

# HOMework FOR A NEW SEASON

On the pages that follow and the enclosed booklet you'll find ideas. Challenges. Opportunities for yourself and your company.

We've chosen these excerpts because they chart a new course for business. We've given them to you because, for this new season to be successful, every one of us has to start thinking and changing. It's not enough for the president to change. It's not enough for the managers to change. Everyone must change.

Change will take time. But we're starting here with some fresh ideas.

Read the booklet and the excerpts. We've included some comments and questions on the left-hand side of each page to guide your reading. We've emphasized some key ideas. But you will find even more. Grab a pencil or high-lighter and mark the items that challenge or bother you. Read with your brain in gear. Look for things that can help us change.

We start with a direct question: How can we get ordinary people to do extraordinary things? That's the theme for these readings. Look for answers in the excerpts and in the booklet. On the last page, write down your conclusions. We'll discuss your answers when we meet in Atlanta.

It's a new season. Look for new ideas.

---



## ORDINARY PEOPLE DOING EXTRAORDINARY THINGS

How can *we* get ordinary people to do extraordinary things? How can *you* do extraordinary things? Greenwalt gives some hints. But you need to read the rest of the excerpts and the booklet to find more.

As you read these paragraphs, mark the ways that companies and thinkers found to be extraordinary.

An organization does not flourish by virtue of the superior talents it enlists. All organizations fish in the same general pool and it is unlikely that any nets a catch appreciably better than others. Its advancement will derive from having provided for its people a climate of achievement in which *men of ordinary stature are somehow stimulated to extraordinary performance*. The extent to which any given individual can produce beyond his rated capacity may be very small, yet the sum of these, added together, will make the difference between a great organization and an indifferent one.

Obviously this process, through which *common men perform uncommon deeds*, cannot endure in the face of anything that deprives the individual of his dignity or his importance. Nor can it exist in our intricate day and age in an atmosphere of anarchy which ignores the need for close relationship and group effort. Somewhere between the two lies the middle ground through which men can find their way to satisfying careers and on which the organization can find its most effective pace.

In our organization we put *the highest possible premium on ideas, fresh and original ideas that are important to the extent that they do not mirror traditional thinking*. We are not conscious of any inhibiting restrictions. I have yet to see a man make his way to the upper levels by conforming to any precast or prefabricated mold. I have seen many fail by following such a course. And I have seen far more fail by pursuing conventional approaches than I have ever seen fail by ignoring them.

Crawford H. Greenwalt, *The Individual and the Organization*, 1961.

## NEW PIONEERS

What does it take to be a pioneering business?

Look for how many times in these readings people talk about dealing with complexity, chaos and change. Here it's "dizzying." Other places it's "discombobulation" or "pandemonium." Notice how people not only endure change, but thrive on it.

Today's pioneers have embarked on a new frontier, some in search of riches, others in search of freedom, all in search of the new. Unlike the West of old this frontier is not one of place. It is a frontier of technologies, ideas, and values. The new pioneers celebrate individuality over conformity among their employees and customers alike. They deploy technology to distribute rather than consolidate authority and creativity. They compete through resilience instead of resistance, through adaptation instead of control. In a time of dizzying complexity and change, they realize that tightly drawn strategies become brittle while shared purpose endures. Capitalism, in short, is merging with humanism.

Tom Petzinger, *The New Pioneers*, 1999, p. 17.

## EXAMPLE: ROWE FURNITURE AND A NEW PROCESS

What's different about this factory? How did these people end up doing something extraordinary? Were they super-workers? What made the difference? How can it make a difference for us?

After several weeks of plant-wide pandemonium [at the Rowe Furniture plant in West Virginia], the pieces at last fell into place, causing productivity and quality to shoot through the roof. Before long the factory was delivering custom-made goods to the consumer within thirty days; several months later the lead time had reached merely ten days, a stunning accomplishment in an industry accustomed to working on lead times of as long as six months. *A culture of speed permeated the plant*. When a technology specialist named Ken Potter wanted to install a state-of-the-art frame-cutting tool, he was stunned to win management's instant approval. "It's exciting to feel like you're on the cutting edge," he said as the new computer-controlled machine buzzed behind him. "In the past we were told to wait until someone else in the industry got one."

