

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

A tongue-in-cheek guide series ;)

Everyone Is Nice Until the Reorganization Begins

**How to Navigate Organizational Restructuring,
Uncertainty, and Office Politics Without Treating
Every HR Meeting Invitation Like a Cipher**



**We've got a problem. But relax.
It can be solved—and we'll even have something to laugh about.**

Everyone Is Nice Until the Reorganization Begins

How to Navigate Organizational
Restructuring, Uncertainty, and Office
Politics Without Treating Every HR Meeting
Invitation Like a Cipher

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

ISBN: 978-83-8483-638-5

CONTENTS

INTRO	5
Chapter 1 - The Organizational Chart Changed Overnight, but Nobody Told the Actual Work.....	12
Chapter 2 - The Company Says Nothing, and the Rumor Mill Hires Extra Staff.....	22
Chapter 3 - Everyone Wants What's Best for the Company, Preferably With Their Own Name on It.....	32
Chapter 4 - How to Make a Reorganization Worse Without Even Trying	42
Chapter 5 - Two Bosses, Three Priorities, and One Employee Expected to Perform Miracles	53
Chapter 6 - One New Team, Two Old Cultures, and a Surprisingly Serious Argument About Meetings.....	63
Chapter 7 - You Used to Have Authority. Now You Have an Exciting Opportunity to Influence	74
Chapter 8 - You're Welcome to Question the Plan, Provided You Remain Extremely Excited About It	84
Chapter 9 - Before They Decide Where You Belong, Find Out What You Actually Bring to the Table	95
Chapter 10 - The Meeting With HR: How to Ask Questions When Everyone Else Knows the Agenda	105
Chapter 11 - Your New Boss Doesn't Know Your History, and You Haven't Received Their Operating Instructions	116
Chapter 12 - We Transferred the Responsibilities, but Apparently the Responsibilities Refused to Leave	126

Chapter 13 - New Targets, Old Results, and a Bonus That Apparently Requires a Detective	137
Chapter 14 - The New Role Sounds Wonderful Until You Ask What Comes With It.....	148
Chapter 15 - The Company Is Restructuring, but Your Rent Hasn't Been Informed.....	159
Chapter 16 - Congratulations, You Survived the Layoffs. Now Please Do Everyone Else's Work	169
Chapter 17 - When Loyalty Means Agreeing With Something You Know Isn't True	180
Chapter 18 - The Reorganization Is Officially Complete. Now Can Somebody Make It Work?	191
Chapter 19 - The Reorganization Is Over, So Why Is the Old Chaos Coming Back?	204
Chapter 20 - Your Company Can Redesign Its Structure, but It Doesn't Get to Design Your Entire Life	215

INTRO

At 4:46 on a Thursday afternoon, an email arrives with the subject line "Important Update to Our Operating Model." The message begins by celebrating the company's remarkable achievements and ends by announcing a mandatory meeting the following morning. Between those two pieces of information sits a paragraph about strategic alignment, organizational agility, and unlocking opportunities. You read it twice. You understand every individual word, yet somehow the paragraph communicates approximately as much as a weather forecast written by a committee of accountants. Your colleague sends you a private message: "Do you think they're getting rid of our department?" You reply, "Probably not," despite possessing no more information than a moderately intelligent office plant. By the time you leave work, you have mentally rehearsed three possible futures, reconsidered your relationship with your manager, and developed an unexpected interest in whether your employment contract contains the phrase "organizational changes." Congratulations. The reorganization has barely started, and it's already taken over your evening.

Corporate restructuring has a peculiar ability to transform ordinary professionals into amateur intelligence analysts. People who previously struggled to remember their colleagues' birthdays suddenly know who attended which executive meeting, who stopped speaking to whom, and why a particular director has been unusually cheerful since Tuesday. A harmless lunch between two managers becomes evidence of a secret alliance. A canceled project review suggests imminent layoffs. Someone changes their LinkedIn headline, and half the department starts preparing for a

leadership vacuum. Meanwhile, the official communication insists that everyone should remain focused on business as usual. Business as usual, apparently, now includes investigating the organizational significance of someone's choice to eat lunch alone.

