

Slice of MIT Podcast | Mindful Leadership

[SLICE OF MIT THEME MUSIC]

ANNOUNCER: You're listening to the Slice of MIT Podcast, a production of the MIT Alumni Association.

[MUSIC]

HOST: The MIT community is more diverse than any time in institute history. More than 30% of the 11,000 plus student body is from outside of the United States and 28% are members of US minority groups. Women are nearly 40% of the student population, up from only 14% in 1975 and barely 1% in 1950. And diverse communities require mindful leadership, so how can leaders be more effective in creating a more inclusive environment?

Assistant professor Renee Richardson Gosline says let's start by being mindful, recognize the biases that affect us all, and question our own heuristics Professor Gosline is the MIT Sloan's Zenon Zannetos 1955 Career Development Assistant Professor of Marketing. Her research studies how we process information about products, brands, and each other. And she believes cognitive association and heuristics, or the decision making shortcuts provided by the subconscious, are often at the root of bias.

She has been named one of the world's top 40 professors under 40, been named an MIT "Iron Professor," and prior to MIT, she was a marketing practitioner at the LVMH Moët Hennessy Luxury Goods conglomerate and Leo Burnett Worldwide advertising company. In this Slice of MIT Podcast, Professor Gosline applied her background in marketing to MIT's goals of diversity inclusion. And how our authentic self must be at the core of any leadership directive.

Professor Gosline's lecture was recorded at the 2015 MIT Alumni Leadership Conference, MIT's cornerstone event for alumni volunteers that featured discussion with the Institute leadership and updates on the future of MIT. Visit alc.mit.edu for more information. During the podcast, Professor Gosline will occasionally refer to images and graphs that appeared during her discussion. While these images aren't necessary to follow along, you can find a slide show complete with the time stamp of when each image appears on the Slice of MIT Blog at the link bit.ly/goslinepodcast. Enjoy the discussion.

RENEE Hi, everybody.

RICHARDSON

GOSLINE:

AUDIENCE: Hi.

GOSLINE: Great to see you. I know I'm in the unenviable position of standing between you and lunch. So I promise you I will try my best not to put you to sleep. And I will minimize the amount of references in this presentation to food. All right. So you might be wondering why a professor in management science, and particularly the marketing group here at MIT, is speaking to you with regard to diversity and inclusion. Well, the fact of the matter is that diversity and inclusion has a branding problem.

When you talk about this issue, you tend to get two reactions. One is you tend to find yourself preaching to the choir, and people get it. We know it's a problem. The other reaction is-- yeah, yeah, that's all well and good, but we're focused on performance right now, see. And we'll get to that when we have made our numbers. Now, the thing about diversity and inclusion is like ethics, it need not be on the side.

Rather, it's imperative that it is embedded in each of your decisions on a daily basis. So today I'd like to talk to you about taking a mindful approach. A mindful approach with your leadership style such that inclusive atmosphere is not on the side or something you think about after the fact, but rather something you can incorporate on a daily basis. And when you think about branding and applying it to your leadership style people always think about this notion of personal branding.

Now, I'm here to tell you that the phrase personal branding to me is like nails on a chalkboard. It sounds very reality-TV-Kardashian, put-a-label-on-me-- and it sounds very superficial very cheesy. So if you remember one thing out of this talk-- please, I ask you, do not say Professor Gosline came to us and talked to us about personal branding. I will disavow all knowledge of you. Now, we're not going to do is talk about personal branding, but what we're going to talk about is leadership that is authentic.

And in order for it to be authentic, it needs to start with who you are. This is not about asking people to fit into a mold or a box or to be all the same. Rather, it is leveraging each individual talent, skill, and perspective that the people in your organizations have and getting them to reach their full potential. So yes, you are not a product, but it is interesting that principals from branding can be applied to enhance your leadership style and to create a more inclusive

atmosphere. So why think about it in this regard?

Well, we are at MIT so we've got to apply the science. And the science indicates that we have cognitive maps in our brains, such that when a name, a group, a brand, a place is mentioned, certain associations come to mind. This is very important for you to be mindful of because these associations affect the degree to which people trust you, how they evaluate you, and ultimately, not only your performance but the performance of people around you. So I'd like to give you a little homework but not home, here.

I am a professor. I've got to give you work, come on. You didn't think I'd let you a free ride. So there are five words that I'd like you to think about, that come to mind. And I'm going to show you a picture. And I'd like you to think about five words when you see this. Take a couple of seconds to think about it. So we haven't rehearsed this.

