AXIS as the Operating System

What Moneyball did to baseball, AXIS does to leadership

Matthew Graham

Foundership Institute

ISBN 979-8-9965431-3-7

2026

thefoundership.org

AXIS as the Operating System

What Moneyball did to baseball, AXIS does to leadership

ISBN: 979-8-9965431-3-7

Published by Foundership Institute
thefoundership.org
matt@thefoundership.org

First edition, 2026.

Citation: Graham, M. (2026). *AXIS as the Operating System: What Moneyball did to baseball, AXIS does to leadership*. Foundership Institute. ISBN 979-8-9965431-3-7.

AXIS as the Operating System

What Moneyball did to baseball, AXIS does to leadership

A Foundership Institute white paper · Matthew Graham · v1 · 2026-06-06

Abstract

This paper specifies the structural position of the Foundership Institute's AXIS framework — the four-phase architecture of Alignment, eXecution, Identity, and Self — as the architectural layer underneath the existing leadership canon. The principal leadership frameworks (Sinek, Schein, Kotter, Drucker, Mintzberg, Senge, Lencioni, Gulati) operate on the structural variable that AXIS names without naming it themselves. Each canonical leadership framework can be mapped into a specific AXIS phase: Sinek's Why operates as an Alignment-phase intervention; Schein's iceberg operates as an Identity-phase diagnostic; Kotter's eight-step process operates as an Execution-phase deployment sequence; Senge's learning organization operates in the Self phase; and so forth. The framework draws an explicit structural analogy to the relationship between Bill James's sabermetrics and traditional baseball scouting (James, 1982; Lewis, 2003): the existing leadership frameworks are the scouts of the leadership-thinking field; AXIS is the analytics layer underneath that names the structural variable the scouts have been operating on without measuring. The paper engages Kuhn's (1962) framework for paradigm shifts, Boyd's strategic theory (Osinga, 2007; Coram, 2002), Henderson and Clark's (1990) work on architectural innovation, and Iansiti and Lakhani's (2020) treatment of operating architectures, and integrates these into the position that AXIS is the operating system underneath the leadership-thinking application layer. The paper specifies the four-phase architecture, maps the leadership canon into the phases, and outlines the empirical research program required to validate the structural claim.

1. Introduction: The frame and the picture

For seven decades, leadership thinking has produced frameworks. Drucker (1954) gave us management as a discipline. Mintzberg (1973) gave us the ten managerial roles. Schein (1985) gave us organizational culture as artifacts, espoused values, and basic underlying assumptions. Kotter (1996) gave us the eight-step change process. Senge (1990) gave us the learning organization. Lencioni (2002) gave us the five dysfunctions of teams. Sinek (2009) gave us the Why. Gulati (2022) gave us deep purpose.

Each of these frameworks is a real contribution. Each one names something true. Each one has helped operators in real organizations make better decisions about real problems. None of them is wrong.

What each of them does not name — what none of them names — is the structural variable they all operate on. Sinek's Why is a process for surfacing founding belief. Schein's iceberg is a diagnostic for what founding belief looks like when it has been buried under espoused values and surface artifacts. Kotter's eight steps are a sequence for installing new founding belief when the old one has failed. Lencioni's dys-

functions are symptoms of founding belief that is drifting. Each framework operates on founding belief. None of them names founding belief as the structural variable.

The Foundership Institute names the structural variable. The four-phase AXIS architecture — Alignment, eXecution, Identity, Self — specifies what the architectural layer underneath the leadership-thinking field looks like and how the existing frameworks fit inside it.

The closest historical analogy is the relationship between sabermetrics and traditional baseball scouting. Bill James's *Baseball Abstract* series, beginning in 1977 and reaching mass-market publication in 1982 through Ballantine Books (James, 1982), did not replace the scouts. James and the sabermetricians named the structural variables (on-base percentage, slugging, runs created) that the scouts had been operating on for decades without measuring. The scouts kept their craft; sabermetrics added the analytics layer underneath. By 2002, when Billy Beane and the Oakland Athletics applied sabermetric principles to a $44 million payroll competitive against the New York Yankees' $125 million (Lewis, 2003), the structural integration had been worked out in practice. Today every Major League Baseball organization has both scouts and analytics. Neither is sufficient alone.