The Rowe Furniture turnaround is meaningful on many levels. It dramatizes the range of initiative that people display when freed to do their best work. It reveals the creative power of human interaction. It suggests that efficiency is intrinsic; that people are naturally productive; that when inspired with vision, equipped with the right tools, and guided by information about their own performance, people will build on each other's actions to a more efficient result than any single brain could design. In fact it's rather like saying that being good in business calls on being good at being human.

Tom Petzinger, *The New Pioneers*, 1999, pp. 31-32.

#### EXAMPLE: BANK OF BOULDER AND BOLD CUSTOMER SERVICE

What did Steve Bosley do differently than everyone else? Did he follow their lead or pioneer his own way? How did his bank become extraordinary?

Responding to customers may involve nothing more complex than pure human empathy. A banker I know in Colorado, Steve Bosley, built a tiny community institution called the Bank of Boulder into a regional powerhouse by projecting himself into the position of his customers. For one, Bosley preferred conducting his own banking in front of a human teller. When other banks began cutting back on drive-through teller windows in favor of ATM machines, he went the other way, expanding drive-through service with live tellers twenty-four hours a day. The service was not profitable in itself, but it generated an image of customer service that advertisements could never buy. Bosley launched a ten-kilometer run called the Boulder Boulder, which became one of the most popular in the world, drawing thousands of contestants into his bank branches every year for entry forms. He offered an extra quarter-point of interest on certain certificates of deposit when the University of Colorado won a big game, the kind of premium that cost very little but that drew massive deposits to the bank.

Once, running just a little behind schedule, Bosley found himself banging on the door of a dry cleaner at one minute past closing as a punk clerk inside the store silently shook his head and pointed to his watch; from that moment forward the Bank of Boulder never closed a branch door earlier than 5:39 P.M. Does this stuff pay off? Always a moneymaker, the Bank of Boulder was once ranked the most profitable community bank among the thousands in America.

Tom Petzinger, *The New Pioneers*, 1999, pp. 80-81.

#### EXAMPLE: TOYOTA AND QUALITY CRAFTSMEN

Here's a good example of a production process. What does Toyota do to make its process both fast *and* good? No doubt, they are staffed with ordinary people. How are they doing extraordinary things?

Yet, in all this haste, each worker [in Toyota City] has the power to bring the assembly line to a halt, pulling a wire above his head if he (there are no women to be seen) spots a fault. And the news of the fault is immediately flashed on one of the many electronic boards suspended from the ceiling that also tell everybody how many cars have been made and how near the line is to hitting its target. The general air is that of competitive collaboration, with each team vying to be the most efficient. One young man displays a tool he invented a couple of years ago to make it easier to insert the steering column into its shaft. The tool is now used in Toyota's factories around the world. A second worker shows off another invention (this time from another factory): a mobile chair, suspended from the ceiling, allows him to dart in and out of the passing cars without having to clamber all over them. The management puts an unusual amount of emphasis on the workers' comfort. Robots do the back-breaking

work of lifting rather than the skilled work of welding. The cars are suspended above the ground so that the workers can insert parts without bending down. Spare parts are stored at eye level for the same reason.

John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, *The Witch Doctors: Making Sense of the Management Gurus*, 1996, p. 238.

---

KEY IDEA: RELATIONSHIPS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN TRANSACTIONS

How does a focus on relationships get people to do extraordinary things? How can we make use of this key idea?

Please don't get me wrong; we're not about to do away with money. What is changing is this: Money is mainly about accounting for individual transactions, and transactions are less important than relationships. Businesses are coming to realize that pushing around a lot of nickels and dimes is less useful than sustaining continuous collaborations.

Tom Petzinger, *The New Pioneers*, 1999, p. 114.

---

KEY IDEA: COMMUNICATION

Do you know this organization's three highest priorities? If not, you will soon. How can communication help us do extraordinary things?

Billions are spent every year on internal corporate communications, including \$50 million. Even so, most organizations still do a miserable job of helping their folks understand the direction, goals, and priorities of the business (let alone securing their Commitment to them). If you doubt the magnitude of this "failure to communicate" claim, take five minutes and go do some field research of your own. Ask a sample of your people to jot down what they believe to be the organization's three highest priorities and where they think it is headed. When the answers come back without any degree of consistency, the question is obvious: If they don't know where you're going, how can they possibly help you get there?

Bill Catlette and Richard Hadden, *Contented Cows Give Better Milk: The Plain Truth about Employee Relations and Your Bottom Line*, 1998, p. 56.

Do we all communicate enough? Do you communicate with your team members enough?

