



**Episode 24 – Emotion at Work Anniversary Special  
Chatting with Phil Wilcox (@philwilcox)**

Phil: Hello and welcome to the Emotion at Work podcast, where we take a deep dive into the human condition. This episode is a special one because it's been a year unbelievably, listeners, it's been 12 months of the Emotion at Work podcast. I began my podcast journey a year ago last May with a reflection from me about why I was doing the podcast and what it was about and where it was coming from. About halfway through the year I did another pause and reflection and in this episode you're going to get to hear more from me as well. I'm sorry about that but there are the breaks, as the listeners you don't get to control what you get in your ears, I get the gift of giving that to you. Today you're going to get to hear more from me. I know that today's guest is a mix of excited and I guess a little bit nervous and curious about how it's going to go, because today's guest has no idea what's coming really. They've done a little bit of prep but they're going to have to give away control and I'm not sure how our guest feels about giving away control. So, yeah, it's going to be an interesting one today, I'm not sure...

Mark: Excuse, me, that is Phil isn't it?

Phil: Hello. What do you think you're doing? I'm on my opening monologue.

Mark: Well fair listener please do not adjust your set, this is Mark Gilroy. I'm going to be your guest host for the podcast today. As Phil's just been suggesting the reason for this is because the podcast itself is about to turn a year old. Of course for the last year we've been listening to one person's voice for the last roughly two weeks and we never really get to hear from him in some detail. So he usually asks the questions, this time that's going to be me, Phil's going to be giving some answers. So let's get him back and into the guest seat. It's the emotion geek himself Phil Wilcox.

Phil: Hey, welcome to the...no, I can't say that.

Mark: No.

Phil: It's nice to have your voice in my ears, you have such a lovely radio voice and I know there's impicature around that around that you've got no face for radio gags are coming, but you do have a wonderful radio voice, Mr Gilroy.

Mark: That is very kind of you sir. As we both know you have a wonderful singing voice too.

Phil: Absolutely. We'll put a link to that in the show notes everybody, we'll put a link to the duet in the show notes.

Mark: In this podcast we're going to be doing a review, a year in review of what's been going on, hopefully finding out a little bit more about your story, about some of the conversations and the journey that's got us to this place so far and maybe looking at what's coming in the future. But before we get started, back in episode five you had the wonderful Georgie Nightingall on as a guest



and you guys talked about disrupting the standard network type conversations of what do you do. She had some brilliant unexpected questions and I know you've kept that as a bit of a theme.

Phil: I do and I love it, I always find it a fascinating segue into the podcast.

Mark: It works really well I think, it works really well. Many networking type conversations has been met with mixtures of delight, fear, shock, surprise but mainly a smile which is always good.

Phil: I was reading a post from her on Facebook yesterday and she got on a train and she went to put her bag down and she put her bag on someone's toes and the person said, "Oh don't worry it didn't hurt." She went, "Next time I'll try harder." And then proceeded to have a wonderful four or five minute conversation in between tube stops on that basis. I love the way she goes about because that's just not something you would say is it, you accidentally put your bag on someone's foot, they say oh don't worry it didn't hurt and you go sorry, sorry, sorry. She goes with, I'll try harder next time. I love that.

Mark: Wonderful, I love that story. Are you ready for an unexpected question?

Phil: I am, yes, sorry I am.

Mark: You know I'm into my tech, so I thought we'd do a tech themed question. In your tech virtual world we can, do control copy, control and c to copy, control and z to undo, but if you could do one of those in real life would you rather be able to copy and paste in real life or undo in real life?

Phil: Would I rather copy and paste or undo? Actually I don't think I'd like either of them but you've given me a false choice so in which case I will say copy and paste because for me when I think about undo, then I think about a regret or a mistake. I have a bit of a mantra at the moment which is that never regret any choice that you made, only regret the information you used if it was flawed. If you used flawed information to make the decision then regret using that information, don't regret the decision. Learn from the flaw in your thinking or the flaw in the data or the flaw in the reasoning, don't regret the decision. Because one of the worst things I think is to go through life stuck in a state of stuckness where you're not making any decisions. So for me it's about make a decision and then if you regret the outcome then reflect on the data that you used to make the decision, don't regret the decision. Don't try and undo what you did, learn from the data or the information or the way that you reached your conclusion that informs your decision, don't regret the decision. Because making a decision is much, much better than not making a decision. If you're going to have regret, regret the reasons that you made it or the data that you used, don't regret the decision itself.

Mark: I love that. You can see tracking back that's the sort of thinking that is why we as a species we don't live in caves scared of the world anymore because at some point we had to make a decision that might fail, that might result in something that we're not particularly happy with, but we can learn from it and we can move forward and we can try again.

Phil: Yeah, absolutely. What about for you, what would be your...?



Mark: I can see merit in both, the copy and paste and undo, but I think I'm going to go with the copy and paste. I think there are so many experiences and things that you come across in life that are so fleeting, whether it's just a little moan up between two people or whether it's something you observe between others. It would be so great to be able to replicate that, little moments of magic. So, yeah, I do a lot of work in the world of team development and team work, and every now and again you come across these magic teams that there's just something within them. Often they're there for a little short time, maybe a week or so or a couple of days of absolute optimum working and if you could copy and paste that and replicate it, gosh what could be achieved. On a more superficial note I very much enjoy wine but I get extreme anxiety about the fact that very often if you open a bottle of wine, even if you've bought the same type of wine you're never going to get exactly the same one again.

Phil: Really?

Mark: The idea that you could put something and have that exact same experience, taste, etc, yeah, I like that. If I could click copy and paste on a bottle of wine, happy days.

Phil: I thought you were going to go somewhere else with that, I thought you were going to go if I could hit copy and paste on the time I drank a bottle of wine and I wasn't hung-over that would be great. That's where my mind went anyway.

Mark: Unfortunately that has never happened which tells you about my wine consumption habits. So shall we get started?

Phil: Yeah, go on then.

Mark: This is a year in review. Now you did do a mini review around episode 13 where you took stock and looked at where you'd come from so far and what had been going on and that you were going to take a bit of time off at that stage in the podcast. You've come quite a way since then, let's start off, how does it feel to be a year in?

Phil: It feels really good. It continues to be something that brings me joy. I remember in that episode I talked about how...or was it in episode 14, I can't remember which one it was, it was either 13 or 14 I talked about how...or was it in my blog? At some point around that time of the year last year, I talked about how doing the podcast brings me joy. There was some stuff happening with me being ill and the impact it was having on my mood and my mental health and stuff, that just meant that I was grumpy a lot. Because I was in pain a lot, so being in pain a lot makes you grumpy a lot. So doing the podcast I talked about how I continued to do it because it was something a) I could do from home, b) didn't involve me travelling anywhere, c) brought me joy. That's still the case now. All of the conversations that I've had with all of the guests along the way I just love doing them. It depends how you frame it. So is it because I'm nosey? Maybe. Or is it because I'm curious? Definitely. By my use of maybe and definitely I've indicated which frame I prefer. But I really, really enjoy finding out more about people, about what makes them think, about what makes them feel, about how those two things interact and overlap. I also get enjoyment from the impact it has on others then. When I get Tweets or messages or when I see shares from other people when they're



sharing the podcast, they're talking about how it might have resonated with them or how helpful they found it, how it got them thinking differently or how they want to listen to it multiple times, because there was so much in there they couldn't grab hold of it first time round. That sort of stuff makes me really happy as well because part of what I want to do which is about shifting the narrative around emotion in the workplace, there's only so much I can do on my own. There's only so many conversations I can have, there's only so many businesses I can work with, there's only so many hours in the day. I really see the podcast for me as a way of changing that narrative on a broader scale because I can have one conversation that can be listened to by 200 different people. And if it resonates with only 10% of those that's 20 people who are going right that's really got me thinking about either anxiety if they were listening to the one with Tony Jackson or about humanising the workplace if you were listening to Episode 19 with Sarah Taylor. Or that's really got me thinking about how we interact with other people if they listened to Episode 12 with Dawn Archer.

