



Episode 29 – Emotion at Work in Banter, Impoliteness and Power Chatting with Dr Derek Bousfield (@DrWordyBoy)

Phil: Hello fair podcast listeners and welcome to the Episode 29 of the Emotion at Work podcast! Before we go into the podcast properly, there are a few things I wanted to do. I wanted to make a couple of apologies, share some appreciation and then make a request. Apology number one: it is very rare, and I don't think I've ever overly edited an episode of the Emotion at Work podcast until this one. When I started recording I was looking at the waveform on the audio recording device and thought this doesn't look very big and then I've realised that the microphone I selected wasn't the one that was in front of my face but the one that was about a metre away so I'm a bit teeny for the first 3 minutes or so. And then in the background I've closed down that recording and then opened up a new one, so you will hear me much, much clearer, much like I am now. Apologies for the audio quality right at the beginning. It picks up and gets a bit better after about 2 or 3 minutes of the podcast. Second apology is the sporadic nature of my publications recently. Normally I like to publish every two weeks on a Thursday. Every other Thursday is my goal and I've not hit that for a while. As the regular listeners of the podcast will know, I've had some trials and tribulations with moving house and as you would hear about more in the episode to come, I've moved house. Yay! What that meant was that I had other priorities I needed to focus on and so wasn't recording additional episode podcasts plus I was without internet for a while and that made it a little bit tricky too. My appreciation then is to you. I'm always blown away by the fact that this podcast gets between 150-200 listeners every week and I just wanted to say thank you very much to all listeners for your support and for sticking with the Emotion at Work podcast. It picks up new followers every week and its listener numbers get bigger and bigger every week, so I just wanted to say thank you for sticking with the podcast. If you've got any suggestions or feedback or recommendations for guests or areas you'd like us to talk about or explore or anything like that then please let me know. And then my request: it looks like this podcast works well for the listener in the way that I see it being shared online, the comments that I get back directly to me but also when I see people sharing the podcast. The listener numbers are high, the number of new listeners that we pick up is increasing as followers of the podcast increase as well. My request is if you'd be willing, please share the love for the Emotion at Work podcast by leaving us a review and rating us whether that would be on iTunes, Overcast, Stitcher, Podbean or wherever it is that you get your podcast from. If you leave us a review it helps other people find the great content that you already enjoy and that's it from me. In Episode 29 we're continuing with our linguistic theme and we've got another linguist as a guest this week to add to the other ones we've had before because I think it's a much needed to be explored topic. So, Episode 29, here we go!

Phil: Hello and welcome to Episode 29 of the Emotion at Work podcast where we take a deep dive into the human condition and I'm very excited today because today's episode is building on a number of aspects that have been covered off in previous episodes of the podcast but it's also picking up on some of the things that I think are so common in the workplace especially in teams and also in wider organisational cultures. Also as the majority of my listeners I think are working in Human Resources or Training and Development type team or organisational development and change world, I think the topics that we are going to be discussing today are going to be particularly relevant for our audience so I am very, very excited about where we are going to go today. We're



taking a linguistics angle. Already on the podcast in the past we had Samuel Lerner who came on and talked about forensic linguistics and we also had Jessica Roberts talking to us about interaction and we also had professor Dawn Archer on and then there's me talking about some interactional aspects as well. Today our guest is also from the research background and that is Mr Derek Bousfield. Let's get him on the air. Hello, Derek! How are you?

Derek: I'm fine Phil and thank you very much indeed for having me on today.

Phil: I'm very excited to have you on and I'm really looking forward to what we are going to talk about. Before we get there, let's keep the listeners in suspense. I always open the Emotion at Work podcast with an unexpected yet innocuous question. A couple of weeks ago I went out to Twitter and said "I need to build up my bank of questions. Give me some suggestions big wide world!" and today's one comes from Christine Locher and she's @ChristineLocher on Twitter if you wanted to find her and her unexpected yet innocuous question is: if you had lots of money what would you never outsource and why?

Derek: Wow! That's interesting. If I had lots of money, what would I never outsource and why? The flippant version of me would basically say going on holiday because obviously that's something you can only experience yourself and if I had lots of money that's what I would be doing. However, if we were talking about this from a professional rather than a personal perspective...

Phil: It could be either, to be fair.

Derek: If it's personal, then obviously I wouldn't outsource basically the way in which I choose to go on holiday with my family because we need to do that ourselves. And we would engage in a series of not just basically foreign holidays but a series of experiences – cycling, lake canoeing, all these kinds of things that we've done on occasion when we had time and resource but we just don't get an opportunity to do often enough. But if it's professional, from a professional working perspective, if I had a huge amount of money or if I had an unlimited amount of money, what I would not outsource it's got to be the expertise that I see in my team and the passion that they actually bring and the commitment they actually bring to teaching, to research, to knowledge exchange. These things are really hard to find, easy to lose if mishandled and they are simply things that you cannot outsource with any surety that you're going to get the same level of passion and commitment and therefore effect and response so it's literally those things which are impossible to outsource, basically the absolute wealth of experience and the passion that comes with it from your colleagues. You can outsource it but then what you tend to do is lose significant amount of effectiveness.

Phil: Ok. I like that. That's really good. I have a slight advantage yet I also now have a slight disadvantage because I say it's an unexpected and innocuous question but I get to see it in advance because I choose it. I haven't thought about it from a professional point of view so I'm going to start with that as that is the unexpectedness for me. I think it would be... [long pause]

Derek: Come on, you got me in suspense now.



Phil: Yeah. I'm trying to decide. It would definitely be the interaction with other people. If there's one thing I enjoy most is enjoying conversations and discussions and explorations with people whether that would be in a coaching capacity or in a consulting way, that sort of stuff. There's plenty of things that are easy that I would outsource: admin, yes. But I think yes, professionally, it would be interacting with other humans because that brings me a lot of joy. If it was personally, I came at it from a different angle. Mine would be cooking.

