Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

A tongue-in-cheek guide series ;)

There's a New Boss at Work and Suddenly Everything Has a New Name

How to Adjust to a New Leader, Understand New Priorities, and Stop Treating Every Reorganization as a Sign of the End of the World



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

There's a New Boss at Work and Suddenly Everything Has a New Name

How to Adjust to a New Leader, Understand New Priorities, and Stop Treating Every Reorganization as a Sign of the End of the World

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

ISBN: 978-83-8483-780-1

ALL-IN Rafał Płonkowski



CONTENTS

INTRO 5

Chapter 1 - The Same Office, a Different Rulebook 11

Chapter 2 - The Disaster Your Brain Scheduled Without Consulting You 21

Chapter 3 - Eleven Number-One Priorities and the Mathematics of Corporate Ambition 31

Chapter 4 - Applause, Resistance, and Other Ways to Make a New Boss's Life Difficult 41

Chapter 5 - Two Systems, Three Versions of the Truth, and Nobody in Charge of the Actual Process 51

Chapter 6 - Keep Me in the Loop, but Please Stop Sending Me Everything 61

Chapter 7 - The Old Guard, the New Favorites, and the Office Civil War Nobody Declared 72

Chapter 8 - The Efficiency Revolution That Somehow Stole Everyone's Evenings 82

Chapter 9 - Your New Boss Has Never Heard of Your Best Work 93

Chapter 10 - Test the Brilliant Idea Before Rebuilding the Entire Company 103

Chapter 11 - Two Bosses, Three Instructions, and One Employee Who Has to Make It Happen 113

Chapter 12 - Yesterday You Were Excellent. Today They've Changed the Definition of Excellence 123

Chapter 13 - The New Boss Wants to Approve Everything, Including the Angle of a Product Photo 134

Chapter 14 - Your Customer Didn't Sign Up for the Reorganization 144

Chapter 15 - When Your Job Disappears but Everyone Keeps Calling It an Opportunity 155

Chapter 16 - The Brilliant New Strategy Has Failed. Unfortunately, Nobody Told the Presentation 165

Chapter 17 - When the New Boss Calls It High Standards but Everyone Else Calls It Fear 175

Chapter 18 - The Transformation Is Complete. So Why Does Everything Stop When Ben Takes a Holiday? 185

Chapter 19 - The Old Chaos Is Making a Comeback, and It Has Learned to Use the New Software 196

Chapter 20 - The Next Boss Will Arrive Eventually. You Don't Have to Start Your Career From Scratch 205

INTRO

At 8:37 on a Tuesday morning, Hannah discovers that her department no longer exists. Technically, everyone still has a job. The desks are occupied, the computers work, and the same customers are waiting for the same orders. But according to an email from the new Chief Operating Officer, the Supply Coordination Team has become the Business Continuity and Delivery Excellence Hub. Hannah reads the announcement twice, searching for an explanation of what this means for the urgent shipment she needs to authorize before lunch. Instead, she finds six references to alignment, four mentions of transformation, and a promise to unlock operational potential. The email is beautifully formatted. Unfortunately, operational potential has yet to approve a single shipment.

By ten o'clock, three colleagues have interpreted the announcement differently. One believes all purchasing decisions now require central approval. Another insists the new structure only changes reporting lines. A third has heard that the previous department manager will be leaving, although nobody can establish where this information originated. Meanwhile, the new executive has scheduled a company-wide meeting to explain the organization's refreshed strategic direction. Everyone is encouraged to bring questions. Hannah considers asking whether the company still intends to deliver the products customers have already paid for, but suspects this might be considered insufficiently visionary. She settles for opening her existing project tracker and hoping it will survive until Friday.

A change of leadership can make an experienced professional feel strangely inexperienced. Yesterday, you understood how decisions were made, which problems deserved immediate attention, and how to get something done without involving seven people in a conference call. Today, familiar tasks suddenly contain unfamiliar questions. Does your new manager expect to approve everything? Are previous commitments still valid? Will your achievements count under the new performance system? Should you continue a project your former boss considered essential when the new boss has never mentioned it? Your professional knowledge has not disappeared, but the unwritten instructions that helped you use it have become unreliable. It is rather like knowing how to drive perfectly well while somebody quietly replaces all the road signs overnight.

The discomfort is understandable because a job represents considerably more than a collection of tasks. Your income may support a family, cover a mortgage, or provide the stability that allows you to make plans beyond next Thursday. Your working relationships may have taken years to develop. You might have invested enormous effort in becoming good at a role that now appears to be under review. When somebody announces that the organization is being redesigned, you cannot always respond with cheerful curiosity. You may have legitimate questions about your position, your responsibilities, and your future. Telling yourself to embrace uncertainty does not answer those questions. Neither does listening to a motivational speech delivered by someone whose employment contract appears remarkably unaffected by the transformation.

