Federal Judicial Center
In Session Episode 4
Scientific Secrets of Perfect Timing
December 5, 2018

Lori Murphy: Hello. I'm Lori Murphy, Assistant Division Director for Executive Education at the Federal Judicial Center. Welcome to a new podcast from the Federal Judicial Center focused on executive leadership in the federal judiciary. Each episode is designed to bring practical leadership guidance, research and insight to judiciary executives.

Today's episode is about the importance of timing. Time is the great equalizer. We all get the same number of minutes and hours in each day, yet some of us get more done in those 24 hours and seem happier as a result. And while some people claim to be night owls, are they really doing their best work during those hours? Scientific research indicates there are better times to do certain tasks and even to make important decisions. For leaders who are often focused on what to do or how to do it, today's episode sheds light on why focusing on when to do things might just be a leadership game changer. Our host for today's episode is my colleague, Michael Siegel, Senior Education Specialist at the Federal Judicial Center.Michael, take it away.

Michael Siegel: Thanks, Lori. Today we're going to talk with Daniel Pink, the highly acclaimed author of numerous bestselling books including his latest, *When: The Scientific Secrets of Perfect Timing*, which we're going to talk about today. In addition to being a well-known author, Dan was the host and co-executive producer of *Crowd Control*, a television series about human behavior on the National Geographic Channel. He appears frequently on NPR's *Hidden Brain*, the *PBS NewsHour* and other TV and radio networks. Dan has also been a contributing editor at *Fast Company* and has published articles and essays in *The New York Times*, *Harvard Business Review,* and *The New Republic*. His TED Talk on the science of motivation is one of the ten most watched TED Talks of all time. It's my pleasure to introduce Daniel Pink.

Daniel Pink: Michael, it's great to be here.

Michael Siegel: So Dan, let's talk about your most recently written book, *When: The Scientific Secrets of Perfect Timing.* In the last sentence of that book you say, "I used to think that timing was everything. Now, I believe that everything is timing."Why do you say that?

Daniel Pink: Well, if you look at the research on timing, which is research that spreads across literally two dozen different disciplines, what it suggests is that what's fundamental to being human is that we are temporal creatures.

We talk about a biological clock. We have biological clocks in every cell in our body and we are moving through time. So if you look at this rich body of research, it gives us clues about how to construct our day, when to take breaks, how beginnings affect us, how midpoints affect us, how endings affect us, how groups synchronize in time, how the way we think about time affects what we do. We're immersed in a whole array of timing decisions in our lives and we tend to make them in a pretty sloppy ill-informed way. What I'm hoping in this book is to give people the evidence to make them in a smarter more systematic more scientific way.

Michael Siegel: Well, we could all use that.

Daniel Pink: Absolutely.

Michael Siegel: Your book teaches us that we all operate as you've just said with internal biological clocks and these dictate a sequence of effectiveness in our day.

Daniel Pink: Right.

Michael Siegel: We have peaks, troughs, and recoveries, which affect not only our energy level, but even our cognitive abilities. Why is this important for us to know?

Daniel Pink: Your last point is really essential, our cognitive abilities. One of the things this research tells us is that our cognitive abilities do not stay the same throughout the day. They change.They change in predictable ways. And

the difference between the daily highpoint and the daily low point can be significant. And what's more is that our best time to do something cognitively depends on what kind of cognitive task it is.

So let me take three steps back and explain this. Almost all of us go through the day in three stages as you mentioned, Michael, a peak, a trough, a recovery. Now, about 80 percent of us go through in that order: peak early in the day, trough in the middle of the day, recovery later in the day. People who are night owls - about 20 percent of the population - much, much, much more complicated. The key with them is that they hit their peak late afternoon, early evening into the evening.

Now, here's what we know about these three stages. Each of them have different characteristics. The peak, the main characteristic of the peak is that that's when we are most vigilant. What does it mean to be a vigilant? Vigilant means you're able to bat away distractions. That makes the peak - which again for most of us is early in the day, for owls, much, much later in the day. That makes the peak the ideal time to do analytic work, work that requires heads down, focus, and attention.

Now, during the trough, the middle, early to midafternoon, that's a very dangerous time. There's a whole array of data showing that there are more auto accidents then. There are more

medical errors then. Corporate performance drops. Student test scores sink. It's not our ideal time of day. So what we should be doing then is doing the kind of work that doesn't require massive cognitive power or creativity, answering routine emails, filling out expense reports, something like that.

