

Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us

Introduction

The performance of the task, he said, “provided intrinsic reward.” The monkeys solved the puzzles simply because they found it gratifying to solve puzzles.

If the monkeys were rewarded with raisins for solving puzzles, they’d no doubt perform better. Yet when Harlow tested that approach, the monkeys actually made more errors and solved puzzles less frequently. “Introduction of food in the present experiment,” Harlow wrote, “served to disrupt performance, a phenomenon not reported in the literature.”

“When money is used as an external reward for some activity, the subjects lose intrinsic interest for the activity,” he wrote. Rewards can deliver a short term boost just as a jolt of caffeine can keep you cranking for a few more hours. But the effect wears off and worse, can reduce a person’s longer term motivation to continue the project.

Human beings, Deci said, had an inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise their capacities, to explore, and to learn.”

Chapter 1: The Rise and Fall of Motivation 2.0

Wolf uncovered a range of motives, but they found “that enjoyment based intrinsic motivation, namely how creative a person feels when working on the project, is the strongest and most pervasive driver.” A large majority of programmers, the researchers discovered, reported that they frequently reached the state of optimum challenge called “flow”.

“a set of predominantly intrinsic motives in particular, the fun of mastering the challenge of a given software problem.”

In the course of a day, each of us was constantly figuring the cost and benefits of our actions and then deciding how to act. Economists studied what people did, rather than what we said, because we did what was best for us.

We are awesome at calculating our self-interests.

Play a game with me and I’ll try to illustrate the point. Suppose somebody gives me ten dollars and tells me to share it, some, all, or none, with you. If you accept my offer, we both get to keep the money. If you reject it, neither of us gets anything. If I offered you six dollars (keeping \$4 for myself), would you take it? Almost certainly. If I offered you \$5, you’d probably take that too. But what if I offered you \$2? Would you take it? In an experiment replicated around the world, most people rejected the offer of \$2 and below. That makes no sense in terms of wealth maximization. If you take my offer of \$2 you’re \$2 richer. If you reject it, you get

nothing. Your cognitive calculator knows two is greater than zero, but because you are a human being, your notions of fair play or your desire for revenge or your simple irritation overrides it.

The very premise of extrinsic incentives is that we'll always respond rationally to them.

But for a surprisingly large number of people, jobs have become more complex, more interesting, and more self directed.

Routine work can be outsourced or automated, artistic, empathetic, non-routine work generally cannot.

Harvard Business School's Teresa Amabile have found that external rewards and punishments, both carrots and sticks, can work nicely for algorithmic tasks. But they can be devastating for heuristic ones. Those sorts of challenges like solving novel problems or creating something the world didn't know it was missing, depend heavily on intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is conducive to creativity, controlling extrinsic motivation is detrimental to creativity.

The current operating system rests on the belief that work is not inherently enjoyable, which is precisely why we must coax people with external rewards and threaten them with outside punishment.

But if work is inherently enjoyable for more and more people, then the external inducements at the heart of the current system become less necessary. Adding certain kinds of extrinsic rewards on top of inherently interesting tasks can often dampen motivation and diminish performance.

As organizations flatten, companies need people who are self-motivated. Non-routine more interesting work depends on self-direction.

Because for growing numbers of people, work is often creative, interesting, and self-directed rather than unrelenting routine, boring and other-directed.

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

In other words, rewards can perform a weird sort of behavioral alchemy: They can transform an interesting task into a boring one. Then can turn play into work. And by diminishing intrinsic motivation, they can send performance, creativity, and even upstanding behavior toppling like dominoes.

To be clear, it wasn't necessarily the rewards themselves that dampened the children's interest. Remember: When children didn't expect a reward, receiving one had little impact on their intrinsic motivation. Only contingent rewards, if you do this, then you'll get that, had a

negative effect. Why? “If-then” rewards require people to forfeit some of their autonomy. And that can spring a hole in the bottom of the motivation bucket, draining an activity of its enjoyment. These rewards can greatly reduce someone’s intrinsic motivation.