I haven't met most of you before. How many people here when they thought about the five words-- this is, of course, a bottle of Corona beer-- one of the words that came to mind was "beach"? Raise your hand if that was the case. All right, a large number. How many people thought lime? Absolutely, large number. How many people thought Mexico? Yes, any other words that you think would come up?

AUDIENCE: Cold!

GOSLINE: Cold! Sun, a party, vacation, taste-- exactly. Wow.

[LAUGHTER]

I see you've done your research in this category.

[LAUGHTER]

AUDIENCE: Lots of research!

GOSLINE: So we didn't rehearse this, right? But there's a reason why those names, those associations came to mind amongst a large group of people here. It's by design, right? These images have been embedded in your mind through exposure, such that there is a cognitive map where if we place corona in the center and we have different branches leading off from it-- sun, beach, lime, Mexico, cool, taste, vacation-- all of these things will branch from here.

Now, I'd like you to do the same exercise. But I'd like you to think about, instead of Corona, yourself, your leadership style. What five words would come to mind for others when thinking about you? I'm not going to ask you to share it, so you can be honest with yourself.

[LAUGHTER]

Some people say friend. So five words that come to mind. Two things I want you to note. One is it shouldn't be easier for you to do this list for yourself than it is for you to do it for Corona beer. Because assuming none of you works for Corona, you should know yourself better than you know this product or any product really. So that's the first thing to note. How long does it take you to come up with those words?

The second thing to note is that when you come up with five of these words, three of them are wrong. That is there is only a 0.4 correlation between the influence you think you're making and the influence and the impact you actually are making. So I say this not to terrify you, but to tell you that, like Corona, if you are deliberate and mindful of the impact you wish to make, you can increase this correlation from 0.4 to closer to 1.

So what is authentic leadership? It's not about personal branding. It's about aligning the way in which you want to affect others around you with the way that you actually do and being mindful of that in your interactions. So let's talk a little bit about the science of this. This is an iceberg and the iceberg represents the brain. Now, human beings are incredible creatures, and we can do so much with these brains.

But we have limited cognitive capacity, even the brilliant people in room here. I have to say with all due respect even you have a limited amount of cognitive processing that you can do at any time. And as a result, the human brain is incredibly wired to use heuristics. Heuristics are, in a sense, in essence shortcuts. So if you go to the cereal aisle or the toothpaste aisle in the supermarket and you see 1000 cereals, 1000 toothpastes, you're not going to go through each one, read the ingredients, and so on.

You see maybe Kellogg's on one. You say, ah, yes, I'm familiar with Kellogg's. I know that that's Frosted Flakes, maybe. OK, no one can narrow down the 1000 options, right? The reason why our minds work this way is because our conscious minds, which are represented by the top of the iceberg that you can see above the water which as we know is the minimal part, can process about as much information as can fit on a Post It note-- even the brilliant minds in the room.

So your conscious mind is hearing me say a Post It note. It's seeing a Post It note with "Do It Now" written and seeing an iceberg. But fortunately, the bulk of the work, the bulk of your brain is working on non-conscious processes-- the bulk of your mind. And this is likened to the NASA supercomputer. And so you don't have to sit here in your chair and say, "Lungs, please breathe. Heart, be sure to beat."

So that's a good thing because really that would be a full time job, wouldn't it? But the thing about these non-conscious processes is that these heuristics are subject to bias. So that in addition to your hearing me talk about icebergs, you're also noticing that I'm a woman of color. You're also noticing perhaps my age, if I have a discernible accent, things of this nature.

Things that you may not think are necessarily important or impacting the way you receive me, but in fact, you are noticing. And it is influencing you. So we need to be mindful of heuristics because though they help our brains process in a brilliant fashion, they are subject to bias. So you could read that sentence even though those three words were jumbled.

Because your brain has seen the words "mindful," "effect," and "decisions" many, many times. And so you don't need to read each individual letter. The problem with this, of course, is that as our brains are being quite efficient, they are prone to bias. For instance, in experiments, experimental subjects were asked to do cognitive tasks and were given, in one group randomly assigned, MIT pens and in the other group, pens that had no name on them. The people in the MIT condition randomly assigned equal intelligence felt more intelligent.

[LAUGHTER]

Be sure to visit the COOP before you leave.

