

## “Drive”

Daniel H. Pink

Kindle Notes by Dave Kraft

Carrots and sticks—can work nicely for algorithmic tasks. But they can be devastating for heuristic ones. In other words, the central tenets of Motivation 2.0 may actually impair performance of the heuristic, right-brain work on which modern economies depend. Routine, not-so-interesting jobs require direction; non-routine, more interesting work depends on self-direction. Motivation 2.0 is similar. At its heart are two elegant and simple ideas: Rewarding an activity will get you more of it. Punishing an activity will get you less of it.“

Careful consideration of reward effects reported in 128 experiments lead to the conclusion that tangible rewards tend to have a substantially negative effect on intrinsic motivation. For artists, scientists, inventors, schoolchildren, 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. 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. The problem with making an extrinsic reward the only destination that matters is that some people will choose the quickest route there, even if it means taking the low road.

In fact, the business school professors suggest they 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. The very presence of goals may lead employees to focus myopically on short-term gains and to lose sight of the potential devastating long-term effects on the organization.

The essential requirement: Any extrinsic reward should be unexpected and offered only after the task is complete. 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. The Motivation 2.0 operating system depended on, and fostered, what I call Type X behavior. Type X behavior is fueled more by extrinsic desires than intrinsic ones. It concerns itself less with the inherent satisfaction of an activity and more with the external rewards to which that activity leads. The Motivation 3.0 operating system—the upgrade that’s needed to meet the new realities of how we organize, think about, and do what we do—depends on what I call Type I behavior.

Type I behavior is fueled more by intrinsic desires than extrinsic ones. Ultimately Type I behavior depends on three nutrients: **autonomy, mastery, and purpose.** Type I behavior is self-directed. It is devoted to becoming better and better at something that matters. And it connects that quest for excellence to a larger purpose.

On the edges of the economy—slowly, but inexorably—old-fashioned ideas of management are giving way to a newfangled emphasis on self-direction. Management isn't about walking around and seeing if people are in their offices.

It's about creating conditions for people to do their best work; resisting the temptation to control people—and instead doing everything we can to reawaken their deep-seated sense of autonomy. Autonomous motivation involves behaving with a full sense of volition and choice, whereas controlled motivation involves behaving with the experience of pressure and demand toward specific outcomes that comes from forces perceived to be external to the self. The ultimate freedom for creative groups is the freedom to experiment with new ideas. Some skeptics insist that innovation is expensive. In the long run, innovation is cheap. Mediocrity is expensive—and autonomy can be the antidote. Even in high-poverty non-Western locales like Bangladesh, social scientists have found that autonomy is something that people seek and that improves their lives. Perhaps it's time to toss the very word “management” onto the linguistic ash heap alongside “icebox” and “horseless carriage.” This era doesn't call for better management. It calls for a renaissance of self-direction.

But beyond that, money is not a motivator. What matters are these other features.” And what a few future-facing businesses are discovering is that one of these essential features is autonomy—in particular, autonomy over four aspects of work: what people do, when they do it, how they do it, and whom they do it with. Type I behavior emerges when people have autonomy over the four T's: their task, time, technique, and team. In the 1930s and 1940s, 3M's president and chairman was William McKnight, a fellow who was as unassuming in his manner as he was visionary in his thinking. McKnight believed in a simple, and at the time, subversive, credo: “Hire good people, and leave them alone.” For non-routine tasks, including law, the link between how much time somebody spends and what that somebody produces is irregular and unpredictable.

Without sovereignty over our time, it's nearly impossible to have autonomy over our lives. What Zappos is doing is part of a small but growing move to restore some measure of individual freedom in jobs usually known for the lack of it. Ample research has shown that people working in self-organized teams are more satisfied than those working in inherited teams. Encouraging autonomy doesn't mean discouraging accountability. We're born to be players, not pawns.

We're meant to be autonomous individuals, not individual automatons. The opposite of autonomy is control. And since they sit at different poles of the behavioral compass, they point us toward different destinations. Control leads to compliance; autonomy leads to engagement.