The trouble is that restructuring affects far more than reporting lines. Those neat little boxes on an organizational chart represent salaries, relationships, responsibilities, ambitions, and years of accumulated experience. Moving a position from one department to another may look simple during an executive presentation. For the person occupying that position, it might mean losing a trusted manager, inheriting unfamiliar responsibilities, traveling more frequently, or discovering that a carefully planned career path no longer exists. Even changes that eventually prove beneficial can be unsettling while their consequences remain unclear. You may genuinely understand why the company needs to evolve and still dislike what that evolution means for your Monday mornings. Those two feelings can coexist without requiring an emergency workshop on your attitude toward change.

Uncertainty makes everything harder because your imagination has an unfortunate habit of working overtime when reliable information becomes scarce. If management announces a confirmed decision, you can assess its consequences and consider your options. But when executives say that several scenarios remain under consideration, your mind starts attempting to finish the analysis on their behalf. Perhaps your role will expand. Perhaps it will disappear. Perhaps the new director will recognize your experience. Perhaps the person who has spent three years disagreeing with you about everything will

suddenly become your boss. The scenarios multiply, and your ability to distinguish a reasonable concern from an elaborate prediction begins to deteriorate. You can spend an entire weekend worrying about a decision that nobody has actually made.

This is where conventional advice often becomes spectacularly unhelpful. "Stay positive," someone says, as though optimism can clarify an employment agreement or produce an approved budget. "Embrace change," suggests another colleague, preferably from a department that isn't being reorganized. Someone else recommends keeping your head down, demonstrating exceptional commitment, or strengthening relationships with influential people. Each suggestion may contain a grain of practical wisdom, but none works universally. Working harder cannot guarantee that a position will survive. Remaining invisible may protect you from unnecessary arguments while also making your contribution harder to recognize. Networking can build useful professional relationships, but desperate attempts to impress every incoming executive usually have all the subtlety of campaigning for office in a building with forty employees.

Office politics becomes particularly visible when the familiar distribution of authority begins to shift. People who cooperated comfortably yesterday may suddenly find themselves competing for the same budget, leadership position, or strategic project. Managers defend teams they have spent years building. Specialists worry that their expertise will be overlooked. Employees try to understand whether the colleague offering enthusiastic support genuinely wants to help or is carefully positioning themselves for an attractive vacancy. Not every

disagreement is manipulation, and not every ambitious colleague is plotting something sinister. Nevertheless, pretending that personal interests have no influence on organizational decisions is equally unrealistic. Understanding these dynamics requires careful observation, sensible boundaries, and the ability to disagree without turning every meeting into a courtroom drama.

The cost of getting this wrong can be considerable. You might accept a new role before discovering that the impressive title comes with additional accountability but no meaningful authority. You might become responsible for targets calculated under a structure that no longer exists. You could spend months doing work inherited from colleagues who have left, while everyone assumes that your willingness to help means the arrangement is sustainable. Or you might allow anxiety and resentment to shape your behavior until your professional relationships become more difficult than the restructuring itself. These outcomes are not inevitable, but they are common enough as practical possibilities to deserve serious attention. The goal is to make deliberate choices before pressure, habit, or somebody else's urgency makes them for you.

There are also circumstances in which the consequences are genuinely serious. Restructuring can involve redundancy, reduced income, significant changes to employment conditions, or the loss of a position that matters deeply to someone's identity. Financial obligations do not politely disappear because an organization has identified opportunities for efficiency. Nor does a difficult decision become harmless simply because its announcement features warm language about valuing people. When your employment rights, financial security, or personal well-being

are at stake, you may need reliable documentation, independent professional advice, and time to examine the available options. No amount of cheerful corporate vocabulary can replace those things. This book will not pretend otherwise.

