

# Disrupt Yourself Podcast

## EPISODE 194: ROGER MARTIN

Welcome to the Disrupt Yourself podcast, a podcast where we discuss strategies and advice for how to climb the S curve of Learning™ in your professional and personal life, disrupting who you are now to slingshot into who you want to be.

I'm your host, Whitney Johnson. And today we are joined by Roger Martin.

Roger is the former dean of the Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto. He was named the world's number one management thinker by Thinkers 50, a global ranking of management thinkers in 2017. He's written 28 articles for the Harvard Business Review and published 11 books. His latest book has an intriguing title, When More Is Not Better. The idea is that we're actually better off with things not being perfect.

This place where we're willing to be in the sweet spot consistently, which often feels like the launch point of an S curve, figuring things out rather than pining for the perceived perfection at the high end of the curve. He's talking about this from an economic perspective, but it also applies to the individual. Roger believes a little friction or disruption is a good thing. And I, of course, agree.

Roger, you have a new book out called When More Is Not Better. Can you tell us what that means and why this idea is important to you?

**Roger Martin:** Well, what it means, Whitney, is that more ice cream is often better, but at a certain point, more ice cream doesn't become better.

And that's the same thing for efficiency. So the modern economy is pursuing efficiency, which has many good things about it. But when you get too much of an obsessive pursuit of it, it turns from good to bad. And the way it turns to bad is it produces more extreme outcomes that aren't good for the functioning of democratic capitalism, including more single firms dominating industries, more wealth going to the very rich instead of to the to the median families. That's when more stops being better.

**Whitney Johnson:** Ok, so in your book, you tell the story about your father and an experience that you had with him, that seems like it really set the stage for this thesis and this big idea of yours. Can you tell us what happened?

**Roger Martin:** Yeah. So, my dad started a company when I was two years old, and it was, of course, a very small company when, when I was growing up.

It's gotten bigger now and my older brother now runs it.

But at the time, my older brother had joined the, join the firm and, and was contemplating building another feed mill beside the existing one so that we could expand our capacity quite dramatically.

And Rick, my older brother, was all enthused about it. And Dad was, was kind of reluctant. And I asked him point blank, I said, "Dad, are you worried that this is going to be a bad investment? Are you worried that we can't make a go of this and we'd be spending kind of money and getting into debt or whatever?" I was baffled.

And he said, "Oh, no, no, no, I'm sure it will be extremely successful, but I want to be careful. The farmers need the security of supply. This industry is critical to that. Yes, we want to be highly competitive. We'd love to be number one, but we don't want to grow so much that we put others out of business because that wouldn't be good for the farmers. And by the way, Roger, you know, you remember when the mill burned down..." Which I did. "Well, those competitors that I would put out of business actually produced feed for me to be able to sell to my customers while we were rebuilding the mill. And that's the kind of system we need. One where there are people to help out and farmers aren't dependent on just one supplier."

And I thought, "Well, that's, that's interesting, Dad." It made a lot of sense to me. On one hand, Dad could be so interested in being highly competitive. He wanted to be successful, wanted to be number one, if he could, in market share, but not to the extent of being so obsessed about it that he would make it worse for the long-term future of the industry and the farmers who depended on it.

**Whitney Johnson:** Ok, I have to pause for just a second because I just heard you say that your mill burned down and when it burned down your family's competitors to your business, made feed available to your father to sell. Did I hear that right?

**Roger Martin:** You heard that, that right. And when the shoe is on the other foot, dad did that for his customers. Sadly, the feed mills burned down more, more often than you, we wish. The combination of, of fine dust and heavy machinery ends up making this happen. But yes, you heard me exactly right, Whitney.

**Whitney Johnson:** So, this is the thesis of your book: when more is not better. Your father said, "I could put them out of business, but I'm not going to because that kind of more is not necessarily better for us, for our community and for our customers."

**Roger Martin:** Yeah, I like this thesis, I didn't think of it that that way, but it probably was always in the back of my mind. And when it came to writing the book, that story illustrated the point very well. I thought so. That's why it's, why it's in the book. But you have probably figured out the broader implication of it.

**Whitney Johnson:** So you, you have this thesis now and you're trying to solve this problem and can you just talk us through sort of at a broader economic level what problem you're trying to solve?

And then, and then we're going to talk about the solutions. But if you can talk about the broader economic problem that you're seeing.

