

Drive Synopsis by Daniel Pink

Introduction:

Types of Drives: biological, extrinsic (rewards and punishments the environment delivered for behaving in certain ways) and intrinsic.

Harlow discovered (experiments with monkeys) Third drive: Intrinsic drive, newly discovered drive, the joy of the task was its own reward--performance of the task.

Deci continued research and found when money is used as an external reward for some activity, the subjects lose intrinsic interest for the activity. Rewards can deliver a short-term boost but the effects wear off and can reduce a person's longer-term motivation to continue the project.

Deci--an inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise their capacities, to explore and to learn.

Third drive is more fragile and needs the right environment to survive.

For too long, there's been a mismatch between what science knows and what business does.

Chapter 1 The Rise and Fall of Motivation 2.0

In the early 1900's American engineer Frederick Taylor invented "scientific management": workers were like parts in a complicated machine. If they did the right work in the right way at the right time, the machine would function smoothly. And to ensure that happened, you simply rewarded the behavior you sought and punished the behavior you discouraged. Extrinsic Motivators. Carrots and sticks. Human beings aren't much different from horses. It worked extremely well until it didn't.

Harlow's student, Maslow, developed "humanistic psychology" and McGregor imported those ideas into business

1960, MIT management professor, McGregor, people have other, higher drives and businesses could benefit if it respected those higher drives.

Models of intrinsic drive: Wikipedia (open source), Firefox (web browser), Linus (software)

For many, participation in these projects can burnish their reputations and sharpen their skills, which can enhance their earning power. Entrepreneurs have launched new, and

sometimes lucrative, companies to help organizations implement and maintain open-source software applications.

Bob Wolf surveyed 684 open-source developers: enjoyment-based intrinsic motivation, namely how creative a person feels when working on the project is the strongest and most pervasive driver.

Large majority said that they frequently reached the state of optimal challenge called “flow.”

“the fun...of maturing the challenge of a given software program” and the “desire to give a gift to the programmer community.”

Purpose Maximizer Entities (NY Times)

New businesses are cropping up to account for evolving focus away from exclusively profit maximizing corps.

2008 Vermont became the first US State to allow a new type of business called “low-profit limited liability corp’ L3C: operates like a for profit business generating at least modest profits, but its primary aim is to offer significant social benefits. Other states are following.

Nobel Peace Prize winner creating what he calls “social businesses”: companies that raise capital, develop products, and sell them in an open market but do so in the service of a larger social mission “with the profit-maximization principle replaced by the social benefit principle.

Fourth Sector Network in the US and Denmark is promoting “the for-benefit organization” : a hybrid that it says represents a new category of organization that is both economically self-sustaining and animated by a public purpose.

“B Corporation” evented by 3 U.S. entrepreneurs--a designation that requires companies to amend their by laws so that the incentives favor long term value and social impact instead of short term economic gain.

How We Think About What We Do

Economics wasn't the study of money. It was the study of behavior.

2002 Nobel prize in economics when to someone who wasn't an economist. American psychologist whose study said that people weren't always rational calculators of our economic self interest and that the parties often didn't bargain to a wealth maximizing result.

Another economist says we are irrational and predicatably so but most

Very premise of extrinsic incentives is that we'll always respond rationally to them but often these motivators don't work

If we're predictably irrational -- and clearly we are__why couldn't we also be predictably transcendent?

We work to master stuff on the weekends although we have little hope of making a dime or finding a mate? Musical instruments, sports like golf, cross word puzzles, etc

How We Do What We Do

Behaviorial scientists often divide what we do on the job or learnin school into two categories:

Algorithmic: a task is one in which you follow a set of established instructions down a single pathway to one conclusion. There's an algorithm for solving it.

Heuristic: Is the opposite--precisely because there is no algorithm exists, you have to experiment with possibilities and devise a novel solution.

20th century most work was algorithmic. Reduce most jobs to a script.

21st century work is evolving into heuristic as algorithmic work moves overseas or is solved by a computer.

McKinsey & Co. estimates that in the US. only 30 % of job growth now comes from algorithmic work while 70% comes from heuristic work. Routine work can be outsourced or automated; artistic, empathic, nonroutine work generally cannot.

The implications for motivation are vast.

Tons of research suggests that external rewards and punishments--carrots and sticks---can work nicely for algorithmic tasks. but they can be devastating for heuristic ones.