A number of obligations go along with good communication. We must understand that access to pertinent information is essential to getting a job done. The right to know is basic. *Moreover, it is better to err on the side of sharing too much information than risk leaving someone in the dark. Information is power, but it is pointless power if hoarded. Power must be shared for an organization or a relationship to work.*

Max DePree, *Leadership is an Art*, 1989, pp. 104-105.

Have you "checked out?" Have you felt the frustration of not knowing the direction? What do you need to get back in gear—from yourself and from your leaders?

I became aware of the call of meaning in our organizational lives when I worked with a number of incoherent companies that had been tipped into chaos by reorganizations or leveraged buyouts. They had lost any purpose beyond the basic struggle to survive. Yet under these circumstances, I saw some employees who continued to work hard and contribute to the organization even when the organization could offer them nothing, not even the promise of a job in the future. Most employees had, more predictably, checked out psychologically, just putting in their time, waiting for the inevitable. But others stayed creative and focused on creating new services, even with the great uncertainty of the future. This puzzled me greatly.

I assumed at first that they were simply denying reality. But when I talked to these employees, it became evident that something else much more important was going

on. They were staying creative, making sense out of non-sense, because they had taken the time to create a meaning for their work, one that transcended present organizational circumstances. They wanted to hold onto motivation and direction in the midst of turbulence, and the only way they could do this was by investing the current situation with meaning.

I have also seen companies make deliberate use of meaning to move through times of traumatic change. *I've seen leaders make great efforts to speak forthrightly and frequently to employees about current struggles, about the tough times that lie ahead, and about what they dream of for the future. These conversations fill a painful period with new purpose, giving reasons for the current need to sacrifice and hold on. In most cases, given this kind of meaningful information, workers respond with allegiance and energy.*

Do you know what all this “new season” stuff means? If not, speak up; you need to know.

All of us want so much to know the “why” of what is going on. (How often have you heard yourself or others say, “I just wish they would tell me why we’re doing this”?) *We instinctively reach out to leaders who work with us on creating meaning.* Those who give voice and form to our search for meaning, and who help us make our work purposeful, are leaders we cherish, and to whom we return gift for gift.

Margaret J. Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science: Learning about Organization from an Orderly Universe*, 1992, pp. 134-135

#### KEY IDEA: PEOPLE ARE A PRIZE

How can we make the most of “people factors” to do extraordinary things?

It has been said that “the only way for any organization to ensure its financial security is by creating satisfied, loyal customers.” To the extent that the organization is at all labor-dependent, we propose that the principal requirement for operationalizing that aim is the creation of a satisfied, fully engaged workforce. In the main, our products and services, technology, methods, tools, and strategies can all be copied. But it’s not as easy to duplicate a focused, caring workforce. In the final analysis, “people factors” are frequently the key source of competitive advantage—the factor least visible to the naked eye and most difficult to emulate. Sooner or later, we must come to grips with the fact that most businesses aren’t so much capital- or expertise- or even product-driven as they are PEOPLE-driven.

Bill Catlette and Richard Hadden, *Contented Cows Give Better Milk: The Plain Truth about Employee Relations and Your Bottom Line*, 1998, p. 7.

#### KEY IDEA: THE PROCESS OF PLANNING OR “GETTING THERE IS ALL THE FUN”

What skills can you contribute to achieve extraordinary performance? How can we create “revolutionary quality improvement?”

*Tomorrow’s successful corporation will be a collection of skills and capabilities ever ready to pounce on brief market anomalies.* Any useful strategic plan, or planning process, must focus upon the development and honing of these skills (which translates into readiness to seek and exploit opportunities), rather than emphasize static approaches to market development. That is, the strategy should focus primarily on such things as the time and energy to be devoted to creating revolutionary quality improvement or getting linked up fast with almost all of our customers.

The “new” strategic plan, and planning process, must necessarily be “bottom-up.” Assessing the ability (and necessary skills) to execute-to be responsive, flexible, attentive to customers-starts on the front line. Obviously, as the process moves

forward, it will involve debate among senior officers, and compromise. *But it should never lose touch with or sight of the front line, where execution takes place.*

The plan, whose development involves everyone, should be shared with everyone after completion. At that point, there is a serious case to be made for destroying it—if not in practice, at least in spirit. Its value is as an assemblage of thoughts, not constraints. The process of developing it is close to 100 percent of its value—or perhaps more than 100 percent of its value. *Slavishly following the plan despite changing conditions (now the norm), because of the time and political capital spent in assembling it, is counterproductive.*

Finally, the content and format of the plan and the planning process should be modified substantially every year. Most plans and planning processes readily become bureaucratic (within two years), whereas the sole purpose is to be thought-provoking. Only changes in process which demand wholly new questions—from near the front line especially—will ensure vitality and usefulness.