When institutions, families, schools, businesses, and athletic teams, for example, focus on the short term and opt for controlling people’s behavior, they do considerable long term damage.

In eight of nine tasks we examined across the three experiments, higher incentives led to worse performance.

Rewards by their very nature, narrow our focus. That’s helpful when there’s a clear path to the solution. They help us stare ahead and race faster. But “if-then” motivators are terrible for challenges that involve creativity.

The commissioned works of art were rated as significantly less creative than the non-commissioned works of art, yet they were not that different in technical quality. Moreover, the artists reported feeling significantly more constrained when doing commissioned works than when doing the non-commissioned work.

The less evidence of extrinsic motivation during art school, the more success in professional art both several years after graduation and nearly twenty years later.

It is those who are least motivated to pursue extrinsic rewards who eventually receive them.

Extrinsic rewards can be effective for algorithmic tasks, those that depend on following an existing formula to its logical conclusion. But for more right brained undertakings, those that demand flexible problem solving, inventiveness, or conceptual understanding, contingent rewards can be dangerous.

Add a monetary incentive didn’t lead to more of the desired behavior. It led to less. The reason: It tainted an altruistic act and crowded out the intrinsic desire to do something good. Doing good is what blood donation is all about. It provides what the American Red Cross brochures say is a feeling that money can’t buy.

For instance, when the Italian government gave blood donors paid time off work, blood donations increased.

Goals can get us to try harder, work longer, and achieve more.

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.

Likewise, when an extrinsic goal is paramount, particularly in a short term, measurable on who achievement delivers a pay off, its presence can restrict our view of the broader dimensions of our behavior. Substantial evidence demonstrates that in addition to motivating constructive effort, goal setting can induce unethical behavior.

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.

Contrast that approach with behavior sparked by intrinsic motivation. When the reward is the activity itself, deepening learning, delighting customers, doing one's best, there are no shortcuts, no one cheats.

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 fine for picking your child up late from day care shifted the parent's decision from a partly moral obligation (be fair to my kid's teachers) to a pure transaction (I can buy extra time). There wasn't room for both. The punishment didn't promote good behavior, it crowded it out.

According to these scholars, cash rewards and shiny trophies can provide a delicious jolt of pleasure at first, but the feeling soon dissipates, and to keep it alive, the recipient requires ever larger and more frequent doses.

By offering a reward, a principal signals to the agent that the task is undesirable. If the task were desirable the agent would not need a reward. But the initial signal, and the reward that goes with it, forces the principal onto a path that is difficult to leave. Offer too small a reward and the agent won't comply. But offer a reward that's enticing enough to get the agent to act the first time, and the principal "is doomed to give into it a second time." There's no going back. Pay your son to take out the trash and you've pretty much guaranteed the kid will never do it again for free.

Rewards are addictive in that once offered, a contingent reward makes an agent expect it whenever a similar task is faced, which in turn compels the principal to use rewards over and over again.

When the participants anticipated getting a reward but not when they anticipated losing one, a burst of the brain chemical dopamine surged in their brain. This particular brain chemical surging to a particular part of the brain is what happens in addiction. The mechanism of most addictive drugs is to send a fusillade of dopamine to the nucleus accumbens. The feeling delights, then dissipates, then demands another dose.

Anticipation of rewards activates the nucleus accumbens, which may lead to an increase in the likelihood of individuals switching from risk averse to risk seeking behavior.

But extrinsic motivators, especially tangible “if-then” ones, can also reduce the depth of our thinking. They can focus our sights on only what’s immediately before us rather than what’s off in the distance.

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 efforts on the organization.

In environments where extrinsic rewards are most salient, many people only work to the point that triggers the reward and no further. So if students get a prize for reading three books, may won’t pick up a fourth, let alone embark on a lifetime of reading.

Meaningful achievement depends on lifting one’s sights and pushing towards the horizon.

Chapter 2A . . . and the Special Circumstances When They Do

The scholars exploring human motivation have revealed not only the many glitches in the traditional approach, but also the narrow band of circumstances in which carrots and sticks do their jobs reasonably well.