And then the recovery, which again for most of us is late afternoon, early evening, that's a very interesting time because our mood is up, but our vigilance is down. That makes it an interesting time, an effective time at least for iterative brainstorming, things that require mental looseness. And what this tells us is that if we do the right work at the right time, we're going to do better. We're going to feel better, but we're also going to do better.

Michael Siegel: Uh-huh.

Daniel Pink: This research shows the time of day alone explains about 80 percent of the variance in how people perform on cognitive tasks.So if we're intentional about it, if we do our analytic work during the peak, our administrative work during the trough, and our insight iterative creative work during the recovery, we're going to perform a little better.

Michael Siegel: Absolutely fascinating. Let's say for instance that I'm a federal judge who has an important opinion to write or a court unit executive who has to conduct a

performance appraisal for an employee. When is the best time to act?

Daniel Pink: Whoa and that's a huge, huge question, and there are actually some very, very interesting research - not all of it exactly heartening about judicial decision-making and even jury decision-making. What it tells us pretty clearly is that decision makers of any kind, which include judges, juries, don't make the same decisions at different times of day.

There's a famous study - probably some of your listeners will know about this - out of Israel of judges making decisions about parole. What the study found is that potential parolees were more likely to get parole early in the day and immediately after the judge had her break. So in this study, which is done in part by Jonathan Levav at Stanford, going for parole before a judge's break gave you about a 10 percent of getting parole. Going for parole having your hearing immediately after the judge had a break, gave you about a 70 percent chance. So there's a seven X difference explicable almost entirely by time of day.

You see the same thing in jury decision-making at least experimentally. Some interesting research showing that if the jurors who deliberate in the afternoon are more likely to resort to racial stereotypes than jurors who deliberate in the morning. Again, it's all about vigilance. When we're vigilant, we don't take as many of these shortcuts whether it's ignoring the

evidence, whether it's sloppy reasoning, whether it is stereotyping.

As for the performance reviews, that's a really, really important and interesting question. It really depends. I mean you have to think about what the purpose of the performance review is. If the purpose of the performance review is to help the other person grow and learn, then I would argue for most people, it's better to do it in the morning rather than any other time of day.

There's some interesting evidence for things like therapy. To me it's a form of learning, other kinds of learning that people actually learn a little bit - many people, not all - learn a little bit more early in the day rather than later in the day. So a performance review early in the day might be more effective than one later in the day. But the question you asked is the key question, which is we have to start factoring that in when we make these kinds of decisions. And what we've done in general, not only in the court system and the judicial system in the justice system, is we have ignored time of day as a factor. It doesn't explain everything, but it explains a lot.

Michael Siegel: Great. I'm thinking the performance review in the morning could make it more of an analytical rather than an administrative task.

Daniel Pink: Absolutely. That's a great point too. I mean a performance review, what's the point of the exercise? The point of the exercise is to give people information to help them make progress and learning growth in an employee. So you want to do that when there's some degree of learning capacity. You don't want to do that at 1:00 in the afternoon when both the giver and the recipient are nodding off.

Michael Siegel: Your research strongly suggests that for most of us - night owls excluded - strong cognitive effort that requires focus and vigilance should be completed in the morning, while insightful exercises that require more expansive creative thinking should be completed in the afternoon. Can you elaborate?

Daniel Pink: I think it's important to understand a little bit more about why this is, and as you mentioned in your question, Michael, a lot of it goes to vigilance. Vigilance is extremely important factor in a lot of cognitive performance. Here is the challenge with vigilance. For some cognitive tasks, vigilance is actually a bug rather than a feature.

So let's say that you and I are at a meeting. What you don't want in a brainstorming session is people who are hyper vigilant saying that's a bad idea, that's a bad idea, that's a bad idea. And especially with people who are trained in the law who themselves are very good at deconstructing things rather

than constructing things. The most important thing here is - and it's in your question, Michael - is this, intentionality. We are not very intentional about when we do things in the course of a day. We think it, oh, I happen to have a pocket of time to write this opinion between 2:00 and 3:00. That's probably a bad idea for most judges, right? What you want to be able to do is you want to be intentional about when you do things in the same way, that we are intentional about what we do, how we do it, who we do it with. We're reasonably intentional about those aspects of our work, but when it comes to when we do things, we think it doesn't matter. It matters. It matters a lot.

Michael Siegel: Absolutely. On the other hand, in organizations like the judiciary, we really can't control our schedule with that kind of intentionality in mind, right?

Daniel Pink: Yeah. Sure.

