

# Both/And Thinking with Marianne Lewis

**Marianne Lewis:** [00:00:00] it's paradoxical that you think that the approach that is safest, less risky, um, makes you less vulnerable, actually does just the opposite because you're not giving any space to the nuance and understanding, and in doing that, you're intensifying the other.

**Yael Schonbrun:** That was Marianne Lewis on psychologist Off the clock.

We are three clinical psychologists here to bring you cutting edge and science-based ideas from psychology to help you flourish in your relationships, work and health.

**Debbie Sorensen:** I'm Dr. Debbie Sorensen practicing in Mile high Denver, Colorado, author of Act Daily Journal, the Act Daily Card Deck, and the upcoming book Act for Burnout.

**Yael Schonbrun:** I'm Dr. Yael Schonbrun a Boston-based clinical psychologist, assistant professor at Brown University, and author of the book Work Parent Thrive.

**Jill Stoddard:** And from Coastal New England. I'm Dr. Jill Stoddard, author of Be Mighty, the big book of Act metaphors and the [00:01:00] Upcoming Imposter. No more.

**Debbie Sorensen:** We hope you take what you learn here to build a rich and meaningful life.

**Jill Stoddard:** Thank you for listening to Psychologists Off the Clock.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Hi everyone, this is Yael and Jill here to introduce an episode on both and thinking, and I'm gonna start with just a little story. I went to a kid's birthday party yesterday, and as, another family with two little kids was leaving, they had. One umbrella, these two little kids. And both kids wanted it, and the parents They were trying to engage the kids in both and thinking like, okay, you can both have a turn and maybe we could, you know, you could walk it to the car and then you could hold it while you're in the car.

And the, the parents were so cute about trying to get them to. You know, do this integrative, like, can we both have a chance? And you know, both participate in holding this cute little kid umbrella. And the kids were like having none of it. They were like, no, I want it. I want it and you can't have it. And it just struck me how common either [00:02:00] or thinking is and how we often get stuck in it.

And so for me, this interview, this conversation that I had with the author of the book both and thinking embracing creative tensions to solve your toughest problems. It has two authors, Wendy Smith and Maryanne Lewis, and it was Maryanne Lewis that I spoke with, and I just really loved picking her brain about this dilemma of how we often get stuck in either or thinking when both Anne thinking would work so much better for our lives.

And so Jill, what did you think of the episode?

**Jill Stoddard:** Yeah. Well I could tell you were excited to talk to her and I loved listening to the two of you talk for that reason. And I think a lot of what she shared really mapped on to the things you are passionate about. It reminded me of the work you do around. Role conflict, the things that you write about in your book, and you talk in the episode about how you try to shift couples.

So in your couples therapy you try to shift couples from either or thinking to both and thinking, and I was finding [00:03:00] myself really curious about how you go about doing that. Like if did, so when you were reading the book, did that map on perfectly to the way you try to shift people's mindsets? Or do you have other kinds of strategies that you used?

**Yael Schonbrun:** when I was reading the book, I actually was kind of inspired to add to my repertoire of things that I do with couples in session. so she talks a lot in our conversation and in the book about paradoxical thinking, and that's, this is sort of a, a really dominant theme for how I think about relationships.

How I think about the relationship between our life roles as well as the relationship between partners is that often when. We feel most. At an impasse with the other person. Most at odds with how we see things. It's because we're, we're on sort of two opposite sides, but often two opposite sides are really complimentary.

So what we see as forces in opposition are actually far more often compliments to one another. So it's dark and light, feminine and masculine, [00:04:00] quiet and loud, disciplinarian and loving. Um, Spontaneous and planful, introvert and

extrovert. And these things sort of sit in opposition, but they actually together create really healthy balance.

And so what I often try to educate couples on is to try to reframe differences in ways that they can take advantage of how they, um, sit in tension with one another as opposed to being adversarial with one another. And she has a lot of really terrific tools that I've started that I think to some extent maybe I already used, but I can sort of more explicitly put a label on them.

And one of my favorites is just, um, and she talks about this during our conversation, is shifting the question. So rather than Is it gonna be my way or your way, right? When it comes to setting a rule with the kids or planning how we're gonna save for our retirement. Is it gonna be my way or your way?

It's more about how are we gonna achieve our [00:05:00] goals? And then it gets to the second, tip that she has that we do a lot of inacceptance and commitment therapy, which is really clarifying our values. And she calls, she talks about it as clarifying your higher purpose, which is figuring out where's the overlap in where you're going.

Most partners can identify like we have similar values or a similar end goal of, you know, launching our kids into healthy adulthood or being able to pay off a mortgage or, supporting one another or having fun. Whatever the goals are in that particular area that you're discussing to figure out where is it that in general you can agree that you're going?

And then frame the question as like, how can we, given that we see things differently, figure out how to get there, instead of dropping into, is it gonna be me that gets my way, or you that gets your way. And so reframing that by identifying the common shared values is one of the really helpful tools and I.

Do do a lot of, obviously I do a lot of values [00:06:00] clarification with couples in sessions. So those are two of the strategies that I think really overlap. But she her strategies and research really gives me, um, some confidence in using those and, and kind of a label and, and more structure around it too.

**Jill Stoddard:** Yeah. And isn't that one of the things we love most about the podcast is when we learn from people and then can take those ideas and use them in our, in our work and, and in our lives. So I think that's awesome and it makes so much sense that we, we default into, you know, you gave the example of disciplinarian versus loving, I think.

Is that what you said? Yeah. Kind of the softer, gentle appearance like, No, I, discipline is important. My way is the right way. Your way is the wrong way. As opposed to this like, no, these two ways compliment each other and it's more about the process of how we go about moving in the direction that we want to.

So I love that when I hear things. We, we often hear things from different people in different areas. Like, oh, values are important. In [00:07:00] most of the episodes we do, we might call them different things, but it comes up over and over, and process over outcome is really important, you know, and so I just, I, I appreciate it, um, you know, learning from her and, and from you.

So that's really cool.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. Dovetailing on what you're saying, one of the strategies that she talks about in her book that I do think that I naturally do in couples therapy, but now I have more of a name for it, is that she really encourages people to think about that.

If you were on the polar extreme, of your own preferential choice? What would be the disadvantages? So getting people to recognize that even my way that I would choose for very good reasons comes with advantages, and it comes with disadvantages in your way. Comes with disadvantages, which is why I didn't pick it.