AXIS occupies the same structural position relative to leadership thinking. The existing frameworks are the scouts of the field; AXIS is the analytics layer underneath. Each does work the other cannot do. The integration is the contribution.

2. Premise

The Foundership Institute has been operating on the claim that founding belief in a founder-led enterprise is a maintenance-dependent structural asset measurable through the four-metric Vase instrument (Graham, 2025a). Companion papers have specified architectural infrastructure as a fourth source of belief maintenance (Graham, 2026b), storefront signage as a publicly readable structural diagnostic (Graham, 2026c), and the framework's methodological position as explicitly mixed-methods (Graham, 2026d).

The present paper specifies the framework's structural position in the broader leadership-thinking field:

AXIS — the four-phase architecture of Alignment, eXecution, Identity, and Self — is the architectural layer underneath the existing leadership-thinking canon. Each of the canonical leadership frameworks operates on the structural variable AXIS names without naming it themselves. The integration is one-directional: AXIS organizes the existing frameworks by phase; the existing frameworks do not organize AXIS. This is the same structural position sabermetrics occupies relative to baseball scouting and the same position operating system software occupies relative to application software. The relationship is not replacement; it is architectural layering.

The claim is made carefully. The existing frameworks are not wrong. They are operating at a specific layer (the application layer). AXIS operates at a different layer (the architectural layer). Each layer does work the other cannot do. The relationship is collaboration through structural specification, not competition through replacement.

3. The Moneyball precedent specified

Bill James founded what he later named sabermetrics — the term derived from the Society for American Baseball Research (SABR), founded in 1971 (Society for American Baseball Research, n.d.) — when he began self-publishing the *Baseball Abstract* in 1977. By 1982, Ballantine Books had picked up mass-market publication, and James was able to leave his factory work to pursue baseball analytics full-time (James, 1982). His central methodological contribution was the systematic statistical analysis of baseball outcomes to identify which variables actually produced wins.

The structural insight that emerged from sabermetric analysis was that traditional baseball measurement had been focused on the wrong variables. Batting average, runs batted in, and home runs — the staples of the box score and the scout's evaluation — were less predictive of run creation than on-base percentage and slugging percentage. The traditional metrics tracked the surface state of the game; the sabermetric metrics tracked the structural variables underneath. Scouts had been operating on the structural variables for decades through pattern recognition and craft intuition. James named them and gave them measurement.

Michael Lewis's *Moneyball* (2003) documented the operational application of sabermetric thinking by Billy Beane's Oakland Athletics organization. The Athletics' $44 million payroll competing against the New York Yankees' $125 million in the 2002 season demonstrated that the structural variables sabermetrics named could be used to construct a competitive baseball team at substantial economic disadvantage. The book's commercial and critical success — and the 2011 film adaptation starring Brad Pitt as Beane and Jonah Hill as a composite analytics character — catalyzed widespread adoption of sabermetric methods across Major League Baseball.

By the second decade of the twenty-first century, the integration had been worked out. Every Major League Baseball organization now employs both scouts and analytics personnel. Neither is sufficient alone. The scouts see what the analytics miss; the analytics measure what the scouts cannot quantify. The combination produces better evaluation than either alone.

This is the structural template the present paper claims for the relationship between the existing leadership canon and AXIS. The existing frameworks are the scouts; AXIS is the analytics layer. The integration is collaborative.

The lessons from the Moneyball transition relevant to the present claim:

1. **Resistance from incumbents is expected.** Lewis (2003) documents extensive resistance from traditional baseball insiders to sabermetric methods. The structural insight (better measurement of run-producing variables) was correct; the cultural integration took time.
2. **The integration is layered, not replacement.** Scouts did not disappear. They were supplemented, and the most effective organizations learned to deploy both layers in coordinated decision-making.
3. **The application succeeds where the structural insight is operationalized.** Beane's contribution was not the development of sabermetric methods (James had done that); it was the operational deployment of sabermetric thinking at organizational scale.

The Foundership Institute's position is structurally analogous. The existing leadership frameworks are not displaced; they are supplemented by an architectural layer underneath. The integration is layered. The application of the framework — operator deployment in actual founder-led enterprises — is where the structural insight gets validated.