Derek: [laughs]

Phil: I'm absolutely adamant that you should outsource ironing. I'm adamant that nobody in their life should ever have to iron ever. It's the devil's work.

Derek: I agree to an extent. I am going to come across as someone who really likes ironing. I don't, but ironing is instrumental in my household. When we divvy up work tasks, let me put it this way, whoever is ironing gets to choose what's on the TV, on the big TV in the front room. If there's something you really want to watch, then basically you volunteer to do the ironing and then everybody else either has to sit through what you want to watch, or they have to go and find something else to do. So, I'm a bit of a geek, I'd be quite happily watching the ITV run through of the Hobbit and Lord of the Rings series. I was ironing on Saturday night purely on the basis that I wanted to watch the Lord of the Rings which happened to be on ITV from 8 until around 11 o'clock. There you go. You see. I understand what you're saying, ironing wouldn't be the first choice of one of the things I need to do, however, what it did do it gave me some quality time on our relatively new TV that we've got on the wall. So what can I say? Instrumental. Sometimes you just got to do things which you don't actually want to do because it actually has a benefit for you or for others down the line and that is really the way in which I view ironing. Though if I could find a way of basically securing the TV in my house where I am basically outnumbered 4 to 1 (and that includes the cat who is also female) without having to iron, then trust me, I'd do it. But this is the most effective way of doing it. So that's not necessarily something I would outsource because it's a means to an end.

Phil: Yes. That still doesn't sway it for me. [laughs]

Derek: Fair enough. It was a good attempt. [laughs]

Phil: That was a very good attempt. Someone else has described it in the past as quite mindful. They find it quite therapeutic in that way whereas cooking is that therapeutic thing for me. I just get lost in cooking. Opening the fridge and saying "right, what have we got?" and then creating something that tastes really good. I really enjoy that.

Derek: I'm pleased that you said that. Unfortunately, and this is going to sound horribly traditional, but the extent of cooking for me is instant food. However, my wife and both of my kids actually find the creative aspects of cooking to be incredibly rewarding. They find it doubly rewarding because the deal is if they are cooking, I'm the one cleaning the kitchen.

Phil: Ah, ok!

Derek: Yes, basically everybody is happy. And I know that sounds horribly traditional but basically I'm not the one who does cooking but I'm not particularly good at it I'm afraid. I like cleaning the kitchen. I know that sounds a little bit sad but it's a bit therapeutic and I view that as a price well worth paying for an absolutely fantastic meal with my family. Everybody has their strengths, unfortunately cooking is not one of mine.

Phil: Yeah. I know that there's lots of atypical things that are not my strengths at all. I can't hang a shelf. Anything to do with working with my hands I just find really tricky to do. I was chatting to the new neighbour as we've just moved house. Regular podcasters would be pleased to know I've moved house and I'm now recording this podcast in my new home which is amazingly exciting. So I was chatting with our new neighbour as there's a fence which needs replacing but neither of us are sure whose fence it is and the Land Registry can't help us to find out. We'll split the cost between us and we'll divvy up and we both agreed what we are going to get instead so on and so on. And I said "whoever we get in to do it" and he said "what do you mean we get someone to do it? Can't we do it?". And I said "No. No. I'm not going nowhere near that" And he said "that's fine because I'm a joiner by trade and I do lots of this sort of stuff." And I said "You know what, if you want to do that and you're happy to construct it, fill your boots but that's just nowhere near my strength in any way shape or form. I'd be useless when it comes to anything like that."

Derek: Being a farmer's son I should say I am absolutely fantastic with my hands, I can fix any engine I'm seeing and I can hang doors and shelves and things like that. Unfortunately, whilst I can turn my hand to hanging shelves, my father-in-law who lives very close is always the first one to arrive with the toolbox and the demand for coffee whenever we have anything like that and so I just let him get on with it partly because he's significantly better at it than me and partly because I get an easy life that way.

Phil: So where I'm going to go and this wasn't my intention at all but where I'm going to go with it, how I'm going to take that into today then is: when I left that conversation with my new neighbour, my wife said to me in jest "so did you walk away from that feeling really weak and feeble then?" What did she say...? She didn't say "weak and feeble". "Feeling a bit girly", that was it! And I was like "No, actually, because that's what he's good at, that's what I'm good at". Because of the relationship I have with my wife she can get away with that, but if that had been someone else that might be different. So where am I going with that for the listeners? We are talking today about banter, impoliteness and power and I just thought that might be a nice way to take us from what we've been discussing so far into the topic at hand for today.

Derek: Yes, it's a nice one especially considering similar situations. My wife said something similar to me as well because I've got that kind of relationship with her and she would say things to me like "are you not feeling quite as manly as you otherwise could be because my dad's come around and fixed the door for you?" And actually put it like that "fix the door for you" not for the family but for you. And I'm really comfortable with that. He's got his strengths and I've got mine, but he does talk to this kind of society's notions of identity and gender identity and also your notions of competencies both in society and when you get into workplace environment, competencies in terms of someone's professional aspect. Then you've got all these notions around identity which include more sociological factors such as age, biological factors beyond gender which include age, ethnicity,