Michael Siegel: But you still suggest there are ways to mitigate the negative consequences of doing things in nonpeak hours when our schedule may force us to do that.

Daniel Pink: Uh-huh. Right, right.

Michael Siegel: So can you discuss for example vigilance and taking restorative breaks?

Daniel Pink: Sure. Sure. I think it's a really great point. At any kind of workplace, people don't have full

discretion over when you do things. Now, at certain aspects of the judiciary, you're going to have more discretion, less discretion at certain moments in a judge's or a team's work. You're going to have more discretion less discretion, but you're not going to have 100 percent discretion over the when. Nobody really has that, so what do you do? First of all, you have to exercise the discretion - because that sounds like a legal term - we have to exercise the discretion when you can. So if you have some authority about when you do your analytic work, when you do your insight work, make those decisions in accordance with the science.

Now, the other thing, what you mentioned is breaks, extraordinarily important. What we know about breaks, with the science of breaks now is where the science of sleep was 15 years ago, about to break through the surface. One way to mitigate some of these harms especially in that afternoon trough is to have -- what we know about breaks is this, that something is better than nothing so even a short break is better than no break at all. We know that moving is better than stationary. So the extent to which you can have people walk around or the center which you yourself walk around, that's good. Outside is better than inside.

Some really interesting research on the restorative effects of nature, we know that social is better than solo. That's true

even for introverts, that breaks with other people are more restorative than breaks on our own. And we know that fully detached beats semidetached. So that when you take a break let's say in an office, don't talk about work during the break, and don't bring your phone with you.

If we get into the habit not only in judicial workplaces, but in workplaces of any stripe, every afternoon, people take a 10 or 15 minute walk outside with someone they like talking about something other than work and leaving their phone behind. You're going to have higher performance and you're going to have happier people.

Michael Siegel: I love that advice.

Daniel Pink: It's something that's within our grasp. Because here's the thing, you know, it's like we can't change everything. It's really, really hard to make bold changes in a workplace.

Michael Siegel: Uh-huh.

Daniel Pink: There are demands on all of us. Everybody particularly in any kind of government setting has to do more with less. You can't fix everything, but this idea of like taking this regular break in the afternoon is something that all of us can do. It's not a nicey nice thing, Michael. There's an incredible body of evidence showing that this helps us perform better and feel better.

Michael Siegel: Great. We're about to take a restorative break ourselves. So one more question before we take a break, Dan, and this goes to the leaders that are listening to us, the court unit executives, the chief judges, et cetera. If you're able to control anything about the calendar as a leader, what can you do to set yourself and your staff up for success during the day or during the week?

Daniel Pink: I think the most important thing is meetings. So in any kind of workplace including any kind of court system or judicial unit, people have meetings. When we talk about meetings in the workplace, when we schedule meetings, the only criteria and people ever used is availability. Is Mary available, is Jose available, and is conference room 3C open?

We need to be strategic and intentional about meetings and say okay, who's going to be at this meeting. Most important, what kind of meeting is it? Is this a meeting where we need people to be analytical? Is this purely an administrative meeting? Is this a meeting about our travel voucher policy? Is this an insight meeting? Are we brainstorming ideas for things?

Then who's going to be at this meeting? Are there people who are more morning-oriented types, or just people who are more evening-oriented types? Are there people who are in the middle? We don't factor those in.We just say who's available and is there a room open. What we need to do, the best thing that we

can do at any kind of workplace is to ask those questions when we schedule meetings. What types of people are going to be there, what types of tasks need to get done and what do we know about the science of timing to allow us to schedule those meetings at the right time.

Michael Siegel: Excellent. Thank you. We're going to take a quick break. When we come back, we're going to continue talking with Daniel Pink about the impact of timing on leadership.

Jennifer Richter: Are you a deputy court unit executive who wants to take your leadership skills to the next level? If so, check out what upcoming deputy CUE programs and opportunities the FJC has in store for you. The new deputy CUE program is a three-day seminar that focuses on the critical knowledge, skills and attributes that new deputy CUEs need in order to successfully transition into an executive role for the first time. If you're a deputy CUE who has been in your position from six months to two years, then check out the new deputy CUE program.

On the other hand, if you have three or more years in your role as a deputy CUE, then the experienced deputy CUE program may be for you. This two-and-a-half day seminar explores

advanced leadership skills that experienced deputy CUEs can refine in order to excel in their roles.