But it also comes with advantages. So really, Helping people to kind of open up their minds to do this more integrative thinking. , which is so powerful, and what she talks about in her book that just really gets me so excited is not just in the business sphere or in the couple's room, but it's really [00:08:00] like a way to approach our most complicated, modern problems, and in fact, by collaborating and doing this kind of creative both and thinking we can be more strategic, more productive, and more progressive in such powerful ways.

**Jill Stoddard:** Right, right. And it really requires like broadening your field of vision and engaging in a lot of perspective taking.

**Yael Schonbrun:** That's exactly right. So we hope you get a lot out of this episode on both and thinking.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Maryanne w Lewis is Dean and professor of Management at the College of Business, university of Cincinnati.

She previously served as Dean of the business school at City University of London. She's a thought leader in organizational paradoxes, exploring tensions surrounding leadership and innovation. Marianne has been recognized among the world's most cited research in her field, and her work has appeared in media outlets, including Harvard Business Review, fast Company and Newsweek.

And her latest book, which I'm so excited to talk to her about, is called *Both and Thinking*, embracing Creative Tensions to Solve Your Toughest Problems, and she co-authored it with her colleague, Wendy Smith. Welcome, Marianne. I'm so excited to have you here.

**Marianne Lewis:** Oh yeah, it's so, it's a pleasure to be here. I'm looking forward to our conversation.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Oh gosh. Me too. I, I love this book and I was sharing with you before I started recording that I, I was like all lit up as I was reading it because it has so many parallels to the work that I do in working parenthood and reframing what we often think of as conflict in a new way in, in sort of a more synergistic way. I also really love this book because I and my co-host colleagues all practice a treatment called Acceptance and Commitment Therapy. And also because I'm a relationship specialist, so either or thinking is often what brings couples into my office, and I'm always hoping to leave them with both and thinking before they leave. And I love how your research really outlines some evidence-based practical steps to take in making the shift away from either or and into both and thinking, because it's really not easy to do.

**Marianne Lewis:** no.

**Yael Schonbrun:** So I wonder if [00:10:00] maybe we could just start by kind of setting the stage in what is either or thinking and why do we get so stuck in it?

**Marianne Lewis:** I, I, I agree. I think that that's usually a very good place to start because I, it's either we're thinking is probably something we take for granted because it happens so quickly in our approach. Um, it's really formal logic and it is the way. Nearly all of us are taught, but particularly in the Western Hemisphere, we tend to be taught this way.

But basically it means we're facing competing demands, right? We feel ourselves caught in a tug of war. It could be, you know, work life tensions. It could be efficiency versus innovation. I mean, there's a very, uh, infinite list of these, and we move into this very quick approach of, okay, let's, you know, put

'em on two sides of the scale, weigh the pros and cons, make a decision and move on.

That's either or the, the challenge with either or. There are a few of pieces here. I mean, one is, [00:11:00] are we really limited to those two options? Right? So right off the bat, we've limited ourselves in the way we've framed that question to those two. Much more importantly, in my view, is, It's not just limiting.

It can be counterproductive. It, if not destructive, because we in those peer, those moments of dilemma or tension will lean toward our favorite side. We are tend to be more comfortable on one or the other. I'm a workaholic. I'm gonna lean more on the work than the family. Right? I'm not proud of that. It just, if I just play in my muscle memory, that's what's gonna happen.

And it means that in that weighing a whole host of issues are coming in that are everything from. Bias to routines, to who am I talking to? More importantly, who am I listening to, right? All of these issues are coming in, so we, we lean and lean and lean and we call this Wendy, and I call this the rabbit hole.

The next thing you know, we've dug [00:12:00] this ditch on one side of the scales that influences what we see and don't see how we respond on an ongoing basis. And so what is attention? That I'm ta and the tensions I'm talking about, like I'll keep leaning on, uh, life, uh, work life. Those don't go away. We might feel something in the moment that feels like I need to make a decision in this dilemma, but we're gonna have another issue like this come up tomorrow.

Right? And if we keep going down that rabbit hole, we're gonna find ourselves really deep and missing the other, the needs of the opposing side, which we know we need. And it's gonna intensify that tension.

Yeah. So I, there's so much that I wanna unpack in what you said, but one thing that I think is really interesting is that you're pointing to the fact that we're taught in a particular way to think in this kind of style, in this either or thinking approach. And I guess I wonder if there's also an evolutionary basis for [00:13:00] that and I'll share that.

Um, I had written a piece about switching. To a work family enrichment mindset away from a work family conflict mindset. And for this piece, I interviewed, , an evolutionary psychologist by the name of Steve Stewart Williams, who we've had on the podcast before, and he's wonderful. And I asked him what he thought the evolutionary function might be and I'm curious

what you think about it, but, so I'll share the quote that he gave me, which is, Why would natural selection build such a chronically conflicted animal?

Part of the answer is that there are many paths to success, and by equipping us with a diverse array of desires and drives, natural selection ensures that we're ready to take whichever path presents itself to us. A side effect though is that we sometimes end up with an unfulfilled longing for the paths we didn't take. Another part of the answer is that having multiple incompatible desires is like having a miniature parliament. In our heads, one faction argues for one thing, another argues for another, and the clash of perspectives often leads to better decisions. But every time part of us wins, another part loses. So although [00:14:00] the process might be adaptive, adaptive doesn't necessarily mean fun.

So this is sort of speaking to the evolution, the potential evolutionary function,

Mm-hmm.

**Yael Schonbrun:** also it's both and my guess is, but I'm curious what your thoughts are on sort of the, the. The learned part versus the nature part.

**Marianne Lewis:** I, I, I think that's a, I I really appreciate that quote. I mean, the, there's plenty of work in, in psychology in general that builds from biological senses, which it sounds like what he, where he was coming from that we need. Certainty, clarity, right? A whole host of things, both cognitively, but just as humans to continue to move forward.

So if you think about either or, it's, it's efficient, it's fast, it gets us to where we wanna go. I mean, I like where, where you immediately go to somebody like, you know, evolutionary biology and. I mean, I have gone down so many paths to explore. Where does this come from? You can go to linguistics. I mean, so much of [00:15:00] language is built on.

You know what? You define what something is by what it is not. There's this, this notion of opposites is really integral to who we are. It helps us define things, see things more clearly. It's also artificial. It's not really always there. If you get into like the more Eastern philosophies, you get into much blurrier dynamic kind of approaches that.