levels of education, where you are actually from. We've got all these kind of weird what Roland Barthes calls Barthesian myths or rather the stories of society that we as members of society or culture tell ourselves that it is actually normal. And if you're basically getting into any kind of interaction then your sense of self, your sense of identity, this notion of both social and academic notion of what is called face then becomes a particular issue and I'm sure that your regular podcast listeners have come across the concept of face when you talked to Dawn Archer recently. This notion of face is absolutely instrumental in the notion of banter. When you're actually doing banter which is broadly defined from an academic perspective (and I should point out just as an aside here that academia doesn't try and force definitions on other people; it tries to take a descriptive view saying this is what we feel members of society are meaning when they're using terms like banter) as insincere impoliteness, it basically means if I know you very well, I may actually venture an insult to you on the understanding that you will recognise that it is insincere because we are such close friends, because our mutual identity construction is so close that I can risk offending you knowing full well that you will recognise it as me just simply poking fun for fun's sake. Now there is an inherent risk in that because if I'm relying on you more potentially than other forms of communication to recognise what I am trying to do, if you don't take that the way in which I intended it, and that notion of intention is very problematic of course, if you don't take that in the way in which I've intended it, that can cause either damage or breakdown of relationships or if it's in a workplace setting a very uncomfortable lengthy process which requires a lot of explanation to colleagues in HR. And that has happened in the past in various professional settings of which I am aware. This notion of banter, when I put it like that, people may think why on earth would you want to put yourself at risk like that. Well, banter in many ways is actually essential for the construction and maintenance of the construction of social groups because it indicates when it's communicated and accepted for what it is, it indicates that not only are we co-operators but we are such close co-operators that potential damage to our relationship (a) will not work and (b) will not actually negatively impact the collective way in which we work together. There are huge positives for us to have banter relationships but also significant risks if you get it wrong, if it's overused or if it's used where there is a disparity of power relationships, if there is an asymmetry as it's called between power relations or if there are sensitive sociological factors at work either external or internal to the communication. For example, if somebody was to say to me if I've done something slightly wrong and they said "oh you old fool". If I genuinely felt sensitive about my age and the age is a very real issue in the workplace in the UK, then ultimately that attempt at banter which is a fairly common place, a fairly innocuous thing to say but people may actually take offence of that and then if you start moving into notions of ethnicity or gender or region of origin or level of education, you've got a real potential for a very messy outcome where one was not intended.

Phil: Absolutely. And I can think of a number of examples from my professional past where the banter or the insincere impoliteness was around somebody being from Yorkshire and their propensity to spend money. As the budget holder I can't remember the exact phrasing but essentially it was "oh, there we go, there's the Yorkshireman again" and it wasn't about me or where I'm from but this is about the fact that you're being frivolous with money and as the budget holder I'm saying no that's an irresponsible way of spending the cash. This isn't about me being from Yorkshire and all the identity that brings with it. This is just an example of what you're coming to me with a request for money for and I'm saying no because I don't think it's worthwhile or it's a spending we don't need to make.

Derek: Yes. And that example beautifully exemplifies the differences between banter which is insincere impoliteness and actually failed genuine impoliteness. One of the things that we need to be aware of is that there is currently no linguistic way of distinguishing between the two and that's really I think why you get so many people constructing offence where it may not have been intended and then genuinely feeling it (and we're not talking about people who are overly precious here) because there is no linguistic way of differentiating between banter and basically impoliteness which is masked as banter if you see what I mean, i.e. if it's something which I want you to see as banter but it's actually barred behind it. There are many documented cases of that. It really is all down to context which includes notions of personality and identity and we need to be aware of that whenever someone says something like that "oh, there's the Yorkshireman coming out again". I've often theorised and I need to do more research on this that when you label something then there is a whole set of semantic meanings behind that label which you neatly package and then throw away. You see that in politics online a lot nowadays when somebody defines somebody as a lefty or the classic remoaner around the whole Brexit debate and the ongoing sensitivities around the UK leaving the European Union. The moment somebody labels somebody else as a remoaner it uses a label and what it does do it seems to indicate I can dismiss everything you said and that's a risk for labelling. When somebody uses labelling as banter there's always an opportunity for somebody to think "oh, you are simply just trying to encapsulate everything which is meaningful about what I am trying to say and then dismiss it as being meaningless" and so that's one of the fantastic (from an academic perspective) but horrific (from an actual workplace perspective) understandings around how banter and its close linguistic associates work, i.e. things like impoliteness which is masked as banter. I find this utterly fascinating I guess in the same way in which an immunologist finds human lethal viruses to be fascinating. It's not necessarily something you want to actually have inflicted on you but it's something which from an academic perspective I find absolutely fascinating whilst understanding it can be horrifically damaging.

Phil: Tell me more about labelling.

Derek: Labelling is a way of dismissing basically the points and the content of what people are actually saying and so if you're actually using things like "oh, there's the Yorkshireman speaking" then that's potentially a way of dismissing somebody's otherwise valuable contribution to an interaction. Let me give you an example. I was explaining something to one of the sub-teams in my own department and a colleague who happened to be a female colleague, a senior lecturer, in a fifth of my department as I was explaining a particular issue which was a relatively minor issue which I wanted the team to address, this particular colleague simply interrupted me which in itself is particularly a challenging thing to do and then she said "oh, are you mansplaining?". I immediately took offence to that. Now this colleague is known for her banter and I immediately felt a flash of negative emotion at that and in the end I simply relatively timely said "no, I'm bossplaining" so that's how I dealt with it. I actually hate the term "mansplaining" because that use of that label robs an entire gender in the same way as "womansplaining" which I am now starting to see appearing online. Womansplaining or mansplaining rob entire genders of their right to contribute and that's why I dislike them because I find even though this particular colleague attempted to use them (I realised very quickly) in a banter type way, it didn't work at that particular point in time. I didn't come down heavy on her but it was that notion about labelling. So it is an issue to know when to use

banter and how to use banter in a way where you may use a label like remoaner. If somebody is described as a remoaner as I mentioned earlier on it's almost like an excuse to say I can now ignore everything that you are actually saying because I've labelled you as a remoaner and therefore what you are actually saying has no value even if it is a genuinely valid point. So the use of labels in banter settings is particularly problematic.