The starting point, of course is to ensure that the baseline rewards, wages, salaries, benefits and so on, are adequate and fair. Without a healthy baseline, motivation of any sort is difficult and often impossible.

The first question you should ask when contemplating external motivators: Is the task at hand routine? That is, does accomplishing it require following a prescribed set of rules to a specified end?

For routine tasks, which aren’t very interesting and don’t demand much creative thinking, rewards can provide a small motivational booster show without the harmful side effects. Rewards do not undermine people’s intrinsic motivation for dull tasks because there is little or no intrinsic motivation to be undermined.

For some people, much of what they do all day consists of these routine, not terribly captivating tasks. In these situations it’s best to try and unleash the positive side of the sawyer Effect by attempting to turn work into play, to increase the task’s variety, to make it more like a game, or to use it to help master other skills.

And you’ll increase your chances of success by supplementing the rewards for doing a routine task with these three important practices:

1. Offer a rationale for why the task is necessary. A job that's not inherently interesting can become more meaningful, and therefore more engaging, if it's part of a larger purpose.
2. Acknowledge that the task is boring.
3. Allow people to complete the task in their own way. Think autonomy, not control. State the outcome you need. But instead of specifying precisely the way to reach it, give them the freedom to do the job however they want.

Emphasize the elements of deeper motivation, autonomy, mastery, and purpose.

Amabile also discovered that when the artists considered their commissions "enabling", that is the commission enable the artist to do something interesting or exciting, the creativity ranking of what they produced shot back up. The same was true for commissions the artists felt provided them with useful information and feedback about their ability.

The essential requirement: Any extrinsic reward should be unexpected and only offered when the task is completed.

In other words, where "if-then" rewards are a mistake, shift to "now that" rewards.

If tangible rewards are given unexpectedly to people after they have finished a task, the rewards are less likely to be experienced as the reason for doing the task and thus less likely to be detrimental to intrinsic motivation.

But keep in mind on ginormous caveat: Repeated "now that" bonuses can quickly become expected "if-then" entitlements which can then deter effective performance.

You'll do better if you follow these two guidelines:

1. First consider tangible rewards. Praise and positive feedback are much less corrosive than cash and trophies. Positive feedback can have an enhancing effect on intrinsic motivation.
2. Provide useful information. Give people meaningful information about their work. The more the feedback focuses on specifics and the more the praise is about effort and strategy rather than about achieving some particular outcome, the more effective it can be.

In brief, for creative, right brain, heuristic tasks, you are on shaky ground offering "if-then" rewards. You're better off using "now that" rewards. And you're best off if your "now that" rewards provide praise, feedback, and useful information.

Self Determination Theory (SDT) begins with a notion of universal needs, competence, autonomy, and relatedness. When those needs are satisfied, we're motivated, productive, and happy. If there's anything fundamental about our nature, it's the capacity for interest. Some things facilitate it. Some things undermine it.

Human beings have an innate inner drive to be autonomous, self-determined, and connected to one another.

Does what energizes you, what gets you up in the morning and propels you through the day, come from the inside or from the outside?

Intrinsically motivated people usually achieve more than their reward seeking counterparts. An intense focus on extrinsic rewards can indeed deliver fast results. The trouble is, this approach is difficult to sustain.

Intrinsically motivated people work hard and persist through difficulties because of their internal desire to control their lives, learn about their world, and accomplish something that endures.

But one reason fair and adequate pay is so essential is that it takes the issue of money off the table so they can focus on the work itself. By contrast, for many Type X's, money is the table. Type I's like being recognized for their accomplishments, because recognition is a form of feedback.

According to many studies from SDT research, 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. People who validate themselves with money, fame, beauty, etc. tend to have poorer psychological health.

Chapter 4 Autonomy

Our basic nature is to be curious and self-directed.

Autonomy means acting with choice, which means we can be both autonomous and happily interdependent with others.

Social scientists have found that autonomy is something that people seek and that improves their lives.

According to a cluster of recent studies, 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.

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. Task, time, technique, and team.

Today's economy demands non-routine, creative, conceptual abilities, as any artist or interior designer would agree.