Yet assuming that every leadership change signals disaster can be equally unhelpful. A new boss might uncover serious inefficiencies, challenge outdated habits, or introduce improvements that people have wanted for years. Perhaps the old approval process really was unnecessarily complicated. Perhaps certain reports existed because an executive who retired three years ago liked receiving them. Equally, the incoming leader may misunderstand important constraints and attempt to transplant a successful practice from a completely different organization. Fresh thinking does not automatically produce better decisions, just as long experience does not automatically make existing methods correct. The useful question is what the proposed change accomplishes, under which conditions, and at whose expense.

New leaders are also operating under pressure. They may have been hired specifically to improve disappointing results, reduce costs, or repair organizational problems. They must understand unfamiliar teams while demonstrating progress to people above them. This can produce a strange combination of genuine curiosity and theatrical certainty. An executive may be asking perfectly reasonable questions privately while announcing a magnificent new operating philosophy publicly. Unfortunately, the people expected to implement that philosophy often receive the announcement before anyone has worked out the details. What sounds like a compelling direction in the boardroom may arrive at an employee's desk as three extra spreadsheets and a deadline that existed before the new strategy was invented.

When this happens, familiar survival strategies become tempting. Some employees applaud every suggestion, hoping enthusiasm will secure their place in the new order.

Others defend established practices as though changing the weekly reporting format would erase decades of civilization. Another group tries to remain invisible until the excitement passes. These reactions offer short-term emotional protection but can create longer-term problems. Uncritical agreement produces commitments nobody has properly evaluated. Automatic resistance prevents useful improvements. Disappearing from the conversation means important decisions may be made without the knowledge of the people who understand the work. None of these approaches reliably protects your interests, and all three can leave you feeling less influential than before.

Then there is the unofficial communication department, which appears spontaneously whenever formal communication becomes vague. Somebody notices that a senior manager has canceled two meetings. Someone else knows the finance director has requested revised staffing figures. A third colleague remembers similar events preceding layoffs at a previous employer. By lunchtime, a plausible story is circulating about an impending restructuring. By late afternoon, the story has acquired proposed dates, affected departments, and an astonishing level of confidence. Real warning signs should never be dismissed, particularly when jobs or working conditions might genuinely be at risk. But speculation does not become evidence simply because it has traveled through several messaging groups and been repeated by a person who sounds unusually well informed.

This book is about recovering the ability to make useful judgments amid that uncertainty. You will learn to recognize the difference between cosmetic announcements and changes that affect actual decisions, responsibilities,

resources, and performance expectations. You will see how to make sense of competing priorities when leadership declares five objectives equally essential, and how to work with a new manager without becoming either their permanent admirer or their unofficial opposition leader. We will examine what happens when reporting lines overlap, when ambitious improvements fail in practice, and when the demands of transformation begin consuming the time supposedly saved by transformation. The aim is not to give you a clever response to every corporate buzzword. It is to help you understand what action a situation genuinely requires.

Consider a small but revealing question you can ask when an unfamiliar instruction affects your work: "Which part of my decision-making authority has changed, and which responsibilities remain mine?" The answer may expose a genuine shift in accountability. It may reveal that the announcement concerns only how information is shared. Or it may show that management has not yet settled the question. Each outcome is more useful than silently inventing a rule and hoping your interpretation matches what somebody intended. You will not always receive immediate clarity, but you can identify the decision you need, the consequences of delay, and the person with authority to resolve it. That is a practical skill, not an exercise in corporate optimism.

Some circumstances will demand more than better questions. Leadership changes can involve redundancies, unfair treatment, unreasonable workloads, or pressure to act dishonestly. No communication technique can guarantee a good manager, protect every job, or make an unlawful demand acceptable. When a situation affects contractual

rights, safety, or serious personal well-being, appropriate professional advice or formal support may be necessary. Your ability to adapt has limits, and those limits deserve respect. Success does not always mean remaining in the same organization. Sometimes it means recognizing what can be improved, what must be challenged, and when protecting your future requires considering a different workplace.

