech bubble was not the new economy — there is a new economy that has been going on for years at a deeper level. But the brutal fact is that the companies that were at the top of the tech bubble didn't have results. You can't make zero profits and have results. As for companies that had good results before the bubble burst, they're in a down period now, but so what? The bottom line of a company like Cisco is, we don't know the answer yet. It may be that these companies are only in a very difficult 6- to 12-month period. Let me use an analogy. Let's say you have a great basketball dynasty like the UCLA Bruins under John Wooden. This is a team that will win 10 NCAA championships in 12 years. They are a team that went from good to good. But in 1970, they lost three games. Does that mean we should write them off and say they're not a good team? We need to look at for a long time. The same goes for companies that got stuck in the bubble. It was too short a time. It will take longer to tell which companies are in trouble now simply going through a temporary period and will have the resilience to come back. But for many businessmen, the current slowdown is a sign of the demise of the new economy. This is one of the most wonderful times in history. Two or three years ago, what was the big complaint we heard? It's so hard to get good people! Whine, whine, whine! Today we have been given the greatest opportunity that we will have for decades to have snag a boatload - not a busload, but a boatload - of great people. And good companies always start with who, not what. We can finally get to the right side of Packard's Law. Packard's law is like a law of physics for large companies. It says that no company can become or remain large if it allows its growth rate in revenue to exceed its growth to get the right people in a sustainable way. It is one of the timeless truths that transcends technology and economics. Now, instead of trying to raise capital, we can gather people. If I run a business today, I would have a priority above all others: to acquire as many of the best people as I could. I would put off everything else if I could afford it —buildings, new projects, R&D—to fill my bus. Because things are going to come back. My flywheel will start to turn. And the single biggest constraint on growth and success of my organization is not markets, is not technology, is not possible, is not the stock market. If you want to be a good company, the single biggest limitation on your ability to grow is the ability to get and hang on enough of the right people. This is also a good time to force yourself to look back. When you broke Packard's law, you probably let a lot of the wrong people on the bus. is a good time to get rid of them. In fact, it's a little easier to do it now. We can blame it on the circumstances. What else would you do to capitalize on this period of reevaluation? This is also a great time to ask yourself some really difficult questions. In an age of irrational prosperity, where the market would give you money whether you delivered or not, a lot of companies hadn't answered any of the questions in the three circles (What can we be the best in the world at? What is the economic denominator that best drives our economic engine? And what are our core people deeply passionate?). They had no idea what they could do better than any other company in the world that was sustainable, they had no profit denominator, and the only thing they had passion for was turning the company around. Now we can no longer live in that fantasy land. We need to take a hard look at all the things we do and put them all to three-circle testing. All the things that fail the test we have to stop doing—today. I see lots of companies that found themselves with lots of capital. So they wandered into all kinds of acquisitions or new ventures or new directions, simply because they could. But they didn't necessarily fit into the three circles. Today, the task is for them to crop away. Those who clarify their three circles will come out of this just fine. The ones who don't deserve to die. CEOs today find themselves with little time to prove their worth. What advice would you give to a CEO on the hot seat? If I was a CEO on the hot seat taking over a company that I wanted to move from good to good, here's what I would do. I would take the good to good stock charts, and I would put it in front of my directors. I would say, We are on the left side of this curve. We want to be on the right side of the curve. Right? If that's what we all want, we know what will take to get it. You can't keep lurching from CEO to CEO. If you do, you'll end up in the Doom Loop – and we'll end up as one of the comparison companies, not one of the big companies. I don't think all directors are stupid. Most of them are intelligent, but they are active out of ignorance rather than a lack of good intentions. We must hit them in the head with the empirical results. Our job is to beat the market in a sustainable way over time. We have to think about the share price over a five-year period. And we need to start doing everything necessary to turn the swing. Finally, if I'm ceo, I want the board to give me the following assurance: How long or short my time as CEO might be, who you choose as my successor must pick up that flywheel in the middle of time and to continue to push in a consistent direction. I might just get the flywheel turning at 16 rpm. But my successor has to take it to 100 rpm. His successor must take it to 500 rpm, and his successor to 1,000 rpm. It's not about me as CEO — it's about a commitment to a consistent program. We will make a Doom Loop.De CEOs who took their companies from good to big were largely anonymous — a far cry from the celebrity CEOs we read about. Is it an accident? Or is it cause and effect? I think it is more a matter of cause and effect than an accident. There is no direct correlation between the absence of celebrity and the presence of good-to-good results. Why? First, when you have a celebrity, the company turns into a genius with 1,000 helpers. It creates a feeling that it's all really about the CEO. And it leads to all sorts of problems—whether the person passes away or if the person turns out not to be a genius after all. On a deeper level, we found that for leaders to do something great, their ambition must be for the greatness of work