[LAUGHTER]

In another experiment, people were given wine randomly assigned to two conditions, the exact same wine. In one condition, the bottle of wine said this one is from France. In the other condition, the wine was labeled from North Dakota. No offense to North Dakota. But turns out, in the condition where people received the French wine, though the wine was identical, they reported the wine was more tasty, the food that they ate at the event was more delicious, and the people at the event were more charming. When you shop for wine for your next dinner party, perhaps you should keep this in mind.

And research done right here at MIT has shown that when people were given a 10% discount-- who wouldn't want a 10% discount. When people were given a 10% discount on the exact same item-- the discount not related to quality of the product-- they performed worse or had less efficacy in the version where the product was given a 10% discount. So even though rationally they say hey, 10% discount, very good.

They, in their behavior in a non-conscious way, behave differently with this discount. This is very important for us to consider because here at MIT and in the world, we fancy ourselves living in a meritocracy. We evaluate people based on objective criteria-- did you meet these goals, how did you do this work, were you are intelligent enough, and so on. But the fact of the matter is that our evaluations are really affected by these cognitive biases that operate under the surface.

And role incongruity, the degree to which you think-- well, what does a professor look like? That image comes to mind. And then you see me. If I don't fit that image, what happens? So research, for instance, has shown that people of color and women tend to be penalized more so when they behave-- they have the same actions, but they behave in a way that is ostensibly incongruent with the expectations of the role.

Female leaders, for instance, given more negative evaluations after the same suggestions and arguments. Professor evaluations-- women tend to be described as bossy and their male counterparts as brilliant. I was not one of the professors that was surveyed in this experiment. But yeah and MBAs-- experiments done with MBAs, the identical CV, identical achievements with the name Heidi.

Heidi seems competent, but not the type of person you'd want to work with. Compared to the exact same CV with the name Howard on it. And there has also been research-- same CVs, names that sound African-American with lower callback and hiring rates. Now, this can also be internalized. And so I want you to be really mindful of checking your own cognitive biases, whether you're part of the dominant group or part of a minority group.

This is work that we all need to do. For instance, the famous Kenneth Clark research, that led to *Brown v. Board of Education*, had children two and three years old-- very, very young. Black children shone white dolls and black dolls, asked to identify the doll that looked most like them. The children pointed to the black dolls. Asked to identify the pretty doll, the children invariably pointed to the white doll.

Asked to identify the smart doll, the same children pointed toward the white doll. Asked to identify the bad doll, the same children pointed toward the doll that looked like them-- the black doll. So we need to think about this because there is a competence gap, that women and people of color are particularly subject to. And I'm here to remind you that confidence is an extremely important part of competence.

And so not only building your own confidence is important but building the confidence of others in your group who may experience a confidence gap. For instance, in an experiment after a science test where none of the participants had any prior knowledge or leg up-- having no knowledge even of how they performed-- and asked or invited to join a competition afterward. Only 49% of the women would sign up to participate in this competition-- the men, 71%.

When I was growing up the lotto had this tagline, you have to be in it to win it. But how can you be in it if you don't think that you belong there? Another study at HP showed that women felt that they needed 100% of the qualifications in order to apply for a promotion-- men only 60%. Confidence extremely important to competence. So I'd like to show you some of my research that really gets to this issue.

Let's suspend disbelief and say that there is a possibility that you could become even smarter than you are already. And let's assume then that you want to boost your cognitive ability, and you decide to purchase a product that purports to do this very thing. In fact, this is a real product that is available, but you may have heard of others-- example, Luminosity which has you do sort of intellectual calisthenics in a degree to increase your mental acuity.

So we have the same product. And let's say you've decided you want to buy a product like this, but you can buy this product from two different purveyors-- one, MIT and two, the University of Phoenix. Now, I am speaking to a group of MIT people, so we have a sense of which direction you would go. But let's even presume that that were not the case, that you're not MIT people for instance. And which would you choose?

The fact of the matter is that if I ask would you choose University of Phoenix or MIT, how many people would use the MIT? Right. So this is pretty much how everyone answers with almost no variation unless, perhaps, you're the dean of the University of Phoenix. Now, if you paid attention to the earlier part of this lecture, you probably know that I'm going to show you that using one affects your performance versus the other. The wine study for instance?

And indeed versus the control with this exact same product, we had people train with it, and we tested them afterward. Turns out though there are reverse placebo effects, such that with these participants who were not MIT people, they performed worse in the condition where they were given the MIT product. Again, randomly assigned, no difference in incoming intellect, and this is a between subjects design, meaning the people in this condition were not aware that this other condition existed.