4. The four-phase AXIS architecture

The AXIS framework specifies four recursive phases through which founder-led enterprise belief operates:

Alignment. The phase in which founding belief is surfaced, articulated, and shared. Tools that operate in this phase address the question *what does the operator believe, and how is that belief made coherent to the people around them?* Alignment is the phase most directly addressed by frameworks like Sinek's Why and Gulati's deep purpose.

eXecution. The phase in which the operator's belief is converted into operational practice. Tools that operate in this phase address the question *how does the operator do the thing they believe in, on the floor, in the moment, day after day?* Execution is the phase most directly addressed by frameworks like Drucker's management discipline, Mintzberg's managerial roles, and Kotter's eight-step change process.

Identity. The phase in which the operator's belief is encoded into the structural identity of the enterprise — the artifacts, the buildings, the products, the practices that persist across operator transitions. Tools that operate in this phase address the question *what does the enterprise look like from the outside, and how does that exterior carry the belief?* Identity is the phase most directly addressed by Schein's iceberg model and by the vessel framework specified in Graham (2026b).

Self. The phase in which the operator's own ongoing development as a believer-in-the-belief is maintained. Tools that operate in this phase address the question *how does the operator stay the person who can hold the founding belief over decades?* Self is the phase most directly addressed by Senge's learning organization discipline and by the operator-development work that does not yet have a canonical leadership-framework name.

The four phases are recursive. An enterprise can be in the Alignment phase relative to a new initiative, the Execution phase relative to an existing operation, the Identity phase relative to a generational succession question, and the Self phase relative to the operator's own development — all simultaneously. The framework does not assert linear sequence; the phases describe structural positions an enterprise occupies relative to its belief at any given moment.

The recursive specification means AXIS does not compete with the existing leadership frameworks at the level they operate. The existing frameworks address specific intervention questions inside specific phases. AXIS addresses the structural question of which phase a given operation is in and which intervention is appropriate for that phase.

5. Mapping the leadership canon into AXIS

The structural claim of the present paper can be specified through explicit mapping of canonical leadership frameworks into AXIS phases:

Sinek (2009) — *Start With Why*. Sinek's Golden Circle (Why, How, What) and the operational practice of articulating organizational Why are an Alignment-phase intervention. The framework addresses the question of surfacing founding belief and making it shareable. Sinek's contribution is operationally significant within the Alignment phase. The framework does not address the Execution phase (how the Why is converted into daily practice), the Identity phase (how the Why is encoded into the enterprise's exterior structural identity), or the Self phase (how the founder maintains the capacity to hold the Why over decades). These are not failures of Sinek's framework; they are structural specifications of the phase the framework operates in.

Schein (1985, 2017) — *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Schein's three-level iceberg (artifacts, espoused values, basic underlying assumptions) is an Identity-phase diagnostic. The framework addresses the question of what the organization looks like from the outside and how the exterior carries the belief that may not be visible to the operator. Schein's contribution is foundational within the Identity phase. The framework treats the operator's role as a culture-leader within the Identity phase but does not specify Alignment, Execution, or Self interventions.

Kotter (1996) — *Leading Change*. Kotter's eight-step process for organizational change is an Execution-phase deployment sequence. The framework specifies what the operator does, in sequence, to install new belief or replace failing belief in an existing enterprise. Kotter's contribution is operationally significant within the Execution phase. The framework treats the new belief as given and addresses the question of execution; it does not address how the new belief is surfaced (Alignment), how it is encoded into structural identity (Identity), or how the operator maintains capacity to hold it (Self).

Drucker (1954) — *The Practice of Management*. Drucker's framework of management as a discipline of objectives, decisions, and operational structure is an Execution-phase framework. The framework specifies what the operator does to convert belief into running operational reality. Drucker's contribution is the foundational specification of management as a deliberate discipline rather than an ad hoc practice. The framework operates within the Execution phase and treats the operator's belief as the input to be operationalized.

Mintzberg (1973) — *The Nature of Managerial Work*. Mintzberg's ten managerial roles (interpersonal, informational, decisional) are an Execution-phase characterization of the operator's actual activities. The framework describes what managers do hour by hour and how their work breaks into the recognizable roles. Mintzberg's contribution is empirical observation of managerial work within the Execution phase.

Senge (1990) — *The Fifth Discipline*. Senge's five disciplines of the learning organization (systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning) operate primarily in the Self phase, with extensions into Alignment (shared vision) and Identity (mental models). The framework's central contribution — per-

sonal mastery — is a Self-phase development discipline. Senge's framework is one of the few in the canon that engages Self-phase work substantially.