and the company rather than for themselves. That doesn't mean they don't have an ego. That doesn't mean they don't have any self-needs. That means that at decision point after decision point — at critical times when Choice A would benefit their ego and Choice B would benefit the company and its work — time and again the leaders pick Choice B. Celebrity CEOs, at the same decision points, are more likely to favor self and ego over business and work. Like the anonymous CEOs, most of the companies that made the transformation from good to good are unheralded. What does that tell us? The truth is, most people don't work in the most glamorous things in the world. They do real work — which means most of the time they do one of a lot of drudgery with only few points of excitement. Some put out baked bread. Some build stores. The real work of the economy gets done by people who make cars, who sell real estate, who run grocery stores and banks. So one of the great results of this study is that you can be in a big company and do it in steel, in pharmacies, in grocery stores. It's just not that if you're not in Silicon Valley, you're not cool. So no one has the right to whine about their company, their industry, or the kind of business they're in — ever again. Did the eleven companies that made the transformation of their anonymity benefit? One of the great advantages that these companies had was, no one cared! Kroger started its transition; Nucor started its transition; no one expected much. They could underpromise and overdeliver. In fact, if I took over a company and tried to get it going from good to good, I would tell my vice president of communications that his job was to make the whole world believe that we were constantly on the verge of doom. During our study, we actually printed out transcripts of the CEO presentations to analysts of the good-to-large companies and comparison companies. We read all these. And it's striking. The good-to-good people always talk about the challenges they face, the programs they build, the things Worried. You go to the comparison companies, they constantly hyping themselves, they sell the future — but they never deliver results. If I'm not a CEO, how does the good-to-good lessons apply to me? The good-to-good concepts apply to all situations — as long as you can choose the people around you. That's the crucial thing. But basically, we really do — we have a lot of discretion over the people in our lives, the people we decide to let on our department at work or in our personal lives. What the basic message is this: Build your own flywheel. You're going to make it. You can start building momentum into something that you are responsible for. You can build a good department. You can build a large church community. You can take each of the good to good ideas and apply them to your own work or your own life. What did your study teach you about change in business in general? Is it essentially a message to go back to basics? Very rarely do significant changes ever lead to results in a sustainable way. It's one of the really important results of the book. We started with 1,435 companies. And 11 companies did. Let's just look at the fact for a moment. In fact, it doesn't happen very often. Why not? Because we don't know what the hell we're doing! And since we don't know what we're doing, we start in all sorts of things that don't produce results. We end up like a bunch of primitives dancing around the campfire and chanting on the moon. What I feel strongly is that we need some science to understand what it really takes to change things. Is it back to basics? No, it's forward to understanding. Why is it back to basics to say that CEOs need to be ambitious for their companies and not for themselves? Why is it back to the basics to make who and the people ask first and what and where to ask others? Since when is it back to the basics of a company to start with a question like, Why have we sucked for 100 years, and what are the brutal facts that we have to confront? Why is it back to basics to say that stop-doing lists are more important than to-do lists? And since when has it been back to basics to say that technology is just an accelerator and not a creator of anything? I don't think these concepts are back to basics. Because if they are, we should be able to go back in time and find that people were using these ideas. People didn't — which is why there are only 11 out of 1,435. So, no, it's not back to basics. It's forward to understanding. What is your assessment of the new economy? We have seen a lot of changes, and we have seen a lot of backlash against the change. How do you make sense of it all? The enormous changes that are taking place around us make it the most exciting time in history to live. It's really fun. All these changes — changes in technology, they are brutal facts that must be integrated into whatever decisions we make. The people at Walgreens didn't. Internet because they focused only on the basics. They confronted the brutal fact of the internet and then asked, How does it fit into our three circles, and how can we use it to spin our flywheel faster? You never ignore change — you beat them straight to the point as brutal facts, or you come to them with a great sense of joy and excitement. This change, this new technology opens up a way for you to win, to become even better as a company. All the good to large companies took changes and used them to their advantage, often with great pleasure. When new pianos arrived, Mozart didn't hang up his music. He didn't say, there are these new pianos! Harsichord is out of the way, so I'm washed up as a composer! He thought, This is so cool! I can do it loud with the piano fast! This is really neat! He kept the discipline to write good music and at the same time embraced with great joy and excitement the invention of pianos. With all the change around us, we must be just like Mozart. We maintain a great discipline about our music, but at the same time, we embrace things that can allow us to make even bigger music. Alan M. Webber (awebber@fastcompany.com) is a Fast Company founding editor. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote the essay Built to Flip in the March 2000 issue of Fast Company. His new book, Good to Great: Why Some Companies Are Doing Leap... And others do not, will be available in October. October.