If you're looking for something a little more in-depth, the Judiciary Executive Leadership Program or JELP is a yearlong blended learning program that has been crafted to inspire experienced CUEs and deputy CUEs to further develop their expertise. This program investigates new ideas and best practices that are aimed at improving your individual districts, circuits and the judiciary. JELP is your path to discovering emerging leadership and management challenges, best organizational practices and state of the art thinking about organizational development.

And last but not least, if you are a deputy CUE with solid teaching experience, a passion for collaborative learning with your peers and a desire to cultivate leadership in others, the FJC is currently recruiting potential candidates to serve as faculty for our deputy programs. For more information on eligibility and how to apply or to learn more about any of these programs, visit the Executive Education page on fjc.dcn and see why past participants have called these programs, quote, the most valuable in my career.

Michael Siegel: Welcome back. I'm Michael Siegel I'm talking with Daniel Pink, author of *When: The Scientific Secrets of Perfect Timing*.

Dan, until now, we've been talking about your book and what to do in any given day to maximize productivity and satisfaction. In the second section of the book, you discuss why beginnings, middles and endings are so critical as time markers. That is looking at things that take place over longer than a day such as a project or even taking it to the personal level of career.

Daniel Pink: Uh-huh.

Michael Siegel: And looking first at beginnings, how do beginnings influence our thinking and behavior?

Daniel Pink: Yeah. Well, I mean it's a really important point here just in general because the day exerts a powerful effect on our mood in our performance, and we can respond to that. But we're on a planet that's turning. Okay. We have no control over the day. But much of our lives, as you suggest, Michael, are episodic and episodes have stages. There is a beginning, there's a middle, and an end. Each of those stages in those episodes exerts a different effect on our behavior.

You mentioned beginnings. Beginnings have all kinds of effects. So if you look at something like careers, there's some incredible research from Lisa Kahn at Yale, she's an economist, showing that the unemployment rate the year somebody graduates from college can predict their wages 20 years later, that the initial starting conditions of your career have an outsized

effect literally on how much you earn. So if you have two similarly situated people, equal levels of ability, background, et cetera, and one graduates in a recession and one graduates in a boom, the person graduating in a boom 20 years into their career is likely to be out earning the other person.

You look at even graduation from MBA programs. If you graduate from an MBA program, master of business administration program during a recession, you are less likely to become CEO of a large company. So these initial conditions matter a lot more. You see then a whole range of different activities and this is one area where we have some, but not full capacity to reshape those beginnings.

Michael Siegel: And Dan, why is the concept of a fresh start so important?

Daniel Pink: Well, that's exactly one of the areas where we do have ability to shape our beginnings. Let's take a step back here. There's a rich body of research on what are called temporal landmarks.Temporal landmarks are days and dates that stand out in time the way that physical landmarks stand out in space. So let's think about a physical landmark in space. You're traveling along. You're driving your car.Someone says look for the Chipotle on the corner, right? So you're driving along. Oh, there's the Chipotle on the corner. You slow down a little bit. You orient yourself.

Certain dates of the year have that same kind of effect. A lot of dates of the year just kind of fly by us, but some dates are more landmarks. Some researchers said at the University of Pennsylvania, Katie Milkman, Jason Riis and Hengchen Dai have done some research on what they call fresh start dates. These fresh start dates are really, really intriguing. What they do is they trigger a peculiar form of mental accounting. There are certain dates of the year where we treat them like a business treats the first day of the year or first day of a calendar. We open up essentially a fresh ledger on ourselves in the same way that a business opens up a fresh ledger at the beginning of a reporting period, like a quarter.

What this means is the following. So the dates that operate as fresh start dates for us are things like the beginning of the month, the beginning of the week, certain personal milestones. That makes it a better time to begin a form of behavior change. So you're more likely to say start a diet or start a new exercise regimen and therefore more likely to actually succeed in doing it because you have started. You're more likely to do that on a Monday rather than a Thursday, the first of the month rather than the thirteenth for the month; the day after your birthday rather than two days before your birthday; the first day of spring semester if you're a college student rather than 14 days before the end of winter

semester. So these kinds of temporal landmarks, we can use them to more intentionally make that fresh start and try to do something that is enormously difficult for human beings, which is to change our behavior.

Michael Siegel: Let's turn to the midpoints. I was captured by your discussion of this. You said that research indicates that midpoints can propel us providing a spark, or they can mire us providing a slump. How can we have more sparks and fewer slumps?

Daniel Pink: Yeah. Oh, you got it exactly right in the analysis. Midpoints have a dual effect. Sometimes, they bring us down. Sometimes, they fire us up. So you see evidence of people getting to the middle of a process.