If these different episodes are having an effect on people and it is then shifting their thinking, which I don't know if it shifts their actions, but I know their actions aren't going to change if their thinking hasn't shifted. So if I shifted their thinking there's a chance that their actions are going to change. If they're actions are going to change then there's a chance that that can be better for people in the workplace. If I can feel confident that I am affecting people's thinking then I will work with the fact that I believe that that will then change into action, and that will then have a better impact on workplaces around the globe.

Mark: Was that the original reason that started you thinking about producing your own podcast around shifting thinking and getting people changing their narratives?

Phil: Yes, in part definitely. So 2013 I think was the first time that I really properly dedicated some time to think about why am I doing what I'm doing? I set my company up in 2011 and I knew then that emotion was important to me. I knew then that having a strong evidence base was important to me. I knew then that I wanted people to have an extraordinary experience in the work they did with me. Back then I didn't have a reason to do that. I didn't have a really clear idea of what that was. So the purpose as it sits now which is I promise to make work better for everybody by placing emotion where it belongs, at the heart of work. I do all of that either to enrich lives or to provide protection or reduce harm. It's a bit of a long purpose but I don't really care about that. It covers all the key aspects of what I do. But that is my fifth version of my why. So in 2013 I started on, I want to create happiness, that was what I wanted to do, that was my *raison d'être* and that's what I'm here to do, I'm here to create happiness for people. Then that evolved into I want to create conditions that allow happiness to flourish. Then I got thinking about the credibility of happiness as an emotion in the workplace. The more I thought about the positive intent behind what I was trying to do, actually if there was a word that would better sit where happiness was it would be creating contentment. Because happiness for me is one word used in two different ways. So there's the momentary happiness which is the happiness that you feel when you experience something pleasurable, whether that be you see someone you haven't seen for a long time, you smell a smell that just reminds you of your past, you eat some amazing food, you hear a joke. So happiness is that fleeting momentary emotion of joy or happiness. That happiness can be that you can be laughing at someone else's misfortune, but whatever it is something that brings you pleasure.

But happiness is also used to describe states of contentment, where people are overall happy with their lot. So in the last episode the one that came out this week, Monica Parker talks about how people can be massively engaged and hate the fact the toilets are dirty. That's a good example of overall that person is happy and content in their work and their workplace, but there are things that they would love to change. They'd love it if the toilets were clean. And this is where I wanted to move away from it just being about happiness for me, because actually to aspire for people to be only happy in the workplace I think is a fool's errand. It's a flawed aspiration to have because it's just rubbish really. You can't have an emotion where people are only happy, partly because as you and Sukh talked about in your podcast on optimism and positivity that you did for [Circon 00:17:26] history, a good podcast, overbearing happiness if taken to its extreme will mean that you'll take unnecessary risks, you will ignore data that says that this is the wrong thing to do, you will chase highs all of the time. So it's actually it could be disadvantageous to individuals and workplaces to be perpetually happy. So that's where I thought right you know what I don't want it to just be about happiness actually, this needs to be much more about all of the emotions in the workplace and making it okay to experience different emotions. Because emotions are fleeting, I think this is the bit that I get frustrated by in that...let's say I have what a researcher would call a flooding out moment, which is where the emotion gets to a point where my filters or my ability to regulate my emotion is inhibited, and you will see say me being really angry. So that could be shouting, it could be hitting a desk, it could be me slamming a door and walking out of a meeting, it could be me telling somebody to go away in a less than polite manner. Often those incidences then are viewed as that being something to do with a character. So they then become a trait. That momentary emotion of that flooding out or outpouring of anger then becomes a trait, they're an angry person or they are irritable, it becomes a trait for the individual. And depending on the severity of that absolutely appropriate disciplinary action may need to be taken depending on what it was. If somebody's flooding out involved them hitting somebody else, then that's clearly an inappropriate action in the workplace. I think we too often go to those extremes.

So we either go to oh well it's extreme in that we're hitting somebody if it's anger or we want people to be happy. For me there's a whole massive range of grey area in between. I remember being part of a team where somebody would say, oh they're just awkward, they are just a pain the arse. If there's a way that they can stop you getting where you need to get to or put a barrier in the way then they will do it. I said are you sure that's what they are, they are obstructive or they are annoying, what them as a person or could it be about their personality, where they're really good at identifying flaws or downsides in what you're doing? Or actually is it that they're not being heard on something else and what you're seeing is the display of frustration and not being heard, or frustration in not being recognised that's playing out in different ways. But rather than go and ask somebody, rather than go and ask that individual and try and find out what's happening, we just make an assumption that they're just awkward. All of that is just unhelpful for me. Sorry that was a long monologue.

Mark: Not at all and you answered a few questions I was about to ask you there which was around your different versions of your why, you mentioned you're on your fifth version of why. I really like that distinction between happiness and contentment and that idea of happiness being happy with your lot. I really resonate with there's a degree of emotional maturity that comes with that. I forget



the attribution but there's a quote running around, around if you don't know how much is enough the default is always more.

Phil: That's nice. I've not heard that before, that's nice.

Mark: You can apply that to all sorts can't you, you can apply it to things like salary or to the accumulation of things or it could be around relationships. But the idea of if you don't have a conversation with yourself at some point and say how much is enough. When are you prepared to say yes this is enough I'm content with my lot, your default will always be I want more, I need more.

Phil: I often think that that applies to an individual. So the risk is I'm going to quote all my back catalogue of stuff now.

Mark: Do it.

Phil: But I will self sensor and do it anyway. So I did the night talk at the Ellen Dee show in 2016 I think it was, it might have been 2017, I can't remember now. Again I'll put a link to that in the show notes, but it was along the lines of am I enough or when I am enough? It took me a long time to get to a point where I was able or satisfied to say to myself I'm enough now. For a long time I was chasing things that I felt like I needed. So to a certain degree my MSc in completing that was a chase because I never went to uni and never did an undergraduate degree. So 17/18 finished my A-levels, got the lowest grade possible that you can get before you fail, so I got three Es and I was predicted a B and two Cs. I really should have failed those exams and I don't know how I got through because I did no revision whatsoever. I was far too busy working at McDonalds earning money and having fun. But I always felt like I let my mum and dad down by not going to uni. I remember the look on their face when I handed them my A-level results and I said, yeah, well never mind don't matter anyway I'm off at the pub. I remember being in the hallway, literally just handed the envelope, turned around and walked out the door and went out. This was about ten o'clock in the morning and I was just on a session all day. Because I generally didn't care and part of that I guess, if I look back on that part of that is about me rebelling, part of that was about pushing back against their expectations. But also part of it was that I just didn't find anything that interested me academically. I was interested in people.