By the end, the company around you may still have its Strategic Alignment Sessions, Operational Excellence Initiatives, and whatever fashionable expression has replaced the humble word "meeting." You cannot control every managerial decision, and you certainly cannot prevent executives from discovering new names for activities employees have performed for decades. But you can become better at recognizing what matters, asking useful questions, protecting your professional judgment, and deciding where your energy belongs. The next time a new boss arrives promising to reinvent everything, you need not immediately celebrate or prepare for the apocalypse. First, find out what is actually changing. Then decide what deserves your attention. Because while the entire organization may have acquired a revolutionary new vocabulary overnight, somebody still has to get that shipment out before lunch.

Chapter 1 - The Same Office, a Different Rulebook

At 7:52 on Monday morning, Ruth is trying to arrange cover for an absent employee at one of the eight cinemas she helps manage. This would normally take five minutes. She would check availability, contact a qualified colleague, update the roster, and inform the local manager. Unfortunately, the company appointed a new Chief Operating Officer on Friday, and his first announcement included the phrase "centralized workforce decision-making." Ruth has no idea whether this applies to ordinary shift changes. She considers asking her previous manager, who is still employed but now belongs to a department called People Operations Excellence. She considers contacting the new director, whose calendar suggests he is unavailable until approximately Christmas. Meanwhile, the cinema opens in three hours, and somebody needs to operate the ticket counter. Centralized workforce decision-making has yet to volunteer.

This is one of the more peculiar effects of changing leadership. You can know your job extremely well and suddenly become uncertain about the simplest decisions. Nobody has taken away your experience. The buildings remain where they were, the customers still expect service, and the equipment continues to malfunction with reassuring consistency. Yet the invisible rules governing everyday work have become questionable. People begin asking permission for activities they previously handled independently, copying senior managers into routine messages, and postponing perfectly reasonable decisions because nobody wants to

discover that an unfamiliar restriction was introduced during Friday's leadership announcement.

Every workplace develops an unofficial operating manual. Much of it is never written down. Employees learn which questions require formal approval, which colleagues have specialist knowledge, when a deadline is genuinely immovable, and how much information different managers need before making decisions. They understand the difference between a problem that requires immediate escalation and one they are expected to resolve independently. This knowledge accumulates through ordinary experience, including mistakes, unexpected complications, and conversations that never appear in any official document. It makes daily work faster because employees no longer need to reconsider every assumption. A new leader can disturb that arrangement without changing a single published procedure.

The important distinction is between losing your familiarity with a manager and losing your competence. Ruth still understands staffing requirements, service standards, and the practical consequences of leaving a ticket counter unattended. Those capabilities remain valuable. What she does not know is whether her authority has changed. Confusing these two matters can produce unnecessary insecurity. Experienced employees sometimes respond to new leadership as though their previous accomplishments have been invalidated and their professional credibility must be rebuilt from nothing. In reality, the organization may need a different approach to certain decisions while continuing to depend heavily on the knowledge accumulated by its existing workforce.

Before adapting to a new rule, however, you need to establish whether that rule actually exists. Leadership announcements frequently combine firm decisions, broad intentions, and attractive vocabulary without clearly distinguishing between them. A director might say that the company needs stronger financial discipline. This does not necessarily mean every minor purchase now requires executive approval. Another might announce closer collaboration between departments. That does not automatically authorize colleagues from one department to assign work to employees in another. Statements about direction matter, but they are not always complete operating instructions. Treating every strategic remark as an immediate procedural requirement can create restrictions that management never intended.

Ruth examines the announcement more carefully. It confirms that major staffing decisions will be reviewed centrally, but it does not define what counts as major. She sends a short question to the newly designated workforce coordinator: "Until the revised policy is published, can local managers continue arranging qualified cover for ordinary absences within their approved staffing budgets?" The question identifies a specific activity, acknowledges the possible change, and describes the existing safeguards. It is far more useful than asking whether the entire organization has entered a new era of workforce transformation. That might be an excellent question for a conference panel, but it will not get anyone behind the ticket counter.

The coordinator confirms that routine substitutions remain locally managed, provided staffing and safety requirements are met. Larger changes to approved staffing levels require central review. Ruth can now proceed without inventing a

policy or ignoring a legitimate restriction. She records the clarification in the appropriate shared location so that other managers can use it. This matters because a private answer solves only her immediate problem, while an accessible instruction reduces the likelihood of eight cinema managers reaching eight different conclusions. A clarification should not be treated as universal authority if it came from someone without the power to establish policy. For significant decisions, the source of the instruction matters as much as its wording.

