Body: stand straight, two feet spread evenly  
Rate: medium, Pitch: medium, Volume: high, Quality:

(Below, focus on pause and emph.)

TODO: increase intent.

TODO: focus on how to say it.

TODO: figure out whether the tomorrow’s leader’s makes sense.

TODO:

Who are tomorrow’s leaders of the world? Is it the MBA from an Ivy League School? Or the PhD from a top-ranked engineering school?

TODO  
Who are tomorrow’s leaders? Who shapes the trends and innovation of tomorrow. The one that knows a lot about a little, or the one that knows a little about a lot?   
  
(opt. pause- make the audience think)   
  
By the way, the type of person with the skill sets I just mentioned have names. The former is a generalist. The latter is a specialist.

(short pause)

While not a rule, a manager of a consulting company with an MBA might be a generalist, and a scientist with a PhD might be a specialist. The debate between the merits of a generalist and specialist is age-old, and I’ve seen it on my GRE writing. And both sides seem to have an argument.

Statistics show that all CEOs, as an identifier of leadership, have an MBA from an Ivy League school. Quote from … . And I agree. They are trained to have the skills to manage and be leaders. I think it is who you know, and not just what you know. Specialists are trained .

The thing is, if you look online for a form of this argument today, you’ll find several articles arguing for the importance of the generalists in today’s globalized world, with the main argument being that generalists can see (slt emph) the bigger picture (emph-up), adapt to a changing environment (emph-up), and promote team building (emph-up) – all of which are necessary in this increasingly flat world. But, not too many articles exist that make this same case for *specialists*; can’t specialists (body: / emph: ) have these positive qualities too, even if they don't have the actual leadership training that instills these qualities (vocal: emph)? I would like to provide an argument that specialists can shape the ideas of tomorrow also.

As I see it, there are 3 different ways scientists and engineers can develop these strong qualities associated with a generalist. (pause).   
  
1. specialist can understand the bigger picture of the work they are doing. Many publications, particularly those in computer science, are judged by novelty. Knowing the novelty of a solution involves constant assessments of needs in society. Grant proposals require a broader impact section, and scientists must have a way to come up with good cases for their research, otherwise they will not get funded to do what they are doing.   
  
2. even though specialists don't know broad skill sets, specialists often have this unique ability to learn *how* (emph) to learn, allowing them to pick up a broad skill set if needed. The act of doing a lab experiment to find a new virus requires a discovery process that involves learning new things as you go. Coming technologies abound. up with new algorithms and implementing them requires one to pick up skill sets in an uncertain environment where several   
  
3. specialists are *already* team-builders. Cross-lab collaborations are a big part of working together in research. It's often up to the scientists to s*eek out* these collaborations, and this involves networking. Once a collaboration has been formed, it involves finding a way to work as a team. Faciltating, listening. The training of many specialists, notably PhDs, often requires some aspect of teaching undergraduate students. This involves leading students to collectively learn in the classroom (by making sure to answer all their questions), and planning and overseeing group projects of the class. The skills acquired here in teaching students can be transferred to leadership skills.   
  
(Pause)  
  
Generalists may be in high-demand due to their abilities to have a broad range (body: / emph: ) of skill sets applicable in many domains. Yet in my opinion, the viewpoint that various articles suggests is that only generalists are well-equipped to take on leadership roles, and this viewpoint sometimes implicitly suggests that specialists *aren’t*. If one considers the skills that a specialist must have to succeed in her job, this viewpoint may be a bit extreme. A specialist can learn to adapt / understand broader impact, and build teams too.   
  
Perhaps their skills won't be as refined as managers, but they can learn on their own and pick up skills, if they worked hard at it, to get practical, real-world experience doing it. In my opinion, it's a matter of realizing how the skills a scientist or engineer already has (shortPause) can be transferred in the context of managerial positions. Once realized, it’s then a matter of practicing and engaging oneself in such leadership positions, and thriving through the energy that specialists so often have.

For those young people, I say get encouraged to pursue science and engineering, even after college graduation. Having been through the process.

More broadly speaking, it seems to me that it's really up to a person's motivation and hard work, rather than their degrees or certifications, that makes a person a leader.

Meta-tasks : 1. don’t give away too much 2. Make a todo list

Introduce MBAs .

The business-savvy or the math and science? The MBA who is networked. Or a PhD who has worked tirelessly.

First (body: ), a specialist can understand the bigger picture of the work they are doing. Many publications, particularly those in computer science, are judged by novelty. Knowing the novelty of a solution involves constant assessments of needs in society. Grant proposals require a broader impact section, and scientists must have a way to come up with good cases for their research, otherwise they will not get funded to do what they are doing. The ability to understand related work can be expanded through using their skills to broaden their knowledge and become better.