What you can develop, however, is a more useful relationship with uncertainty. Instead of attempting to decode every unexplained decision, you can learn to identify which information genuinely affects your work and which remains speculation. Instead of accepting contradictory instructions in silence, you can clarify responsibilities without volunteering to referee a dispute between senior managers. You can explain the value of your experience without exaggerating your achievements, prepare for conversations about future roles, and recognize when a proposed change requires more than an encouraging speech. You can remain cooperative without surrendering the right to ask reasonable questions. Those skills do not make you immune to bad organizational decisions, but they can prevent avoidable confusion from becoming an additional burden.

Just as importantly, you can learn to recognize your limits. You cannot force senior leadership to communicate perfectly, make every colleague behave honorably, or guarantee that a new structure will reward the people who deserve recognition. You can influence how you present your work, which commitments you accept, how you respond to conflicting expectations, and when you seek support. Sometimes the appropriate response will be to collaborate enthusiastically. Sometimes it will be to negotiate, document a concern, or prepare an alternative career path. And sometimes you'll discover that the most

sensible action is to finish your actual work, close the laptop, and allow an unresolved corporate question to remain unresolved until someone with the authority to answer it finally does so.

You do not need to become cynical to navigate organizational politics intelligently. You can appreciate your colleagues, enjoy your work, and trust people who have earned that trust while acknowledging that professional relationships operate within changing circumstances. You can support a restructuring initiative without declaring every aspect of its implementation brilliant. You can value your career without allowing your current job title to define your entire identity. Perhaps most liberatingly, you can stop treating every ordinary workplace interaction as a clue in an elaborate mystery. Sometimes a meeting really is just a meeting. Sometimes your manager is unavailable because your manager is busy. And sometimes the new organizational model truly is badly designed, without any hidden conspiracy required to explain it.

The aim is not to turn you into the office's most sophisticated political operator or its permanently cheerful change ambassador. It is to help you remain a capable, thoughtful professional when the environment around you becomes less predictable. You will not always get the outcome you want. You may occasionally make a decision that looks imperfect in hindsight. But you can learn to approach organizational change with more clarity, better judgment, and enough perspective to recognize when corporate absurdity deserves a practical response rather than another sleepless night.

So when the next announcement arrives promising a more agile, integrated, future-ready organization, you won't

need to celebrate immediately or assume disaster. You can read what has actually been decided, consider what it means for you, and decide what deserves your attention. The company may rearrange its departments, rename its leadership positions, and publish another presentation explaining why the future begins next quarter. Your entire life does not have to be reorganized along with it.

Chapter 1 - The Organizational Chart Changed Overnight, but Nobody Told the Actual Work

At 8:30 on Monday morning, Rachel discovers that she has been transferred to a new division. Nobody has moved her desk, changed her job title, or explained what the division actually does. Nevertheless, the company's internal directory now places her under a director she has never met, and the purchasing system insists that she belongs to a cost center that does not exist. Rachel has been trying to approve replacement equipment for a distribution center since Friday. Last week, the purchase required one signature. This week, the system demands approval from a position labeled "Regional Operational Excellence Owner," which sounds impressive but does not appear to have a living occupant. Rachel contacts IT, which refers her to Finance. Finance refers her to the transformation office. The transformation office congratulates her on joining the new operating model and sends a link to a presentation. Unfortunately, the presentation does not contain the replacement equipment, the missing approver, or any indication of when reality is expected to catch up with the organizational chart.

This is an important distinction to understand from the beginning. A reorganization is not simply the act of moving people between departments. It changes relationships among responsibilities, decisions, resources, and expectations. The new structure may look perfectly reasonable from the executive conference room while creating temporary confusion for the employees expected to

make it function. That does not automatically make the restructuring misguided. A company may have excellent reasons to consolidate purchasing, merge regional teams, or eliminate duplicated management layers. But designing a structure and making it operational are different jobs. The first involves deciding how work should be organized. The second involves discovering what happens when an actual customer needs an actual answer before Thursday.