The second element of Type I behavior: mastery—the desire to get better and better at something that matters. Where Motivation 2.0 sought compliance, Motivation 3.0 seeks engagement. Living a satisfying life requires more than simply meeting the demands of those in control. Yet in our offices and our classrooms we have way too much compliance and way too little engagement.“

The desire to do something because you find it deeply satisfying and personally challenging inspires the highest levels of creativity, whether it's in the arts, sciences, or business. For example, Stefan Falk, a vice president at Ericsson, the Swedish telecommunications concern, used the principles of flow to smooth a merger of the company's business units. He persuaded managers to configure work assignments so that employees had clear objectives and a way to get quick feedback. And instead of meeting with their charges for once-a-year performance reviews, managers sat down with employees one-on-one six times a year, often for as long as ninety minutes, to discuss their level of engagement and path toward mastery.

He developed a method of training managers in how flow worked. Then he required them to meet with staff once a month to get a sense of whether people were overwhelmed or underwhelmed with their work—and to adjust assignments to help them find flow. One source of frustration in the workplace is the frequent mismatch between what people must do and what people can do. When what they must do exceeds their capabilities, the result is anxiety. When what they must do falls short of their capabilities, the result is boredom. Mastery is a mindset. Type X behavior often holds an entity theory of intelligence, prefers performance goals to learning goals, and disdains effort as a sign of weakness.

Type I behavior has an incremental theory of intelligence, prizes learning goals over performance goals, and welcomes effort as a way to improve at something that matters. Begin with one mindset, and mastery is impossible. Begin with the other, and it can be inevitable. Mastery Is a Pain

Whereas the importance of working harder is easily apprehended, the importance of working longer without switching objectives may be less perceptible. In every field, grit may be as essential as talent to high accomplishment. Being a professional," Julius Erving once said, "is doing the things you love to do, on the days you don't feel like doing them." The experiment suggests that flow, the deep sense of engagement that Motivation 3.0 calls for, isn't a nicety. It's a necessity. We need it to survive. It is the oxygen of the soul. Autonomous people working toward mastery perform at very high levels. But those who do so in the service of some greater objective can achieve even more. This is the final big distinction between the two operating systems. Motivation 2.0 centered on profit maximization. Motivation 3.0 doesn't reject profits, but it places equal emphasis on purpose maximization.

In 1962, Clare Boothe Luce, one of the first women to serve in the U.S. Congress, offered some advice to President John F. Kennedy. "A great man," she told him, "is one sentence." Abraham Lincoln's sentence was: "He preserved the union and freed the slaves." Franklin Roosevelt's was: "He lifted us out of a great depression and helped us win a world war." Luce feared that Kennedy's attention was so splintered among different priorities that his sentence risked becoming a muddled paragraph. One way to orient your life toward greater purpose is to think about your sentence. Make sure you understand how every aspect of your work relates to your larger purpose.

In his insightful book *Rules of Thumb*, *Fast Company* magazine cofounder Alan Webber offers a smart and simple exercise for assessing whether you're on the path to autonomy, mastery, and purpose. Get a few blank three-by-five-inch cards. On one of the cards, write your answer to this question: "What gets you up in the morning?" Now, on the other side of the card, write your answer to another question: "What keeps you up at night?" Pare each response to a single sentence. And if you don't like an answer, toss the card and try again until you've crafted something you can live with. Then read what you've produced. If both answers give you a sense of meaning and direction, "Congratulations!" says Webber. "Use them as your compass, checking from time to time to see if they're still true. If you don't like one or both of your answers, it opens up a new question: What are you going to do about it?"

Type X bosses relish control. Type I bosses relinquish control. Good grades become a reward for compliance—but don't have much to do with learning.

Jim Collins suggests four basic practices for creating a culture where self-motivation can flourish:

1. "Lead with questions, not answers."
2. "Engage in dialogue and debate, not coercion."
3. "Conduct autopsies, without blame."
4. "Build 'red flag' mechanisms."

In other words, make it easy for employees and customers to speak up when they identify a problem. ROWE, described in Chapter 4, affords employees complete autonomy over when, where, and how they do their work. The only thing that matters is results. Carrots & sticks are so last century. Drive says for 21st century work, we need to upgrade to autonomy, mastery & purpose.