Phil: I agree with you and I wonder... sorry, lots of thoughts going on in my head. Let's take a breath. I agree with you in that the label that somebody used robs that individual of their agency because it homogenises them into a group that has certain characteristics real or perceived as viewed by whoever it is that is making that statement. What I view/perceive might be different to what the labeller has viewed or perceived and then it also brings in that notion of the relationship between the individuals at play (because you talked about context earlier on, I bang on all the time about how important context is). In your example I feel that flash of negative emotion (as you labelled it), anger, offence or whatever it was at being accused of mansplaining yet you managed to catch that, cognitively reappraise it and then you remembered that this lady in particular is known for her banter so then my response would be "no, I'm bossplaining not mansplaining". You reframed the emotional response that you had in that way and I think if individuals that are either doing the banter or receiving the banter are unaware or they don't account for that contextual aspect, that can make life really tricky and that's where those misunderstandings and miscommunications can come from. I also wanted to take a few steps back because we did a really good job at defining banter but within that we used some words that I don't think many people would be that familiar with. One of those was impoliteness. So can we define it (and remind me we need to define politeness as well) as it might be useful to define what they are.

Derek: Yes. As with every academic term these are hotly contested and really as academics now basically operate and have done for a number of decades, we prefer to take a descriptive approach rather than a prescriptive approach. What we mean by that is we like to look at what society at large understands by certain concepts and certain terms. Having said that if you actually ask 100 people in the UK what impoliteness means, you are likely to get close to 100 separate definitions not all of which will actually concur. Impoliteness has both an academic and a non-academic set of understandings and so that's why we use the content one as a technical term and in a technical term this basically means this is what academia understands it at this time knowing full well that members of society at large may not fully recognise that definition. So there is my rider, if you see what I mean.

Phil: Yeah, that's fine.

Derek: Impoliteness as a technical term in an academic sense simply means the use of linguistic terms and strategies which if effectively communicated cause offence or have the risk of causing offence to the recipients. Offence, politeness and impoliteness, these are considered to be mostly instrumental if not entirely instrumental. Now what instrumental actually means is that they are used as a means to an end. If you think about politeness, we might like to think that we are polite for politeness' sake when we are not. We are polite because if I'm polite to you or you are polite to me, you are more likely to do what I am asking you to do or I'm more likely to do what you are asking me to do or you require of me or whatever both immediately and longer term. So that's instrumental.

The whole reason for being polite is a way of getting things done in society without us attempting to take big chunks out of each other. Because again our face and our notions of identity are constantly at risk so how do you mitigate, how do you reduce the impact, how do you acknowledge that somebody else's individuality, somebody else's individual identity and their face are intact? You use politeness. From time to time (if you've been out in Manchester on a Friday night) you'll probably see that not everybody is as polite to one another as we might otherwise like to think or would want to happen. I'm not just picking on Manchester, basically any town or city in the UK. I'm originally from Kendall and I can tell you if you're going out on a Friday night in Kendall when I used to do that, there would be quite a few conflicts of elocution which I think it's the technical term, quite a few linguistic arguments which is basically saying people are having a right old go at one another both physically as well as linguistically, i.e. they were being impolite. They were using linguistic terms, language in order to purposefully attempt to offend somebody else. That's what impoliteness means. It tends to be viewed instrumental because when you start looking at things like army training discourse whilst society at large wouldn't necessarily say "hey, that's impoliteness" because they wouldn't recognise it as such, it comes under the technical term of impoliteness, i.e. it is linguistically aggressive behaviour which is used instrumentally. In British army training and in American army training you will often find non-commissioned officers, i.e. sergeants, corporals, who for the purposes of training recruits will use aggressive language in no uncertain terms as a way of quickly encouraging the recruits to fit into the mould of the model soldier because if you do that and you get it right, those people will survive on a battlefield in high stress situations. Now that's an extreme form of instrumentality but you can also see instrumental behaviour if you actually look at chef to chef interaction. You only actually have to look at any of the number of TV shows like Hell's Kitchen or I remember from the late 1990s a Channel 4 programme called Boiling Point where you actually have the head chef who is actually very aggressive towards the rest of the cheffing staff or the rest of the brigade, as it's called, within the kitchen. It's done so because it's high stress, it's high stakes, they've got to move very quickly, they've got a reputation to uphold. Politeness takes time. Impoliteness doesn't take quite as much time and it nevertheless pushes forward the force of what you mean very quickly. So whilst politeness is a way of getting things done, sadly impoliteness does seem to have more agency in getting things done. The downside is it gets things done quicker but at the cost of damaging personal and sometimes professional relationships.

Phil: I think, and this is where you can correct me if I'm misinterpreting or misrepresenting anything now so you have absolute agency to correct me...

Derek: Ok. I'll try to do so politely [laughs]

Phil: As well as the aggression, impoliteness can be done through the lack of politeness markers. For example, if you were expecting someone to use a form or title (sir or madam or Dr or professor) and they deliberately leave that out when they call somebody by their first name. Maybe it's a bit of a trivial example but my next door neighbour who I was referring to earlier on, when I was talking about the male in the relationship, the female in the relationship is a teacher at the local primary school where all three of my children up until recently have gone. They are struggling with calling her by her Christian name in the house. They've only been in for a week or two weeks I think but yesterday and the day before they were still calling her by her teacher name "Mrs" and then her surname as opposed to her Christian name. And she said "oh just call me by my Christian name, it's

absolutely fine, just call me Ruth, that's fine" but they are struggling with that because they know the politeness rules are that when I see that lady I do it.

Derek: Yes, a precedent has been set.

Phil: Yes, absolutely. If they were than in school and accidentally called her Ruth, I'm sure she'd be fine about it but if they were doing it then deliberately that would be a form of impoliteness. So it's not aggressive in that way.

