



As Richard says, conventional leadership literature suggests it is the role of a leader to create a vision from which goals are set, competencies and strategies agreed, and people with the right capabilities are sought to create the culture to execute the leaders strategy (shown as grey in the model). The model proposes that it is not the leader but through acts of leadership from anyone in the group that shared meaning can evolve and new insights and scenarios emerge. The design space is used for clarifying purpose before any reframing and visioning take place. The red design space must always come first for the grey to be effective.

The internal/today quadrant is the space of our worldviews. That is it is the stories we tell ourselves about who we are and what our organisation stands for – the organisational litany. In conventional planning the trend is to go straight from this space into the external/today quadrant as the way we implement our strategy. I have argued before that the real strategy of any organisation is what they *actually* do in the here-and-now. It is strategy iterated through time, as the strategy narrative emerges based on worldviews. This is the comfortable route to take but it is also the least effective because it does nothing about different worldview narratives i.e. other coherent sets of assumptions and principles about how the world works.

Futures work harnesses the role of intuitive inquiry and storytelling to enable less familiar drivers of change to be considered as relevant which takes us into the tomorrow/internal/external quadrants as all views (worldviews) of the future count particularly when confronting powerful vested interests and exclusion of alternative interests and contradictory perspectives. This is why futures work matters and why it involves acts of leadership and why futures work can help in navigating the productive range of anxiety any significant change process offers.