One useful way to understand a leadership transition is to follow an ordinary piece of work from beginning to end. Choose something your team performs regularly, such as approving a supplier invoice, responding to a customer complaint, or scheduling a maintenance visit. Identify the people who initiate the work, the decisions requiring approval, and the final result. Then look for actual changes in that sequence. Perhaps the process remains identical but reporting now goes to another manager. Perhaps an approval threshold has changed. Perhaps responsibility has moved entirely to another team. Such differences have distinct consequences, and understanding them is more useful than repeatedly studying an organizational chart that contains twenty-seven boxes and a troubling number of dotted lines.

There is another complication: the new leader may not understand why the old arrangements existed. That can be frustrating when employees have spent years developing practices around genuine constraints. Imagine a facilities director discovering that maintenance teams submit paper inspection forms even though the company owns an electronic reporting system. She asks why the procedure

has not been digitized. An employee replies, "Because that's how we've always done it," which provides approximately the same explanatory value as a shrug. The real reason might be that the existing application does not work reliably in areas without network coverage. Once that limitation is explained, the conversation becomes productive. The director can investigate an offline solution instead of concluding that the team is resistant to technology.

Of course, sometimes the honest explanation really is that nobody has questioned an old habit. Organizations preserve remarkable quantities of inherited administration. A monthly report may still circulate because somebody once requested it and no one ever asked whether that person was still reading it. A particular approval might exist because of a problem resolved several years earlier. Experienced employees should be prepared to distinguish essential safeguards from routines that have outlived their purpose. Defending every familiar practice makes genuine expertise harder to recognize. If you claim that absolutely everything is indispensable, a new manager may reasonably wonder why the organization has never managed to improve anything.

New leadership also changes the relationship between employees and the people evaluating their work. Your former manager may have witnessed years of difficult projects and understood the circumstances behind unusual results. The incoming manager possesses only fragments of that history. This creates a practical information gap, not necessarily a judgment against you. A concise introduction to your responsibilities, current commitments, and significant achievements can help. Explain the outcomes your work supports, the decisions you are authorized to make, and the

dependencies that affect delivery. Avoid attempting to narrate your entire career chronologically. Your manager needs an accurate working picture, not an extended documentary featuring every spreadsheet you have ever rescued from disaster.

It is tempting to use those first conversations to establish yourself as the indispensable employee who knows everything. Resist that temptation. Nobody knows everything about a complex organization, and claiming otherwise becomes awkward the moment an unfamiliar problem appears. A more credible approach combines experience with openness about its limits. You might explain that you understand the current process thoroughly but need clarification about how a proposed change affects another department. Or that a particular method has worked well under previous conditions, although you have not yet tested it against the new expectations. Such statements communicate professional judgment rather than weakness. They also allow a new manager to learn from you without being expected to accept every recommendation unquestioningly.

Early impressions can be misleading on both sides. Some managers begin by asking unusually detailed questions because they are trying to understand unfamiliar operations. Others initially communicate very little because they are gathering information before making decisions. Employees may interpret these behaviors as micromanagement or indifference long before a reliable pattern emerges. What matters is whether explanations improve, decisions become clearer, and the leader responds reasonably when new facts appear. A manager who asks difficult questions is not automatically hostile. A manager who delivers an

enthusiastic welcome speech is not automatically supportive. The most accurate picture usually comes from repeated decisions rather than first-week performances.

Your own behavior contributes to that picture. If you promise outcomes you cannot deliver merely to appear cooperative, you may create expectations that later damage your credibility. If you refuse every suggestion because it differs from established practice, you may prevent useful improvements. And if you quietly stop making decisions until somebody gives you perfect instructions, you may create bottlenecks that nobody intended. Professional cooperation involves making appropriate decisions within your authority, requesting clarification when authority is genuinely uncertain, and explaining consequences before they become emergencies. It is considerably less theatrical than demonstrating total devotion to the new strategy, but it tends to produce better work.

Not everyone has equal freedom to challenge uncertain instructions. A senior specialist with a strong reputation may feel comfortable approaching a director directly. A recently hired employee on a temporary contract may reasonably be more cautious. People can also have different experiences of how previous managers responded to questions. If an open discussion feels unsafe, it may be more appropriate to seek clarification through an immediate supervisor or established workplace channel. The objective is to obtain reliable guidance without exposing yourself to unnecessary difficulty. Advice that assumes every employee can cheerfully challenge the chief executive over breakfast ignores how workplaces and employment relationships actually function.

Some matters require greater care than routine operational confusion. A change affecting compensation, contractual duties, formal authority, or employment conditions should not be accepted as settled solely because somebody mentioned it during a meeting. The relevant documents, authorized decisions, and applicable employment rules matter. Depending on your circumstances and location, specialist employment advice may be appropriate. There is no need to turn every administrative update into a legal dispute, but equally little reason to rely entirely on informal assurances when significant personal consequences are involved. A new organizational chart is not necessarily a complete description of your legal or contractual position.