**Roger Martin:** Sure. The, I mean, the problem that I'm trying to solve is to give democratic capitalism the future I think it deserves, which is a positive future. And I think the combination of democracy and capitalism, I think necessitates that the median family in America moves forward kind of smartly, economically over time. Why is that important? Well, because in some sense, the median family is the swing voter. Now, I know it's not exactly that family, but it's the families around the median that help one party or another gain the right to govern. That's, that's the nature of democracy. And so if that band around the median, those families feel that the system that's in place now is working for them, they'll vote to perpetuate it. And up until 1976, it was working for that band. For as long as

we were measuring median family income, it had been growing at a clip of 2.4 percent compound annual real. And what does that really mean? It means doubling in real terms in 30 years or approximately one generation. So that was the story of America, arguably in its first 200 years, was that the average family, the median family in the country, was moving ahead smartly.

Then in the mid 70s, something happened that changed this dramatically and a bunch of things seem to have happened around the same time to change this so that the, the rate of increase and median family income has declined precipitously to a quarter of what it was before. And what that means is now median family income is doubling at a rate of only one hundred years, a century, three plus generations. And so, the problem now is that we have the swing voter, the people around the median less convinced that this democratic capitalist system actually works for them. And my, my view is, once they decide it doesn't work for them, they'll start experimenting with other fundamental systems. And, you know, I started this work in 2013. And in 2013, you didn't have large swaths of especially younger voters saying, "Hey, you know, socialism, that wouldn't be too bad. We could try socialism." Right? So, I'm fearful that we're seeing signs already of this discouragement in the working of the system.

**Whitney Johnson:** Yeah. In your book, you said something I thought was really powerful. You said, "American capitalism requires the consent of the majority of American citizens. If 51 percent or more experienced stagnation versus growth, they will defect from capitalism." And so, what I hear you saying is that in 2016, people started experimenting with that defection. And so, what are you seeing with 2020? Where, where are we in that experiment thus far?

**Roger Martin:** I think it's hard to tell what a new administration will or will not actually do. So, we'll sort of have to wait to see. I would say that one way of interpreting this election is people casting a vote for an answer that makes them feel more comfortable about the future. And of course, whoever is declared officially, officially to have won this would, would know that it would split right down the middle, right? There wasn't a consensus on one side or the other, but a relatively close vote. So, lots of people casting a vote and having different views of what's required to, to fix it.

**Whitney Johnson:** But you do have a solution. So that's what we're going to talk about. You, you talk about in the book how you would solve this. And can you talk us through your solution? What are your thoughts?

**Roger Martin:** Well, one thing we have to do is, I think abandon the dominant model that we've used to guide the way we think about manage the economy and businesses. And that is this model of the economy as a machine. And what I mean by that, I mean, it's a sort of a perfectible machine. You can break it down to minute subsystems, make each piece as efficient as possible. Hand them back up and voila, you'll have a super-efficient economy. And what that's done is caused us to create silos, both in economic policy, world trade policy, thought of independently from fiscal policy and labor policy and environmental regulation. They're all, they're all silos where everybody says, "I got to fix this silo and in business the same thing, marketing, sales, accounting, et cetera." And there's a view that you can make them perfect. And the tool we've used to make them perfect is pursuing efficiency until the point we get to a perfect level of efficiency.

I argue in the book that that is just a completely flawed and naive model of the economy or of a business within that economy. They're not machines that are perfectible. They're complex adaptive systems, either systems where all the pieces fit together. They are complex in that it is really hard to tell how one thing influences another thing and they're adaptive. Whatever the system is in place, the set of rules that's in place, the actors in it will adapt to that and change their behavior. So, even if you had an answer to a given problem or issue in the, in the system, it may change by the time that solution gets in place.

**Whitney Johnson:** We need to stop thinking about our economy as a machine and think of it as an adaptive system. And then you cite three design principles that you would suggest that we consider. Could you talk through each of those?