Harlow's third drive: Intrinsic motivation

Harvard B School researcher Teresa Amabile (world's leading expert on creativity) coins a new phrase "Intrinsic motivation is conducive to creativity; controlling extrinsic motivation is detrimental to creativity and may actually impair performance of heuristic, right brain work on which modern economics depend.

If work is becoming more creative and less routine then it is becoming more enjoyable and there is less need for extrinsic inducements.

Vocation Vacations are good examples.

US Census Bureau has 18 million calls non-employer business -- business without any paid employees.

With companies becoming learner and less hierarchical to reduce costs they are trimming middle management. As organizations flatten, companies need people who are self-motivated.

Routine, not-so-interesting jobs require direction

Nonroutine, more interesting work depends on self-direction

Chapter 2 Seven Reasons Carrots and Sticks (Often) Don't Work

Old theory: rewarding an activity will get you more of it. Punishing an activity will get you less of it. Hidden costs of rewards.

People have to earn a living. If "baseline rewards" aren't adequate or equitable, her focus will be on the unfairness of her situation and the anxiety of her circumstance. You'll get neither the predictability of extrinsic motivation nor the weirdness of intrinsic motivation. You'll get very little motivation at all.

But once we're past that threshold, carrots and sticks can achieve precisely the opposite of their intended aims. Can dampen motivation. Can reduce creativity. Programs to promote good deeds can make them disappear.

Meanwhile, instead of restraining negative behavior, rewards and punishments can often set it loose--and give rise to cheating, addiction, and dangerously myopic thinking.

They can give us less of what we want and more of what we don't want.

Mark Twain's Tom Sawyer while painting the fence white extracted a key motivational principle: Work consists of whatever a body is OBLIGED to do and that Play consists of whatever a body is not obliged to do.

Rewards can transform an interesting task into a drudge turning play into work. Diminishing motivating and sending performance, creativity and upstanding behavior toppling like dominoes. called the Sawyer Effect ~ turning work into play or play into work.

Contingent rewards (if-then rewards) --if you do this, then you'll get that--had a negative effect. Forfeit of autonomy and drain an activity of its enjoyment.

When institutions focus on the short term and opt for controlling people's behavior they do considerable long term damage.

People use rewards expecting to gain the benefit of increasing another person's motivation and behavior, but in so doing, they often incur the unintentional and hidden cost of undermining that person's intrinsic motivation toward the activity.

India experiment: paying people to perform a task

People offered the medium sized bonus didn't perform any better than those offered the small one. The highest bonus group performed the worst in every measure.

MIT, Carnegie Mellon, University of Chicago, Federal Reserve, London School of Economics all agree that financial incentives can result in a negative impact on overall performance.

In creative solution performance task--the incentivised group took nearly three and a half minutes longer to come up with the proper creative solution than did nonincentivized group.

Rewards, by their very nature, narrow our focus. That's helpful when there's a clear path to a solution. They help us stare ahead and race faster. Candle Experiment showed that rewards narrowed people's focus and blinkered the wide view that might have allowed them to see new uses for old objects.

Amabile (Harvard Creativity)

Rewards for right-brained undertaking--those that demand flexible problem solving, inventiveness or conceptual understanding --contingent rewards can be dangerous. Rewarded subjects often have a harder time seeing the periphery and creating original solutions.

For artists, scientists, inventors, school children and the rest of us, intrinsic motivation--the drive to do something because it is interesting, challenging, and absorbing--is essential for high levels of creativity. Alarming gap between what science knows and business does.

Same goes for good behavior--giving blood. When people were offered pay to give blood the donations decreased by nearly half. Doing good is what blood donation is all about and that good feeling was removed. A feeling that money can't buy. Italian gov't gave workers paid time off work to give blood, donations increased because it removed an obstacle to altruism.

Deploying rewards without understanding the peculiar science of motivation is a very dangerous game.

When used improperly, extrinsic motivators can have another unintended collateral consequence: They can give us more of what we don't want promoting bad behavior, unethical behavior.

Goals work but not in the way you may want them to.