Tom Peters, *Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for a Management Revolution*, 1987, pp. 616-17.

This procedure challenges the entire basis of mass production, which was (and in many parts of the world still is) the dominant manufacturing philosophy. Mass production depends on economics of scale and specialization. Workers, it is supposed, need to become more and more specialized in order to do their job more efficiently. And factories need to become bigger and bigger to achieve economics of scale. As the Japanese realized, however, this system also entails two serious costs.

*First, the classic mass-production system is unable to respond to rapid changes in demand.* Mass producers tend to be much keener on keeping standardized designs in production than in experimenting with new products, partly because of the heavy costs of changing the production line and partly because their specialized workers are happiest with what they know. With a change in fashion, the factory may have to close down for months as machines are recalibrated and workers retrained. Producers may also have to throw away huge quantities of expensively stored but now obsolete inventory. By the time the factory is capable of mass-producing the new product, the demand may have changed once again.

*Second, the system turns out an unacceptably high rate of faulty products.* Large batches make it difficult to detect defects. A defective part may not reveal itself until the finished car finally breaks down. The Japanese argued that it is easier for the next person on the assembly line to check a small batch. *And a worker making only a small batch is more likely to feel like a craftsman*, whereas mass production usually achieves its economies of scale by reducing jobs to drudgery. By contrast, lean production continues to engage at least some of the intellectual gifts of the workers. They can see the impact of their workmanship—good or bad—on the company's manufacturing process. Pats on the back from one's colleagues are delivered for a job well done, scowls for a job skimmed.

You'll see our process more clearly next week. Will you challenge it? Will you find ways to make it better?

#### KEY IDEA: ECONOMIES OF SCALE VS. ECONOMIES OF TIME

What are the costs of traditional models of production?

How can we do an extraordinary job of responding to changing market demands?

How can we do an extraordinary job of making quality loans?

Are you a craftsman? Do you know the whole process? Do you take control of your work?

*Lean producers ram home this concept of responsibility by making everybody aware not only of what they are doing but how well they are doing it.* This information is communicated in “quality circles”—sessions at which people sit around discussing their performance and the quality of what they have produced. Workers are also fed continuous information on the job: hence the lighted electronic displays that are visible at every workstation in Toyota’s factories.

Here’s relationships again. How can we make use of relationships to be extraordinary?

Lean production also means rethinking the boundaries of the firm—in particular its relationship with its suppliers. The parent company treats the supply firms as partners rather than playing them off against each other. The suppliers provide the goods “just in time” in return for long-term relationships with the main manufacturers. . . . Even today Toyota can design and build a car twice as fast as an American-owned factory in Detroit.

Instead of looking for the *shortest* time, we need to think of the *best* time. How can we make use of timing to be extraordinary?

John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, *The Witch Doctors: Making Sense of the Management Gurus*, 1996, p. 242-43.

#### KEY IDEA: YOU WON’T FIND SUCCESS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PACK

Look at how often in these excerpts successful companies struck out on their own. They didn’t follow the standard. They set the standard. Where are we limiting ourselves by following accepted notions? How can we be extraordinary by looking for a new and better way?

Practicing a discipline is different from emulating “a model.” All too often, new management innovations are described in terms of the “best practices” of so-called leading firms. While interesting, I believe such descriptions can often do more harm than good, leading to piecemeal copying and playing catch-up. I do not believe great organizations have ever been built by trying to emulate another, any more than individual greatness is achieved by trying to copy another great person.”

Peter Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*, 1990, p. 11.

#### KEY IDEA: MAKE CONNECTIONS

The word “ingenuity” comes from the idea of seeing connections between things that other people may not see. What connections have we ignored in our process? How can we find new connections to leverage our situation, skills and advantages? Remember, this doesn’t just apply to big corporate stuff; it applies to how you do your job every day.

“Every act of imagination is the discovery of likenesses between two things which were thought unlike,” says the mathematician Jacob Bronowski in *The Origins of Knowledge and Imagination*. In a similar vein the humanist psychologist Abraham Maslow in 1964 defined invention as “a sudden integration of previously known bits of knowledge not yet suitably patterned.”