Even when I did sociology at A-level it was all about Marxism and Leninism, and socialism. I was like I don't care about any of that I want to know about people and I want to learn what happens in the way that people interact with each other. But I do know that I was chasing that for a long time, there had been other things that I had been chasing as well. I'm not sure what it was I can't pinpoint it but I remember getting to a point and thinking you know what yeah I don't need to chase anything else. If there's other things I want to do then I'll do them because I want to do it. Do I want to do a PhD? Yes. But I'm not chasing that, for me I can feel the tangible difference in my outlook at that, that part of the reason I did the MSc was because I was chasing that attainment of academic level. But PhD isn't about that, I'm enough with what I've got. I want to do a PhD because I want to do that but because I want to do more research, I want to publish more papers, I want to write...actually I don't want to write more because I don't like writing. But there's other reasons I want to do the PhD which isn't about chasing something, it's not about chasing the badge or chasing this or chasing the

other, it's doing it whilst knowing that who I am and what I do is enough. There's a risk in that that I sound like somebody who doesn't ever feel inadequate or doesn't ever feel any of those things and that's just a load of shit because I do, I still feel all those things. But I find it a lot easier now to remind myself that I am enough. So could I charge higher fees? Yes. But I know that what I am is enough and I know what I charge is enough. Could I do more of this stuff? Yes, but I know that I don't need to do that. I could do it but I don't need to for me. Sometimes I'll feel a psychological pressure or I put pressure on myself to do more of these things or do less of these things or change this or change that. I have to remind myself, no, you reviewed your lot a while ago and you looked at your lot and went I'm really content with my lot actually. There's other things I'd like to do but if you were to say to me, Phil, this is it, it's going to be this forever. I'd go brilliant, I'm happy with that.

Mark: What a great step to get to. Some people go through their entire lives and don't reach that step. Sadly I think that's very much the case where people just strive and strive, and strive for more and more, and more without really having that conversation with themselves. Just going back to that step in your life where you had...there must have been a conversation you had with either yourself or with somebody else or with a group of people where you decided to take that step to focus on what you focused on for your MSc. Can you describe that step, did you have a conversation with yourself, were other people involved in that decision to undertake your MSc?

Phil: So yes and no. If I'm honest nobody else was involved in the decision. So I made that decision, what I then needed was to secure the support to allow it to happen. Once I found the MSc then I knew straightway. Soon as I knew of its existence I was like that's it, if there's something that's going to get me into studying then this is it. Because it was about everything that I love, it was about emotion, it was about credibility and it was about deception. It was about the interplay of those three things and it was about psychology and it was about linguistics, and it was about sociology. I know some of these disciplines overlap, it was about pragmatics and it was about linguistics, it was about theory of mind, it was about applications in corporate and forensic, and other settings. It was everything I wanted because it was all about people. And this for me I think is one of the bits that I think makes me different, and I run the risk if I'm disparaging to anybody I don't mean to, what I'm advocating is my view of things as I sit here today. I think a lot of people focus on what goes on within, so whether that be through personality profiling, whether that be through cognitive psychology, whether that be through neuroscience, whether that be through whatever discipline you choose. A lot of people focus on what happens in the mind. There's another group of people that focus on what happens between. So they focus on what happens between people, so you might include something like linguistics within it. Linguistics is the study of language use, that's analysing what happens between people not what's within somebody's head. For me what those two disciplines miss loads of stuff, because those that focus on what goes on between don't link that then back to what goes on within. Those that look within don't translate that to what goes on between. That for me is a massive oversight. You can't just look at what happens within and not then consider what happens between. You can't just look at what happens between and not consider what happens within.

Where my PhD is going is researching this notion of face and face work. That's about the micro identities that we negotiate for ourselves in the interactions that we have. Now the sociologists only look at what happens in the interaction and I'm saying to my supervisor that we're missing a trick,

we have to link this back to what happens within. This has to link back to individuals reality paradigms, this has to link into individual's sense of self and identity and personality, and the way that they see and articulate themselves. Because the way that I describe myself to myself in my head will then show up in what happens between. So to just look at what happens between and not consider what goes on in the head that's just bonkers for me. And likewise if a neuroscientist is saying this is what's happening in the brain, so when I'm showing people these sorts of images or when I'm asking them to lie in an FMRI scanner and think about these things, this is what's happening in the brain. Well that's lovely but that doesn't translate across to what happens...to look at that in isolation without thinking about what happens in between is really limiting, it's limiting in the scope and the application and so on of your research. Because people don't walk around life inside an FMRI scanner, so there's no point in saying when people are doing this, this is what's happening in their brain. No, that was what happened in their brain in an FMRI scanner. Let's think about it, god I'm on a soapbox now, we've got neuroscience research that's happening invariably that's involving different equipment, either it's involving an MRI or an FMRI scanner or it's involving an EEG or it's involving another one, a PS something I can't remember what it is. Some EEGs are portable, some P thingamajigs are portable but an FMRI scanner, if you're talking about real in-depth brain scan analysis work then you can't...if you haven't been in an MRI scanner it's like a big tube that you have to sit inside and then a magnet goes round. So playing you sounds is tricky because an FMRI scanner is really noisy and all that's left then is to show you pictures. If you were to have an audio conversation with somebody when you're in an MRI scanner again that brings big risks, because MRI scanners need stability, they need you to be still to get accurate and clear images. So if you're asking somebody to have a conversation and you're doing a brain scan, bearing in mind the conversation is going to involve movement of the mouth and movement of the chin, potentially movement of the nose and all those sorts of things, then that risks movement. Then if people are moving then the images are less clear. So for all of the neuroscience research that is done I challenge the majority of its validity in the workplace. It's interesting, don't get me wrong, I find it absolutely fascinating. But the transferability then over to the workplace is really, really tricky.

Mark: So your listeners can't see me at the moment but I'm beaming because I'm reminded suddenly of the first time I came across you and your thoughts, and your experiences that you share with the world which was via Twitter. It was one of the big LND HR Twitter hours that take place during the week. Something that I instantly start associating your name and Twitter handle with was a word beginning with 'c'.

Phil: Is it the one with 'c' and end in 't', that one?

Mark: It absolutely is. It's the context bell and we can ring it. I wish I bought a bell with me because I was starting to ring it in my head there, but it's so right. It is, it has to take place with the interplay between two. It's the same with so many other aspects of life and you're looking at design thinking as well, where you've got an architect or a designer, they would never design something in isolation like a chair. You design a chair that has a set place within a room and that room has a set place within a house. The house has a set place within a street, within a city, within a town and so on. All of those things interweave together to create an experience that other people observe and interact with. Just as you've described there, the interplay within things, if the context piece is missed you lose out on a lot of richness. At the start of the podcasts that you do, bringing this back to the

review of your 12 months, you talk about the interplay between three constructs that you describe as overlapping. Do you want to say something about that, what are those constructs and how do they overlap and why did you choose those three?

Phil: In a way I didn't choose those, are we talking about emotion, credibility and deception, those three?

Mark: Yes.