Harvard Business School, Northwestern Kellogg School of Management, U of Arizona and Wharton's research: "Rather than being offered as an over-the-counter salve for boosting performance, goal setting should be prescribed selectively, presented with a warning label, and closely monitored. Goals that people set for themselves and that are devoted to attaining mastery are usually healthy. But goals imposed by others--sales targets, quarterly returns, standardized test scores, and so on--can sometimes have dangerous side effects."

Like all extrinsic motivators, goals narrow our focus. That's one reason they can be effective; they concentrate the mind. But narrow focus exacts a cost

For complex or conceptual tasks, offering a reward can blinker the wide ranging thinking necessary to come up with innovative solutions. Its presence can restrict our view of the broader dimensions of our behavior. Goal setting can induce unethical behavior.

People will sometimes choose the quickest route there, even if it means taking the low road.

With intrinsic motivation the reward is the activity itself --deepening learning, delighting customers, doing one's best--the only route to the destination is the high road. Shortcuts or unethical behavior is difficult, if not impossible, because the person who's disadvantaged isn't a competitor but yourself.

Goals and extrinsic rewards aren't inherently corrupting but they are more toxic than previously recognized.

Business School professors suggest that goals should come with their own warning label: Goals may cause systematic problems for organizations due to narrowed focus, unethical behavior, increased risk taking, decreased cooperation, and decreased intrinsic motivation. Use care when applying goals in your organization.

Child Care Provider fine for picking up kids after hours shifted the parents' decision from a partly moral obligation (be fair to my kids' teachers) to a pure transaction (I can buy extra time) The punishment didn't promote good behavior; it crowded it out.

Cash rewards and trophies provide a jolt of pleasure but then the recipient requires ever larger and more frequent doses.

Russian economist Suvorov calls it "principal-agent theory" Think of principal as the motivator--employer, teacher, parent. Agent is the motivatee.

Principal essentially tries to get the agent to do what the principal wants, while the agent balances his own interests with whatever the principal is offering. By offering a reward, the principal signals to the agent that the task is undesirable.

If the offer is too small, the agent won't comply. If the reward is enticing the agent may act the first time but be less enthusiastic the second and so on.

Knutson, neuroscientist, rewards addictive qualities can also distort decision-making.

Rewards can limit the breadth of our thinking but also (especially "if-then" ones) can reduce the depth of our thinking. Increase in quick pay off short term thinking.

Many companies exist for short term goals: what their executives and middle managers do each day is aimed single-mindedly at the corporation's performance over the next three months.

Several researchers have found that companies that spend the most time offering guidance on quarterly earnings deliver significantly lower long term growth rates than companies that offer guidance less frequently.

One reason: earnings-obsessed companies typically invest less in research and development.

Mastery is inherently long term because complete mastery is in a sense unattainable. Tiger Woods still reworks his swing, etc.

In environments where extrinsic rewards are most salient, many people work only to the point that triggers the reward and no further.

Carrots and Sticks: The Seven Deadly Flaws

They can extinguish intrinsic motivation.

They can diminish performance

They can crush creativity

They can crowd out good behavior

They can encourage cheating, shortcuts and unethical behavior

They can become addictive

They can foster short-term thinking.

Chapter 2A And the Special Circumstances When They Do

When contemplating external motivators: Is the task at hand routine? Follow a prescribed set of rules to a specified end?

Rewards do not undermine people's intrinsic motivation for dull tasks, routine tasks, because there is little or no intrinsic motivation to be undermined.

for routine tasks, it is best to unleash the positive side of the Sawyer Effect by attempting to turn work into play--increase the task's variety, to make it more like a game, or to use it to help master other skills. "If-then" rewards are an option and do work in those circumstances where the task is routine.

Example: What's the best way to enlist your staff of ten in a massive poster mailing session on a weekend?

1. Managerial coercion. Might comply but the damage to their morale and long term commitment could be substantial.
2. Ask for volunteers.
3. If-then reward--gift certificate to everyone who participates or office party.
4. Small sum of money for every poster mailed

Consider:

1. Offer a rationale for why the task is necessary
2. Acknowledge that the task is boring
3. Allow people to complete the task their own way.

What about for creative task?

Even people who do creative work still want to be paid.

Study of artists by Amabile: Experts judged (blind study) art that was commissioned vs. art that was not commissioned. All voted for noncommissioned work as better on all measures. Still, when commissioned work didn't provide parameters--do something interesting or exciting--this negated the effect and those works were rank same as noncommissioned work.

