124 The Circle of Competence

Perspective Book · https://kb.jeffreysummers.com/docs/124-the-circle-of-competence/

Every operator has a circle of competence. Most operators do not know where it ends.

That is not a character flaw. It is a structural problem — the edges of competence are invisible from the inside. The operator who is operating within their circle feels the same confidence as the operator who has stepped beyond it. The difference only becomes visible in the outcomes, and by the time the outcomes make the gap clear, the decisions that exposed it have already been made.

The discipline is not about staying small. It is about knowing the terrain before you commit resources to it — understanding where your knowledge is genuine and where it is borrowed, where your judgment is calibrated by experience and where it is running on assumption.

The Cost of Crossing the Line Without Knowing It

The failure that results from operating outside competence has a specific signature. It does not look like bad luck. It does not look like bad timing. It looks like consistent blind spots in the same domain, repeated mistakes the operator does not see coming, and outcomes that surprise the operator but not the people around them who could see the gap from the beginning.

The operator who opens a second location in a market they have never lived in, prices for a competitive set they have never studied, or builds a menu for a Guest they have never served — is not being bold. They are operating beyond their circle with the confidence of someone who is still inside it. The confidence is real. The competence is not. And the bill arrives slowly enough that the operator often blames the market, the location, or the economy before they trace the failure to the decision that produced it.

The people in the building almost always saw it before the operator did. The cast member who knew the neighborhood was wrong for the concept. The kitchen manager who knew the menu was built for the wrong Guest. The bookkeeper who ran the numbers and knew the margins could not support the rent. All of them saw the edge the operator could not see — because they were standing on the other side of it.

That is what competence gaps cost. Not just the failed venture. The invisible tax on every decision made beyond the edge — the misplaced confidence that keeps the operator from asking the questions that would have revealed the gap before it produced the outcome.

Two Tools for Mapping the Circle

There is no single right way to map a circle of competence. What matters is honesty — a genuine willingness to distinguish between what you know from experience and what you know from assumption. Two tools that produce that honesty in different ways:

Tool 1 — The Decision Audit

Review the last ten significant decisions you made. For each one, ask: did I have genuine first-hand knowledge of this domain, or was I operating on assumption, borrowed thinking, or unfamiliarity with the terrain?

Not whether the decision worked out — outcomes can be lucky. Whether you had the competence the decision required at the time you made it.

The pattern that emerges from ten honest answers maps the edges of the circle more accurately than any self-assessment. The domains where you consistently operated on assumption — where the outcomes surprised you, where the people around you saw things you did not — are the domains where the edge is closer than you thought. The domains where your read was accurate, your judgment held, and your outcomes tracked your expectations are the domains where the circle is solid.

The decision audit works because it uses behavior as the evidence, not self-perception. What the operator actually decided is more honest than what the operator thinks they know.

Tool 2 — The Domain Inventory

Map explicitly what you know from direct experience versus what you know secondhand.

Menu development from years in the kitchen versus menu development from trend reports — different circles. Labor management from years building schedules and running the shift versus labor management from a software recommendation — different circles. Guest relationship architecture from decades of direct Guest work versus Guest relationship architecture from a consulting framework — different circles.

The domain inventory makes the circle visible as a map rather than revealing it through behavioral patterns. For each major domain the operation requires — food and beverage, labor, marketing, Guest experience, financial management, cast development, vendor relationships — the operator places themselves honestly: deep competence from direct experience, working competence from guided exposure, surface competence from secondhand knowledge, or outside the circle entirely.

The map does not judge any position. It simply names where genuine competence exists and where it does not — which is the only information the operator needs to make better decisions about when to trust their own judgment and when to bring in someone whose circle covers the ground theirs does not.

Which Tool to Use

The decision audit is more honest — it reveals the circle through behavior rather than self-assessment, which is always more accurate. It is also more uncomfortable, because it requires looking at decisions that may not have produced the outcomes the operator hoped for.

The domain inventory is more actionable — it produces a usable map going forward. It is also easier to rationalize, because self-assessment tends to place the edge further out than the evidence supports.

Use both if you can. Use the one you are more willing to be honest about if you can only use one. The tool that produces genuine discomfort is almost always the one producing genuine insight.

How the Circle Expands

The circle of competence is not a fixed boundary. It is a living edge that moves outward through accumulated experience — not through a formal program, not through a planned curriculum, but through the natural compounding of an operator who stays curious, keeps extracting, and keeps prodding beyond their current comfort zone.

The operator who ran the circle discipline correctly — who knew their edge, operated honestly within it, and extracted deliberately from every experience near it — finds the edge moving outward on its own. Each experience at the boundary adds to the prior one. Each honest extraction from a near-edge decision builds the foundation for the next step beyond it. The circle grows because the operator kept paying attention, not because they followed a plan.

The failure mode to avoid is confusing the circle of competence with the circle of comfort. They are not the same thing. The circle of comfort contracts away from the edge — it gets smaller over time as the operator defaults to what is familiar and avoids what is not. The circle of competence expands toward the edge — it gets larger over time as the operator deliberately engages with what lies just beyond their current knowledge and extracts from the contact.

The operator who stays permanently inside their current circle is not being disciplined. They are being static. [Static Decline] does not require the operator to make a bad decision. It only requires them to stop growing — to let the circle of comfort replace the circle of competence and call it experience.

The circle of competence is not a boundary you defend. It is a frontier you keep moving.

What Changes Tomorrow

Pick one domain your operation requires where you suspect your competence is thinner than your confidence. Run the decision audit on the last three decisions you made in that domain. Were they based on genuine knowledge or on assumption? What did the outcomes tell you? If the audit reveals a gap — that is not a failure. It is the edge of the circle, now visible, now available to work on deliberately. That is where the next expansion begins.