Lencioni (2002) — *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team*. Lencioni's five dysfunctions (absence of trust, fear of conflict, lack of commitment, avoidance of accountability, inattention to results) are symptom diagnoses of belief-drift across the Alignment and Execution phases. The framework specifies what an enterprise looks like when the belief-maintenance practice has eroded. Lencioni's contribution is diagnostic, operating across phases.

Gulati (2022) — *Deep Purpose*. Gulati's framework of deep purpose as a strategic frame addresses the Alignment phase. The framework specifies how organizational purpose is articulated, integrated into strategy, and used as a competitive advantage. Gulati's contribution operates within the Alignment phase and overlaps with Sinek's territory at higher abstraction.

The mapping is not exhaustive of the canon, but the principle holds: each canonical framework specifies tools for operating within a specific AXIS phase. The frameworks do not compete with each other across phases because they were not designed to. AXIS organizes them by phase and specifies which framework is appropriate to deploy when an enterprise needs work in a specific phase.

6. Adjacent literatures

6.1 Paradigm theory and structural specification

Kuhn (1962) established the concept of the paradigm shift in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* — the framework for understanding how scientific fields undergo periodic restructuring as accumulated anomalies precipitate the replacement of an old paradigm by an incompatible new one. Kuhn's contribution was the recognition that scientific progress is not purely cumulative; periods of normal science within a paradigm are punctuated by revolutionary periods in which the paradigm itself shifts.

The Foundership claim is not a paradigm shift in Kuhn's strong sense. The existing leadership frameworks are not being replaced by AXIS; they are being structurally organized by it. The relationship is architectural integration rather than paradigm replacement. This is a weaker claim than Kuhn's framework specifies but a more appropriate characterization of the actual structural position. AXIS does not assert the incommensurability of the existing frameworks; it asserts the structural specification of where each one operates.

6.2 Boyd's strategic theory and operational architecture

John Boyd developed what is commonly called the OODA loop (Observe, Orient, Decide, Act) as a strategic framework for action under uncertainty (Osinga, 2007; Coram, 2002; Hammond, 2001). Boyd's central insight was that success in competitive environments depends on the ability to cycle through the OODA process faster than the adversary, with particular emphasis on the Orient phase as the cognitive frame within which observations become decisions.

Boyd's framework is the closest predecessor to architectural-layer thinking in operational doctrine. The OODA loop operates inside an existing belief structure rather than specifying the structure itself; Boyd treats orientation as the operator's existing cognitive frame, not as a structural variable independent of the operator. The AXIS framework operates one architectural layer above the OODA loop: AXIS specifies the phases the OODA loop is operating in (an enterprise in the Alignment phase is doing different OODA work than one in the Execution phase). The two frameworks are compatible. Boyd's contribution operates at the decision-cycle layer; AXIS operates at the structural-phase layer.

6.3 Architectural innovation in management

Henderson and Clark (1990), in *Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms*, established a framework for innovation that distinguished component-level innovation (changes to specific parts of a product or system) from architectural innovation (reconfiguration of how the components are organized). Their central empirical finding was that established firms tend to fail at architectural innovation even when they succeed at component innovation, because architectural change requires the firm to reconfigure its own organizational structure to match the new product architecture.

The Foundership Institute's structural claim is, in Henderson and Clark's terms, an architectural specification of the leadership-thinking field. The existing frameworks (Sinek, Schein, Kotter, Drucker, Mintzberg, Senge, Lencioni, Gulati) are component-level contributions within a previously unspecified architecture. AXIS specifies the architecture into which the components fit. The framework's contribution is architectural rather than component-level.

6.4 Operating architectures in management

Iansiti and Lakhani (2020), in *Competing in the Age of AI*, developed the concept of a data-centric operating architecture as the structural foundation for the AI-enabled enterprise. Their core insight was that digital transformation is not the addition of a digital function but the fundamental restructuring of the enterprise's operating architecture. The AI factory — the scalable decision engine that powers the digital operating system of the twenty-first-century firm — is the architectural specification underneath the application-level AI deployment work.

The Foundership Institute's claim is structurally analogous in the leadership-thinking domain. AXIS specifies the operating architecture underneath the existing leadership frameworks. The frameworks operate at the application layer; AXIS specifies the operating-system layer underneath. The relationship is the same architectural specification Iansiti and Lakhani describe for AI deployment.