Students who had greater autonomy over their course selection, their assignments, and the relations with professors showed far less steep declines and actually posted better grades and bar exam scores.

If we begin from an alternative, and more accurate, presumption, that people want to do good work, then we ought to let them focus on the work itself rather than the time it takes them to do it.

Ample research has shown that people in self organized teams are more satisfied than those working in inherited teams.

Encouraging autonomy doesn't mean discouraging accountability. People must be accountable for their work.

It presumes that people want to be accountable, and that making sure they have control over their task, their time, their technique, and their team is a pathway to that destination.

Studies have shown that perceived control is an important component of one's happiness. However, what people feel like they want control over really varies, so I don't think there's one aspect of autonomy that's universally the most important. Different individuals have different desires, so the best strategy for an employer would be to figure out what's important to each individual employee.

Chapter 5 Mastery

Mastery-the desire to get better and better at something that matters.

More than 50% of employees are not engaged at work and nearly 20% are actively disengaged. The cost of disengagement is about 300 billion a year in lost productivity.

Only engagement can produce mastery. And the pursuit of mastery, an important but often dormant part of our third drive, has become essential in making one's way in today's economy.

Equally important, engagement as a route to mastery is a powerful force in our personal lives.

In an autotelic experience, the goal is self-fulfilling; the activity is its own reward.

The highest and most satisfying experience in people's lives are when they are in the flow experience.

The flow goals are clear and the feedback is immediate.

Most important, in flow, the relationship between what a person had to do and what he could do was perfect. The challenge wasn't too easy. Nor was it too difficult. It was a notch or two above their current abilities, which stretched the body and mind in a way that made the effort itself the most delicious reward. That balance produced a degree of focus and satisfaction that easily surpassed other, more quotidian, experiences. In flow, people lived so deeply in the moment, and felt so utterly in control, that their sense of time, place, and even self melted away. They were autonomous of course. But more than that, they were engaged.

First, they provide employees with what I call "Goldilocks tasks", challenges that are not too hot and not too cold, neither overly difficult or simple. 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.

The second tactic that smart organizations use to increase their flow-friendliness and their employees' opportunities for mastery is to trigger the positive side of the Sawyer Effect (turning work into play).

So the shrewdest enterprises afford employees the freedom to sculpt their jobs in ways that bring a little flow into their otherwise mundane duties.

The Three Laws Of Mastery.

Flow is essential to mastery. But flow doesn't guarantee mastery. Because the two concepts operate on different horizons of time. One happens in the moment, the other unfolds over months, years, sometimes decades. You and I each might reach flow tomorrow morning, but neither one of us will achieve mastery overnight.

Master abides by three, somewhat peculiar laws.

The pursuit of mastery is all in our head. Dweck's signature insight is that what people believe shapes what they achieve. Our beliefs about ourselves and the nature of our abilities, what she calls our "self-theories", determine how we interpret our experiences and can set the boundaries on what we accomplish. Mastery is mindset.

According to Dweck, people can hold two different views of their own intelligence. Those who have an "entity theory" believe that intelligence is just that, an entity. It exists within us, in a

finite supply and can never increase. Those who subscribe to an “incremental theory” take a different view. They believe that while intelligence may vary slightly from person to person, it is ultimately something, with effort, we can increase. Incremental theorists consider intelligence to be something like strength, something that can be increased with effort. Entity theorists view intelligence as something like height, and can not be increased. If you believe intelligence is a fixed quantity, then every educational and professional encounter becomes a measure of how much you have. If you believe intelligence is something you can increase, then the same encounters become opportunities for growth. In one view, intelligence is something you demonstrate, in the other, it’s something you develop.

For instance, consider goals. Dweck says they come in two varieties, performance goals and learning goals. Getting an A in French class is a performance goal. Being able to speak French is a learning goal. Both goals are entirely normal and pretty much universal. Both can fuel achievement. But only one leads to mastery. In several studies Dweck found that giving children a performance goal was effective for relatively straight forward problems but often inhibited children’s ability to apply concepts to new situations. Students with learning goals score significantly higher when given challenges and work longer and try more solutions to problems. With a learning goal, students don’t have to feel that they’re already good at something in order to hang in and keep trying. After all, their goal is to learn, not to prove they’re smart.