Sense of autonomy is critical for creative tasks.

Example: develop a new poster.

Do not offer an "if-then" reward--ten percent bonus to the best poster.

Best approach is to have already established conditions of genuinely motivating environment with baseline rewards sufficient:

Provide:

1. Congenial place to work
2. People on Team must have autonomy
3. Ample opportunity to pursue mastery
4. Daily duties must relate to a larger purpose
5. Get out of the way.
6. Any extrinsic rewards should be unexpected and offered only after the task is complete--called "now that" rewards.

Rewards

“Now that” rewards

1. nontangible rewards--praise and positive feedback are much less corrosive than cash and trophies because they can have an enhancing effect on intrinsic motivation.
2. provide useful information--people are thirsting to learn about how they're doing, but only if the information isn't a tacit effort to manipulate their behavior.

Don't tell the team--"That poster was perfect. You did it exactly the way I asked." Give more feedback based on specifics--great use of color, effort and strategy rather than a particular outcome. Useful information works best.

Chapter 3 Type I and Type X

Researchers Deci and Ryan fashioned what they call "self determination theory" (SDT) begins with the notion of universal human needs. We have three innate psychological needs--competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Then those needs are satisfied, we're motivated, productive, and happy. When they're thwarted, our motivation, productivity, and happiness plummet. Our capacity for interest is fundamental and some things facilitate it. Some things undermine it.

This a a really big thing in management. When people aren't producing, companies typically resort to rewards or punishment. Trying to run over the problem with a carrot or stick rather than doing the hard work of diagnosing what the problem is.

Instead, Deci and Ryan say we should focus our efforts on creating environments for our innate psychological needs to flourish.

Human beings have an innate inner drive to be autonomous, self-determined, and connected to one another. And when that drive is liberated, people achieve more and live richer lives.

Csikszentmihalyi wrote book about "flow" and another researcher Seligman wrote that helplessness is learned and not innate behavior.

"Positive psychology" moves away from focusing on dysfunction and moves towards focusing on well-being and effective functioning.

Cardiologist "discovered" Type A Personality: demonstrated that people were significantly more likely to develop heart disease than others who shared similar physical attributes, exercise regimens, diets, and family histories if they led their lives in a particular way:

"a particular complex of personality traits, including excessive competition drive, aggressiveness, impatience, and a harrying sense of time urgency. Individuasl

displaying this pattern seem to be engaged in a chronic, ceaseless, and often fruitless struggle--with themselves, with others, with circumstances, with time, sometimes with life itself.

Type A behavior/people suffered from "hurry sickness"

Found that Type B people -- rarely harrid by life or made hostile by its demands were just as intelligent and frequently just as ambitious but they wore their ambition differently. Type B people may also have a considerable amount of drive ut its character is such that it seems to steady him, give confidence and security to him rather than to goal, irritate, and infuriate, as with Type A man.

Goal: to help Type A become more like Type B

McGregory took research and began applying it to modern management. The Human Side of Enterprise argued that those running companies were operating from faulty assumptions about human behavior. Most leaders believed that the people in their organizations fundamentally disliked work and would avoid it if they could. They needed to be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment.

McGregor said that taking an interest in work is as natural as play or rat, that creativity and ingenuity were widly distributed in the population and that udner the proper conditions people will accept and even seek responsibility.

If you believed in the mediocrity of the masses then mediocrity became the ceiling on what you could achieve.

Type I and Type X

Type X behavior is fueled more by extrinsic desires than intrinsic ones. Second drive.

Type I behavior is fueld more by intrinsic desires than extrinsic ones. concerned more with inherent satisfaction of the activity itself. Third drive.

Need to move from type X to Type I to strengthen our organizations and get beyond the inchoate sense that something's gone wrong in our business, our lives, and our world.

type I behavior is made, not born. These behaivoral patterns aren't fixed traits and can be learned so any Type X can become a Type I. Type I behavior does not depend on age, gender or nationality as it arises in part from universal human needs.

Type I's almost always outperform Type X's in the long run but may not be in the short term. An intense focus on extrinsic rewards can indeed deliver fast results but this is difficult to sustain.

type I behavior does not disdain money or recognition. Both Types care about money and recognition. But when a baseline of fair and adequate pay is established then the Types work for different reasons. Type X work for the money. Distinction is Type X money (and recognition) is why they do what they do.