Are are very different. And it, I think it's a great question. Nature versus nurture, and it, it is, I'm sure it's both,

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah, it's both and Right. Here's a great example of both and, but just to sort of dovetail on, on one piece of what you just said, which I think is so interesting, so this is a part of, um, a writing project that I'm working on, is that I'm looking at sort of the cognitive biases that lead us to think in more efficient ways, and they really do. Cause us to drop into either or because it's, it is more efficient and it's, it allows us [00:16:00] to do a lot of cognitive work, unconsciously, sort of outside of our awareness, which is just much more efficient and and less taxing for our, our brain. And there's a terrific book by Tim Wilson called Strangers to Ourselves, which really speaks to how much we don't know about what we think like we think.

We are thinking in nuanced, open-minded ways, but often we do drop into this more narrow thinking because again, it's more efficient. So, and he writes, just as you commented, that such a system has obvious advantages, but it also comes with the cost. The quicker the analysis, the more error prone it's likely to be.

And so a lot of the tools that you and Wendy share are ones to kind of slow us down and do. Take a pause and do this more deep thinking as opposed to just leaning into our impulses, you know, whether they're learned or or innate, which they're both.

**Marianne Lewis:** Yeah. But, but I, I, and I so appreciate that because I will tell you, Wendy and I have both been [00:17:00] challenged of, wait a minute, you're, you're arguing for both hand thinking against either or thinking, but isn't that an either or? I wanna be very clear. You need either or thinking. There will be a host of things, whether it's because you need it very quickly, whether it's a more simple, clear, routine decision, there are a whole host of reasons you still need to get really good at either or thinking.

The point is you need both and tools in your toolkit. Because for these types of tensions that do not go away, they are very persistent because actually the opposites are interwoven and you need both sides over time, that pause and deeper thinking will do wonders for you. On a long-term basis, but you're gonna have to have both of those, right?

I mean, this is really, how do you build out? And maybe to your point about the cognitive side, I mean, I, I do think about this quite a bit as well on the listening. Um, [00:18:00] we found, uh, some, some varied, vicious cycles. I talked about one vicious cycle we call the rabbit hole. But basically it's, it's intensification.

You just keep leaning on one side until it becomes. So core to who you are, you basically find yourself at the bottom, realize, wait a minute. I need to shift from



work to life, from innovation to efficiency, from local to global. I mean picket, and you swing the pendulum very, very hard. And we call that overcorrecting.

But the third, uh, vicious cycle, I think speaks to what you're getting at here. We call this, um, trench warfare is our, the way we kind of visualize it. But basically what we mean is you or you at your group and versus another group are really digging separate rabbit holes, right? You're digging your trenches.

And in that digging, you're becoming increasingly separated, increasingly isolated, which means listening to others within that same trench, right, within that same mindset, focal [00:19:00] point, et cetera, and actually starting to dehumanize the other. And in that entire process, listening goes out the window.

Because literally you were firing across the trenches. And you know, I, I love Adam Grant's work and think again, it's just one of my favorite books. And, and he's pushing on that as well as you are never going to actually make the most of diversity, creativity, curiosity, all of these things if you are shooting rather than pausing and listening.

Not necessarily to be convinced, but to understand and that takes real work.

**Yael Schonbrun:** It does take real work. The another book that you cite in your book that I absolutely love, so I, I love Adam Grant's. Think Again. Anybody who's listening should pick it up. It is, is such a great book. I also really liked Ezra Kleins. Why we're Polarized that you, that you talk about in your book, because it really speaks to how that process of trench warfare and polarization and [00:20:00] dehumanization has happened in our political system and it's really unfortunate for everybody.

Well, I guess I'm curious, like have you ever worked with folks in politics to really try to teach them some of these skills?

**Marianne Lewis:** Do you know it, it's so interesting that you said that because Wendy and I, in our late night writings will go off on our own tangents and they tend to be politics and our frustrations. Um, no, we have, not specifically, but one concern we both have, and I, I think about this so much. I mean, everything is poli.

So much is politicized right now.

Too much so I don't think you have to be in politics. ha right, to be able to have this question a bit about how do you work. Um, in fact, I think, I think our next

book is very likely to be in this topic of polarization because it's a vicious cycle that is inhibiting so much personal growth, let alone sustainable, whether it's business or societal growth.

And I love as your [00:21:00] Klein's work. I think, uh, Arthur Brooks, love your enemies is brilliant.

I, I just read that recently. So good.

Um, I'm now

**Yael Schonbrun:** one of his less well-known books. Uh, um, it's terrific. It's, and it, it actually calls in a lot of couples research, which is very cool.

**Marianne Lewis:** It does. No, I think he, but there, it's, what I find interesting with St. Brooks and Klein is they're both looking at the same phenomena, but they're seeing it differently in a way that I think actually really matters. And I think it is both. I mean, this is an elephant and this is. You know, blind men looking at it from different angles.

And I'm not saying they're blind, I just mean, I think we need more groups read. Looking at the challenges of polarization, how do we actually listen, let alone collaborate? There's a great book I'm reading right now, I think it's called Collaborating with the Enemy. Um, but it is really challenging my mind because I think there's a lot of great work going on in this space right now, yet is collaborating with the enemy.

Uh, it's Adam Kahani. [00:22:00] Um,

I dunno that one.

And he, he also is taking a different tact, but there's really, yeah. Yeah. They're speaking to your question of what is it that, what, what are the barriers to listening by what you really mean actually collaborating, understanding,

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah.

And

and I think what I really mean is like being open to other people, and what you said was so spot on, because that doesn't mean that you're saying. I'll let you

convince me that's unrealistic, but just being open to considering a different perspective and seeing that it has value, even if it's not one that you'd like to adopt.

And that is really challenging for folks because we are so inclined to drop into that either or thinking. And as a couples therapists, I think, and and psychologists, I think about this a lot from an emotional reactivity point of view. And so, you know, in the. Political sphere, it's really about identity threat in the couple's room.

It's a lot about feeling unsafe with somebody who has hurt you in the past or who you anticipate is, you know, not gonna be careful with your [00:23:00] feelings going forward. And so that sort of dropping into that black and white thinking seems like it's gonna be protective, but it, it actually isn't. And so I want, maybe you can speak to that.