Since incremental theorists believe that ability is malleable, they see working harder as a way to get better. By contrast, the entity theory is a system that requires a diet of easy successes. In this schema, if you have to work hard, it means you are not very good. People therefore choose easy targets that, when hit, reaffirm their existing abilities but do little to expend them. In a sense, entity theorists want to look like masters without expending the effort to attain mastery.

Students who subscribe to the idea that brain power is fixed give up quickly on tough problems and blame their lack of intelligence for their difficulties. Students with a more expansive mindset kept working in spite of the difficulty and deployed far more inventive strategies to find a solution.

The entity theory of intelligence, prefers performance goals and disdains effort as a sign of weakness. The incremental theory prizes learning over performance goals and welcomes effort as a way to improve at something that matters.

Mastery is Pain.

The best predictor of success was the cadets' ratings on non-cognitive, non-physical trait known as grit, defined as perseverance and passion for long term goals. The experience of these army officers in training confirms the second law of mastery, mastery is pain.

As wonderful as flow is, the path to mastery, becoming ever better at something you care about, is not lined with daisies and spanned by a rainbow. If it were, more of us would make the trip. Mastery hurts. Sometimes, many times, it's not fun.

Many characteristics once believed to reflect innate talent are actually the results of intense practice for a minimum of ten years. The work required to achieve excellence is reflected by those that did their best typically spent the most time and effort on the mundane activities that readied them.

West point grit researchers found that grittiness, rather than IQ or standardized test scores, is the most accurate predictor of college grades. Whereas the importance of working without switching objectives may be less perceptible, in every field, grit may be as essential as talent in high accomplishments.

If people are conscious of what puts them in flow, they'll have a clearer idea of what they should devote the time and dedication to master. And those moments of flow in the course of pursuing excellence can help people pass through the rough parts. Mastery often involves working and working and showing little improvement, perhaps with a few moments of flow pulling you along, then making a little progress, and then working and working on that new, slightly higher plateau again. It's grueling, to be sure. But that's not the problem, that's the solution.

Effort is one of the things that gives meaning to life. Effort means you care about something, that something is important to you and you are willing to work for it. It would be an impoverished existence if you were not willing to value things and commit yourself to working toward them.

"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."

Forty-eight hours without flow plunged people into a state eerily similar to a serious psychiatric disorder. The experiment suggests that flow, the deep sense of engagement is a necessity and we need it to survive.

People are much more likely to reach the state of flow while doing work, instead of leisure. Flow includes clear goals, immediate feedback, and challenges well matched to our abilities.

Children go from one flow moment to the next, animated by a sense of joy, equipped with a mindset of possibility, and working with the dedication of a West Point cadet. They use their brains and their bodies to probe and draw feedback from the environment in an endless pursuit of mastery.

The Purpose Motive

Autonomy and mastery are essential. But for proper balance we need a third leg, purpose, which provides context for the other two. 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. The most deeply motivated people, not to mention those who are the most productive and the most satisfied, hitch their desires to a cause larger than themselves.

Purpose provides activation energy for living.

Business leaders must find ways to infuse mundane business activities with deeper, soul stirring ideals, such as honor, truth, love, justice, and beauty.

Do the workers refer to the company as “they”? Or do they describe it in terms of “we”? “They” companies and “we” companies tend to be very different places.

The better approach could be to enlist the power of autonomy in the service of purpose maximization. Two intriguing examples demonstrate what I mean.

How people spend their money may be at least as important as how much money they earn. Spending money on other people or on a cause rather than spending it on yourself can actually increase our subjective well being.

But field research at the prestigious medical facility found that letting doctors spend one day a week on the aspect of their job that was most meaningful to them, whether patient care, research, or community service, could reduce the physical and emotional exhaustion that accompanies their work. Doctors who participated in this trial policy had half the burnout rate of those who did not.