Phil: So in a way I didn't choose those three I was introduced to those three through the MSc I suppose in a way. I was aware of those three things but I hadn't necessarily linked them together in that way. But if I may I'll play with it with an example. I'm using my past experience plus those three lenses to decode something that happened for me. One of the jobs I used to have was in a call centre and I was good at that. I could often understand and really emphasise with customers that were ringing up and I did that job really well. Now there was one call in particular and the lady and I went round and round, and round in circles. We took two very different positions, mine was then siding on the side of the company and hers was supporting her view. After about 45 minute I leant over to the headset or the turret as it was called, and on there was a mute button and I hit the mute button lent back...she'd opened a monologue so she started...I learned that when she said this particular phrase that meant she would have a number of seconds if not a minute of monologue because she was going to lay out her position again. I leant over hit the mute button and said, it's my podcast I can swear, I leant over and hit the mute button I said, "Do you know what, why don't you just shut the fuck up and stop crying like a bitch." Then in my ear I heard, "Pardon?" I hadn't hit the mute button. I then tried to explain it away, "Oh sorry did you hear that I was talking to a colleague opposite who was being really noisy and they were distracting me from talking with you." Meanwhile filled with panic, filled with regret. In an instant I'd gone from being really angry and because I'd been doing all the classic stuff, I'd been pacing around, sitting down, standing up again. I'd been getting more and more frustrated with this lady and justifiably so by the way when I look back on it in reflection. Now I was filled with regret, filled with fear, filled with more anger but this time directed at myself for either a) not hitting the mute button and b) just saying it in the first place. And then she hung up and then I went on 'not ready' which is a button you can press to signify so no calls will come through to you when you're not ready. I sat there and I waited and I waited, and I waited and then I saw it. From the desk I was sat at, the lady that took the call was at my ten o'clock, the classic kind of fighter jet analogy, so she was at my ten o'clock and I just saw her head pop up and look direct at me and then slowly slink back down again. I was like there it is, there's the call. Then the phone on my line manager's desk rang, she looked up at me, looked over at the lady and then the call got put through to my boss's desk, so I just stayed sat on 'not ready', sat stock still not knowing what to do. Once my manager had finished she said go down to the canteen, wait for me down there I'll be down in a minute. She came downstairs and she asked me one question and that question was, did you do it? Now at that moment those three disciplines of emotion and credibility, and deception were all at play in my mind. I'd been sat there downstairs thinking how could I explain it away, what could I say that would maintain my credibility. I had a really strong reputation. I'd been performing well, I'd had two mini promotions. I was on track to continue my career and I'm sat thinking you know what I really need to be fired for what I've done. So how can I do it, how can I save myself? I was riddled with emotion, my credibility was massively at risk here

and the temptation to lie was huge because I didn't want to admit that I'd done it. Because if I admitted that I did it I might get sacked and if I might get sacked then I'd have to tell my parents that I've been sacked. I'm going to have to tell my girlfriend, because I was with my wife at the time, and we weren't married but I would have to tell me girlfriend that I've been sacked for doing this. Then they're not going to be able to provide me a reference which means that for this five years of work that I've had I'm not going to be able to provide a reference for that. So that's not going to be great for any future employment either. So my career prospects are nose-diving, my whole life is falling apart in front of my eyes. The temptation to hide was huge because I was ashamed, I was really ashamed of what I'd done. So when she asked me did you do it, I said, "Yeah I did, I said, I'm really sorry but I did." She went, "Go home, come back in tomorrow, I'll let you know what we're going to do." That night was awful, it was just the worst experience. Went in the next day and she said to me, "Here's your final written warning, if you do anything like this again in the next six months you're out the door. Keep your nose clean and it will go in time." I was absolutely flabbergasted, couldn't believe it. I said, "Why?" She said, "Because you admitted it, if you'd have done anything else I'd have sacked you but because you said, yeah, straight away no excuses, no reasoning, no nothing, you just went yeah I did." It wasn't like an arrogant way, she said, "I could see the regret written all over you."

That day was really pinnacle for me for a few different reasons. So one what I think it does is it really illustrates how those three disciplines overlap. So if you then think about the workplace and you think about say something like mistakes, everyone talks about we need to create cultures where people can make mistakes. That is so easily said and massively hard to do because a mistake is seen by individuals themselves, because if you ask most people if you make a mistake does that make you look bad? Yes. In my words does that risk your credibility? Yes, it does. So therefore if something's risking your credibility then that's likely to trigger emotions in you, which emotions it will be I could have a good guess, but let's just go with emotions for now. So therefore the temptation to hide that mistake, especially if it's a small one, mine was monumentally big, but if it's a small one then it could just be easier to hide that and brush it under the carpet and not have to worry about it. Because you want to maintain your credibility. It's the reason why senior leaders won't admit mistakes, it's the reason why people will hold back communication. Just using mistakes as an example but it's that interplay of those three that I get really fascinated by, because deception doesn't happen without feelings and deception doesn't happen without people thinking about their reputation and their credibility. People can't think about their reputation or their credibility without it involving emotions and then without them being concerned about how other people might see them, which means they want to manage the information. Deception is a very evocative word but, yeah, there's a real spectrum of what counts that as deception, and it even depends on what definition you use of deception. But if I put that to one side. At that moment was also really pinnacle for me because it was the day I decided that I had to pay more attention to my emotions. At the time I phrased it as I won't let my emotions get the better of me again. I can't say that's happened because emotions have got the better of me many, many times since then. But I was always aware of other people and myself but that moment of being told no you're not going to be sacked and here's your final written warning, that that stilled something in me to say right these things are crucial and if you can't work with these, at that point in my life I wouldn't have used these words, but if you can't work with these things effectively then you are always going to be on the back foot. This matters, you've got to pay

attention to these and manage these and work with these differently. Because what happened can't happen again.

Mark: Talking about emotions can you remember the emotion that went through your mind when you received that final written warning, what was the series of emotions that happened when she handed over that written warning and you were clearly expecting something else?

Phil: So surprise and then relief, and whether this is valid or not I don't know, but if that manager rang me now and asked me for something I would drop everything and do it. So I have a huge sense of indebtedness to her for doing what she did. Now I don't know for sure whether it was her decision to do that, she certainly left me with that impression, she certainly left me with the impression that she could have sacked me and she chose not to. It's not like this was someone else's call or someone else's decision, but the sense of indebtedness that that created in me was then huge and wanting to make it up to her and to myself was there. So, yeah, initially surprise/amazement, relief but then a real sense of right I owe you, anything you want I will work my arse for you, anything you want, anything you need I'll do it. This is where it then goes back into credibility now because now I have to make it good, I have to repair. If I use the language that I would now use my competence face, I had to take a massive chunk out of my competence face, I had lost a huge amount of competence. Because it got around, this isn't something that was kept quiet in a call centre of 50 people, a) people heard me say it, b) people then knew that I had been sent down to the canteen, I hadn't come in the next morning and all of that sort of stuff. It was common knowledge, so I knew that I had some repair work to do. I had to repair my competence face to be able to do my job and do it well. I also needed to repair my personal face because people like, really Phil, Phil said that, really? I know he likes a bit of a swearsy in the pub but not in the office and never with a customer. I had a lot of face repair work to do. Also I needed to demonstrate the trust that was shown in me, I couldn't let my manager down, I couldn't let her down because if I did then that would look bad on her. As well as having to repair my face it was well I can't screw up again because she's given me a chance. Whether she did do this or not I don't know because I never asked her, but in my mind I'd envisioned her pleading my case in the dock with HR as the judge or the senior leader as the judge or whatever it was and her pleading my case for me to stay. If I then let her down she'd then have to go back in and say, yeah sorry I got it wrong. I imagined this whole court case where she'd been there wig on and everything pleading my case. I couldn't let her down, it just wasn't an option.

Mark: I'm interested in that repairing a face piece, maybe we could stay with that for a minute, before we do thank you for the story that's such a compelling story. I'm sure there will be listeners there who have been in those moments, those life defining moments of shame that you end up revisiting in the dark hours when you wake up in the middle of the night and you go oh my gosh did that really happen, that really happened to me, how did I let myself get into that? I'll happily share with you one of my own, it's not on the scale of yours but it's something I put in my shame well that I revisit regularly. When I was a teenager I spent a lot of time working in hotels and restaurants and service industry, there was a hotel I was working in I think I must have been about 17 and it was one of those restaurants that had a carvery and an hors d'oeuvres plate, like a chilled hors d'oeuvres plate, you don't see them anymore really. I remember drifting over to this woman who I could see was struggling at the hos d'oeuvres plate, she was trying to pick up some melon balls or something.