The proof is overwhelming. After spending two years watching research scientists conduct hundreds of experiments, Kevin Dunbar of McGill University in Montreal concluded that they “rely largely on analogy—the process of applying knowledge in one area to solve problems in another. In a study based on 630,000 U.S. patents, the Israel Institute of Technology asserted, “Innovation is essentially a process of coupling.” The highly itinerant Quakers accelerated the industrial revolution in England by skillfully applying the practices of one industry to another. For instance, they used coke, a high-energy fuel developed for: the brewing process, as a substitute for charcoal in the production of a new and stronger cast iron, without which the steam engine would never have taken off. By contrast, societies that centrally managed technological development, as the emperors of ancient China did, were highly stable but produced little material wealth.

Such bold advances often arise from nothing more than a heightened awareness of everyday living. “The innovator needs a very concrete vision of the new invention

What's going on at the margins of your work?

Be creative. Make a connection.

#### KEY IDEA: THE POWER OF A SYSTEM

A system can direct us to focus on certain things and ignore others—without our even knowing it. We get frustrated with people, when really it's the system that created the problems.

Have you blamed others for the fault of the system? How can we change the system to get extraordinary results? Can you step outside your job and look at the big picture to find new opportunities and better ways to do the job?

What connections or interrelationships are there in our process? Have we taken advantage of them, or have we stumbled over them? How can we make better use of them?

that she thinks will succeed before she can go about acquiring the necessary knowledge," Flores says. *This demands a sharp eye for "marginal practices," he goes on, for spotting "something that someone else is doing, which is not central to us, and could even belong to another industry.* As leaders, we need to fall in love with the cultivation of marginal practices, because this is where we see the future before it happens."

Tom Petzinger, *The New Pioneers*, 1999, pp. 67-68.

---

#### The Learning Disabilities and Our Ways of Thinking

- Because they "become their position," people do not see how their actions affect the other positions.
- Consequently, when problems arise, they quickly blame each other—"the enemy" becomes the players at the other positions, or even the customers.
- When they get "proactive" and place more orders, they make matters worse.
- Because their overordering builds up gradually, they don't realize the direness of their situation until it's too late.
- By and large, they don't learn from their experience because the most important consequences of their actions occur elsewhere in the system, eventually coming back to create the very problems they blame on others."
- The "teams" running the different positions (usually there are two or three individuals at each position) become consumed with blaming the other players for their problems, precluding any opportunity to learn from each others' experience.

Peter Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*, 1990, p. 51-52.

---

#### 1. Structure Influences Behavior

Different people in the same structure tend to produce qualitatively similar results. When there are problems, or performance fails to live up to what is intended, it is easy to find someone or something to blame. But, more often than we realize, systems cause their own crises, not external forces or individuals' mistakes.

#### 2. Structure in Human Systems is Subtle

We tend to think of "structure" as external constraints on the individual. But, structure in complex living systems, such as the "structure" of the multiple "systems" in a human body (for example, the cardiovascular and neuromuscular) means the basic interrelationships that control behavior. In human systems, structure includes how people make decisions—the "operating policies" whereby we translate perceptions, goals, rules, and norms into actions.

#### 3. Leverage Often Comes from New Ways of Thinking

In human systems, people often have potential leverage that they do not exercise because they focus only on their own decisions and ignore how their decisions affect

## KEY IDEA: LEVERAGE

Archimedes said, "Give me a lever long enough and a place to stand, and single-handed I can move the world." Leverage means finding a way to move the most with the least effort. Most of the time, we spend a lot of energy trying to do things the hard way, instead of finding an easier, less costly method. Do you look for the leveraged solution to a problem? How can we use the idea of leverage to be extraordinary?

## CHALLENGE: WELCOME CHANGE

What changes do we face as a company? How can we best respond to them in an extraordinary way?

## CHALLENGE: BE FLEXIBLE AND DISCIPLINED

How can we be both flexible and disciplined? Both fast and thorough?

others. In the beer game, players have it in their power to eliminate the extreme instabilities that invariably occur, but they fail to do so because they do not understand how they are creating the instability in the first place.

Peter Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*, 1990, p. 40.

The bigger they are, the harder they fall. Such corporate Goliaths as IBM and General Motors once dominated American industry. Now they hemorrhage billions of dollars in a single year. What happened? Like the dinosaurs that once roamed the earth, they failed to keep up with the times. "Nothing is forever," says Louis Lataif, dean of the Boston University School of Management. "None of us today could name the 50 largest companies in America in 1900, but everyone alive at the time thought they would all go on forever."