Derek: No, absolutely. The hearer/receiver needs to make a judgement call and when you make a judgement call you are not always necessarily correct and that's something we need to be aware of when banter goes wrong but ultimately you've got to make a judgement call and you know sometimes you can do so incorrectly. Sometimes you can make a judgement call whether something was intended or not. For example, and I am going to put you on the spot, when you introduced me you said you are really excited to talk to Mr Bousfield. It's technically Dr Bousfield. I wasn't going to mention it but you put out the example of someone like this. But you know what, you didn't know, so therefore basically that's not even a micro aggression so therefore it's not what might be viewed as a micro example of impoliteness. It's not even rudeness, i.e. you simply didn't know, it's not that you didn't give me the attention or respect that I wanted. You just simply didn't know. Let me give you another example. About 10-12 years ago I was teaching a bunch of first years at the institution I was working at the time. It was at the end of the freshers week and I was giving them a session on a Friday. I walked in and some of them were still calling me Dr Bousfield even though we've been telling them all week just call us by our first names because there's no social distance between us and students. Some students find it very difficult, especially those who came through their A levels from school, coming to university they assume they have to call us by title and last name and I've told them just call me Derek. I distinctly remember this and I remembered it for years and told my children who think it's hilarious. So I came in the room and said "Hi, for those of you who don't already know, I'm Derek" and one of those guys who heard me say all week "call me Derek" from the back just shouted at me and said (bear in mind this is their first year, they've only just started) "yes, this is Derek but you guys get to call him DK" and then all of the guys started laughing. I've never been called DK in my life and everybody started laughing. So I turned around and basically said "a number of people call me a number of different things but you guys do not get to call me DK. You get to call me Derek. Simple as that." And that's how I dealt with the situation but it always struck me as how this one student felt so comfortable that he decided to throw that one in. He was intending to use banter. I interpreted that as not an attempt to offend but as an attempt to do banter which failed so ultimately in hindsight I would say it's probably a little bit rude and he never called me DK again throughout the entirety of his career and he was with me till the end. He was a good student and he got a good degree at the end of it but the fact is like everything else he tested the boundaries and I basically quietly put him back in his box if you want to put it that way. Ultimately everything was good. He attempted to use banter, it didn't quite work on me, I corrected this. We've even had discussions with students when teaching first year social linguistics, i.e. how society and language come together, I'd say to students when introducing them to social linguistics to think about how you address your mom and dad, your friends, even me. And then we talk about notions of address. For example, my nickname amongst my friends and my family is Des. Nobody outside of my friends' group or my family calls me Des. Everybody in my family and friends calls me

Des. Nobody outside that calls me Des. I've mentioned this to students. I basically said you would actually have your own nicknames which may sound absolutely perfectly fine if they come from family and friends but if I use the nickname to you, you'd be horrified. In the same way that none of you in this room get to call me Des ever. And that normally goes down really well. They kind of have lots of smiles and they know never to use it and those that try to use it once, I'd try and have a chat to them about it. It's just a way of getting these things across and this indicates something which you mentioned earlier on, Phil. It's basically not so much what you say it's who you are saying it to and what that relationship is like. That is hugely instrumental in the interpretation by any individual of what is meant to be banter and what is not to be taken as banter.

Phil: I think in the workplace as well we have to account for overhearers who are not necessarily the intended recipient of the banter. I've had to deal with cases in my HR experience where you have two individuals who have a relationship that they feel between them allows them to use particular language or terminology or terms of address or what they describe as terms of endearment. But when you factor in overhearers whether they'd be peers in the team or members of the public in one example, or others, their interpretation of that can be massively different to what those interlocutors (or those speakers I should say probably) are trying to do between them. The instrumentality of that is that we are using these terms, address terms or phrases because we know between us we can say that and it's OK but then when you bring in an overhearer it gets more complex. I had an example once in a team when somebody new joined the team this banter happened in the team meeting and they were mortally offended by the fact that people in a professional context were using the language in the way that it was being used. It being precedent in the team for quite a while, nobody saw the issue.

Derek: Yes, I've got example after example I could tell you of that happening but of course one thing you've got to guard against is that fundamentally banter is healthy. However you also have to guard against the fact that banter represents a particular cultural way of doing things. Now, when you've got new members of the team coming in, to expect them to simply knuckle down and accept and actually join in with that cultural aspect can actually be quite problematic and new teams should really be gently asked to behave. If you've got a constant way of talking to one another which outside of that group and outside of that practice may actually be interpreted differently than you need to be mindful of that with others. I can give you example after example of situations where people overhearing it or people who have joined a group have actually seen something that they'd been horrified about. I'll give you one example when that has happened to a colleague of mine who was in his late 30s at another institution and had a habit of being on Facebook. His policy was he never invited anybody, but he never refused anybody on Facebook. Because he was actually a very popular colleague amongst students at the institution he was working at the time, a lot of the students would actually invite him on Facebook and he would accept them. In hindsight given his own experiences with HR about what I'm about to tell you, he subsequently is more circumspect. He is still on Facebook but he does not actually accept new students. He is a lot more careful when accepting new students when they try and invite him, so he leaves them there so that they can't re-invite him and things like that. In this situation and it was admittedly late at night, one of his students whom he knew very well who was an inspired student by all accounts, who has actually done an awful lot of research and worked with this particular colleague at another institution throughout her first year, second year and third year she said something along the lines of (I was



called in as an expert by this institution's HR to talk about this) "eek only 3 more weeks of my degree course. Slightly worried that I don't know what I'm going to do with my life." Bear in mind that this colleague was male in his late 30s and the student who was posting on Facebook was 21-22. This particular colleague who'd been teaching her for 3 years then listed 20 things in there she could do (because that's just the way he does things, he is incredibly bombastic) and then summarised it with a sting in the tale which was "or you could stay with us to pursue a masters". The problem was one of the early things he'd actually suggested she could do with her degree was pole dancer.

Phil: Right, ok.