Organizational charts are attractive because they simplify complicated relationships. Every person appears in a box, every department has a name, and reporting lines connect everything with admirable precision. The chart suggests that authority flows neatly downward while information travels upward, presumably without getting lost in meetings about information flow. Real organizations are considerably messier. Decisions depend on specialist knowledge, access to systems, informal cooperation, customer relationships, and people who understand why a particular procedure exists. Some of these dependencies are invisible on the chart. When a company restructures, those invisible connections do not disappear just because the boxes have moved. They must either be preserved, replaced, or deliberately redesigned.

Four things that change even when your job title doesn't

To understand the practical effects of restructuring, it helps to examine four dimensions of work: accountability, authority, resources, and evaluation. Accountability concerns the results you are expected to deliver. Authority determines which decisions you are permitted to make. Resources include the people, money, systems, information, and time available to you. Evaluation concerns how the organization decides whether you have performed well. A

reasonably functional role requires these elements to make sense together, although perfect alignment is rare. Reorganization can change one dimension without adjusting the others, which is where many apparently mysterious workplace problems begin.

Consider someone responsible for maintaining equipment across several facilities. Before restructuring, their local manager could authorize routine repairs immediately. After a centralization initiative, the employee remains accountable for equipment availability, but repair expenditure must be approved by a centralized purchasing team. That arrangement could improve cost control, especially if the company previously had inconsistent contracts and prices. It could also delay repairs unless there is a clear procedure for urgent situations. The important question is not whether centralization is inherently good or bad. It is whether the responsibilities, decision rights, and response times still allow the employee to deliver the expected result. If they do not, someone must resolve the mismatch instead of asking the employee to demonstrate greater ownership.

Evaluation can create a second mismatch. Imagine a customer support team that previously handled straightforward requests but now receives complicated cases escalated from several newly combined departments. Management continues comparing its response times with the old figures. Performance appears to deteriorate, even though the nature of the work has fundamentally changed. The measurement may still be useful, but its interpretation requires context. A reorganization that alters the composition of work without reconsidering how performance is judged can produce misleading conclusions. Employees may be blamed for outcomes created partly by

the structure itself. This matters because evaluation affects more than an attractive dashboard. It can influence compensation, promotion, staffing, and the credibility of the people being assessed.

There are good business reasons for changing these arrangements. A growing company may need clearer specialization. A struggling company may need to reduce costs. A merger can create duplicated functions, while new technology can make previously essential tasks unnecessary. Leadership might also be trying to correct genuine weaknesses in the existing organization. None of these explanations automatically guarantees a good result. Executives work with incomplete information and competing demands, just like everyone else, although they tend to express their uncertainty in considerably more expensive presentation templates. A restructuring decision may be commercially understandable while still being poorly communicated or difficult for individual employees. You can recognize the organization's objective without pretending that every consequence is beneficial to you.

This distinction protects you from two opposite mistakes. The first is treating every structural change as evidence that the company is collapsing. The second is assuming that a reasonable business objective makes every implementation decision reasonable. A company can successfully reduce administrative costs while creating excessive workloads elsewhere. It can improve strategic coordination while slowing operational decisions. It can eliminate overlapping roles while accidentally removing expertise that nobody realized was concentrated in one person. The useful question is what the new arrangement actually changes and whether it improves the work it was designed to improve. A

confident announcement is a statement of intent, not evidence that the intended outcome has already occurred.

Find the decision, not just the department

Rachel's equipment problem offers a practical starting point. Instead of repeatedly asking which department now owns purchasing, she needs to identify the decision required to release the order. Who can authorize the expenditure? Who has the necessary system access? Which cost center should carry the expense? What happens if the normal approval route cannot operate? These questions are more specific than asking for an explanation of the entire reorganization. Rachel may receive different answers from Finance and Operations, but those differences reveal exactly where the new arrangement remains incomplete. Her problem becomes a decision that somebody can resolve rather than a general complaint that everything is confusing.