There's a famous study of giving people five shapes to cut out. They try to cut the shapes out as meticulously as possible. And they're given five shapes and people are very meticulous on shape one, very meticulous on shape five, least meticulous on shape three. That could have sag in the middle.

You see some interesting research on the wellbeing across almost all nationalities where you have a U-shaped curve of wellbeing. So in the middle of our lives, there's no crisis, but there's a gentle slump. Yet there's other evidence showing that, for instance, in basketball teams, all right.

One of the things about midpoints is that midpoints are generally invisible in our lives. Sometimes, beginnings are a little bit more visible. You look in the calendar and say hey, it's the first of October.And some of these endings are visible because oh wow, I'm having a going away party for this job I had for 30 years.

But midpoints are less visible to us yet they exert that effect. And one of the ways that we see a spark is with the following. So there are some enterprises where midpoints are made visible and one of them would be basketball. Basketball has a midpoint. It has a halftime. A horn goes off at the midpoint. So a couple of researchers, Devin Pope at the University of Chicago and Jonah Berger at the University of Pennsylvania looked at tens of thousands of NBA, National Basketball Association games to see whether the score at halftime predicted the outcome of the game. It turned out it did. Teams that were ahead at halftime were more likely to win. Not a shocker. I don't think. The game is half over and the team is ahead.

But there was an exception to that and the exception was this. Teams that were down by one were more likely to win the game than teams that were ahead by one at halftime. That being behind by one at halftime was as advantageous as being ahead by two at halftime. In later experimental research, what they

found was that being slightly behind at the midpoint to be very motivating. So, one way to reckon with midpoints is to be aware of them. Once we're aware of something, we can more intentionally and consciously use them as a spark rather than a slump. One way to help them create a spark is to imagine at the midpoint we're a little bit behind.

Michael Siegel: So let's take that and apply it to a group working on a project in the courts.

Daniel Pink: Okay.

Michael Siegel: It is not on your research a steady march forward. It has moments of slump.

Daniel Pink: Exactly, yeah.

Michael Siegel: So how do we deal with that and for supervising projects?

Daniel Pink: Yeah. Well, that's a great point. In some of the team performance, there seems to be this organic thing happening with team performance.

This is a research of Connie Gersick, formerly of UCLA, showing when she studied teams how they actually got through a project. She was looking at kind of the meat and potatoes of organizational teamwork, so the insurance company starting a new onboarding process or something like that. What she found is that -- and her methodology was to videotape and audiotape all of these team interactions. Let's say a team has 31 days to do

a project. What she found is that during the first half of that 31 days, very little happened. There was a lot of posturing, there was a lot of status taking, there was some enthusiasm, but there wasn't a huge amount of actual work. And then what happened there was moment when groups kicked off old patterns and really got down to business. That was invariably at the temporal midpoint. So much so that there was often a person on the team who acted like that basketball halftime horn who said, hey guys, we've squandered half of our time; we got to get going here.

So what happened was that when teams progressed, it wasn't the steady smooth linear progression from beginning to end. It was much more volatile. So nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing, boom and then things really got going. Now, that could be okay. All right. That could be a way, but a way to help mitigate that perhaps would be for team leaders to impose interim deadlines on things.

Michael Siegel: I see.

Daniel Pink: So if you have 31 days, say, all right, at the end of day 5, we want to accomplish this. At the end of day 11, we want to accomplish this, so establishing those kinds of milestones might be a way to preventing the team from getting behind. Milestones can be effective. Just lay down a few

milestones along the way and people will move toward those milestones.

Michael Siegel: Super. The last societal time marker you talked about are endings, what is it about the end of something, a task, a project or a program that's so powerful, and what can we do to make endings even more impactful?

Daniel Pink: Well, I mean on the second part, we can have endings that have more impact when we're intentional about them. Endings have a profound effect on our behavior on a number of different dimensions. So one of them I just mentioned is that when we get to the end of something, we kick a little harder. So when an end becomes salient, we move a little bit faster.

There's a very, very sturdy finding id psychological science literally from like the 1930s or so, and some of the research that a fellow named Clark Hull did with rats, that when we see the end of something, we kick harder. This is one reason why you have very peculiar kinds of findings. So for instance, there's a well-known study of gift certificates where the researchers gave, let's say a $100 gift certificate to a large group of people. Half of them had three weeks to cash in the gift certificate, half of them had two months to cash in the gift certificate. Now, you would think the group with more time would be more likely to cash in the gift certificate, but that's wrong. The group that had less time was five times more likely

to cash in the gift certificate than the group that had more time. It just doesn't make any sense until you start reckoning with this that for the group with only three weeks, the end was salient.