**Roger Martin:** Sure. So, what I say is we've got to strive for a balance between this obsessive pursuit of efficiency and the pursuit of resilience, the ability to change, modify over time and be resilient shocks to the system. And that requires balancing three different things. One would be pressure and friction. So, we've adopted a notion that if we

can increase the pressure on the economy, it'll become more efficient and that'll be better. So, we will open up trade, we will deregulate, we will allow mergers if they make the merged entities more efficient. So, we keep putting more and more pressure for efficiency onto the market. We need to balance that with friction with the idea that actually some barriers to going more obsessively faster are actually good barriers for us. Is it like putting a governor on a, on a, on a vehicle so that it doesn't go too fast, right? That's friction that you're putting in place because it's better for the resilience of it. It's going to make it less likely that it'll crash. That's what they do. And they highly banked tracks and, and NASCAR put a, put a restrictor plates on the carburetor so that they can go less fast and they can go on less than tracks because they need to keep the drivers safer. So, not just saying pressuring it more to get ever more efficiency, that's not always the better answer. Friction is its balance.

**Whitney Johnson:** Yeah, one of the things I'm wondering, Roger, is I'm listening to you. You know, this this with COVID, there's been all sorts of friction that's been introduced into the system, which is definitely an understatement. But I do wonder if in some ways, I mean, given what you're saying, that friction has its positives and long-term increases, the resilience certainly of the human beings.

**Roger Martin:** One, I think your analysis is bang on. And two, I guess I would just make the general point that I do think people are stepping back and asking a lot of questions going, "Remind me again why we used to do things the way we did?" And I think the kinds of things that people are figuring out, like it arguably is more efficient to have everybody from who works at you pick the downtown Manhattan bank, JPMorgan Chase, everybody, every day come in from New Jersey, Connecticut, Upper West Side, where or wherever, so that your meetings can be more efficient in your boardroom at JP Morgan Chase and Midtown. But does that make for the maximum amount of resilience where those moms and dads are commuting for two or three hours a day? So that has efficiency in one narrow sense. And that's again, what my book focuses on is when you measure efficiency really narrowly. It is efficient for us to get the people together for a meeting. Sure is if they're in the building. But at a broader level, is that going to be kind of long term efficient? Well, it only will be if it's resilient and I don't know about you, Whitney, but I know a lot of senior executives who say, "I'm never doing that again. I'm not going to be in the office five days a week. One day, two days a week. Yeah. Five? No." And so, that is implicitly a balance of pressure and friction, I think.

**Whitney Johnson:** Let's go to the second one. The second thing that you suggest.

**Roger Martin:** Sure. And that's balancing the drive for perfection with the desire for improvement. So, if you've got this model of machine, you tend to think of machines as perfectible and you can be working on them until they become the perfect thing. And we know perfectly how they work. Well, the economy isn't a machine and it's not perfectible.

But you can improve it, right? You can keep tweaking and tweaking and improve it.

That's what we should be striving for. And so, for example, in public policy, if you sort of think about the, the nature of the dialog around things that that Congress tends to do, they tend to kind of promote them as the perfect fix for something. So, Sarbanes-Oxley came in after the dot com crash and the thought was, "Oh, there's a bunch of things that, that companies could kind of get away with that, that caused that crash. We were going to put in Sarbanes-Oxley in place. And that will fix the problem." Well, how did that work out? Who did a bunch of things under Sarbanes-Oxley that ended up rather than having the next great market crash in the 70 years between Black Monday in 1929 and dotcom bust, seven years to have an even bigger crash? Well, that's because it is not possible to create perfection. So, let's stop making that assumption and instead say, "Here's the problem that this legislation is designed to address. We know it's going to be wrong in certain respects because it is a complex adaptive system and we can't figure out in advance everything. And we are going to revisit this and tweak it and tweak it and tweak it to make it ever better." I use the example in the book of Canada on this front.

Canada's most important financial services regulation is the Bank Act, which is a super comprehensive act that covers the financial services sector quite broadly. So, it's like a whole bunch of US regulations about financial services all wrapped into one. What was the wisdom of that? That was put in place in 1871, four years after Canada became a country. And it had embedded in it the requirement that the government do a formal in-depth review every 10 years of the bank act and come up with revisions that would make it more suitable for the market at that

point. And that worked so well that they reduced it to five years in 1992. And as people may or may not realize, in the global financial crisis where most European banks, the US banks kind of melted down, required gigantic bailouts. North of the border, there were no bailouts, no financial distress whatsoever. And I believe that that was partially, not entirely, but partially because we had in Canada banking legislation that had been tweaked less than five years before that. And we weren't dealing with antiquated regulations that have been put in place as if it was perfect for the future.

**Whitney Johnson:** Why do you think that matters so much, Roger? Because I think this is really interesting. You say, "Perfection is an unrealistic goal with the downside of creating a paradise for gamers. When you perceive something to be perfect, you give gamers more time to enrich themselves at the system's expense." What are your thoughts?