Derek: Now bear in mind this is Facebook and this is a very public environment. It wasn't the student herself who received the reply that took offence of that. It was a friend of hers who didn't know this colleague and never had him as a tutor. She had taken her understanding of what a student-tutor relationship should be like and found his comment of pole dancer offensive. He'd also put in things like lion tamer, safari expedition leader, you know, things that were equally beyond the bizarre, things like jet fighter, test pilot, he'd done a series of about 19 or 20 of these ridiculous things and then summarised with or you could pursue a masters. This was his particular defence but the point was a third party had taken offence on behalf of the student to whom that comment was directed because she didn't know the culture that existed between this particular colleague and his particular students. The student in question, the one to whom the pole dancer comment was directed to, had said she was not offended in any way, shape or form this is just what [this particular colleague's name] is like and it's simply not offensive it's just who he is. Coming back just to link on this one and other things, you may have seen that my Twitter handle is @drwordyboy. One of the reasons it's @drwordyboy is that my friends, and my family don't do this, but my friends, the people I grew up with and I'm still in contact with and meet basically once every two weeks to catch up with, they would refer to me as Wordy Boy, simple as that. I'm not offended by that, but they use that as a label thinking back to what I said earlier on about labels. They use this as a label and they use it to basically say that I'm the only one of my friends group (not the only one who's been to university) but the only one of my friends group that's actually gone all the way through university doing a PhD this, that and the other. One of my friends is running his own building firm, one is running an electrical business, one is basically co-partner in an independent financial advice business and another one is running the distribution for a major North-West food distribution organisation. These are all friends who in their own fields by their own definition made a success of themselves, but they signal to me, interestingly enough, that my particular experiences and expertise are no more or less valuable than their own. Whenever I come up with something like "actually from a definition point of view" or if I say anything that is vaguely linguistical they say "here we go, here is the wordy boy" or they would turn to me and say "oh, come on wordy boy, we're paying your wages, what does this mean?" or something along these lines. And occasionally people who aren't the centre of that group, more peripheral members will actually get quite offended by hearing this and in the past they have done. They would say things like "they shouldn't be talking to you like that". Society says academics should be viewed in this way but I've grown up with these people sitting on the floor with grazed knees crying at age 5, that kind of stuff. There is a history there that you dismiss at your peril and for me and my friends group given that we are basically very close knit friends, we have been for more decades than I care to remember, that probably has more weight amongst the group of us but



it doesn't mean to say that we don't fall out, we occasionally do about other things that have been said but significantly less as time goes on.

Phil: But I guess there's also an instrumental aspect as well to it. As well as elements of banter/faux mocking, there is also some endearment within that.

Derek: There is, yes. There is a huge amount of endearment. They call me "wordy boy" but I call the one who runs his own electrical business "sparky" simple as that and we will occasionally round on another friend who sells independent financial advice and say "at least we are doing something productive you are selling fear of the future, fear of getting old" and those kind of comments. There is always a sense of endearment but there is a game-like quality to it as well at least within my friends group. This is a term of endearment, I can say these things to them because we have been friends for more than 40 years in some cases. We know how we each take it, we know what presses buttons and how far we can press them but there is also (and this could be gender specific identity construction here) doing laddishness even though now we are mid to late 40s if you see what I mean. There is a game like quality to it. When we are engaging in banter, how good can the banter be, how near the knuckle can it be, before it actually tips over to something serious? There is a real game like quality with that – how far can you push it? That kind of thing. But there are obviously a few things which are off topic. These things being basically nobody in my friends group and as far as I can see from the research and the data that I've actually seen nobody else ever says anything negative about the children of everybody else. You just don't do it. There are some things which are totally off topic: children, parents, deceased friends or family members, none of these things are ever pushed. However, if you've got friends who've got itinerant girlfriends or things like that, they are not off topic. If you've got people who are friends of friends, they're not off topic. If you've got things where people tried to do something and they've been either successful or unsuccessful, they're not off topic. So there are some things which can be very close near the knuckle and there are other things which it's almost like self-regulation in terms of the banter. There are things which you just do not mention and if they were mentioned in a banter like setting, the group quickly shuts those kinds of things down.

Phil: Yeah. I'm trying to think now if in my experience there any other taboo topics. I'll save that one for later, I think. So I want to do a bit of a summary. I don't want to end this yet because I also want to talk about power but I think it would be useful to bring together where we're at. We talked about how banter is and give me your description again: banter is...

Derek: Banter is insincere impoliteness.

Phil: Wonderful. And it's intended and interpreted in that way.

Derek: When it's successful, yes.

Phil: And banter is a healthy thing because it signals closeness in relationships, it signals understanding of other people within that context and that environment.



Derek: Yes. It signals the strength of the relationship as well as a huge endearment, affection element to it as well. The problem is, like everything else, it can misfire. And if it misfires, then everything you are attempting to achieve which includes re-affirming, re-strengthening the social bonds, showing endearment, if you're unlucky and you've mishandled it, you can have the complete opposite effect.

Phil: Ok. So that then brings us back into the impoliteness bit. This is where things are done to either aggravate or offend or threaten or be aggressive towards or something in that way, most commonly using linguistic and paralinguistic elements, I suppose, but we can come to that later.

Derek: Yes, definitely paralinguistic as well.

Phil: Ok. So using linguistic and paralinguistic elements. On the contrasting side of that there is politeness where we are doing either linguistic or paralinguistic things to grease the wheels I call it.

Derek: Yeah, that's a good way of putting it.

Phil: Yes, greasing the wheels of actions or working relationships. Both politeness and impoliteness then can happen within interaction with other people and banter is the insincere aspects of impoliteness.

Derek: Yeah.

Phil: As much as Venn diagrams are often overused, if one of my circles in my Venn diagram is impoliteness, another one of those then is banter because you can do impoliteness and be doing banter and you can do impoliteness and not be doing banter, if we then bring power into it as well then, how does or what does the research tell us about how power interplays or overlaps with those other two aspects?

Derek: Yeah. It interplays and overlaps very carefully. The reason being that there is a power asymmetry because the theory and the practice and the data seem to suggest that people who are more powerful within hierarchies, organisations and structures don't have to use as much politeness (all other things being equal) than those who are more powerless. That then sets up a series of expectations so that if a more powerful person is attempting to use banter with somebody who is more powerless, that can actually therefore be assumed or it can sometimes be interpreted or is more readily interpreted as actually being sincere rather than insincere. Therefore banter from somebody in a senior/boss type position coming down the structure is much more high risk. That doesn't stop people who are slightly lower than the person who is in a managerial position from using banter or attempting to use fairly light or significantly more innocuous banter towards that particular colleague but again that can sometimes be interpreted as a challenge to authority and a challenge to position. So the summary of this particular situation on the understanding that significantly more research is actually needed, is that where power becomes more of a differential then banter is used very carefully.