7. Operational definitions

For the structural claim to be testable, the following constructs require operational definition:

Application-layer leadership framework. A framework that specifies tools, processes, or diagnostics for intervention within a defined AXIS phase. Examples: Sinek's Golden Circle (Alignment-phase intervention tool), Kotter's eight steps (Execution-phase deployment process), Schein's iceberg model (Identity-phase diagnostic).

Architectural-layer framework. A framework that specifies the structural phases within which application-layer frameworks operate, the recursive relationships between phases, and the conditions under which each phase requires intervention. The Foundership AXIS framework is the canonical example.

Phase-appropriate intervention. The deployment of an application-layer framework when its operating phase matches the phase the target enterprise actually requires work in. Operationalized through diagnostic identification of which phase requires work (using the Vase instrument and the storefront-signaling diagnostic) followed by intervention selection from the application-layer framework appropriate to that phase.

Phase-inappropriate intervention. The deployment of an application-layer framework when its operating phase does not match the phase the enterprise requires work in. Predicted to produce execution effort without structural effect, or worse, to damage the structural condition by addressing the wrong layer.

Architectural integration. The condition in which application-layer frameworks are deployed in coordination, with phase-appropriate selection driven by architectural-layer diagnosis. Predicted to produce more effective outcomes than serial deployment of frameworks without architectural specification.

8. Empirical research program

The architectural-layer claim implies a defined empirical program:

8.1 Phase-classification reliability

Question: Do trained analysts reliably identify which AXIS phase a given enterprise requires intervention in?

Design: Inter-rater reliability study. Sample N = 40 enterprises with documented operational state. Three independent analysts classify each into its primary intervention phase using the AXIS framework. Calculate Cohen's kappa for phase agreement.

8.2 Phase-appropriate intervention outcomes

Question: Do interventions selected through architectural-layer diagnosis (phase classification followed by phase-matched framework deployment) produce better outcomes than interventions selected without architectural diagnosis?

Design: Matched comparison study. Sample N = 60 founder-led enterprises receiving leadership interventions. Half receive interventions selected through AXIS phase classification; half receive interventions selected through standard consulting practice. Compare 24-month outcome measures.

8.3 Framework-mapping empirical validation

Question: Do leadership-thinking practitioners reliably identify which AXIS phase a given canonical framework primarily operates in?

Design: Expert-judgment study. Sample N = 30 leadership-thinking practitioners and academics. Present each with the canonical framework list (Sinek, Schein, Kotter, Drucker, Mintzberg, Senge, Lencioni, Gulati) and ask each to assign primary AXIS phase. Compare against the present paper's proposed mappings.

8.4 Phase-state transition dynamics

Question: Do founder-led enterprises transition between AXIS phases in patterns that the framework can predict?

Design: Longitudinal study. Sample N = 50 founder-led enterprises tracked across 36 months with quarterly AXIS phase classification. Test whether phase transitions follow patterns the framework predicts (e.g., Alignment → Execution → Identity → Self as a developmental sequence).

8.5 Architectural-integration value

Question: Do consulting engagements that deploy multiple application-layer frameworks in architectural coordination produce different client outcomes than engagements that deploy frameworks serially without architectural specification?

Design: Quasi-experimental field study with consulting partners. Identify consulting engagements deploying multiple frameworks. Code each engagement for whether deployment follows architectural coordination or serial application. Compare client outcomes at 24 months.

9. Scope notes and limitations

The architectural-layer claim is presented as a structural specification rather than as a paradigm-shift claim in Kuhn's strong sense. Specific limits:

- The framework mapping in Section 5 is a proposed first-pass classification. The empirical study in Section 8.3 specifies how the mappings would be validated against practitioner judgment. Mappings may require refinement following empirical work.
- The four-phase AXIS specification is one architectural possibility among potentially others. The framework claims four phases as canonical based on operational deployment in founder-led enterprise; alternative architectures with different phase specifications may be defensible.
- The relationship between AXIS and Boyd's OODA loop is specified as architectural-layer-above-decision-cycle-layer. This is a structural specification rather than an empirical claim. The compatibility of the two frameworks awaits operational application across enterprises using both.
- The Moneyball precedent is offered as structural analogy, not as predictive analogy. The integration trajectory of sabermetrics into baseball was specific to that

field; the integration trajectory of AXIS into the leadership-thinking field will follow its own dynamics. The analogy is illustrative rather than prescriptive.
- The framework does not claim that any of the canonical leadership frameworks are wrong or should be abandoned. The frameworks operate at the application layer and produce real contributions within their phases. The architectural-layer specification is offered as integration rather than replacement.