**Marianne Lewis:** Uh, I, I, I mean, I think this is why I, I, we end up turning to paradox because I do think it's paradoxical that you think that the approach that is safest, less risky, um, makes you less vulnerable, actually does just the opposite because you're not giving any space to the nuance and understanding, and in doing that, you're intensifying the other.

Right. You're not, not only are you not listening, you're in. Instead, you're gonna actually have a greater push from the opposing side. It's not helping. I, you know, you, you made a good point about when you said, you know, it's not about, um, saying you can convince me. I think part of the reason that we really push to say, go at it from understanding is you need, I need to understand, I'm having this conversation [00:24:00] not to be convinced or to convince you.

But because I, I truly wanna understand, I'm, I'm curious, I don't know where you're coming from and it's amazing how, in a personal conversation, even about the most heated political topic, when you say, let me help you understand where I am on this. Here's, here's my background, here's what I grew up, or here's what happened to me.

You go, okay. I know of. I know where you're coming from. It's a very specific stance. It's personal. Everything's, I mean, everything is really personal when we think about it, but getting that out in the open ends up to me ha it changing the tone of the conversation. Well that, thank you. I appreciate knowing that about you, and I appreciate knowing where you're coming from in that regard.

I've immediately said, you didn't change me. I came from someplace different. But you could even have that conversation about, well, lemme tell you where I've come from. It's helpful to understand why this is such a, you know, wicked problem. Because that's typically what we're talking about when we're talking about the politicized.

They're very wicked. [00:25:00]

**Yael Schonbrun:** a wicked problem. Absolutely. So, backing up a little bit, I wonder if you can offer our listeners just a definition, because there are many definitions floating around of what a paradox is and why it's important to understand and, and embrace paradoxes. In order to shift from either or thinking to both am thinking.

**Marianne Lewis:** So when, I'll go back, when I, when I think about, uh, either or thinking, I typically think about polarities. Like, you put these, you know, these two challenges on opposite ends of a spectrum, a seesaw pick, whatever, a scale, right? Pick that image in your mind. When I think about paradoxes, I think about yin yang.

I see these. Opposites. Like if you can picture kind of the symbol of a yin yang of black and white that actually flow into each other, the two sides create a hole. So in that way, you have opposites. They're contradictory, right? They're pulling in opposing directions, but they're also interdependent, right?

Short-term, long-term, today, tomorrow. Today [00:26:00] becomes tomorrow. But actually our views, our visions of tomorrow guide what we do today, right? So you see this opposite, this intersection, and then that leads to the third piece of it. They persist. They don't go away. Love, hate. They do not go away. Self and other n again, not going away, but in the moment we feel like I'm making a choice and we forget that these choices live in this.

This greater whole and the reason, I mean, I'm being fairly abstract here, but I do believe it's important to shift from that polarity either or mindset to a paradox because it helps us reframe because they go together. Because I do need to understand how my choices will move out into the future. How I can maybe feel some acceptance.

It's okay. The tensions are okay. They're very, they're human. They're natural. They're just existential in many ways, right? And that helps [00:27:00] us have some acceptance so that we can start working toward a new understanding, not necessarily a solution, cuz it's not gonna, again, they're not gonna go away.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Right. I, I love that framing because, well, first of all, I, I love. Just being able to zoom out and see that forces that we often see as in conflict are actually complimentary. They're sort of helping one another's in stable balance. It's sort of like the ecosystem model, like predator and prey. Like yes, they fight each other and yes, it's not gonna end so well for the prey, but we need both and we need that pressure between them to create long-term health for the population of each.

And the other part that I think is so critical is that w. Although it's uncomfortable at times for that tension to exist between the two poles. And even if we solve it momentarily, it, it is just a part of the ecosystem that needs to be a part of the ecosystem. And so the goal of, and, and I talk about this a lot in the [00:28:00] realm of working parenthood, the goal can't be because it's not effective.

The goal can't be to eradicate the conflict between roles. We need that tension . Because it sort of creates a healthy, sustainable life in many ways.

**Marianne Lewis:** You know, and, and I think that the, the way you just described the value of those tensions is what we call a paradox mindset, which is a shift in understanding. It doesn't mean you're gonna love sitting in the tensions, but the, you see value in them really does empower you. In your decision making and just in your life because you're not fighting against them and it doesn't raise those defenses.

That Right. We know from so much of psychology defenses can be our, our worst nightmare because they actually, in the long run, intensify the problem. Right. They can feel momentarily comforting, but they, they don't support us in the long run

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. Yeah. So it's a real mindset shift and like, you know, for example, in the couple's therapy room, if I can get a couple to see, for example, the differences [00:29:00] they might have in parenting. Like one is a disciplinarian and one is really inclined to be emotionally responsive at all times that they can see those differences, not as in.

Conflict with one another, but as a way to create balance in the, in the parenting approach. Like overall, they can have both love and discipline, and that is optimal parenting. So if I can help couples to make that shift, it's so helpful, which is really like appreciating the paradox, appreciating the tension, and almost like using it to their advantage.

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** Uh, I think that's a great example. I mean, one of the key steps we believe in really applying a, both, both am thinking is what we call separating and connecting. And I like the example you just gave because I can picture it even happening in the room when you're talking with them. I mean, on the one hand, for us, separating really means pulling apart these tensions and understanding at its best what does each side bring really at its best.

**Marianne Lewis:** And. [00:30:00] What if it is all you did? What's the dark, dark side? The downside of either side. Right? So you just gave kind of the loving tough, right? Both sides. The disciplinary and, and the caring. You, if you can really pull apart both the high side and the low side, what you can find is that the low side of one is the high side of the other and vice versa.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Like yin and

**Marianne Lewis:** a

**Yael Schonbrun:** yang.

**Marianne Lewis:** Absolutely. And then you get this. Ooh, one, an overarching understanding of we really do need both, which also means we need each other. Cuz I'm gonna lean on this side and you're gonna lean on that. But the connecting is, and what do we really want the two sides to do. Bringing together what are, where are shared values of what.

Great parenting or more likely great children in the future. What do they look like? What, what is it that we want to develop because that's how we're harnessing our opposing and interwoven sides, and if we can agree on the connecting space and that we [00:31:00] need both, we we're 90% of the way there.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. Yeah. So you're pointing to two of the practical steps that I really, really loved. So the separating and connecting and also connecting to sort of a higher purpose. And I wanna come back to that in just a moment because what you and Wendy talk about in the book is as one of the really, I don't wanna say it's sort of like lower hanging fruit.