**Roger Martin:** Yeah, so when I talk about a complex adaptive system and the adaptation there is that players in the system adapt to it to make it work best possible for them. When you have a system that is more rigid, when people say, "Aha, this is going to be in place for a long time." It's a better area to invest in taking advantage of it, exploiting it. So, when the Fed decided in the wake of the dotcom recession, 2002, the economy (inaudible), Fed said, "We're going to keep interest rates low and announce that... We're going to keep interest rates low to stimulate the economy to help us recover from this this downturn." Well, there were people who said, "Ahhh, what we can do is essentially take advantage of this by doing more and more mortgage loans to customers who have less and less qualifications for that loan. So there was an adaptation to it, which is the creation of this entire industry of subprime, as they were called, subprime mortgages. That just didn't happen because of random. It happened as a reaction to it. And a whole bunch of people essentially gamed a system that had been put in place by the Fed, which created the bubble that caused the global financial crisis. Now, if instead the FED would have been in the mode of saying, "This is our intention, we're going to try and go in with lower interest rates."

But instead of saying, "I'm done now," would have been watching very carefully for the gaming and shutting down the gamers immediately then we wouldn't have had the gigantic financial crisis that we produced. We actually produced that crisis that made it in the previous book this allusion to the National Football League as a competition committee. And it's really a great model for this. It sits down at the end of every year and says, "How do we have to tweak the rules to prevent people who have figured out how to game the current rules in a way that while completely, completely legal and not unethical or anything, might damage the game?" I love that because that is seeking improvement, not perfection. The competition company doesn't say, "We'll think really hard. We'll have a special year where we spend the entire year doing nothing but thinking hard about getting the perfect set of rules." Instead, the competition committee says, "We have no idea what these clever coaches are going to come up with, no idea, and all we can say is they're not going to be able to do anything for more than a year without us doing something about it."

**Whitney Johnson:** Oh, that's so good.

**Roger Martin:** I wish that Congress would just take that as its attitude because we'll get closer to perfection here. Here's one of the great ironies, Whitney. The pursuit of perfection is not correlated with achievement of perfection. The pursuit of improvement will get you closer to perfection than the pursuit of perfection.

**Whitney Johnson:** So good. All right, so we've got design for complexity, design for adaptivity, the third one is design for systemic structure. What does that mean?

**Roger Martin:** Well, I think what you've got to do is understand that it's a system and recognize that some amount of connectedness is good and some amount of separation it's good. So we've been on a mode, I think, where we've been viewing that ever more connectedness is great. So ever lower trade barriers is great, connecting all economies, that is a good thing, for example. Well, I think a certain amount of separation is a good thing because we now know lots more about what, what completely free trade does. Economists long believed, "Well, the gains from trade are going to be good enough that, it'll be make everybody better off." Well, we now know it doesn't. If you are an uneducated or undereducated worker in an industry that has been open to trade, you will never get back the economic standing that you had before that change. Never, even though never a long time. So, we have to think more carefully about how connected we want the world economy. Also on the other side, we've got to recognize that

things are connected to one another. And we've pursued separation to an extent that is unhelpful. We've done this in business. We've silo-ized this business. We've done this in education where we silo-ized education. So, we've got to be careful of this sort of tendency towards reductionism that leaves us not understanding the connectedness between pieces and then understand the downsides of incredibly, tightly coupling everything. We learned that in the global financial crisis, right? That coupling everything together meant that, that the crisis rippled through the economy and almost destroyed the economy in the capital markets. So once again, it's back to, back to the same thing. It's balance. Balance of efficiency and resilience. Balance, pressure and friction. Balance perfection and improvement. Balance connectedness and separation. If you believe that one of those things is absolutely superior to the other and will pursue a maximum amount of it, bad things will happen.

**Whitney Johnson:** That's going to be the take away: bad things will happen.

**Roger Martin:** That is right.

**Whitney Johnson:** All right. So let's, let's figure out how to have some good things happen as we start to, start to wrap up.

So, so let's do some practical application. I'm going to ask you, first of all, in business and then education and for us as private citizens, I think certainly as Americans, we have this exceptionalism idea. And how do we get ourselves from thinking we're perfect a little bit and thinking of ourselves as this adaptive system? But let's start with business. What, you know, if you were talking to people and let's do politics as well. So, business, politics, education and private citizens, what are one thing as people are listening to you saying, "I am sold." I just got a Slack message from Melissa, who's our producer listening to this. She's like, "I'm sold!" So what do we do? Give us give us some suggestions on for business. What's one thing you can do?