So, of course, we said, no, can't be because we were all at MIT, and we thought how odd. Maybe MIT is not as great as we thought it was-- turns out it is. People rated the prestige of MIT as higher than the University of Phoenix. And indeed they did expect the MIT product to work better and have higher efficacy. So how odd that we saw these results?

Moreover, the people who worked with the MIT product had a 35% more higher willingness to pay for the product than the people in the other condition. So we thought, well, maybe it's the effort. Maybe when you're in the MIT condition, you're working more, you're working less. Turns out that that's not the case. The alternative explanation of effort is equal through all the conditions.

And maybe you spend more time, maybe you are more deliberative in one condition than the other. Turns out that that's not true either, there's no significant difference there. So we said, well, let's try this again with a different product. Maybe this is an aberration. And we did it with a language learning product. You may be familiar, for instance, with Rosetta Stone which teaches you various languages.

Well, we told them here at MIT we're developing a language training program, but we don't want to give anyone an advantage who may be familiar with the language before so we used a completely fictional language. If you've ever seen the movie *Avatar*, it features blue aliens. And these aliens have their own language which is called Na'vi. Now, I've never seen the movie nor had I heard of Na'va, but fortunately here at MIT, I had a post-doc who is fluent in Na'vi.

[LAUGHTER]

And he created an entire language learning program in Na'vi. You can't make this stuff up. So once again, we have this language learning program and between subjects, we asked people which brand would they choose-- MIT or the University of Phoenix. And once again, people preferred MIT. So how did they perform?

Remember, between subjects designed, randomly assigned, no difference in effort or ingoing advantage. Not surprisingly, none of our participants knew Na'vi going in. They did the training and then they were tested. Here's their objective performance. Once again, lower performance in the MIT condition but that was the objective performance. How did they think they did? Well--

[LAUGHTER]

Turns out that people in the MIT condition felt better prepared. Not only that, they had a higher willingness to pay than in the other condition. So what is really going on here? Did you make a mistake by coming to MIT? Have I? Absolutely not. What's going on here is a process called social comparison. It is something that human beings as social creatures can't help themselves from doing. And you're doing it right now, even if it's non-conscious.

Turns out that in an arena where standards are high, which obviously is the case at MIT and our participants reported that to be their anticipation that the standards at MIT are higher than the standards at the University of Phoenix. These high standards, when you are psychologically close to the target audience, can cause you to rise to the occasion. In this case, if you think the people at MIT are just like me.

I belong at MIT. MIT is a place for me. When I see MIT, I can see myself. You are psychologically close to that standard and you rise to the standard. However, when you feel psychologically distant from that standard-- even though you have the qualifications, even though you're willing to pay more, even though you feel better prepared, even though if given a job or a position at a high standards place, which most people would want-- you still non-consciously find yourself psychologically distant which then leads to intimidation.

You feel like a chihuahua amongst Great Danes. This is important then because each of us as leaders have the opportunity to affect this psychological closeness or distance not only for ourselves but for our organizations. Remember when I asked you, what does a professor look like? To the extent that you don't think a professor looks like me or that I don't think I look like a professor. I am not consciously intimidating and taking myself out of the game.

So it is crucial then that when it comes to performance, we not just think about numbers and diversity as we need to get our numbers up. Because you can get people there-- you can get someone who's the first person in their family to go to college. You can have women in

positions that are not traditionally female or gendered. You can have people of color in positions.

But as long as they feel intimidated or that they don't belong there, you will have such an effect as opposed to their seeing themselves as a part of MIT. Therefore, it's very important that you raise visibility, you raise support, you increase psychological closeness and not just numbers. I'd like to let you know that we try to turn this effect off and here's how you do it.

We did another experiment with MIT students. And in this case, we had MIT students use the same product, but before they used the product, we told them about a fellow student named Eric, a fictional student in this particular case. And in one case, Eric is at MIT, like they are, and Eric is similar to them. And Eric is doing very well. In another case, people were assigned to the condition where Eric, like them, was at MIT but was struggling.

Students at MIT randomly assigned to those two conditions, the performance in the condition where the person similar to them, Eric, was doing well, they assimilated to that standard. In the condition where Eric was like them and doing poorly, their performance was lower. These are MIT students. So thinking about inclusively and performance is extremely important because there is a very strong connection.

Let me tell you what this connection looks like. First, we have psychological safety.