Type I behavior is a renewable resources because it doesn't rely on extrinsic fuel. Intrinsic fuel is easily replenished like the sun. Whereas Type X behavior is like coal.

Type I behavior promotes greater physical and mental well-being. People oriented toward autonomy and intrinsic motivation have higher self-esteem, better interpersonal relationships, and greater general well-being than those who are extrinsically motivated. Harder to control getting money, fame, or beauty and those folks tend to have poor psychological health.

Connection between Type A and Type X--Deci found that those oriented toward control and extrinsic rewards showed greater public self-consciousness, acted more defensively, and were more likely to exhibit the Type A behavior pattern.

Type I behavior depends on: autonomy, mastery, and purpose. type I behavior is self-directed and devoted to becoming better and better at something that matters. It connects that quest for excellence to a larger purpose.

We have a choice. We can cling to a view of human motivation that is grounded more in old habits than in modern science. Or we can listen to the research, drag our business and personal practices into the twenty-first century, and craft a new operating system to help ourselves, our companies, and make the world a little better.

Part Two: The Three Elements

Chapter 4 Autonomy

The reason why some companies are working: "The reason why it works is because of how it works" Emphasis on self-direction.

ROWE--brainchild of Ressler & Thompson, who former human resource executives at Best Buy.

ROWE--results-only work environment. Management isn't walking around and seeing if people are in their offices. It's about creating conditions for people to do their best work. Giving employees a long leash.

People show up when they want to. They just have to get their work done. How they do it, when they do it, and where they do it is up to them.

After a few weeks, most people found their groove and productivity rose and stress declined. Retention rose. Freedom they have to do great work is more valuable than a pay raise.

Reason it works: Employees are focused on the work itself rather than on whether someone would call them a slacker for leaving at 3 pm to watch their daughters soccer game. Bulk of their employees are high-level creative types.

People still had specific goals they had to reach but decided against tying those goals to compensation.

Money was a “threshold motivator.”

Have you ever seen a six-month old or a one-year-old who’s not curious and self-directed? That’s how we are out of the box. If, at age fourteen or forty-three, we’re passive and inert, that’s not because it’s our nature. It’s because something flipped our default setting.

To fix this we must resist the temptation to control people and instead do everything we can to reawaken their deep-seated sense of autonomy.

Of the three needs cited by Deci and Ryan --autonomy is the most important. In fact, they moved away from categorizing behavior as either extrinsically motivated or intrinsically motivated and instead called it either controlled motivation or autonomous motivation.

Acting with a full sense of choice. Can be both autonomous and happily interdependent with others.

Autonomous motivation promotes greater conceptual understanding, better grades, enhanced persistence at school and in sporting activities, higher productivity, less burnout and greater levels of psychological well-being.

Bosses should offer “autonomy support”--meaning see issues from the employee’s point of view, give meaningful feedback and information, provide ample choice over what to do and how to do it, and encourage employees to take on new projects.

Don’t call it empowerment because that assumes the organization has the power and benevolently ladles some of it into waiting bowls of grateful employees. That’s not autonomy.

Flex time is a con game. Still control.

This era doesn’t call for better management. It calls for a renaissance of self-direction.

Type I for Organizations: Nine Ways to Improve Your Company, Office, or Group

Try “20 Percent time” with Training Wheels

Start with, say 10 percent time. That’s just one afternoon of a five-day workweek. Who among us hasn’t wasted that amount of time at work anyway? Commit for 6 months instead of indefinitely. By creating this island of autonomy, you’ll help people act on their great ideas and convert their downtime time more productive time.

Encourage Peer-To-Peer “Now That” Rewards

At any point, without asking permission, anyone in the company can award a \$50 bonus to any of her colleagues. “It works because it’s real-time, and it’s not handed down from any management.” “Any employee who does something exceptional receives recognition from their peers within minutes. They avoid the seven deadly flaws of most corporate carrots because these bonuses are noncontingent “now that” rewards.

Conduct an Autonomy Audit

Ask everyone in your department or on your team to respond to these four questions with a numerical ranking (0 to 10 with 0 meaning almost none and 10 meaning a huge amount).

How much autonomy do you have over your tasks at work--your main responsibilities and what you do in a given day?

How much autonomy do you have over your time at work--when you arrive, when you leave, and how you allocate your hours each day?