Yet the turmoil that grips GM, IBM and other behemoths including Sears and American Express, is more than a matter of size and the inevitable cycles of change. Many giants manage to avoid hardening of the arteries. Du Pont, which is nearly 200 years old, remains an industry leader in synthetic materials Philip Morris started as a tobacco shop in 1847 but is now a \$55 billion-a-year company that sells everything from beer to breakfast cereal. General Electric managed to grow from light bulbs to jet engines, and Motorola from car radios to microchips.

Giants begin to falter when their managers, swollen with arrogance and complacency, allow themselves to lose touch with their customers. This happens most often at firms that maintain a rigid, top-down management style "Big companies find that the challenges of keeping up with what's going on in the marketplace become infinitely greater as the companies get larger," says Scott, a professor at Northwestern University's Kellogg Graduate School of Management. "The layers of management and perks isolate executives too much."

Sometimes big companies need full-scale crises to force changes in their old habits. Ford came back from near bankruptcy in the 1980s by cutting costs and creating teams of workers and managers to design and build new cars. Such teamwork produced the Ford Taurus, which now vies with the Honda Accord for the title of best-selling car in the U.S.

To remain atop their industries, some large companies are trying to act more like flexible, small firms. GE holds regular sessions in which employees are invited to make suggestions for improving everything from products to packaging. It's not just talk; the bosses are expected to respond. Today's management buzz word is "horizontal structure," meaning that power is spread across a company rather than held by a few top managers in the traditional, vertical style. "The large companies in this country were built on a model that copied the military," says Margaret Blair, a Brookings Institution economist. But today, with global competition transforming the marketplace almost daily, Blair says, the old structures are too ponderous to work.

The real task for giant companies is to make change a welcome aspect of corporate life. “Doing well means continually challenging the premises of your business,” says Kellogg’s Scott. “It means having a vision and being restless and discontented with the status quo.” If those guidelines sound daunting, the dangers of standing pat are painfully clear. Says Raymond Miles, a business professor at the University of California Berkeley: “The world used to wait for the next IBM computer or the next Chevy. But no one is waiting now.”

John Greenwald, “Are America’s Corporate Giants a Dying Breed?” *Time*, December 28, 1992, p. 28.

---

Most of the work in advanced economies (brainwork) will be done by networks of itinerants, who gather from hither and thither, do their thing, and disband. It’s certainly not organization as we’ve known it. Well, not organization as the Fortune 500 have practiced it; let’s put it that way. But it is the path taken by Hollywood, professional-service firms, universities, and other repositories of (among other things) purely intellectual talent. In any event, even if you choke over the more extreme forms of discombobulation, it’s certainly clear that do-it-all corporations are dinosaurs. The mad scramble to hollow and expand, to learn how to build (mostly) temporary alliances is on. Victory will go to the highly imaginative and those least fettered by conventional notions of what an organization has to be.

Tom Peters, *Crazy Times Call for Crazy Organizations*, 1994, p. 155.

---

I continue to be very excited at the prospects of joining Transamerica and marketing our capabilities under the Transamerica name. Combining Transamerica’s name recognition with our entrepreneurial spirit creates a powerful force. I can’t wait to put it into action.

Sam Couvillion, Memo to EBC Associates, August 13, 1998.

---

**Q.** *Would you define* entrepreneur?

**A.** The definition is very old. It is somebody who endows resources with new wealth-producing capacity. That’s all.

Peter Drucker, “Interview”, *The Frontiers of Management: Where Tomorrow’s Decisions are Being Shaped Today*, 1986, p. 2.

---

CHALLENGE: USE YOUR IMAGINATION

How can we get beyond conventions and move to what’s extraordinary?

CHALLENGE: BE AN ENTREPRENEUR

Here’s a definition of “entrepreneur.” How can you be an entrepreneur in your own job?

# WRITE IT DOWN:

Based on all these excerpts and the booklet—and your own thinking—how can we be extraordinary?  
List the things you marked along the way.  
We'll talk about these things when we meet.

HOW CAN I, AS AN ORDINARY PERSON, DO EXTRAORDINARY THINGS?

HOW CAN TSBC LEAD ORDINARY PEOPLE TO DO EXTRAORDINARY THINGS?