I approached her from behind and said gently, “Oh can I offer you a hand with that?” She turned round and to my horror she only had one hand, she was missing a hand. I clocked that instantly as she turned around and in my surprise rather than apologising or explaining I just let out a laugh, and it was just involuntary. And this woman’s face turned from shock and surprise to anger in the blink of an eye and I’d realised that not only had I looked like I’d insulted her disability but I then laughed at her through absolute purely innocent intentions. I scurried off into the kitchen and spent the rest of the night polishing cutlery. In that particular incidence that story got around as well, she made a series of complaints, I didn't get fired but I decided at the time, I never would have used this language, but the loss of face was too much to repair, so I just left and got another job somewhere else. In your example and for those listeners who are listening in around these types of examples that we see in the workplace, what steps can people take if they are going to repair face? What sort of things need to happen? A repair job?

Phil: So face is a bit of a tricky thing in that it’s never exclusively yours to own. So part of your face is always on loan to somebody else. So what I mean by that is so face is a version of ourselves that we negotiate in the interactions that we have, but because it’s a negotiation unless we have, I’ll come back to power a bit later, but because it’s a negotiation what that means is that other parties need to agree. If I’m going to take a line, if I’m going to negotiate a version of myself as somebody who is this or somebody who does that or somebody who knows this, that needs to be accepted by other people. In the main it will be and this links back to a guy whose research is just massively underutilised, a guy called Geoffrey Leech who talks about something called the Cooperative Principle, in interaction people will cooperate with one another. If I say this is something that I’m known for, this is something that I’m good at or this is something that I know or this is an experience that I’ve had, then most people will go okay and they’ll go with that. They won’t actively disagree or challenge or not allow you to take that line.

Now there are times though when that won’t work, where you will try and take a line and other people won’t let you do that. So an example of that is where say you’re in a meeting and you’re not the chair, so you’re not the chair, you’re not the facilitator, but you’re annoyed at the conversation and you want it to move on. So you do something to try and move that conversation on. So what’s happening in that micro moment is when I say come on we’ve spent long enough on this, can we just move on now. I am trying to negotiate a line or a face for me of someone who has the ability to move this meeting on. Someone who has enough influence or enough sway to move that meeting on. Now whether that meeting moves on or not will depend on the strength of my face. So if I don't have the credibility or the influence or the power or the sway then my negotiation will be ignored, people go no we’re not ready to move on actually, we need to stay with this and explore it for longer. A different example would be I was in a meeting with a board once where the HR director started talking about the financial performance of the company. I think I mentioned this one in my previous podcasts. The finance director wouldn't let them do it, they said that’s not your role, your role is people, my role is numbers. So if someone’s going to talk about the financial thoughts of the company that’s me. So the finance director in that example saw the HR director trying to talk about numbers as a threat to their face, they were like, no that’s me not you. When you say how can people repair, part of it is about actions that you take, but part of it is about other people then accepting that your actions are enough to do the repair job. So you know when somebody’s crossed you or they’ve disappointed you or they’ve done something that’s really surprised you, at what point

do they then get accepted back in or what time do they're contributions then get accepted back in? As the individual who's made the transgression you cannot dictate when you get let back in. I would argue that's part of the reason that you chose to resign rather than stay because actually it would be more work to repair that face than it is to go off and negotiate a new one somewhere else.

So how can you repair your face then? One of the things as humans that we look for is consistency and often a loss of face is because you do something that is inconsistent with the face that you've negotiated. In your example say you negotiated your face as an attentive, supportive, customer focused individual and maybe just an all round nice guy. What in your interaction with the lady in the desert area is actually you acted in a way that was inconsistent with those versions of you that you negotiated. One of the easiest ways to repair your face is to then go back to being consistent, is to consistently deliver in line with the face that you've now negotiated with yourself. Now one of the decisions that you've got to make is do I try and restore the face that I originally had or do I try and negotiate a new one or a new version of that face? So for me, as an example, another decision I chose to make was, and it's not about shouting it from the rooftops, but if people ask me about that incident I would be open about it. I chose to own the mistake, so rather than go back and negotiate the face I had before which was, Phil doesn't talk like that, Phil doesn't interact with customers in that way, Phil is a safe pair of hands, Phil will always deliver, and Phil's an round nice guy, then that was the face I had before. Again I didn't language it at the time and there wasn't even a conscious thought to say this is what I'm doing. But as I look back now I can see what I decided to do was to negotiate a new face which is I screw up and I work hard to fix it. That's the face I'm now taking, I'm going to own the screw up, I'm not going to shout it from the rooftops but if people ask I will be open. But the face I'm going to renegotiate for myself or the way I'm going to repair my credibility is by doing a yes I screwed up but I only screw up once. I don't do it again. I learn my mistake and off I go. One of the key tenants about repairing face is consistency, it's acting in a way that's consistent with the face that you've negotiated. But to a certain degree you've got an element of choice even though you may not be aware of it, about well what line do I want to take now. So now this has happened what line do I want to take with this from here? Because different people take different lines, some people will take a, I don't want to talk about that, yeah, that was horrible don't talk about that. That's then part of the face that they're negotiating, they're negotiating a we ignore that we carry on face. You've got to a certain degree you've got choices, whether those may be in or out of awareness but you've got choices about the type of face you renegotiate for yourself.

Mark: I like that. So it's about consistency and the choice that you make as to whether you restore the face that you had or renegotiate a different face, a new one?

Phil: Yeah or a new version of it. One of the things I don't like about face is the metaphor we often use is a mask. I don't like it because a mask implies you're trying to be somebody else but I can't think of a better one. So all of these behavioural masks that you wear are still your face, so they're always you, it's not about you pretending to be somebody else, it's not like I'm Phil but I'm going to pretend to be Mark. It's I am Phil and I'm negotiating these different lines but the...is solidity a word?

Mark: Yeah.



Phil: The solidity of those masks then change over time. So when you first negotiate a line, when you first negotiate a version of you, one of the most relatable examples of this, is when somebody gets promoted or a new role within an organisation. So take an example I worked with a HR business partner a few years ago who had started as an admin assistant, then a HR advisor, then a HR consultant and then a HR business partner. Now there were a collection of managers who would regularly ask her to do things like meeting minutes, issue letters, that sort of stuff. The reason they did that was because that's what she used to do when she was an admin assistant and when she was a HR advisor. Now what she hadn't done was successfully negotiate a new version of her face which is as a HR business partner, I don't do that stuff for you anymore. So what she wanted to do was to let go of those tasks, but the individuals and managers in question had associated those tasks with her identity with who she is. This is something that they do, this is what they're known for, this is their actions that they do, it's part of the face that she'd negotiated. Now if she left and went somewhere else she wouldn't have that, that issue would disappear in a heartbeat because what she's doing is she's negotiating a new face. So, yes, she comes with an element of competence because she works in HR, she'll have a job title so that will bring some certain associations with it. But the face that she'd negotiated for herself as a HR advisor was still fairly solid as a HR business partner and the face that she wanted as a HR business partner wasn't very solid either, so she had this mix of faces. So, yes, she would get involved in the business partner-y strategic stuff, but also she'd get pulled in to do minutes and issue letters. When I was mentoring her my advice was what you need to do is you need to explicitly renegotiate your face with these managers in particular, you need to sit down and discuss with them and negotiate with them what is your role and how will you best support them in what they do?

One of the challenges we've got with face is that the negotiations we do are often very implicit, so we don't know that we're doing them and other people don't know we're doing them. So when you find yourself being dragged into stuff that you used to do in the past or you're being asked to do things that you don't want to do or you are being asked opinions on areas that you don't feel comfortable with, then that's because other people's version of your face looks different to how your face looks to you. So to you your face looks like this but other people look at it and see something different. The more you can do to make your faces explicit then the clearer people will be in what they can expect, what they want and how to interact with you.