Psychological safety is a concept that describes the degree to which you feel safe saying I'm not sure or I had a thought and feel like no one's going to laugh at you. You won't look dumb. It's OK. And this concept was pioneered by a colleague of mine at HPS, Amy Edmondson who did research in hospitals, and found that there was this interesting paradox where the best hospitals had the higher percentage of people reporting mistakes and asking questions, seeking help.

To the degree that you feel psychologically safe in an environment, you feel less vulnerable. When you feel less vulnerable, you are less risk averse. Risk aversion is strongly related to performance. It's strongly related to innovation and leadership. How can you put forth new ideas if you're so worried that someone's going to laugh you out of the room?

Psychological safety is related to vulnerability, it's related to risk aversion which ultimately is related to performance. And if you are in an industry where innovation is important-- and I'm going to go out on a limb and say that is true for all of you-- you need to be thinking about this.

So what can you do? Mindful leadership-- thinking about how each moment you are impacting those around you.

First, consider framing. Were I speaking to you today about jazz and music, you may have looked at this image and seen a man playing a saxophone. While talking to you today about women, beauty industry, facial recognition, you may look at the same picture and see the face of a woman. If you've see neither, see me after class.

[LAUGHTER]

Consider framing as an important part of your leadership style in creating an area of inclusivity because diversity does have a branding problem. And when you say diversity, people think oh, well, that's for people on the side. And so in an experiment for instance, Princeton Opponents of Proposition 174. This was a proposition that was framed, or the content was meant to be harmful either to female students or male students, right?

Now, in this experiment, 50% wrote in support of this proposition for their own sex. Self-serving-- oh, it hurts women. I'm a woman. I got to write in on this. Only 22% wrote in for the opposite sex. But just look at the power of framing-- when it was rephrased to Princeton Men and Women Opposed to Proposition 174. The percentage of people who wrote in for the opposite sex rose from just 22% to 72%. That is a massive, massive increase.

So when you think about inclusion, diversity, and all of these issues, think about the terminology and the framing that you're using. Is it a leadership issue? Well, shoot, we all want to be leaders. Or is an issue for women? Is it an issue for black people? Like ethics, where ethics should be organic to your decision making, so must inclusively. The other thing I want you to think about is tone and personal impact.

Your tone, your interactions have a huge effect on the world. Three degrees in that the way you speak with your coworker affects how they speak with their spouse affects how they speak with their child and how their child goes to school and behaves the next day. You literally can change the world with the interactions that you make. And so think about this because here is the same individual whose face indicates very different things and research has shown that your countenance can affect the degree to which people find you approachable, want to speak with you.

And when I look into the room here, I see lovely countenances, especially when I mention this

topic. People's faces start to look a lot better. But remember, this is emotional contagion-- people avoid negative effect imagery because they think it's going to affect them. Happiness is contagious, so is unhappiness. So film yourself, increase that 0.4 correlation because you may have no idea of the impact you're making.

I want to show you a couple examples of this. Here we have Mitt Romney. Now, as you know Mitt Romney worked at Bain Capital. And this image of him during his time at Bain Capital taking a picture with his coworkers with money made the rounds. In this day and age of social media, you can't catch a break. And so this image was then used as emblematic of the fact that he was sort of out of touch with the common man, very wealthy and so on.

And so it became a cover of New York Magazine, memes created on the internet likening him to Gordon Gekko from the movie *Wall Street* whose famous line was, "Greed is good." Cartoonists took the opportunity to liken him to famous greedy characters. And so there was a problem here right. Look at how Mitt Romney became more mindful. Notice, if you see anything in common with these photos.

Now, if I invite you to a job interview and you're going into a job interview, what percentage of people would wear a suit? Just about everybody here. Now, this person was running for the highest office in the nation. This was a deliberate and mindful decision to bring him from a psychologically distant person to psychologically close-- very mindful. Now, of course, the outcome of the election had to do with more than just his wardrobe but the point is that these little things can make a difference.

And to be fair, let's look at his opponent, Barack Obama, running for the President of the United States but also running as a black man. Now, we know that there are stereotypes that exist around black men and so here are some of the images found on the internet representing Barack Obama. Now, here we have people leveraging ingoing cognitive biases in their cognitive map. There is a link from black man to thug, scary. This sort of thing.

See if you see anything in common with these photos of Barack Obama. What do you see in common? Kids, children. You can't be the scary thug if you're getting mugged in the head by a four-year-old. So I want you to think about that tone and impact. The third and the fourth thing I want to leave you with is the power of the narrative. Now, narrative is just really a long way of saying story.