You can apply the same reasoning to your own responsibilities. Take the few tasks whose failure would have meaningful consequences, and trace what must happen for each to be completed. Identify the person accountable for the outcome, the person authorized to approve critical decisions, and the resources needed along the way. Pay particular attention to points where work crosses departmental boundaries. These are often where a restructuring produces friction. A project may have a clear owner but no agreed process for obtaining specialist support. A customer issue may have a designated handler but no person empowered to approve an exception. You do not need to map every activity in the company. You need enough clarity to prevent important work from becoming stranded between newly named departments.

Sometimes this reveals that responsibilities have not merely moved but have changed in substance. A former project manager may now coordinate activities without controlling the budget. A specialist may retain responsibility for technical quality while losing access to the meetings where important design decisions are made. An employee may inherit new geographical coverage without additional travel time or support. Each situation requires a different response. If the problem is a missing approver, identify the appropriate authority. If the job itself has expanded, clarify expectations and available resources. If accountability has increased while decision-making authority has narrowed, explain the operational consequences. One generic complaint about organizational chaos cannot communicate these distinctions effectively.

Timing matters as well. The formal transfer date and the date when a team can function independently may be different. Some responsibilities move immediately, while contracts, permissions, and unfinished projects take longer. This creates a period in which the old and new arrangements overlap. Overlap is not necessarily a failure; it can protect continuity during a complex transition. The risk comes when nobody specifies which rules apply. Employees may continue following old procedures because the new ones are unavailable, while management assumes that the transfer was completed. A clear transition should establish who makes decisions in the meantime, which commitments remain valid, and how unresolved responsibilities will be handed over.

For example, a marketing campaign might have been approved under the previous structure, with suppliers already booked and materials in production. A new director

wants to review all spending, but nobody has clarified whether existing commitments require fresh authorization. Stopping everything may create cancellation costs. Proceeding without checking may violate the new approval requirements. The employee coordinating the campaign should make the issue visible: which commitments are already in place, what decisions remain outstanding, and what consequences follow from a delay. This is a useful form of professional judgment. It avoids both blind continuation and unnecessary paralysis, while leaving decisions requiring formal authority with the people entitled to make them.

It is worth remembering that managers themselves may not have complete information. Someone newly appointed to lead a combined department might still be waiting for confirmation of staffing, budget, or system access. That uncertainty does not excuse failing to communicate, but it changes what you can reasonably ask them to provide. Rather than demanding a definitive answer about everything, ask what is confirmed, which decision remains open, and who is responsible for resolving it. If a manager genuinely cannot answer, an agreed date for checking again may be more useful than another vague assurance. The aim is not to force certainty into existence. It is to prevent uncertainty from becoming an excuse for unmanaged responsibility.

What the structure cannot tell you

Formal arrangements are only one part of the picture. Organizations also depend on working relationships that may never appear in official documentation. The technician everyone consults before a complex repair, the coordinator who knows the history of difficult accounts, and the administrator who can explain an obscure internal procedure

all contribute to how work actually happens. Restructuring can unintentionally separate people from these sources of knowledge. A newly centralized team may inherit responsibility without understanding local conditions. A manager may discover that apparently simple tasks require expertise accumulated over many years. Recognizing these dependencies is not an invitation to cultivate secret networks. It is a reminder that knowledge must remain accessible when responsibilities move.

There is also a personal dimension that deserves attention. The disappearance or alteration of your role can feel like a judgment about your competence, especially if you invested years in building it. Yet organizational decisions often reflect changes in business needs rather than a complete evaluation of individual worth. A skilled manager can lose a management position because the company reduces management layers. A capable specialist can find that their expertise is less central to the new strategy. These developments may still have serious consequences, and you are entitled to examine them critically. But it helps to separate the company's decision about a position from your broader professional identity and abilities.

That perspective should not become an excuse for passivity. If the new structure affects your employment conditions, compensation, legal rights, or continued employment, you may need to examine formal documents and seek qualified advice. Procedures and protections differ by jurisdiction and employment arrangement. A friendly explanation from management is not a substitute for understanding what a proposed change means. Equally, if your duties remain broadly similar, there is little value in inventing a legal crisis simply because someone has

changed the name of your department. Match the seriousness of your response to the actual consequences.