Mark: Thanks for that, Phil, another great example and another nice story of how this would come through in the workplace. I love a metaphor so I'm going to volunteer one, feel free to challenge it, if we're going to put the masks metaphor aside if we're talking about face, as you were describing your story and that previous story, I started thinking about houses and rooms in a house and the many faces that we wear could be just spending time in various rooms in a house. There will be some that we prefer spending time in, there will be some that we don't spend that much time in and suffer as a result. But there is a choice to be able to do it, there is crucially a choice as to where you spend time investing in that face and replenishing that face and being comfortable with presenting that face to the world. I guess when damage occurs you've got some choices as well, you can repair that room exactly as it was, restore it to its former glory or you can replace it or you can extend it or you can move.

Phil: So I like it, can I play with it for a minute?

Mark: Go for it.

Phil: So how do we bring in the dynamicness of interaction into that then? So you're in your house with your rooms and I'm in my house with my rooms, how do we bring the dynamism of interaction to that?

Mark: So when the face that you present when you're in that room by yourself can be different to the face that you present when you have guests round. The choice that you make in order to present it in such a way that says, I don't know if we just play with the analogy, I am somebody who keeps a clean and tidy house, I fill it full of beautiful things and I'm very welcome and hospitable and you're welcome to spend time in this room with me reinforcing your opinion of me in this room as much as you like. Whereas when that person leaves you might be happy leaving things lying around, maybe you present yourself to yourself in a different way through the lack of urgency to establish that face or negotiate that face with another person.

Phil: I like that as a way of thinking about the distinction between within and between. Because for me what you've described then was what I would call impression management, which is I'm okay with a little bit of mess. I can't cope with it being filthy but I'm okay if there's a little bit of mess, but if somebody's coming round it has to be tidy. Because I want people to see me as somebody who has a clean, tidy, well organised house or room whatever that might be. Because for me I get really interested in that transition that goes from how do I see myself to what then do I portray to other people? So my internal face and my external face if that makes sense? This is where you could argue that actually a mask actually does hold weight because if you imagine like a classic mask on a pole, like you'd have in theatre. I can look at the inside of that mask and go this is how I want this to be seen. This is how I'm imagining my face looks. But what I can't see, when I'm holding that in front of me, what I can't see is what other people see. So other people might see a slightly different face to the one that I was looking at from the inside. Or actually I might say this is the face that I see inside but I don't want people to see that, so I'm going to manage how people see this one on the outside by pretending or adapting or masking or covering or something like that. So what I see internally and the external representation I want them to be different in that way. But I don't know how it would work in that.

So with the house metaphor because I can't bring my room to your room if that makes sense. I talk about four families of face in the workplace, that's what my research is telling me there are, there may be more because I'm in early days in my research. But my research so far is indicating to me there are four families of face in the workplace. So one of those is competence, that's your knowledge, your skills, your expertise, what you're known for and typically is associated with the tasks that you do, the objectives you are tasked to meet that sort of stuff. Then you have your company face which is the way you represent the organisation that you work for. So you and I, we both described ourselves as nerds and geeks and being interested in evidence and research, and background. So we have a shared competence face in that way, a shared element of a competence face, but we wear two different company face. I wear the emotion at work company face, you wear the TMSDI company face. So we both represent the organisations that we work for. Then you have your relationship face which is the relationships that you then hold with other people. Now even

though I'm delineating these faces often they will overlap. So there was a really interesting discussion that happened recently on the Good Practice Podcast, name check to the Good Practice Podcast. So there was a live podcast happening in London and Martin Cousins at Learn Patch on Twitter put a challenge in the room around LND'S ability to create acronyms and lingo and language to describe stuff. Ross Garner's response to that was do you know what we are within a community of practice where we have a relationship with each other, so this is the overlapping relationship and competence face. We have a relationship with each other and we know each other in this room and we have a shared level of understanding. So actually for us being a group of 50 LND professionals in a room together, we are allowed to use that language because it is appropriate in our community of practice. If for example we were with a different group of people, so this is back to my favourite context thing, if we were with a group of managers within an organisation, you know what it would be more appropriate to use none of this language and to use something much more plain English and understandable. Because the relationships that we hold affects the interactions that we have. If you know somebody well you will interact with them differently to somebody that you've just met for the first time and different faces will be at play in that way. The final one, the fourth one is your personal face, so this is you as an individual, your interests, your passions, your family, your friends, your commitments, your values, your beliefs, everything that you bring.

If you imagine there's a stage and in the middle there's a spotlight and if there's two people in the interaction there's eight faces on that stage. So if we use you and me as an example there are my four families are facing your full families at face. At the moment in the spotlight in the middle, right now is my competence face as a practitioner and your competence face as an interviewer for a podcast. So they are the two things that are in the middle. Not long ago both of our personal faces were in the spotlight, because I talked about my example in the call centre, you talked about your example in the restaurant. Now you could argue that potentially on the periphery of that spotlight was our relationship face, because actually we get on really well, we're comfortable sharing those sorts of stories with each other, and on the periphery of that spotlight is our competency face, because we are talking about ourselves in the workplace and our actions and our tasks. But at the core of it they were personal stories that we were sharing. At any point in time you could have two or four or six or even all eight of those families are facing the spotlight. You could have all eight you could have just two. To a certain degree people will choose whether they put their face in the spotlight or not. When I used my example earlier on of when people ask me about my mistake I said I owned that and I put that in the spotlight. Whereas other people go yeah I don't want to talk about that. So somebody might say oh what happened with that customer and I've got a choice now, do I put that in the spotlight or do I leave it on the edge of the stage? Now you might say well what happened to that customer? I say nothing, it was nothing really, just a small misunderstanding. You as my compatriot in the conversation you might go all right okay fair enough and leave it. Or you might say no you're not fella, I'm not going to let you get away with that, that easily. You then try and drag it back in, you go that's not what I heard. You drag it into a spotlight and I can resist you again. I go, well I don't know what you've heard but I can tell you that it was nothing major, it was all right, it was fine, nothing to worry about and I'm dragging it away again. Now again you've got a choice now, you could drag it back for a third time and go well I heard actually that you swore at a customer and they made a massive complaint and that you came really close to being fired. Again I can resist or allow that, so I could resist it again and go well the rumours of my downfall have been greatly exaggerated.

I'm using some lovely linguistic strategies to not admit or deny what you're suggesting. But what I'm doing is I'm resisting you and saying no I don't want to put that face in the spotlight, I want to leave it out please, thank you very much. These negotiations, and this is where I say part of your face is always on loan to somebody else, this is a negotiation that you and I are having, you're wanting it and I'm resisting or you're wanting it and I'm giving it. Or we collaborate together and we put whatever we want to put in the spotlight. So these negotiations are happening constantly all of the time in all of the different interactions that we have.

Mark: Thank you for that and great challenge on the house front I do get that, I can't bring my room to your room or vice versa. Yeah, that doesn't quite fit does it?

Phil: I want to think about, not now, but that's something that I think off air it will be useful to explore and kick around some more.

Mark: I guess that's quite a nice link into a change that happened over the course of the last 12 months in your podcast, which is you introduced something different, you had some interview style with expert in particular areas and then you introduced a new element which was Emotion at Work stories, which started with Amanda Arrowsmith at Ponte Carlo Blue talking about imposter syndrome and then since then you've had and you referenced it earlier on Tony Jackson talking about anxiety and then also Amy King talking about burnout. So can you describe a little bit about what was going on there in terms of introducing that new element to the podcast series?