**Roger Martin:** Sure. So business four things for business. But the one, the one maybe I'll focus on is recognize that slack is not the enemy. So, what, what business has been on this kick of is this efficiency kick that says, "We must eliminate all slack because slack is waste and so we've got to get labor rates down as far as possible, get inventories down as far as possible. Every piece of slack is the enemy." It's not. The great guru, And you know his work well, Whitney. W. Edwards Deming, a great quality guru who was into getting waste out of the system, also said there's an optimal level of slack in every system and it is not zero. We're treating it as if it's zero. It's not. That makes you anything but resilient. So, recognize that slack is not the enemy. Recognize that you need an optimal level of slack, not a minimum level of slack. And so if you're a hospital, don't take that last nurse out of the system. Don't take all (inaudible) of the out of the stock rooms because that is slack and therefore it's wasteful. It helps you be resilient. For public policy for politicians, I would go back to the revisions point that we made earlier. That, that would be the most important to have an attitude that says, "We don't believe that any law that we make, literally, any law that we make will stand up to all the adaptation that will go on."

And so, it is no shame to tweak to say, "We're going to revisit." And I would write a necessary revision into everything. So it's not political. Back to the Bank Act in Canada. It's not political when the Conservative Party says, "it's whatever, you know, it's 2021 and it's time to review the bank act." It's because the law says that you have to and if it happens to be liberals at the time, the liberals have to do it. So, it takes it out of the political domain. Is politics completely out of it the way they will review it and revise it? No, of course, that there is some to it, but it doesn't make it a political thing. I mean...

**Whitney Johnson:** Right. Right.

**Roger Martin:** Think of Obamacare, right?

**Whitney Johnson:** Hmm.

**Roger Martin:** Republicans say, "It's political. We want to repeal and replace." What if instead when Obamacare was put in place that there was a need to review and revise? Then people wouldn't have been saying, "I have to eliminate it because I don't like some things about it."

There would be a requirement to tweak it and improve it. That would have been good for America.

I'm not siding on either side of this other than to say the dialog, the nature of the dialog around Obamacare has not made America better, right?

**Whitney Johnson:** Yeah.

Yeah. And that's the problem. It's how we're having the dialog is, is, is the challenge.

**Roger Martin:** Yeah.

And it gets back to we have to put so much energy into getting our legislation in place because it's going to be permanent. And everybody fights and fights and fight to the death because it's going to be there for one hundred years. You wouldn't fight to death. Yeah, experiment and tweak and tweak. For educators, the thing I would add, it's just temper your inclination to teach certainty. Right? When you think about it, Whitney, just think back to your educational experience. You were taught in most of your courses what the right answer is.

**Whitney Johnson:** Right.

**Roger Martin:** As if we know. And how many quizzes did you have that were either actually multiple choice or sort of kind of multiple choice?

**Whitney Johnson:** Yeah.

**Roger Martin:** A, B, D and E are the wrong answer and C is the right answer. You got to get to it. Very little in life has that level of certainty and even the things we're certain about. We did teach Newton certainly right about physics for 175 years. Right. Until this goofy little guy with fuzzy hair and sock wearing...

**Whitney Johnson:** An upstart Einstein.

**Roger Martin:** ... patent clerk, no less said, "Well, it's mainly right, but not entirely right." So, even on the things where we think there's a certain answer, there isn't, actually. And so let's just stop it with that and teach the kids that there are only answers that are better and worse, and your job is to keep making your answers better, recognizing that whenever you get to a better answer, somebody is going to come up with a still better one later. So even if you're Sir Isaac Newton, like one smart dude, there's going to be this other smart dude that comes along later and says, "Here's a way to tweak it to improve of your model."

That's what we've got to do. And lastly, on citizens.

**Whitney Johnson:** Yeah.

**Roger Martin:** It's just utilize your purchasing power in a, in a I think a more strategic way. And here I'd point to multihoming, not my idea of Rayford and Tim Sullivan's idea, as I say in the book. But if you start buying all of your stuff off of Amazon Prime, you are contributing mightily to the creation of a monopoly that you're not going to like as it gets more monopolistically powerful, which is already happening with Amazon, right?