How much autonomy do you have over your team at work--to what extent are you able to choose the people you collaborate with?

How much autonomy do you have over your technique at work--how you actually perform the main responsibilities of your job?

Tabulate the results and determine employee average. The figure will fall somewhere on a 40-point autonomy scale.

Compare that number to people's perceptions. Also calculate separate results for task, time, team, and technique.

It is remarkable sometimes how little the people running organizations know about the experiences of people working around them. It is equally remarkable how often leaders are willing to do things differently if they see real data.

Include a section in your audit for employees to jot down their own ideas about increasing autonomy; you might even find some great solutions.

Take Three Steps Towards Giving Up Control

Type X bosses relish control. Type I bosses relinquish control.

Involve people in goal-setting. Would you rather set your own goals or have them foisted upon you? Bring employees into the process. People often have higher aims than the ones you assign them.

Use noncontrolling language. Don't say "must" or "should." Instead say "think about" or "consider" instead. A small change in wording can help promote engagement over compliance and might even reduce some people's urge to defy.

Hold office hours. Set aside one or two hours a week for employees to talk about anything on their mind.

Play “Whose Purpose is it Anyway?”

This is another exercise designed to close the gap between perception and reality. Gather your team, your department, or, if you can, all the employees in your outfit. Hand everyone a blank three-by-five card. Then ask each person to write down his or her one-sentence answer to the following question:

What is our company’s purpose?

Collect the cards and read them aloud. What do they tell you? Are the answers similar, everyone aligned along a common purpose? Or are they all over the place--some people believing one thing, others something completely different, and still others without even a guess? For all the talk about culture, alignment, and mission, most organizations do a pretty shabby job of assessing this aspect of their business. This simple inquiry can offer a glimpse into the soul of your enterprise. If people don’t know why they’re doing what they’re doing, how can you expect them to be motivated to do it?

Use Reich’s Pronoun Test

Former U.S. labor secretary Robert B. Reich has devised a smart, simple, (and free) diagnostic tool for measuring the health of an organization. When he talks to employees, he listens carefully for the pronouns they use. Do employees refer to their company as “they” or as “we”? “They” suggests at least some amount of disengagement, and perhaps even alienation. “We” suggests the opposite--that employees feel they’re part of something significant and meaningful. If you’re a boss, spend a few days listening to the people around you, not only in formal settings like meetings, but in the hallways and at lunch as well. Are you a “we” organization or a “they” organization? The difference matters. Everybody wants autonomy, mastery, and purpose. The thing is, “we” can get it -- but “they” can’t.

Design for Intrinsic Motivation

Design your web site and your office environment to tap into intrinsic motivation.

Create an environment that makes people feel good about participating.

Gives users autonomy

Keep the system as open as possible.

Promote Goldilocks for Groups

Almost everyone has experienced the satisfaction of a Goldilocks task--the kind that's neither too easy nor too hard, that delivers a delicious sense of flow. But sometimes it's difficult to replicate that experience when you're working in a team. People often end up doing the jobs they always do because they've proven they can do them well, and an unfortunate few get saddled with the flow-free tasks nobody else wants. Here are a few ways to bring a little Goldilocks to your group:

Begin with a diverse team. Set up work groups so that people will stimulate each other and learn from each other, so that they're not homogeneous in terms of their backgrounds and training. You want people who can really cross-fertilize each other's ideas.

Make your group a "no competition" zone. Pitting coworkers against one another in the hope that competition will spark them to perform better rarely works--and almost always undermines intrinsic motivation. If you're going to use a c-word, go with "collaboration" or "cooperation."

Try a little task-shifting. If someone is bored with her current assignment, see if he can train someone else in the skills he's already mastered. Then see if he can take on some aspect of a more experienced team member's work.

Animate with purpose, don't motivate with rewards. Nothing bonds a team like a shared mission. The more that people share a common cause--whether it's creating something insanely great, outperforming an outside competitor, or even changing the world--the more your group will do deeply satisfying and outstanding work.

Turn Your Next Off-Site Into a FedEx Day

Set aside an entire day where employees can work on anything they choose, however they want, with whomever they'd like. Make sure they have the tools and resources they need. And impose just one rule: People must deliver something--a new idea, a prototype of a product, a better internal process--the following day.

