

INSIGHT SERIES · GOVERNANCE / RISK / HUMAN FACTORS · NO. 07

Curiosity Without Discipline Is Just Conversation

Why intelligent organisations treat curiosity as a cycle, not a moment.

Author: Emilio van Doorn · **Date:** June 10, 2024 · **Topic:** Governance / Risk / Human Factors

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Most organisations encourage curiosity. Few sustain it, because curiosity left to chance is eventually overwhelmed by routine — projects demand delivery, meetings demand decisions, and questions quietly give way to answers. This article traces what actually happens inside organisations that keep learning long after the reasons to stop have piled up: observation leads to a question, the question gets connected to other information, the connection improves a decision, and the decision creates the next thing worth observing. That pattern should not be a one-off insight. It is a cycle. Once you recognise the pattern, it becomes clear that organisational intelligence is not an outcome of the cycle—it is the cycle.

1. Introduction

Most organisations genuinely want to be curious. Leaders ask people to be innovative, to challenge assumptions, to speak up when something looks off. I do not doubt any of that is sincere. And yet, given enough time, curiosity in most organisations will fade — not because people stop caring, but when curiosity is left to chance, it always loses to routine.

Projects demand delivery. Meetings demand decisions. Operational pressure demands efficiency, and it demands it every single day. Whereas curiosity rarely announces an urgent deadline of its own. Questions slowly give way to answers. Exploration gives way to execution. The organisation gets very good at doing what it already knows, and gradually worse at discovering what it does not.

This is where the strongest organisations diverge from everyone else. They do not leave curiosity to individual temperament. They build it as a capability — and, more specifically, as something closer to a cycle than a single event.

2. Curiosity Begins With Observation

Every meaningful shift I have ever traced back to its origin started with someone simply noticing something. A customer behaving a little differently. An employee asking a question nobody quite expected. A supplier changed their approach without much explanation. A process producing outcomes that were subtly, almost imperceptibly, off from what everyone assumed.

The observation itself changes nothing. Its only value was the possibility that it might matter — and that possibility is easy to miss if nobody is actually looking for it.

3. Observation Leads to Questions

An observation without a question attached to it tends to become forgotten information within a week. Curious organisations pause deliberately, rather than moving straight past it, and ask a small, consistent set of questions:

- Why has this changed?
- What are we assuming?
- What else could explain it?
- Who is looking at this differently to how we are?

Those questions are what turn an observation into something worth exploring. I would even go further and say the quality of an organisation's learning is really just the quality of its questions, dressed up in more official language.

4. Questions Create Connection

Very few observations explain themselves. Meaning tends to show up only once an observation gets connected to something else that is already known. A supplier delay means more once you notice customer complaints climbing at the same time. Rising staff turnover means more once project performance starts slipping alongside it.

One of the clearest examples comes from Andy Grove, the former President and Chief Operating Officer of Intel, whose leadership transformed the company from a struggling memory-chip manufacturer into the world's dominant microprocessor business. Throughout the 1980s, Intel had been watching Japanese competitors drive prices down while profit margins thinned quarter after quarter. None of these signals were new; they had been accumulating for years. The breakthrough came when Grove and then CEO, Gordon Moore asked a deceptively simple question: *If a new management team took over tomorrow, what would they do?* The answer was immediate—they would leave the memory business. The information had existed all along. What changed was not the evidence, but the willingness to connect it into a single, uncomfortable conclusion. That act of disciplined curiosity ultimately reshaped one of the world's most influential technology companies.

5. Understanding Improves Decisions

Curiosity is not meant to end in endless investigation — its actual purpose is better judgement. Every question worth asking should improve the quality of a decision somewhere down the line. Every observation should leave the organisation slightly more aware than it was the day before. Learning that never touches a decision is, in a fairly real sense, not learning at all. It's just noticing.

6. Decisions Create New Observations

Here is the part that gets missed most often: every decision an organisation makes changes its environment, sometimes in ways nobody predicted. That change becomes new information, which becomes the next thing worth observing — which starts the whole pattern again. Observe. Question. Connect. Understand. Decide. Observe again.

Amazon's approach to experimentation runs on something close to this loop. Each product decision — from one-click ordering to recommendation engines — generated new customer behaviour, which became the next round of signals worth questioning and connecting. The company's discipline was never really about having better answers than its competitors. It was about never letting the loop stop turning.

7. The Cycle of Curiosity

This pattern does not need a complicated name, but it has recurred often enough across organisations I have studied that it is worth giving it one: the Cycle of Curiosity. It is not a process you complete and file away. It is closer to a habit, a discipline, a way an organisation chooses to keep thinking. It keeps organisations acting like students of their own environment, rather than assuming they have already learned everything worth knowing.

Most importantly, it stops learning from becoming episodic — a workshop here, an offsite there — and makes it continuous instead.

Conclusion

The organisations that thrive over the next decade are unlikely to be the ones with the largest governance structures, or the ones holding the most information. I think they will be the ones that deliberately keep the cycle turning long after success has made certainty tempting — because the biggest threat to organisational intelligence was never uncertainty itself. It is the quiet belief that there is nothing left to discover.

The Cycle of Curiosity was never really about asking more questions. It is about making sure an organisation never stops learning from the answers it already has.

ABOUT 99 RISKS PTY LTD

99 Risks Pty Ltd is a specialist governance advisory firm. **RailGuard** by **assessum.com** is our Intelligent Risk assessment platform — using the **Risk Intelligence Index (RII)** to help organisations understand, benchmark, and strengthen how they navigate uncertainty and make better decisions.

For enquiries: www.assessum.com

Disclaimer: This article is provided for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal, regulatory, or professional advice.