First (body: ), a specialist can have a general knowledge. The scientist must understand related work. To do this involves constant reviewing of articles. This may make the scientist overly specialized in their fields. However, there is a skill set involved in acquiring the specific knowledge. A specialist can find these skills to build a rough landscape of the world around them. This picture may not be the best. The manager could help smooth the rough edges. But the specialist is able to find a unique perspective of the world that a manager may not have thought of.

Organize thoughts better 🡪 when you put your mind to it, some really good things can happen.

Second, (body: ), don't know broad range of skill sets, but specialists often have this unique ability to learn how to learn, allowing them to pick up a broad skill set if needed. The act of doing lab experiments to find a new virus requires discovery process that requires learning new things as you go. The discovery process involves forming a hypothesis, testing the hypothesis, designing conclusions. In each part, the scientist must navigate unknowns to come across a conclusion. Doing this continuously doesn’t necessarily increase the specialists knowledge. But, behind the scenes, what it’s simultaneously doing is enhancing the ability to pick up new knowledge on the fly, increasing their abilities to infer knowledge from one piece of knowledge. If a specialist truly wanted to and took the effort to, he or she could become a generalist using their strengths as a specialist.

Third (body: ), specialists are *already* team-builders. Cross-lab collaborations are a big part of working together in research. It's often up to the scientists to s*eek out* these collaborations, and this involves networking. Once a collaboration has been formed, it involves finding a way to work as a team. Faciltsting, listening. The training of many specialists, notably PhDs, often requires some aspect of teaching undergraduate students. This involves leading students to collectively learn in the classroom (by making sure to answer all their questions), and planning and overseeing group projects of the class. The skills acquired here in teaching students can be transferred to leadership skills.

Cross-lab collaborations are a big part of working together in research. It's often up to the scientists to s*eek out* these collaborations, and this involves networking. Once a collaboration has been formed, it involves finding a way to work as a team. Faciltsting, listening. The most basic collabs are student-teacher based.

Who are tomorrow’s leaders? Who shapes the trends and ideas of tomorrow? The one that knows a lot about a little, or the one that knows a little about a lot? (opt. pause- make the audience think)   
  
By the way, the type of person with the skill sets I just mentioned have names. The former is a generalist. The latter is a specialist.

(short pause)

While not a rule, a manager of a consulting company with an MBA might be a generalist, and a scientist with a PhD might be a specialist. The debate between the merits of a generalist and specialist is age-old, and I’ve seen it on my GRE writing. And both sides seem to have an argument.

Statistics show that all CEOs, as an identifier of leadership, have an MBA from an Ivy League school. Quote from … . And I agree. They are trained to have the skills to manage and be leaders. I think it is who you know, and not just what you know. Specialists are trained .

The thing is, if you look online for a form of this argument today, you’ll find several articles arguing for the importance of the generalists in today’s globalized world, with the main argument being that generalists can see (slt emph) the bigger picture (emph-up), adapt to a changing environment (emph-up), and promote team building (emph-up) – all of which are necessary in this increasingly flat world. But, not too many articles exist that make this same case for *specialists*; can’t specialists (body: / emph: ) have these positive qualities too, even if they don't have the actual leadership training that instills these qualities (vocal: emph)? I would like to provide an argument that specialists can shape the ideas of tomorrow also.

As I see it, there are 3 different ways scientists and engineers can develop these strong qualities associated with a generalist. (pause).   
  
1. specialist can understand the bigger picture of the work they are doing. Many publications, particularly those in computer science, are judged by novelty. Knowing the novelty of a solution involves constant assessments of needs in society. Grant proposals require a broader impact section, and scientists must have a way to come up with good cases for their research, otherwise they will not get funded to do what they are doing.   
  
2. even though specialists don't know broad skill sets, specialists often have this unique ability to learn *how* (emph) to learn, allowing them to pick up a broad skill set if needed. The act of doing a lab experiment to find a new virus requires a discovery process that involves learning new things as you go. Coming technologies abound. up with new algorithms and implementing them requires one to pick up skill sets in an uncertain environment where several   
  
3. specialists are *already* team-builders. Cross-lab collaborations are a big part of working together in research. It's often up to the scientists to s*eek out* these collaborations, and this involves networking. Once a collaboration has been formed, it involves finding a way to work as a team. Faciltating, listening. The training of many specialists, notably PhDs, often requires some aspect of teaching undergraduate students. This involves leading students to collectively learn in the classroom (by making sure to answer all their questions), and planning and overseeing group projects of the class. The skills acquired here in teaching students can be transferred to leadership skills.   
  