Phil: It was feedback from listeners actually. So it was, I can't remember who it was, I want to say Annette Hill but I'm not 100% sure that it was, but I got feedback from one person in particular and then when I mentioned it to some other people. I got the feedback and thought that's interesting I've not thought about doing it that before, which was you know what Phil I really like it and it really makes me think, but what would be great is to hear some real personal experiences of people with emotion in the workplace. I thought actually you know what that's something that I haven't done before that's something that we haven't included. Then I asked a few other people and said what do you think and they were like yeah that would be really, really great, that would be really, really interesting. I put a call out on Twitter to say this is something I want to introduce into the podcast series, who would be up for contributing. And Amanda was first to put her hand up and she talks in the podcast about how she put her hand up and then she went oh but I'm sure there's somebody better than me. And then Amy she and I got talking because we've known each other for a while and we got talking and she was sharing her experience with me. I then asked her after we'd finished chatting about it if she'd be interested, willing to share it as a story. Likewise with Tony and then we got some others coming up as well. But, yeah, when that initial request came in it got me thinking to go well you know what actually whilst I am in the podcast at the moment, my focus is on helping people understand what is happening either in their culture, in their organisations, in their interactions and decoding stuff and giving them understanding as to what's happening when different things are occurring. Actually one of the key ways that emotion will effect change in individuals but also if I want to change the narrative, then I can't just change the narrative by almost taking a third party stance on what's happening in the workplace. So there needs to be some first

person narrative around that as well. Yeah, that's where the decision then came to do the stories series.

It's interesting, I'm finding a few challenges with it and when I share these challenges these are then open requests to get people to engage. So one of the challenges I'm finding is men. Tony at the moment is unique in that he's the first man that agreed to do an Emotion at Work Stories piece. I've got one coming up on depression which is going to be really interesting, but again that's with a lady not with a man. I'm not making any gender stereotypes with that, what I'm saying is I would love to have more male voices talking about their stories around emotions in the workplace. Now whilst a lot of it has focused on stuff that you might plot on a mental health spectrum, so anxiety, burnout, stress, imposter syndrome, depression to come, I'd be really happy to chat with somebody who's had an experience like you in the waiting environment, in the restaurant environment or me in the call centre environment, who is willing to share their experiences with emotions in the workplace. To get a broader diverse range of experiences and individuals on the air would be amazing. Because one of the things I'm really conscious of is I use terms like imposter syndrome or burnout or anxiety and they are single word labels for a huge diverse spectrum of experiences that people have. So how anxiety manifests itself for Tony as an example might be demonstrably different to how anxiety manifests itself for somebody else. How imposter syndrome manifests itself for Amanda might be demonstrably different to how it manifests itself for somebody else. And the experiences that they've had in it. Because we're all different, we're all unique in that way. So my plea to the listeners then is even if you're thinking oh yeah but you've already had somebody on talking about that, no I had somebody on talking about their experiences with that, that doesn't mean that that topic is now done or that topic is finished. For me there's more exploration, there's more work to do.

Mark: On a connected note, I noticed yesterday there's a podcast that I've only recently started listening to has jumped to the top of the UK podcast list and it's called Griefcast. In it they have comedians and other personalities come on and talk about their experiences of grief. I was listening to one the other day, there are lots of connections to how grief is affected by and produces effects at work. I think there would be a lot of mileage in having a conversation with somebody about their experience of grief. Because they can, as you say, be hugely varied and enormously nuanced and one person's experience of grief and how it manifested itself in their work could be very different from another's.

Phil: I've had two different conversations with two different people in the last two months and neither of which are willing to come on the air for different reasons about grief. Because again it's another one of those taboos that's not talked about. I did some coaching a while ago with a client who had a close family member who had been diagnosed with a terminal disease and they were getting very emotionally charged about the ways that other individuals were interacting with them. So some would ask directly in front of other people how is, insert name of family member? Other people would say nothing, other people would mention the disease and then go, oh no, and then get really uncomfortable. I said you've got a couple of calls that you could make, one call is that those people that are doing things that you're finding unhelpful, I think the kindest thing you could do to them is to go and tell them what you need. It's to tell them do you know what when you see me can you ask me how I am and not ask me how, insert family member, is. Or can you just give me a nod as a way of indicating...whatever you want it to be that the best thing you could do to help those

individuals is to tell them what you need from them. At the moment they're firing in the dark, they're doing what they think is either what they would like or what they think you like or what they think would be the best thing to do. The best thing you can do is to go and be explicit and say this is what I need from you right now. So if you ask me am I okay and we're on our own and I say, no, what I don't need you to do is to solve my problems for me. I just need you to accept that I am not okay and be all right with that. I don't need you to ask me any questions, I don't need you to counsel me, I just need you to allow me to say no I am not okay and I'm here and let's get on with some work.

What at the moment is implicit assumptions of people making...if you're finding it uncomfortable then I guarantee they are as well, what would make you both more comfortable is make it explicit. Go and have that explicit conversation and say this is what I need from you right now and by the way I might change my mind next week. I might even change my mind tomorrow but as I feel today this is what I need from you and is it okay if I let you know if I change my mind about what I need from you. If the answer to that is yes then great then go for it but they're not doing it...she said, they're doing it to annoy me. I said well that could be the case or they're insensitive. So it could be they're insensitive, it could also be that they're just doing their best with the situation as they know it or what they think is the right thing to do. But, yeah, I'm struggling to get people that are willing to come on, at the moment anyway, and talk about grief.

Mark: It feels like we're moving into a space of what could the future look like, the future of the Emotion at Work podcast. So if you and I could wave a magic wand and put someone on your guest list by this time next year, do you have someone in mind or do you have a series of people in mind that you would absolutely love to have on your podcast over the next 12 months?

Phil: One person who's been on my wish list since the start of the podcast is on, I've got a pre-call with them this evening because they're based in America. So I've got a pre-call with them this evening where we'll agree the frame, how we'll set it up, what sorts of questions I'm likely to ask, what we're going to explore, where I'm going to go, that sort of stuff. As that individual's now confirmed I'll do it...or is it too premature? Yeah, so it's the world's leading researcher in something called Emotion Regulation. Now Emotion Regulation for me is a much underused term. So it happens all of the time but people don't language it in that way and for me it's a very specific part of something like a broader definition of emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence is partly about awareness of emotion and then people talk about emotion management, but for me it's not about emotion management. If it is there's something before that, because emotion management is something much more cognitive and deliberate because you're managing it. Whereas emotion regulation is maybe a bit before that or maybe it needs to replace emotion management. Which is how am I working with and regulating the different emotions that I'm experiencing? Often people think their emotion regulation is about regulating it down and that's just the biggest load of rubbish. Emotional regulation can involve regulating emotion up or down or regulating it at a level. It's not always about, and this is where I challenge the narrative, the narrative is you should reduce the intensity of the emotion. Why? There are some contexts where actually you want more intensity in the emotion. There are also some contexts where you want less intensity in the emotion but for me the default is you regulate it down. Rubbish. There are times when we want you to regulate it up or to maintain it at a level. So, yeah, he's on.

Mark: And will you be playing the Warren G and Nate Dogg song Regulate as you introduce that programme, I hope so?

Phil: [Laughs] So now in my head you've started off a train of thought which is, can I work my introduction in a way that it would mimic the rap? A clear black moon Phil Wilcox was on the street trying to consume a guest for the podcast. I said what's up I need him over there to come and give me the heads up or something like that.

Mark: Beautiful. We did not prepare that, listeners, not even slightly.