One final complication is that the new structure may be genuinely better, but only after people learn to use it. The first weeks can involve mistakes and delays that eventually disappear. Conversely, a seemingly smooth launch may conceal workarounds that become unsustainable later. You need to distinguish temporary adjustment from a persistent defect. An isolated access problem is different from a recurring approval failure affecting dozens of transactions. A new manager needing time to understand a process is different from a role designed without the authority necessary to perform it. Look for repeated consequences, not merely unfamiliar arrangements. This allows you to support sensible change while remaining alert to problems worth correcting.

Rachel eventually gets the equipment order approved after Finance identifies the missing authorization and assigns the appropriate budget owner. Nobody has to reverse the entire restructuring. The new purchasing model may even deliver the savings its designers expected. But the incident reveals something worth fixing before the next urgent order arrives: the company needs a reliable route from operational need to authorized decision. Rachel has helped identify that gap without becoming responsible for redesigning the corporation herself.

You do not have to understand every box, arrow, and executive title to function during a reorganization. You do need to understand what you are expected to deliver, which decisions affect that work, and where unresolved responsibilities create real risk. Those questions turn an abstract organizational announcement into something you

can examine and discuss. The chart may change overnight. The customers, deadlines, obligations, and inconvenient laws of arithmetic will still be there in the morning. A successful reorganization eventually brings those two worlds back into alignment.

Chapter 2 - The Company Says Nothing, and the Rumor Mill Hires Extra Staff

There is a remarkable difference between how quickly organizations make decisions and how quickly employees believe those decisions have been made. A company may spend six weeks evaluating a possible restructuring without reaching a conclusion. Meanwhile, by Wednesday afternoon, staff members have identified the departments being eliminated, named their replacements, calculated the likely severance packages, and established which executive supposedly opposed the plan. One particularly resourceful employee has even found a floor plan showing where the survivors will sit. The floor plan was created for an unrelated office renovation, but this does not discourage anyone. In the absence of reliable information, a sufficiently detailed rumor can begin to look more convincing than an honest announcement saying that no final decision exists.

Rumors are not simply the product of bored employees looking for entertainment. They often emerge because people are trying to understand events that could affect their income, relationships, and professional future. When an organization communicates uncertainty, employees naturally look for additional context. They speak to colleagues, compare experiences, and search for patterns in decisions that previously seemed ordinary. Some of these conversations are useful. They reveal genuine concerns and may identify changes that have not yet been clearly explained. Trouble begins when unconfirmed possibilities are treated as established facts, particularly when the information passes through several people who each add

their own interpretation. A story can become more elaborate without becoming any more accurate.

Imagine a medium-sized technology company preparing to consolidate its office space. Facilities staff begin measuring meeting rooms, and someone notices that the floor assigned to customer operations is missing from a preliminary seating proposal. Within hours, a message circulates suggesting that customer operations will be outsourced. By the next morning, people are discussing the names of potential contractors. One manager hears that the outsourcing agreement has already been signed. In reality, the seating proposal was incomplete because the team responsible for the plan had not yet received updated staffing figures. Outsourcing was one of several ideas discussed earlier, but no decision had been approved. The resulting anxiety is real. The certainty attached to the story is not.

What makes this particularly difficult is that rumors sometimes turn out to be correct. A colleague may genuinely have access to information that has not been announced. An unusual change in staffing or project funding may indicate a serious organizational decision. Dismissing everything unofficial as nonsense would therefore be as unhelpful as accepting every whispered prediction. The skill worth developing is the ability to distinguish a potentially useful signal from a conclusion that has outrun its evidence. This requires asking how information originated, what it actually establishes, and whether its accuracy would change anything you should do now.

A convincing story is not the same as a reliable source

Consider the phrase "I heard it from someone close to leadership." It sounds authoritative until you examine it. Did