Some of the U of R students were labeled as having extrinsic aspirations, for instance, to become wealthy or to achieve fame, what we might call “profit goals”. Others had intrinsic aspirations, to help others improve their lives, to learn, and to grow, or what we might think of as purpose goals. After these students had been out in the real world for between one and two years, the researchers tracked them down to see how they were faring. The people who had purpose goals and felt they were attaining them reported higher levels of satisfaction and subjective well being than when they were in college, and quite low levels of anxiety and

depression. That's probably no surprise. They'd set a personally meaningful goal and felt they were reaching it. In that situation, most of us would likely feel pretty good, too.

But the results for people with profit goals were more complicated. Those who said they were attaining their goals, accumulating wealth, winning acclaim, reported levels of satisfaction, self-esteem, and positive effect no higher than when they were students. In other words, they'd reached their goals, but it didn't make them any happier. What's more, graduates with profit goals showed increases in anxiety, depression and other negative indicators, again, even though they were attaining their goals.

Because the findings suggest that even when we do get what we want, it's not always what we need. People who are very high in extrinsic goals for wealth are more likely to attain that wealth, but they are still unhappy.

That satisfaction depends not merely on having goals, but on having the right goals, can lead sensible people down self-destructive paths.

One of the reasons for anxiety and depression in the high attainers is that they're not having good relationships. They're busying making money and attending to themselves and that means that there's less room in their lives for love and attention and caring and empathy and the things that truly count.

The spark that kept the creators working deep into the night was purpose at least as much as profit.

The science shows that the secret to high performance isn't our biological drive or our reward and punishment drive, but our third drive, our deep seated desire to direct our own lives, to extend and expand our abilities, and to live a life of purpose.

We're designed to be active and engaged. And we know that the richest experiences in our lives aren't when we're clamoring for validation from others, but when we're listening to our own voice, doing something that matters, doing it well, and doing it in the service of a cause larger than ourselves.

As you contemplate your purpose, begin with the big question: What's your sentence? Greatness can be defined in one sentence.

At the end of each day ask yourself whether you were better today than you were yesterday. Did you do more? You don't have to be flawless each day. Instead look for small measures of improvement such as how long you practiced, read, etc.

Good team activity: Give each player an index card and have them write down what the purpose of the team is.

Using a variety of measures that reflect the totality of great work can transform often counterproductive “if-then” rewards into less combustible “now-that” rewards.

Good grades can become a reward for compliance but might not have a lot to do with learning.

At the beginning of the semester ask the students to list their top learning goals. Then, at the end of the semester, ask them to create their own report card along with one or two paragraph review of their progress.

Praise effort and strategy, not intelligence. Children who are praised for being smart often believe that every encounter is a test of whether they really are. So, to avoid looking dumb, they resist new challenges, and choose the easiest path. By contrast, kids who understand that effort and hard work lead to mastery and growth are more willing to take on new, difficult tasks.

Make praise specific: Parents and teachers should give kids useful information about their performance. Tell them specifically what they have done that is noteworthy.

Praise in private: Praise is feedback, not an awards ceremony. That’s why it’s often best to offer it in a one on one situation.

Offer praise only when there is good reason for it: Don’t kid a kid. He can see through fake praise in a nanosecond. Be sincere or be quiet. If you over-praise, kids regard it as dishonest and unearned. Plus, over-praising becomes another “if-then” reward that makes earning praise, rather than moving toward mastery, the objective.

Students often have no idea why they are doing what they are doing. Turn that around by helping them to glimpse the big picture. Whatever they are studying, be sure they can answer these questions: Why am I learning this? How is it relevant to the world I live in now? Then get out of the classroom and apply what they’re studying.

Conduct autopsies without blame.

Ample research in behavioral science shows that people who seek to lose weight for extrinsic reasons, to slim down for a wedding or to look better at a class re-union, often reach their goals. And then they gain the weight back as soon as the target event ends.

People who pursue more intrinsic goals, to get fit in order to feel good or stay healthy for their family, make slower progress at first, but achieve significantly better results in the long run.

Find a form of fitness you enjoy that produces those intoxicating moments of flow.