Phil: No, we didn't. That's one. Who else would I like? I think one of the things that's been missing for me this year is I want to explore getting more non HR-y people on the podcast. In particular then I guess in a way business leaders. I've said from the start that I wanted to get practitioners, researchers and business leaders on the podcast. There are some say like Monica Parker from the last one who is a business leader, because she's a founder of her company Hatch but she's also a practitioner, but she's also within HR. She would say she's not because it's human analytics and so on but broadly speaking she's in HR. I think the only guest I would say that has fell outside of that camp so far was Ben Fletcher who we had on Episode 3 I believe. Finding more people, and again this is what I'm finding a challenge is finding business leaders that will openly talk with me about the role that emotion plays in their workplace. Because that isn't the narrative, that's just not the narrative around work. I haven't answered your question, I've answered it more in terms of type of guest. I'd like to get more business leaders, more diversity in the guest pool that we have, whether that be by gender or other, and more stories, more people who are willing and able to share their stories.

Mark: I wouldn't be much of a coach if I didn't ask you at least once what sort of things are you hoping to do to try and get that type of guest onboard? What sort of strategies, options might you deploy?

Phil: I've got some time allocated away next week to go back and search through the mental health awareness tag from last week. I'm going to go back through that feed and have a look if there are any people on there that I think would be interesting guests to have on, people who have got interesting stories to tell, whether that be personal stories or doing interesting research or have got interesting areas in the field. Beyond that I don't know is the short answer, I haven't thought about how to secure those people yet, the thought is I'd like to secure more of those but beyond making the requests on this episode of the podcast and then doing some searching that's as far as my thinking has gone.

Mark: Of course if anyone's listening in and knows how we could start to make this happen please just get in touch.

Phil: Yes, absolutely, so either [phil@emotionatwork.co.uk](mailto:phil@emotionatwork.co.uk) or you can find me on Twitter [@philwilcox](https://twitter.com/philwilcox).

Mark: So shall we start to move into wrap things up. I've got some questions that you normally ask your guests at the end of the podcast.

Phil: Yeah, go on.

Mark: I'm going to throw them at you this time. Based on what we've talked about today or anything else that's in your sphere of experience and of interest, what books, videos, talks would you recommend for people to find out a little bit more about what we've been talking about?

Phil: If you're interested in face and if you haven't done so already then I would recommend you go back to Episode 12, so that's me and Dawn Archer talking about impression management, so I would recommend going to search that out. I'm looking at my bookshelf and I'm like which ones do I pick? So there's a book by I think it's George Yule which is called Pragmatics. So face is part of a broader linguistics and sociology discipline called pragmatics. Pragmatics is about how we make sense and meaning of interaction. So it covers more than face but it gives a really nice, if you're interested in what happens between it gives you a really nice place to start in terms of the different ways that you can analyse and decode what happens between. So it covers things like politeness and impoliteness. It covers things like speech act theory, it covers things like face to face work. It's a good starter for ten, it's a short read and it costs about six quid I think as well. It's an accessible book. If you're interested in face in particular then you want to read a work by Erving Goffman, so you can pick any one of his really. You've got the Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. You've got The Interaction Ritual is another good one. You've got Forms of Talk where he looks at the different types of talk that you have. And then there's another one called Frame Analysis which is where he starts to introduce and look at framing, so a lot of George Lakoff's work stemmed from Goffman. If you're interested what happens within especially from an emotion angle then you could look at something like Emotions Revealed by Paul Ekman or you could look at a couple of books by Antonio Damasio you could start there as well. But Damasio takes a very brain centred look at it, so he comes at it from a neuroscience, cognitive, psychology angle whereas Ekman comes at it from more of a psychology, just a traditional psychology angle. Or if you're interested in identity and I've plugged this one before because I've introduced one of the authors to the podcast, so it's a book called Everyday Talk by Karen Tracy and Jessica Robles. That's a really nice one as well.

Mark: Just a very quick build on all of those, at the start of the podcast we were talking a bit about perception management, I read a great book recently by an author Beau Lotto, and it's called Deviate, The Science of Seeing Differently. And it's all about the psychology, biology of how we perceive the world around us. Really, really fascinating read and full of lovely visual examples as well for people who still appreciate picture books.

Phil: Wonderful, you'll have to send me a link so we can put that one in the show notes.

Mark: Absolutely. So as we tie off I'm going to first off start by saying a huge congratulations. As one of your fair listeners from day one well done on getting this far, your 12 months of podcasting glory is something that no one can take away from you and I know it's something that people have really, really enjoyed and appreciated listening to and have sparked off new ideas and new conversations and fresh thinking. So congratulations and thank you.



Phil: Thank you.

Mark: Is there anything else going on for you that you're thinking, feeling or want to say before we close off?

Phil: So a couple of things. One is a huge thank you to you for agreeing to host today, I'm very grateful for a) your hosting ability but also the prep and the work that you put in beforehand, so I'm grateful for it. It's been really good being on the other side actually for a change, it's been nice. I felt like I've been a bit shouty at times but I don't know. I'm not used to advocating for so long, I've been very advocacy-ing today and I'm not used to that on the podcast I think because I normally take the enquiry type to use some dialogic Issac(sy) language, normally I'm the enquirer whereas today I've been the advocate. But it's been good though I've enjoyed it.

Mark: Well long may it continue, maybe we'll be back here again in 12 months time, for your two year anniversary.

Phil: Yeah, that would be really good. I don't see any reason why not. Already in the can and ready to go is an episode that maybe is actually a year overdue, which is me talking with a guy called Cliff Lansley who's a long time friend, business partner and mentor. Where we unpick some of the real core basic stuff around emotions, what are they, where do they come from and how do they work, what is emotional intelligence, is it even a thing? So we unpick some of that real core stuff. We've got Jo Stephenson, that episode is in the can. So Jo and I talk about emotion at work in emotional exploitation, which is a really interesting discussion. I've got one lined up, as I said, with my world's leading researcher in emotion regulation. It looks like we're on a good start for another year so I'm looking forward to it.

Mark: Fantastic.

Phil: Well thank you very much, Mark, thank you being...I'm going to take the reins off you and I'm going to close the show if that's all right. So thank you very much Mark. So if people want to find out more about you, lovely Mark Gilroy, how can they get in touch with you if they wanted to?

Mark: I am mostly on Twitter these days, so you'll find me on Twitter, @thatmarkgilroy. I am into all things psychology, coaching, technology at work, leadership. I'm very partial to podcasts and also photography. I very recently became a dad for the first time so at the moment you'll find me Tweeting at all bizarre hours, do not adjust your sets I'm doing okay. I am a managing director at a company called TMSDI, we offer psychometrics for team development, leadership, helping improve conversations at all levels and you can find out a bit more about us at TMSDI.com.

Phil: Thank you. You have a blog as well which you haven't plugged, do you want to plug your blog?

Mark: I do indeed. So taking the photography approach it's snap-leadership.com.



Phil: Wonderful, thank you. One of the things I didn't mention earlier on about the podcast is that I've really fallen out of love with writing, which I know I'll have to change if I do a PhD mind. But that's one of the things that I love most about the podcast is it's allowed me to get into really good discussions and do some really good thinking without me having to write it because I just get to explore it. So thank you very much, Mark. Thank you for hosting the Emotion at Work podcast for us for this episode. Listeners, thank you very much for your time it's another long one. Thank you very much for your attention and thank you for listening. If you'd be ever so kind if you enjoy what you hear then please leave us a review on iTunes, it helps other people find us and you can also follow us on iTunes or on Podbean or Stitcher or Overcast or wherever it is that you get your podcasts from. So thank you very much for taking your time to listen to the podcast today. Thank you, Mark, for coming on the podcast and being the host.

Mark: My pleasure.

Phil: And we'll see you again soon.