And we're all familiar with stories Mother Goose and the like when we were growing up. There's a reason why we learn things in story form. Narratives are processed differently in our brains. What happens is when I give you the same exact information in a story or narrative form, you encode it differently. You encode it in a way that is more conducive to your likelihood of storing that information and your ability to retrieve it. It is why, as children, important lessons, moral lessons are taught to us in story form.

You can use the power of narrative to your advantage as a leader. Because the list of qualities that a business leader should have and the list of qualities that people don't want to have do overlap in one key area-- vulnerability. As a leader creating an inclusive atmosphere, it is imperative that you are able to become comfortable with sharing your vulnerability. And the best way to do this is a narrative form.

Despite the cognitive biases that we have ingoing, there are two key ways to neutralize them. The first is to know that they exist because you are less likely to be prone to cognitive bias when you take it from a non-conscious and bring it to the conscious. The second is to build a connection first. It is much more difficult for you to dismiss me as merely a woman if we've connected in an authentic way.

Now, my personal narrative is that I'm a child of immigrants born in Brooklyn, New York. And my dad sat with me every day after school and asked me, what did you learn today. At one point, my educational attainment outpaced his, where what did you learn today became more of my teaching my dad than my dad teaching me. And this went on through college and graduate school, which to this day I speak with my dad, and I'll talk to him today and tell him about you.

And he'll say, what did you learn today? That's why I became a professor. That's why the things that are of interest to me have to be relevant to the real world. That's my narrative that tells me why I do what I do. What is your narrative? Why do you do what you do? Is it for the money? Is there something that really motivates you?

Think about that and use that as a way of displaying vulnerability-- not crying in the corner in the fetal position, but vulnerability to say I can connect with you. I'm a human being too. You are far more likely to win any negotiation or argument on the strength of your relationship than on the strength of your argument. Last, I'd like to mention resilience. Resilience is essential for every leader in an inclusive place.

And I'd like to encourage you to become comfortable with being uncomfortable. One of the things about talking about issues of inclusively is that people are afraid of saying the wrong thing. Now, I understand that fear. But the problem with that is we don't move forward. When you make authentic connections with people, you can have authentic conversations. And you can learn to be comfortable with being uncomfortable.

One of the best ways of obtaining this is by practicing improv for management. You may have seen improvisational comedy. You'd have a group of people up here, and we're doing some ridiculous activity like planning a trip to Jupiter. And the people in the room have to follow one another, and the two rules are you can't say no. You have to say yes and you can't say but.

Now, what's nice about this is it forces you to listen when the person is speaking before you and to not put up walls but to go with it under pressure and build trust. That is essential for leaders because let me ask you, how many people in this room in a conversation have been thinking about what they were going to say next instead of listening to what the person was saying at the moment? If your hand is not up, I'm not sure you're being truthful.

So these skills developed by improv are also skills that great leaders need to have. Improv for management is something that you can use to get your group together and build these bonds. I'd like to leave you with the thought that this mindful leadership is a process, it is not static-- review, revisit, adapt. It is important that you have a dynamic attitude towards your growth as a leader because that will allow you to grow organically with your organization and with your team.

I'd like to leave you by saying that with my favorite Gandhi quote, "Happiness is when what you think, what you say, and what you do are in harmony." Mindful leadership is about being cognitive, being conscious, about aligning these things so that the impact you have on others is indeed aligned with the impact you wish to have on them. So I wish you that mindfulness leadership, that alignment, and that harmony to lead ultimately to happiness. Thank you for your time,

[APPLAUSE]

HOST:

So what's the true definition of authentic leadership and what's the best way to apply it? Tweet your thoughts on this episode to @MIT_alumni. That's @ MIT underscore alumni. And if you want to hear more surprising and quirky stories about MIT, subscribe to the Slice of MIT

Podcast on iTunes. Rate the podcast and leave a review. Tell us what you liked or didn't like about each episode. And let us know what type of stories you want to hear in the future.

Special thank you to Professor Gosline for allowing us to repurpose her presentation from ALC. And don't forget to visit Slice of MIT at bit.ly/goslinepodcast to view the slides and shots that accompany this episode. And for more information on MIT's Alumni Leadership Conference and how you can attend on September 23rd and 24th 2016, visit alc.mit.edu. Thanks for listening.

[SLICE OF MIT THEME MUSIC]