None of this is easy because, because it is

**Marianne Lewis:** there are lower.

**Yael Schonbrun:** but is, is reframing the question. You

are

**Marianne Lewis:** In fact, I almost said that because the first step we would always say is reframing the because that's how you're gonna get to separating and connecting. Well, I mean, a big part of that yael is we think that that fastest change you can make is getting hypersensitive to the questions you ask.

Because I mean, whether it's in a leadership, a parenting, a personal dilemma as as soon as you have framed an or you're back to, you've set it up as a polar, right? [00:32:00] Polarization, you've picked two sides, one of them is going to lose. You're gonna weigh them and move on. You've set it up. So by getting, I mean I do this so much with, with leaders and in workshops and others, when you start to say, okay, instead of saying, do we.

Right. Or do I Right. Focus on the short term efficiency, today's task list, long term. Right, right. And you start to separate these two things instead of the Do I? You know, there are some fairly simple fixes here. Like how would I, right. How would I make the most of today to achieve what I seek tomorrow?

Right. How would I make sure, how would we, how would we build from the legacy and our long-standing history for a future looking organization or life or, I mean, I'm playing with kind of the short-term long-term tensions there, but we could do it in a variety of ways. But it's about the question and the word how is really powerful because how immediately [00:33:00] pushes you to think about, okay, what are you're asking is what are, what are the outcomes we want both.

And then the question is how do we get there? Now we've just opened up a, a much more creative dialogue that changes the tone and the feel in the room, even

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah, and in fact, therapists are trained in how to ask open-ended versus closed questions, and that's exactly what you are teaching people to do in the book, which is to move from this. Do you yes or no? Or is this yes or no to how, like, you know to, it just opens you up and it moves away from like the two options to a whole world of options that are available to you.

**Marianne Lewis:** I, I appreciate you saying that because, um, I've had, I remember just when early the, the book came out, I had a few people say, Duh. Like, isn't this obvious? And it, it takes a little work for people to realize actually it's not

default is so clearly into either or. Our first questions are, are fast and efficient [00:34:00] and well do I, you know, path, path A or path B.

And don't make it visual, you know, if we don't actually put it out there and call it out, we will, it will wash over us in almost an auto pilot

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. Yeah. I, mean, I, I've been doing therapy now for 20 years, which says a lot about how old I am, but I still catch myself in the therapy room asking a yes, no question. And, and I'll, and I'll sort of pause and say, let me try that again, because. It does, it limits people in expressing what their experience is, and it certainly limits them in their decision making process.

So you talk about negotiating conflict and having these sort of three options, you know, there's win lose. There's compromise and then there's creative integration. So the last one seems obviously superior, but what are some things to keep in mind so that we keep that as our north star for thinking through tough challenges?

**Marianne Lewis:** Uh, I, I think there are, there are a few points. So let's start with the first. I mean, the, the win-lose [00:35:00] scenario, um, is, is such a challenge to, and. Problematic issue with either or thinking, because obviously if you're in a group, I hope this is more obvious, right? When as soon as you put that up and maybe you're doing a vote or whatever you've done, there are people sitting in that room.

I. Who will be disappointed and you will start this kind of, we, they approach in a group, which will, will in many ways harm future discussions and decision making. So it's not just in the moment, it's, it's doesn't mean you have to make everybody happy, but you've immediately shut off part of the

**Yael Schonbrun:** And created teams.

**Marianne Lewis:** Right in a team. But I say that though as well. Yeah. But you know, because even if this was a personal decision in your mind, you've set up a win-lose. I guess I've right. Who knows what you're doing and it's happening very quickly in your mind. So I do wanna note that on the compromise piece, one of the challenges of a, of a compromise truly is [00:36:00] in, in the most typical approach, a compromise is, you know, if you go between A and Z, it's somewhere in the middle.

Right. It's, it's literally everybody's a little unhappy.



**Yael Schonbrun:** What they want. Everybody has to give up something.

**Marianne Lewis:** We've all given up something. This is kinda negotiation. I think if everybody is unhappy, you did well. Right? Well, really. Because the creative integration for us really gets into, and certainly Roger Martin and others have done a lot of work around kind of this approach to how do you, when you're thinking about creative integration and you've separated and connected and you've thought, what is the best things we want out of these opposing sides?

Now the point is get super creative and out of the box to think, well, how do we get them? How do we get both of them and some of that creative integration, uh, we call a mule, right? It's, uh, smarter than a donkey, stronger than a horse, right? It's this one-off that you go, oh my goodness. We've figured out whether it's [00:37:00] like a new product to a strategy.

You've figured them both out. Others we call tightrope walking, which really means we may decide actually, Sometimes we're gonna lean a little bit more toward one side, sometimes another, but everybody's gonna win because what we want is there is a North Star. We're all work working forward. We're gonna put some guardrails in to make sure we don't go too far.

On one side or the other because we're gonna make these small concessions. I mean, the one that comes up all the time, um, with organizations is, is work around kind of, uh, the short term, long term or kind of the inefficiency versus innovation. When times are tight, you better get the. Hit the current targets.

Focus on efficiency, right? Don't go so far that you forget that you're gonna need the innovation in the future. But likewise, when times are flush and great ideas happen, maybe you're gonna overinvest on an innovation side and make the most of it. But if you did that all the time, it would be super risky.[00:38:00]

cannot go all in on that side, so you walk this tightrope between the two. But to us, that's the creative integration. I mean, the creative integration is more of a mule, but those are one-offs, great ideas that come out. You know, you get this brainstorming session that you find a way to do it. More likely we see the tightrope walking

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah, so the tightrope walker is more often The other, I, I wanted to sort of call out that you talk a good amount about the tension, the paradox between, um, Profitability and sustainability. And I think that's a really, it, it's such an important one to be thinking about in our current, you know, like

it just, even as we think about taking care of our world, but also the fact that we need to have an income to support our family.

**Marianne Lewis:** Yes. No, I, I agree. I love that one because it, you can think about it at a very macro level, meaning societal, all the way to an organization leader, to, it's just your life. Right, your job or what you at that moment. So, you know, when we first start talking about it in the book, and actually the [00:39:00] way we first started studying it was an organization.