(Pause)  
  
Generalists may be in high-demand due to their abilities to have a broad range (body: / emph: ) of skill sets applicable in many domains. Yet in my opinion, the viewpoint that various articles suggests is that only generalists are well-equipped to take on leadership roles, and this viewpoint sometimes implicitly suggests that specialists *aren’t*. If one considers the skills that a specialist must have to succeed in her job, this viewpoint may be a bit extreme. A specialist can learn to adapt / understand broader impact, and build teams too.   
  
Perhaps their skills won't be as refined as managers, but they can learn on their own and pick up skills, if they worked hard at it, to get practical, real-world experience doing it. In my opinion, it's a matter of realizing how the skills a scientist or engineer already has (shortPause) can be transferred in the context of managerial positions. Once realized, it’s then a matter of practicing and engaging oneself in such leadership positions, and thriving through the energy that specialists so often have.

For those young people, I say get encouraged to pursue science and engineering, even after college graduation. Having been through the process.

More broadly speaking, it seems to me that it's really up to a person's motivation and hard work, rather than their degrees or certifications, that makes a person a leader.

META-TODO: add priorities to TODO’s.

META-TODO: figure out logistics of TODO’s.

META-TODO: figure out whether we need to be concrete below, or put in more?

META-TODO: Add in more about persuasion.

TODO: check wording below for leaders vs. trends and ideas.

Who are tomorrow’s leaders? Who shapes the trends and ideas of tomorrow? The ones that know a lot about a little, or the ones that know a little about a lot?

TODO: check people vs. person .   
By the way, the two types of people with the different skill sets I just mentioned have names. The former is a generalist. The latter is a specialist.

TODO: check the manager of a consulting company, and see if MBA works.

TODO: expand on “both sides” seem to have an argument .

While not a rule, a manager in a large corporation with an MBA might be a generalist, and a scientist in a research lab with a PhD might be a specialist. The debate between the merits of a generalist and specialist is age-old and fundamental, and both sides seem to have an argument.

TODO: think about whether to put search online vs “look online”.

TODO: think about last sentence that aims to give intent.

The thing is, if you look online for a form of this debate today, you’ll find several articles arguing for the increased importance of the generalists in today’s globalized world. One particular article by the Harvard Business Review titled “All Hail the Generalists” argues that generalists can see the bigger picture, adapt to a changing environment, and promote team building – all of which are necessary in an increasingly globalized world. Yet, not too many articles exist that make this same case for *specialists*; can’t specialists have these positive qualities too, even if they don't have the leadership training that instills these qualities? In the below, I hope to convince you how specialists can shape the ideas of tomorrow also, with the skills that they already have.

1. Seeing the bigger picture: Advancements in science are judged by its novelty. Specialists can understand the bigger picture of the work they are doing. Most scientific publications are judged by novelty. Knowing the novelty of a solution involves constant assessments of needs in society. To assess novelty, scientists must usually do a literature search, and constantly be aware of other work in the neighborhood of their research area. The skill of learning about and relating other work to their own can be applied in a management position, where constantly assessing the competition around them is necessary in delivering a successful product to their customers.   
  
2. Adapt to a changing environment: The skills required to find a new virus requires a process that involves learning how to use new lab equipment, or learning a new chemistry equation. In doing scientific experiments, scientists often have this unique ability to learn *how* to learn. A scientist’s skills used to acquire a depth of knowledge on-the-fly can replicated within a management position, where the environment such as stock market exchange data feeds, are constantly changing.

TODO: refine and add todos.   
3. Being a team-builder: Specialists are *already* team-builders. Cross-lab collaborations are a big part of working together in research. It's often up to the scientists to s*eek out* these collaborations and this involves networking. Once a collaboration has been formed, it involves finding a way to work as a team. The skills acquired can be transferred to a management position, where networking is essential to management positions.

As can be seen, realizing how the skills a scientist or engineer already has can be used to in the context of management position.

There’s a bigger point here than whether it’s today’s graduating PhDs or MBAs that will shape the innovation of tomorrow. The true leader of tomorrow will need to be able find our strengths within ourselves, and grow through building upon those strengths, whether or not we have a PhD, MBA, or any certification whatsoever. Given this, we should start finding our own happiness, being thankful for who we are, and appreciating what we have rather than what we don’t have. In other words, it requires strengthening our inherent strengths, rather than trying to fix all our known weaknesses. Once we realize our strengths, it’s a matter of harnessing them to handle our shortcomings, just like the scientist of a national lab above tries to become a manager of a corporation.