10. Conclusion: The architecture underneath

For seven decades, leadership thinking has accumulated frameworks. Each framework has named something true. Each framework has helped real operators in real organizations. None of them has named the architectural variable underneath that they have all been operating on without specification.

The Foundership Institute names that variable. AXIS — Alignment, eXecution, Identity, Self — specifies the four-phase architecture inside which the existing leadership frameworks operate. The architectural-layer claim is the structural integration: each canonical framework is a phase-specific tool, deployable when its phase matches the enterprise's intervention need, ineffective or counterproductive when deployed out of phase.

The structural analogy that captures the relationship is sabermetrics-to-baseball-scouting. The existing leadership frameworks are the scouts of the leadership-thinking field. AXIS is the analytics layer underneath. The integration is collaborative rather than competitive. The scouts keep their craft. The analytics gives them the structural specification of where their craft fits.

By the second decade of the twenty-first century, baseball had worked out the integration. Every Major League organization deploys both scouts and analytics, and the most effective organizations have learned to coordinate the two layers in decision-making (Lewis, 2003; James, 1982; Britannica, n.d.). The integration is now standard practice in professional baseball.

The Foundership Institute claims the structural position underneath leadership thinking and offers the framework for the same integration trajectory in the leadership-thinking field. AXIS is the operating system. The existing leadership frameworks are the applications. Neither displaces the other. The integration is the contribution.

References

Britannica. (n.d.). Sabermetrics — The rise of advanced statistics. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from britannica.com.

Coram, R. (2002). *Boyd: The fighter pilot who changed the art of war*. New York: Little, Brown.

Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The practice of management*. New York: Harper & Row.

Graham, M. (2026b). The Vase is in the bricks: Architectural infrastructure as belief-maintenance variable in founder-led enterprise. *Foundership Institute white papers. ISBN 979-8-9965431-0-6*. Retrieved from thefoundership.org.

Graham, M. (2026c). What "Under New Management" really means: Storefront belief-signaling as structural diagnostic in founder-led enterprise. *Foundership Institute white papers*. Retrieved from thefoundership.org.

Graham, M. (2026d). Quantification AND qualification of belief: A mixed-methods framework for measuring founder-led enterprise. *Foundership Institute white papers. ISBN 979-8-9965431-2-0*. Retrieved from thefoundership.org.

Graham, M. (2025a). *Foundership: A first-principles discipline focused on preserving founding belief.* Foundership Institute. ISBN 979-8-218-71006-4.

Graham, M. (2025b). *Bridging the Founder's gap: A position paper on belief erosion in growth-stage organizations and the structural discipline required to prevent drift*. Foundership Institute. ISBN 979-8-9965431-5-1.

Gulati, R. (2022). *Deep purpose: The heart and soul of high-performance companies*. New York: Harper Business.

Hammond, G. T. (2001). *The mind of war: John Boyd and American security*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 9–30.

Iansiti, M., & Lakhani, K. R. (2020). *Competing in the age of AI: Strategy and leadership when algorithms and networks run the world*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

James, B. (1982). *The Bill James baseball abstract 1982*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis, M. (2003). *Moneyball: The art of winning an unfair game*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.

Osinga, F. P. B. (2007). *Science, strategy and war: The strategic theory of John Boyd*. London: Routledge.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with why: How great leaders inspire everyone to take action*. New York: Portfolio.

Society for American Baseball Research. (n.d.). About SABR. Retrieved from sabr.org.

The Foundership Institute · thefoundership.org · Inquiries: matt@thefoundership.org · v1 published 2026-06-06. Companion to The Founder's Gap *(Graham, 2025a),* The Vase is in the Bricks *(Graham, 2026b),* What "Under New Management" Really Means *(Graham, 2026c), and* Quantification AND Qualification of Belief *(Graham, 2026d). The final paper in the current series will cover the mispriced-believer signature in private-form enterprise.*