Phil: I guess I want to play with the contrast of that. Can banter be used by those without hierarchical power? You've mentioned you've got a team which is made up of 5 different areas so if I imagine that's 5 different people, if somebody within your team was attempting to use banter as a way of exercising or demonstrating power, is that a thing?

Derek: Yes, that's definitely a thing. Banter is rarely ever used just for the purposes of strengthening the social bonds, showing that we are co-operators and that very little will actually challenge us. It comes back to this notion I've mentioned earlier about the game like quality. In a game, if you think of a traditional game, there is usually one winner or one set of winners and so the moment banter starts to overlap with game like qualities, then there is a sense that power is therefore up for contestation and banter could be one of the mechanisms by which somebody gains either local or short term or long term notions of power and influence. Banter like any other linguistic tool is a tool for instrumentality, i.e. getting things done. And if you are the person who's controlling the getting things done, then you are de facto the person in power.

Phil: Yes. I don't think you and I would disagree in that, we haven't talked about it but I don't think we would disagree. I think power is something that is much more dynamic than I think is often given credit for.

Derek: Hugely.

Phil: The general narrative is that if you are in a hierarchy and you are above other people, therefore you have the power. And I don't buy that necessarily. I think that does happen, but I think it's much more dynamic than that.

Derek: Of course it does.

Phil: Power is something that moves and changes sometimes from utterance to utterance but it can also be from topic to topic or context to context.

Derek: Perfect, yes, absolutely. If you think about that. This is a whole other podcast and probably somebody has done a lot more work on language and power than myself. I've done a little bit. Yes, there is often a view in society that power is hierarchical and it's concrete in institutions and that's simply not true. We use the concept now and I don't think any of your podcast listeners would actually not recognise the fact that people can be what's called upwardly managed. I don't mind being upwardly managed on the basis that I've got colleagues who are teaching German, French, Spanish, Italian, Japanese, Mandarin, as well as linguistics TSOL, digital media communications, multimedia journalism. I'm not a journalist. I don't speak German. I need to be upwardly managed because they have more power in their particular fields of expertise than I do so I require them to be more powerful and more knowledgeable in the areas of German, Spanish, Italian, journalism because I need to manage these particular teams, I've got to lead these teams but they actually have more expert power in those particular areas. I've just got to balance their demands, their needs from an expert power perspective with the university's own allocation of resources in order to ensure that everybody gets the best out of this and that we're not basically running the programme at a financial or any other loss. Students get the very best experience that we can actually provide them and

resources are appropriate to the task at hand and that absolutely relies on people having different types of power and bringing them together in a meaningful way so I absolutely agree with you that we need to move away from this overly simplistic view of power being top down hierarchical. It is diffused, and I agree with you entirely and the research would agree with you, Phil, that power changes from utterance to utterance, from minute to minute, from topic to topic.

Phil: And I guess with that then is and I think this goes back to my very eloquent question “is that a thing?” I put a few minutes ago. I don’t think I have experienced then banter as an instrument that somebody is using to get or assert power of some description in some way. There are two other aspects I want to link into that – one is whether it’s effective, i.e. is it perceived as banter? as insincere impoliteness or have they left themselves what I call wriggle room? That’s where linguistically I see a lot of banter trying to play; in that wriggle room where you’re not really sure whether it is banter or an insult or what you and I might call impoliteness. But what it does, it gives the speaker enough wriggle room to say no, that was just banter.

Derek: Yeah, I suspect there is a huge amount of that. Wherever you get indirectness in language use where people are attempting in one way or another, whether they fully realise it or not, they will be conscious at some point that they’ve given themselves what’s called plausible deniability, i.e. they are saying “oh, I was only intending it as such and such not how you’ve taken it and if you’ve taken it that way, then basically that’s not intended and that becomes now your problem.” And I suspect that’s a common defence especially in workplace settings where you’ve got instances of interactions gone wrong or genuine instances of banter gone wrong or instances where somebody attempted to get quite near the knuckle with somebody and it’s not been pitched rightly and rather than getting instrumentality of power over the other person by using what appears to be a content of banter it’s actually basically being responded to in a more negative way. I think ultimately there is a lot of that can go on. If anybody was actually hoping for a really clear response to basically what is and isn’t banter, I’m afraid we’re not there yet if we’re ever going to be there.

Phil: Yeah, and I think your ending “if we’re ever going to be there” is an accurate one because you’re never going to know. I can say this wasn’t my intention when actually this was my intention, but I don’t want to own that because if I own that, that opens up a whole other type of conversation or a whole other aspect of it because yes, I did want to communicate my displeasure or my frustration or my sarcasm or whatever it was. I often hear people talking about intent vs. impact so what was the intent and what was the actual impact that it had. I can tell you what my intent was but that’s not to mean that that’s actually what my intent is. And I remember one case in particular where I was running the investigation and it was about a number of misunderstandings and if you aggregated up those numbers of misunderstandings and some of the similarities of those misunderstandings actually that led to at least sketch out a picture where it was hard for the individual to say that wasn’t my intention. Arguably they could have got away with it once but with the number of occurrences that we had, it was actually harder for them to maintain that line. And this takes us back to the face aspect of things. It was harder for them to maintain a line of unintentionality when you look at these different examples over time that would suggest that there is some intentionality there.