Each of us has a set of unique capabilities, but its often easy to forget about what we have inside of us, by focusing on what we aren’t rather than what we are.

Finding one’s strengths and harnessing them

I just showed how someone who may have

(Pause)  
TODO: - make high-demand

TODO: make sentences less of a run-on.   
Generalists may be in high-demand due to their abilities of have a broad range (body: / emph: ) of skill sets applicable in many jobs. Yet, in my opinion, the viewpoint that various articles suggests is that only generalists are well-equipped to take on leadership roles, and this viewpoint sometimes implicitly suggests that specialists *aren’t*. If one considers the skills that a

specialist must have to succeed in his or her job, this viewpoint may be a bit extreme. A specialist can learn to adapt, understand broader impact, and build teams too.   
  
TODO: add intentionality.

TODO: fix word “managers”

TODO: fix “once realized”

Perhaps their skills won't be as refined as managers, but they can learn on their own, and if they worked hard at it, to get practical, real-world experience doing it. Once realized, it’s then a matter of engaging oneself in such leadership positions, and thriving through the energy that specialists so often already have.

TODO: add in content about young people here.

TODO: expand on this, and integrate with the above.

TODO: fix qualifier “more broadly speaking”.

More broadly speaking, it seems to me that it's really up to a person's motivation and hard work, rather than their degrees or certifications, that makes a person a leader. For those young people, I say get encouraged to pursue science and engineering, even after college graduation. Having been through the process.

Who are tomorrow’s leaders?

Who are tomorrow’s leaders? The ones that know a lot about a little , or the ones that know a lot about a little?

By the way, the two types of people I just mentioned have names. The former is a generalist. The latter is a specialist.

While not a rule, a manager in a large corporation with an MBA might be a generalist, and a scientist in a research lab with a PhD might be a specialist. The debate between the merits of a generalist and specialist is age-old and fundamental, and both sides seem to have an argument.

The thing is, if you look online for a form of this debate today, you’ll find several articles arguing for the increased importance of the generalists in today’s globalized world[2]. One particular article by the Harvard Business Review titled “All Hail the Generalists” [3] argues that generalists have an added edge because they can see the bigger picture, adapt to a changing environment, and promote team building – all of which are necessary in an increasingly globalized world. Yet, not too many articles exist that make this same case for *specialists*; can’t specialists have these positive qualities too, even if they don't have the leadership training that instills these qualities? In the below, I hope to convince you how a specialist can shape the ideas of tomorrow also, with the skills that they already have.

1. Seeing the bigger picture: Most scientific publications are judged by novelty. To assess novelty, scientists must usually do a literature search, in order to be aware of other work in the neighborhood of their research area. The skill of learning about and relating other work to their own can be applied in a management position, where constantly assessing the competition around them is necessary in delivering a successful product to their customers.   
  
2. Adapting to a changing environment: The skills required to find a new virus requires a process that involves learning how to use new lab equipment, or learning a new chemistry equation. In doing scientific experiments, scientists often have this unique ability to learn *how* to learn. A scientist’s skills used to acquire a depth of knowledge on-the-fly can replicated within a management position, where the environment such as exchange data feeds, are constantly changing.

TODO: refine and add todos.   
3. Being a team-builder: Specialists are *already* team-builders. Cross-lab collaborations are a big part of working together in research. It's often up to the scientists to s*eek out* these collaborations, and this involves networking. Once a collaboration has been formed, it involves finding a way to work as a team. The skills acquired can be transferred to a management position, where networking possible partners is essential to management positions.

As can be seen, the skills a scientist or engineer already has can be used to in the context of management position.

Todo: strenghths within themselves

Todo: and not have

Todo: different dimensions in third semtence .

Todo: after we have a grasp on strengths

TODO: identify the audience more clearly.

Todo: find and harness our happiness

There’s a bigger point here, and it’s not whether it’s today’s graduating PhDs or MBAs that will shape the innovation of tomorrow. With the advent of online courses and training, there are opportunities for those who never had them. Those who make a difference tomorrow may not have any degrees like a PhD, MBA, or any certification whatsoever, and instead will likely find strengths within themselves, and grow through building upon those strengths. And if this is the case, we need to find our own happiness, be thankful for what we have rather than what we don’t, and build on what we have already accomplished rather than start new projects. In other words, we should make best of what we have and make it even better, rather than find and fix what we don’t. Once we focus on our strengths, we are more likely to turn what we don’t have into what we do, just as the scientist above uses what she already has to her advantage to rise up to the challenge of a managerial position.

successfully carry out the role of a manager of a corporation. An individual can transcend the limitations of their training to rise up to a challenge of a role they are faced with. Whoever they want to be.