Michael Siegel: Uh-huh.

Daniel Pink: The group with two weeks [sic], the end kind of faded away and so endings can help us energize. Endings have a disproportionate effect on how people remember experiences and encode experiences.That is huge. Endings are also a source of meaning for people. In general, we want endings with a -- they can help us elevate and feel better, a rising sequence versus the declining sequence.

I think that in the judicial setting particularly for trials, I mean, what happens in the end of a trial is massively important. Everything we know about memory formation and impressions shows that the end has a disproportionate effect on how people will encode the entire experience.

Michael Siegel: And you build on that by indicating that people prefer to end on a high note?

Daniel Pink: Right.

Michael Siegel: So let's go back to the performance appraisal.

Daniel Pink: Yeah.

Michael Siegel: Should the unit executive start with praise or a critique?

Daniel Pink: Not even a close call, Michael, even though I've been doing it wrong all my whole life. I was always someone who'd give the good news first and then the bad news.

Michael Siegel: Uh-huh.

Daniel Pink: Trying to soften the blow, ease into it, absolutely wrong. What the research shows is that when you have good news and bad news to give, you should give the bad news first and then the good news. And if you look at people's preferences - and this is something I've gotten so wrong - most people prefer to give the good news first and then the bad news. But if you asked people what they want to receive, almost four to five people preferred to begin with the bad and end with the good. That's what I want. But even I was too stupid to extrapolate from my own experience and do that for other people, especially if you're giving feedback or if you're doing performance appraisals, bad news first and then good news - bad news first and then good news. And this idea of a feedback sandwich where you go good, bad, good is the worst idea of all.

Michael Siegel: Well, I've been guilty of that myself sometimes.

Daniel Pink: Me too.

Michael Siegel: Yeah. Toward the end of your book, you talked about another fascinating way about endings, synchronization. You shared some amazing studies and evidence about the positive effect of synchronized human effort. What does this look like in a work context and why does it matter?

Daniel Pink: Yeah. So what we know, there's some very interesting research in how groups synchronize in time. And what you can do is you can look at things like choral groups, you can look at things like rowers.And there are huge effects when people are in synchrony with other people. They change psychologically, physiologically. I would argue there's evidence even morally.

So what we know is that for instance, the research on choral singing which is just mindboggling, that people who sing in choruses, not people who sing, but people who sing together with other people report greater satisfaction. There's some evidence that it's a prophylactic against depression. You even see physiological things like elevated pain thresholds, increased production of immunoglobulin. And then you also see when people do synchronized activities, particularly kids, they're more likely afterwards to be open to other people, to be collaborative, to do good deeds.

So there's something fundamental about synchronizing in time with other people. I think that it suggests to, say, small

groups in the judicial workplace, are there things that we can do where we synchronize in time? I don't think that every judicial chamber should have its own mini chorus, but it's actually not that bad of an idea. And what we know about the principles of group synchronization is that it requires a sense of belonging. And that when we synchronize with other people, we're more likely to do good. And when we do good, we get better at synchronizing with other people. So it's one of those areas of life where there actually is a virtuous circle rather than a vicious cycle.

Michael Siegel: So interesting. Dan, is there anything else you'd like our listeners to know about the importance of time and timing?

Daniel Pink: Well, it sort of goes to your very first question, which is that at some level, everything is timing. As I mentioned, we are temporal creatures we human beings. We have biological clocks in essentially every cell in our body. We also move through time, so even this interview, this interview had a beginning, it had a middle, and an end. The interview began in the past. It hasn't ended yet so it's going to end in the future. And then once it's ended, anybody listening to this will be hearing it in the past. So we're immersed in time and timing. So I think if we're awake to that, that's the first step. And then as I mentioned before, if we're intentional

about making decisions and taking in this factor of when, I think we can work smarter and live better.

Michael Siegel: You've given us a lot to think about. Thanks so much.

Daniel Pink: Thank you for having me, Michael.

Lori Murphy: Thanks, Michael and thanks to our listening audience as well. If you're interested in learning more about Dan Pink and his book, *When: The Scientific Secrets of Perfect Timing*, you can visit the Executive Education page on fjc.dcn and click or tap podcast.

In Session is produced by Jennifer Richter and directed by Maisha Pope. I'm Lori Murphy. Thanks for listening, until next time.

[End of file]

[End of transcript]