It was Unilever International, a multinational firm who had to, who significantly turn around the, the firm financially and was touching 2 billion consumers a day. So the leader, Paul Pullman said, wait a minute. We gotta figure out how to do good while we do. You know Well, or vice versa. Right. And the beauty of what he started realizing is in this bold plan to double their profits while they have their environmental footprint, they found the synergies.

I mean, brilliant synergies because actually as they would grow, say take a product into a new market, and he would immediately say, you know, tell me how we're gonna reduce water, reduce packaging, reduce pollution, engage the local community, all of those things, reduced costs.

Okay? What they also did was they actually increased buyers.

They increased investors. They increased employees [00:40:00] because these are, this is a fast moving good. You can get it from anywhere. You could work in a lot of different organizations. You could invest in a lot of different organizations. So now the question is, if I have choices, I may put it in the firm that I think is doing good for this world.

So now we've reduced the costs, increased our buyers, meaning our customers, our talent, and our investors. The profitability happened through the sustainability. It seems so logical in hindsight, but people thought Paul Pullman was crazy. Seriously when he put that this, this was the goal. And I share that because I love, and I, I'm the dean of a business school.

We talk about this a lot. I think we can get a view of it's, is it about the money or is it about the mission? Yes.

**Yael Schonbrun:** The answer's

**Marianne Lewis:** same thing for, you know, when I'm talking to a student about their, your job. Sure you can follow the money and maybe there will be

times that you do [00:41:00] and you use that money to fund your passion and to do other pe, other work in your volunteer life.

But you will have these beautiful mule opportunities where you say, I love this organization. I love what they're doing. I can bring my talents to it and I can serve my mission while I pay the bills. And live a good life, right? But it doesn't always work that way. But in the, you know, model of both and thinking, don't make that trade off.

You don't need to make that trade off.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. And I think that it's so much easier not to make the trade off when you can allow for the discomfort of the tension in in particular moments because it, it. I think that we often get afraid, like, oh, there's conflict and this is uncomfortable, and we need to sort of undo the conflict because it's a sign that something's wrong.

And so in this both and thinking model, you're saying it's not a sign that something's wrong. It's, it's a part of this system and there are ways to help yourself move through it. And I, I wanna sort of return to this, um, part [00:42:00] of. Really clarifying your higher purpose. And in acceptance and commitment therapy, the kind of treatment that I practice, we call this clarifying our values, and you talk about it as, as identifying your higher purpose.

And I'll just share a quote from your book that I loved, which is that a higher purpose invites people to think beyond the conflict, to adopt a more holistic approach that can accommodate competing demands and blurt immediate friction. And I'm particularly interested in that last part, like in what ways does identifying that higher purpose help people? Kind of quiet the friction between A, what could otherwise be opposing factions.

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** Uh, uh, I just, I can't say enough for how important it is to get up to move up the ladder of abstraction we say to this higher purpose, um, because you can take the most contentious idea imaginable. And if you said, I'm going to pick something really contentious, like, you know, guns, but we could decide we don't want any more innocent children dying by guns.

And we would all [00:43:00] agree on it now, where the tensions reside in how we get there. But let's agree on what we want because we actually all can get very quickly clear on we agree. We all want that now that we gotta figure out

how we get there is absolutely, that's where we're gonna feel the tensions. But that is not an easy issue.

Right. I just, I just put out a big one. Right. With guns and then you say, okay, cuz it's a huge systems problem. So actually we need as many options on the table as possible because it is a huge systems issue from from economic inequality to right. Legal issues to. Cultural to right. We could put all sorts of issues.

So what we need is lots of ideas and ways that we might. You know, approach it. Even in the Paul Pullman, Unilever, for example, he would say, when we would be dealing with a, a challenge around profitability and sustainability, we would always remind everybody what we want is to help [00:44:00] people live better lives.

Right? He would have a very high level piece, very, very high level. And then it would say, and if sometimes he would come in and there was no tension, he would remind them that, and he'd say, I better hear some tension, or We don't have enough options on the table.

**Yael Schonbrun:** I

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** We're missing right? Possibilities. And so that's where you get more comfortable in the creative friction because you actually say, oh no, if we need it, it's the signal.

We've got something.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. Yeah, I actually, so this reminds me of another terrific. Book. I'm not sure, I don't think you cited it in your book, but it, it really lines up with this, which is called The Righteous Mind by Jonathan

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** Oh, I love it Absolutely.

**Yael Schonbrun:** great? But he, he really talks about how we do need both sides of the political spectrum, both.

You know, all kinds of religion, and we need their pressure because they help create more sus, more balance and sustainability overall that we all, as you're saying, like have similar ideas. Like we want a sustainable world, we want a

[00:45:00] safe place for, for children and for elderly. We, but we have different ideas of how to get there and each of those sets of ideas.

Has advantages and disadvantages. And of course you have reasons to favor your own and reasons to disfavor others, but there is so much value in being able to say like, everybody brings something to the table. And the differences, the, the tension between us is what is a part of what helps us come up with creative ideas, make sure that we don't allow disadvantages to sort of become overwhelming.

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** Uh, I, I love that you brought hate up because I, I at room, I think Jonathan hate's work is brilliant on that regard because he brings in ethics so much to it, and that in these very complicated issues, when you stand on what you think is moral high ground, what you're. You're, you're missing a whole host of issues in these things.

I mean, this came up in some really, and I appreciate very thoughtful, provocative discussions around sustainability, right? I mean, we can all say we want a more [00:46:00] sustainable global world, but when you hear people pay, potentially pushing towards one extreme, the, it's still almost like the old, uh, what was it called?

The the trolley example. The moral dilemma, we are going a trolley down the hill and you've gotta decide. Yeah. Oh, I mean, those are, they like pain you to think about, but you know, if you read enough about cobalt, right. And some of the challenges to electric vehicles and the incredibly unethical ways that it's.

Mind, you're like, okay, it doesn't mean that it's, everything has to be electric. We better be re really clear about then we have problems on that side. Right? Or you see the, you know, the, the, the horrible challenges that happened in Sri Lanka when they went very fast, kind of extreme. We must be sustainable in all of our practices.

Well, those, at the lower economic income level, it just decimated their capabilities. So that moral high ground actually has also moral implications on certain [00:47:00] groups. So it might be righteous to whom or right to whom, but I like Jonathan Hate because what he, he is kind of putting out this beware the righteous mind because it polarizes us and stops us from listening and realizing these are really complicated issues.