**Whitney Johnson:** Mm hmm.

**Roger Martin:** By 50 percent of your stuff, 60 percent of your stuff is necessary. But go to your local store for some, your chain, national chain retailer for some, another online source for another multi home. You're like over take over some of the time but Lyft and taxes other, other times. If you like Facebook for your news feed, sure, but subscribe to your local newspaper. If everybody did that, we wouldn't have these extreme outcomes that we're currently getting. Because when you take all of your economic purchasing power and giving it to, give it to somebody, you're making them more powerful, make it more likely that other people will do that. And you get this extreme distribution and you can actually stop it. With your own purchasing power, so those are just four of the 18

recommendations I make in the book, across those four categories of business leaders, politicians, educators and citizens.

**Whitney Johnson:** So practical and to the question on Americans in particular who think we have it figured out in many ways, um, suggestions, and maybe it's on the purchasing power piece, but does anything sort of bigger picture come to mind from a meta-perspective?

**Roger Martin:** Sure.

Well, I guess I see an America that was set up knowingly as a great experiment, right? They even called it that. And then it was set up with a legal system that, you know, kind of what's common law. Tweak, tweak, tweak, tweak, tweak. Right? Constitution. What is the Constitution have a whole slew of? Amendments to it. I think the American tradition is tweak, tweak, tweak, keep on making it better. And so I sometimes think Americans should be able to naturally embrace the theme of the book, which is also practical. America is nothing, if not a practical nation. "If it works, let's do more of it if it doesn't, let's, let's try something else." So I think it's lean into the things that have made America great. The division of powers, I think, is the great example of connectedness and separation. So, I think if anything that's happened in the last 50 years, we have moved away from the spirit of the founding of the country.

Now, that may be too big a political statement, but it feels like we've taken something that was thought about in a very holistic way early on and silo-ized it. Applied economic rules that even Adam Smith and David Ricardo would have never said you should have, should apply in sort of a technocratic interpretation of the American system.

So I think we've got all the seeds necessary to reverse course and have democratic capitalism. Have a great next era.

**Whitney Johnson:** Any final, final thoughts? I think this is a wonderful wrap up, so I just wanted to give you a chance to see if there's anything else that you wanted to share.

**Roger Martin:** My admonition at the end is: start small. I... Don't start with the hardest possible thing to do, just start taking small steps in the right direction to provide encouragement to yourself that you should keep on taking steps and you'll go the farthest. If you obsess about, "What is the one grand gesture that I have to do?" You'll probably never do it. And if you do it, it'll probably disappoint you because grand gestures are not what works here. It's taking small steps in the right direction.

**Whitney Johnson:** Roger Martin, thank you for being with us.

**Roger Martin:** Whitney, it is always a pleasure to do anything with you.

---

Roger's thesis reminds me of Aristotle's argument for virtues being found in the mean. I'm simplifying, of course, but according to Aristotle, virtue lies in the mean or balance between deficiency and excess. The virtue of bravery, for example, can be found between the deficiency of cowardice and the excessive confidence moving too far in either direction can lead to disastrous outcomes.

I think Roger's father knew this instinctively, at least. Teaching Roger that growth at the expense of others in the health of the system, it weakens the overall system. The U.S. economy tends to reward large organizations that put smaller operations out of business. And this new, less competitive world, innovation may improve in the short run, but without friction, without disruption, long-term innovation suffers. The system suffers. People suffer.

For democratic capitalism to work, we need to seek improvement, not perfection. To see the economy not as a perfectible machine, but as a complex adaptive system where we're finding a balance between efficiency and resilience.



I think what he's telling us is that we need to step back to grow.

Yes, it can be scary, but if we're willing to not think about being at the top of the S curve as an economy, disruption being a defect in our machine, that would otherwise be perfect, but rather as an opportunity for us to stay in the sweet spot as we relentlessly tweak and assiduously adapt. That kind of more is definitely better for the economy and for us as individuals.

You know what else more of is better? Books. As a way of showing appreciation to you, Roger has kindly agreed to make five copies of his book available.

If you'd like to be eligible for one of those copies follow me on Instagram @johnsonwhitney and tell me what you appreciated about today's episode.

Thank you again to Roger Martin for being our guest.

Thank you to our team, Jennifer Brotherson, Emily Cottrell, Steve Ludwig, Dan Rutty, Melissa Rutty and Nancy Wilson.

I'm Whitney Johnson  
and this is Disrupt Yourself.