Meanwhile, ordinary work still needs to continue. One of the hidden costs of leadership transitions is the attention consumed by discussing possible changes. Teams can spend an astonishing proportion of their week debating who will report to whom, which initiative is likely to survive, and whether a manager's expression during a meeting signaled disapproval. Some of those questions are legitimate. Others have no answer yet. It helps to separate work that can continue under established arrangements from tasks genuinely awaiting new authorization. Protecting that distinction prevents uncertainty in one part of the organization from unnecessarily stopping everything else.

Ruth eventually discovers that most staffing decisions in her cinemas remain unchanged. New requirements apply to budget exceptions and permanent staffing adjustments, while everyday substitutions continue under existing safeguards. Her work is not suddenly effortless, and further decisions may still affect it. But she no longer treats the new

executive's vocabulary as evidence that every familiar responsibility has been withdrawn. When colleagues ask what they are permitted to do, she directs them to the confirmed guidance rather than offering an improvised interpretation based on how important the announcement sounded. This also makes genuine gaps easier to identify. Instead of asking whether anything is still allowed, the team can name the particular decisions requiring clarification.

There is a useful difference between adapting quickly and pretending to understand something nobody has properly explained. The first involves curiosity, judgment, and a willingness to modify established habits. The second involves filling the gaps with guesses, then acting surprised when other people guessed differently. New leaders often need time to understand their organizations, and employees need time to understand new expectations. That does not make every delay acceptable, but it does mean that competence during a transition includes recognizing unresolved questions rather than concealing them behind confident language.

The office may feel unfamiliar for a while, even when almost everything inside it remains physically unchanged. You may have to relearn certain approval routes, develop a working relationship with another manager, or reconsider practices you once took for granted. None of this requires abandoning your professional knowledge or treating your previous experience as obsolete. Start with the actual decisions, the people authorized to make them, and the responsibilities that still belong to you. A company can rename its entire management structure overnight. It takes considerably longer to change what its employees know,

what customers need, and what the work genuinely requires.

Chapter 2 - The Disaster Your Brain Scheduled Without Consulting You

At 4:18 on Thursday afternoon, Leo receives a questionnaire from the new Head of Business Transformation. It asks employees to describe their regular responsibilities, estimate how much time they spend on repetitive tasks, and identify activities that could potentially be automated. The deadline is Monday. Leo works in billing operations, where a substantial part of his job involves checking information between systems. He reads the automation question and feels his stomach tighten. Within minutes, he has decided the company intends to eliminate his position. By dinner, he is considering whether to tell his partner they should cancel their planned holiday. Before bed, he has mentally packed his desk, attended an imaginary redundancy meeting, and developed strong opinions about the severance package nobody has offered him.

The extraordinary part is how little information Leo actually possesses. He has received a questionnaire, not a termination notice. Nobody has announced redundancies, explained the intended automation project, or identified positions likely to change. Nevertheless, his mind has produced a remarkably detailed narrative. This is not evidence that Leo is foolish. His employment matters, and the possibility of losing it deserves serious consideration. The problem is that the seriousness of a possible outcome can make it feel more likely than the available evidence justifies. When the consequences are frightening, uncertainty becomes difficult to tolerate, and an

uncomfortable prediction can start to resemble a confirmed fact.

We rely on prediction throughout ordinary life. It helps us prepare for meetings, organize responsibilities, and recognize potential difficulties before they become expensive mistakes. A workplace undergoing reorganization, however, provides unusually fertile ground for unreliable predictions. Leadership changes create information gaps, decisions may be made privately, and familiar patterns become less dependable. Employees observe fragments of activity without knowing the intentions behind them. A new manager requests staffing information. Finance asks for revised budgets. A department head cancels an established meeting. Each event could have several explanations, but anxiety encourages us to connect them into one coherent story. Once the story exists, additional events seem to fit rather conveniently.

Leo remembers that his previous employer introduced automation shortly before reducing its administrative workforce. That experience matters. It gives him a legitimate reason to ask questions about the possible consequences of the current project. But it does not establish that two organizations will make identical decisions under different circumstances. The new business may want to eliminate repetitive data entry while retaining experienced employees for more complex work. It might intend to restructure certain functions. It may not yet have decided anything beyond investigating technological possibilities. Leo cannot identify the correct explanation from the questionnaire alone. His experience is valuable as a source of questions, but less reliable when treated as a complete forecast.