We're not downgrading. Your view, but you also need to be looking at what are these other elements to it, to understand just how wicked these problems are and how we're gonna start making changes that make a difference and learning as we go.

Because there will be unintended consequences. Right. And how to be able to adjust

**Yael Schonbrun:** right. And that either or thinking blinds you to detecting those consequences even in the, the sort of creative brainstorming process because you get so wrapped up in, in sort of like what you need to defend that you just, I think you either don't see it or you dis discard it really quickly. So one, [00:48:00] one thing that , came up for me as I was reading your book, , because I'm, I'm so in favor of both and thinking, and I, I really embrace it and love it, but I had this thought because I, I.

Have really gotten into the science of subtraction and how our brains tend to overlook, removing things from our plate, removing things from the option list. And I also recently interviewed Annie Duke, who wrote a terrific book called Quit. And so I started thinking, how can we fit subtracting?

Into our both and thinking, because on the face of it, when you say both and you're like, let's do more of everything. But it's so important to be realistic about what we can take on. So like I actually wear a lot of professional hats, right? I'm a psychologist, I'm a podcaster. I am an academic at Brown University.

I write books and. I'm a parent of three, so it's so many things and sometimes I'm like, well, I think my both and thinking has gotten me into trouble. Cuz whenever something new comes up, I'm like, sure, I'll just integrate it. But that can be problematic. So [00:49:00] I wonder what your thoughts are on how to integrate subtraction into both and thinking.

**Marianne Lewis:** Uh, thank you so much for saying that because both end thinking in, in my view, and Wendy, Wendy's view is not just adding, it can't be. It's, and, and I don't say this just for women, but I certainly, we, we speak with enough women's groups who it seems to be a particular challenge for women who just keep adding it.

You know, it's not Yes. And. It's both and, but, but as I say that, I mean, we talk a lot about building guardrails and having some sharp focus on what you want to be doing because you have to have, you have to have enough, uh, sharpness

in either your values and or objectives that help you know when to say no or if it helps you, and it often helps me.

Not yet.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Hmm.

**Marianne Lewis:** Right. Because if you say, here's my North Star, that you [00:50:00] have to really be thinking like even I, I love the way you just rattled off all the hats you wear. I don't know you very well, obviously, but I would imagine you have built opportunities that are highly synergistic around those hats. That, and that is how you busy people.

You give, you know you want something done, you give it to a it's because it's in their wheelhouse, right? It's right in that synergistic sweet spot. I've, I can picture this Venn diagram, y ay, and I can picture you right in the middle with all those hats, but there is something very much connecting those.

And then the question is, are you sharp enough of what is at the center of that Venn diagram to know when you say not yet?

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah.

**Marianne Lewis:** Because it has to be in that sweet spot to truly tap into the synergies. If not, you get so stretched that you can't be at your best to all of the things that you're trying to do, and that's not fair to others as well as yourself.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. Yeah. So, so just out of curiosity, cuz you, [00:51:00] you admit that you're a workaholic, but like, what are your ways of setting those guardrails that help you to perform your job and, and all of your roles in a more sustainable way?

**Marianne Lewis:** No, I, I think it's a very fair statement. I mean, I, I think about that a lot. Um, my higher purpose is to empower learning, and I mean, I can do that as a mother. I can do that as a dean, I can do that in my writing and research, I mean, in the service work that I do. Right? So one is there's a higher purpose, right?

That serves as a guardrail because then I can think, wait a minute,

is, is that really right? I mean, I know, I, sure I could do, you know, I could do some nice work working for say, a non-profit doing acts. But if that's not in my

wheelhouse, am I really the best person? Let alone, it's gonna take me away from where I'm really at my best and can support.

I can also then even think about some guardrails. Um, Wendy and I laugh about this sometimes, but, um, just how to [00:52:00] compartmentalize. I mean, I think one of the great beauties of being an academic is something like a sabbatical. Right, and that you can actually separate some time

and post pandemic. I think we've blurred all these boundaries.

Work and home, right? Weekend and work week.

**Yael Schonbrun:** I actually would love for you to speak to that because I heard you talking or you, you write about it in the book, but I've heard you talking about it in a couple other interviews and I think we don't talk enough about the downsides of hybrid, the hybrid work model

and, and they are real,

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** they are very real. No thank you. Uh, and I'd be curious what you're seeing on this one too. Certainly. Um, you know, when we were asked to write something for Fast Company, uh, earlier in the year, because the view was, you know, it's posed as being the best of both worlds, but most people find it's the worst, right?

You go into the office, you're sitting in a ghost town, you're sitting on Zoom calls.

And you came in, right? [00:53:00] So there's, there's that negative, or you're at home, there are no boundaries. Everything is going on. You're trying to juggle right. Home, house, dogs, pet, right, whatever. And Right. So actually what we found in that article, it kind of pushed us cuz we hadn't thought about it either yet.

We, we just hadn't thought enough about, well, what is, how do you. Separate and connect. How do you work through this? We had a great interview with, um, the Leaders of Rocket Book, which is this very cool startup that was recently bought by B It does, uh, it does, um, reusable notebooks. And they actually started as remote work.



This is pre pandemic and they've now have, you know, headquarters and they've got space. And I said, okay, we're now post pandemic. How have you done this? And they said, well, you know, we kept in mind really, what do we want? We want just the most energized designers. Right. Creators and inventors thinking about what's the, [00:54:00] you know, what's a sustainable way to build, to use and create notebooks?

And we thought, okay, at its best, what is, what are each sides? And they said, at its best, this is what, what these guys said, and I really love this. Remote work is about deep work. If you read works on deep. I mean, it is about that uninterrupted, right? Work on your own bio rhythms. Make sure you're in your special place to have all the juices flowing, be in the zone and getting something done.

To do that. It means that remote work you, you probably do have to compartmentalize, right? I'm a super morning person. Right. Wendy's a middle of the night person. Right. We would like kind of figure out, all right, when are we doing, which actually made us very efficient, right? But, but part of it is understanding.

What is that? Because the Do your great work at home right in the morning for me. Know that you're gonna have some time in the middle. Make the, make the doctor's calls. Go to the grocery store. I didn't, who [00:55:00] cares? That's a workday. This is what they would say to us. And they said, the whole point of being at home is doing that powerful deep work when it first suits you.

And then they would figure out really creative uses of technologies so that you weren't interrupting each other

right. In those times. And then they would say, and I said, well, so what? You know you got a beautiful new headquarters. When do you use it for? And they said, we use it sparingly. We use it when we say, I know this is them.

I know the best ideas are around a whiteboard and a table when we are just all in and it's sometimes they're grueling like days, but that's why we're, when we're in, it's because we want that

and it's purposeful and we bring in food and we bring what, whatever it takes, but it's about the creative

**Yael Schonbrun:** about the connection, creativity.

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** Yeah. But I love that because even as a dean in my own building, it kind of pushed me to go, okay, help people do the deep work at home. And when I say I need you in,[00:56:00] It's not about FaceTime.

**Yael Schonbrun:** yeah, it's really about connection, breeding, creativity.

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** and I've talked to plenty of folks. We have a great real estate program and we always, you know, that firms are rethinking their space.

Right. Do you really need 'em? Cubicles. I mean, if they're sitting in a cubicle, oh my gosh, the chance that they're getting, they're very productive compared, especially compared to deep work is very small,

**Yael Schonbrun:** With one caveat. I mean, it's very, very hard to do deep work in a home space if you have small children

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** well, that's the compartmentalization, right? Then you also might have to think about how do you make sure that that space, I mean, that was where the pandemic kind of messed us

up,

**Yael Schonbrun:** it's, it was, it was painful.

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** deep work at home is not meant to be juggling the children and the work. That is not deep work,

, but you have to, part of it's, you have to know you.

What works, what doesn't, what are, what are gonna be the challenges because it's beautiful and if you don't put the boundaries up, it's never, it's [00:57:00] not gonna work

**Yael Schonbrun:** Yeah. Yeah. So it's about boundaries, guardrails, figuring out what your higher purpose is so that you can figure out what doesn't fit in um, so I wanted to actually finish by saying that to me, ultimately, like your, your research in this book is really a mindset shift book, and I, I love mindset shifts

and, and it really, you know, it's, it's shifting from either or to both and thinking, but it's also about shifting from scarcity to abundance mindset.

Which I just think is really great. Like in full lives we can still feel, and, and even with conflict, we can still feel abundance. And I just really loved the, um, the example that you gave about the mythical pizza, right? Which seems on the face of it, like it has a fixed amount, not an amount that can grow into abundance.

So can you explain how shifting from a scarcity mindset into an abundance mindset can help us even here?

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** I th I think it is so critical. You know, one of the things that we've found in our research, and we've been doing it for 25 years, it is that basically [00:58:00] three things, intensify tensions change, right? Which, uh, change, uh, tomorrow becomes today, becomes tomorrow faster, right? Tomorrow becomes today faster. Um, scarcity.

Which is what we'll come back to. And plurality, which means differing voices and actually all three of those are typically happening and then the perfect storm. But scarcity is a huge piece to this, which is now we are ju, we're wrestling over resources, which is immediately pulling us an opposing.

Directions. So an abundance mindset is huge. It's saying, well, wait a minute, rather than assuming there is only one fixed way of thinking about that resource. How do we shift? So you use the pizza. I love the pizza example because the more Wendy and I thought about it, the more we just laughed and we're like, it's so obvious.

Um, is the idea of a pizza is, look, we, we both paid for a pizza. So you get six slices and I get six. Well, but really I'm not that hungry. Do I really care why I [00:59:00] don't? Please don't force feed me six pieces, but more you can get into really creative approaches. So Wendy and I joke about this all the time. I literally am like a child.

I do not eat crust. I'm not a fan. She loves it. Well, it's not about the slices then. Right. It's about in inside versus outside. But I've had great conversations and debates even with my finance faculty here, that a dollar is a dollar. I don't believe a dollar isn't a dollar. And if you finance people, think about this too, with the time value of money.

It's not to you either, because a dollar today and a dollar tomorrow are not the same thing. So what I'm saying is with the abundance mindset, let's think about how to grow the pie. Let's think about how to think about the pie in different ways. So that we can make decisions that are not resource constrained, but resource enabled.

And some people say, but that sounds like Pollyanna, right? Ted Lasso, I've been called. Look, maybe. But the point is, if you start assuming those constraints, you are not even having a [01:00:00] creative enough, collaborative enough discussion to know what's possible.

**Yael Schonbrun:** I love it. And. I think it's a huge compliment to be called Ted Lasso. So let me end with, uh, a wonderful quote from your book, which goes as follows. Tensions are neither good nor bad. They can drive creativity and sustainability or lead to defensiveness and destruction. Their impact depends on how we respond, and I really think this book gives so many tools for learning how to respond in ways that help our tensions turn into really positive life-affirming.

Success driving happiness, nourishing, ways of being. So thank you so much for coming on and for talking with me. This was so fun. And, um, maybe you can also just share where people can find out more about you and your work.

**bothand-thinking-on-potc\_recording-1\_2023-04-26--t06-03-12pm--guest154224--marianne-lewis:** Thank you, thank you, and I really value your work. I'm looking forward to your next book, by the way, but let's be sure we stay connected. Um, you can find my, uh, my book on, uh, on [01:01:00] Amazon, and all sorts of sources. Please file. Come to, uh, both end thinking.net is our website. We've got lots of other resources and I just appreciate the chance to talk further and wonderful research that you did on the book as well.

So thank you.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Thank you.

**Yael Schonbrun:** Hey, psychologists, off the clock listeners, I'm gonna guess that if you got to the end of this episode that you also love to geek out about books in psychology.

**Michael Herold:** If you don't know where to store all your books and people are already complaining that you talk about this book that you're reading all the time, then why don't you join us once a.

To read a book together.

**Yael Schonbrun:** If you're interested in joining us, we hope you are. Just send an email to off the clock psych gmail.com and we'll send you more information.

**Debbie Sorensen:** Thank you for listening to psychologists off the clock. If you enjoy our podcast, you can help us out by leaving a review or contributing on Patreon.

**Yael Schonbrun:** You can get more psychology tips by subscribing to our newsletter and connecting with us on social media.

**Jill Stoddard:** We'd like to thank our strategic consultant, Michael Harold, and our podcast Production [01:02:00] Manager, Jaidine Stout Williams.

**Debbie Sorensen:** This podcast is for informational and entertainment purposes only, and is not meant to be a substitute for mental health treatment. If you're having a mental health emergency, dial 9 1 1. If you're looking for mental health treatment, please visit the resources page of our website off the clock.

psych.com