Derek: Yes. I think I would agree with that in principle and one thing we need to remember is that words whether written or uttered, once written or uttered no longer belong to the speaker or the writer. It's as simple as that. If you think about it, when you speak or when you write and press send on an email, you are giving those words to somebody else and they therefore take at least partial ownership of those. Language is imperfect. All naturally occurring languages are wonderfully, beautifully, horribly imperfect in terms of communicating our full intent and our full meaning. Ultimately you need to be aware that words no longer belong to the producer of those words, they belong as equally to the receiver of those words and we need to guard against these ancient linguistic theories of the producer owns these words and it's what they intended. We also equally need to guard against what happened in postmodern theories of linguistics around it's what the hearer does with them that counts because that completely then blanks out the speaker. This is essentially a 50/50 or more or less a 50/50 split between both the producer and the receiver or the speaker and the hearer if you want to put it in more simple terms. I remember Bakhtin saying "my word is a bridge between myself and another". If we want to understand that quotation to its full then ultimately it's literally whilst my word is actually a means of communication it rests equally as strongly on both banks of the river of communication. If you see what I mean. And so ultimately I think probably we need to accept that a speaker may or may not claim that's not what they intended, the intention it's one thing, it's the uptake and the effect on the receiver and the relationships now between speaker and hearer that also are equally important.

Phil: Yes. And that's where you get into the things like backhanded compliments. It gets really interesting. You'd know because it was part of the special edition of the Journal that you put out but the ways that individuals can give compliments by disparaging someone else. I guess we're moving slightly away from banter in that way because they weren't doing it in a bantery way. There are endless examples of ways that we linguistically try and do things and that gets us back to the faction that you were talking about earlier on.

Derek: Yes. I distinctly remember that when I was a Masters student I did a particular assessment which I found incredibly challenging on some advanced form of syntax. I handed it in and when it came back with a distinction level mark, I was really chuffed about it because it was probably the most challenging piece of work I've ever done in my academic career and syntax and grammar are not things that I do in terms of my linguistic expertise. I remember the tutor actually said words to the effect of "considering your strengths as a linguist, I find this to be an excellent piece of work". So I thought, great. Thanks so much for the opening clause there, you needn't have done that. As a way of basically giving me a backhanded compliment she recognised that it was not my area of strength and so had chosen to say given that you're not actually a syntactician, you've actually done an excellent piece of work. She could have just said you've done an excellent piece of work. And I would have been happy with that, but she was that kind of person and she felt that she needed to put that in there. It may or may not have been a backhanded compliment. I certainly took it as if it was.

Phil: Yes. Ok. We've covered a lot of ground then over the course of our conversation so far. If our listeners wanted to find out more, are there any books or publications or authors or videos or what resources (that's a better phrase) would you suggest for people who wanted to learn more about some of the areas we talked about today?

Derek: OK. There have been one or two attempts by various colleagues both within academia and outside of academia to start talking about notions of politeness and impoliteness and things like that. My suggestions would be to currently stick with the academic work. Jonathan Culpepper in 2011 did an absolutely fantastic brainstorming piece of work on impoliteness. You'll notice, Phil, what I am attempting to do is not come across as immodest by promoting my own stuff, so Jonathan's work is really good. If anybody wants to plough through my own 2008 Monograph on Impoliteness, that's absolutely fine. Clare Hardacker who has been doing work for the last few years and will shortly have her own monograph on academic work and her non-academic work on trolling online and one or two things that are coming out basically outside of academia where Clare is actually talking about trolling and online aggression, stalking...

Phil: Yes, I know, she is on my podcast guestlist at the moment. I haven't secured her yet.

Derek: She will be great.

Phil: She is on my wish list of guests.

Derek: She will be great. The one thing I would say is that there are one or two pieces of work out there, and I've got to be very careful about what I say but I am the owner of a copy of work by Lynne Truss who is a journalist on politeness in British society. I'm afraid to say whilst I found it an entertaining read there is evidence that she has misunderstood the models and theories about notions of positive and negative politeness and therefore that suggests that her work could probably do with a second edition. I'll put it that way. I'm trying to be as polite as possible because I otherwise found it an entertaining read if a little too (how can I put this...) not rooted in what academic research has actually found people in our society are actually using in terms of notions of politeness so be aware of that. That's not to say that I didn't like it, he says, trying to cover his back very carefully...

Phil: It's that misinterpretation of Brian Levinson type.

Derek: It was. I mean she misunderstood the concepts as she might do on notions of positive politeness and negative politeness. She misunderstood what those concepts actually meant because, of course, we have in our head a scheme that positive means good and negative means bad rather than basically how Brian Levinson uses the terms.

Phil: So basically about reinforcement and acceptance.

Derek: Yes, the desire for approval, freedom of a position, exactly. She misunderstood those and she misrepresented those. Other than that, it was a particularly interesting read if non-secured in the academic research. And then of course you can always get your hand on a copy of Volume 14 of the Journal of Politeness Issue 2 which is on politeness and impoliteness in professional context.

Phil: Indeed. And I think there are a number of different papers that are in that particular special edition.



Derek: There's some fantastic ones in there as well, absolutely. I'm not including my own, of course.

Phil: No, nor me. [laughs]

Derek: The beauty of that is that all this academic work it's coming full circle. It's no longer just drawing from what is going on in society and formalising and recognising what's going on. It's almost like it's trying to identify good practice in certain areas, put it on a firm academic footing and then suggest there are these settings which are effectively used notions of politeness or effectively dealt with impoliteness in these particular types of settings and here it is. Whether this is something you want to adopt into your own policies or whether you want to adopt into your own working practices or adopt into your own training mechanisms, this is what's worked elsewhere. I think this is really the value of this particular special edition and this is really what we intended to do with it.

Phil: Yes, I managed to get hold of 3 of the different papers from that special edition and I agree that there is some really interesting work happening in terms of how can we not just report on what is happening but also progress that and take that further on, how can that be used and how can that support to enable communication and understanding within the workplace. So that is really good. Are there any misconceptions that you would like to clear up that you haven't cleared up already?

Derek: Wow! I don't know. Is there anything I've said or anything I represented from the theory and the practice when put in perspective potentially not as clear as it could be for your regular podcast listeners?

Phil: Not that I can think of. I suppose what I was more thinking rather than your contributions within the discussion we've had today, I was more thinking about are there any general myths out there in the big wide world? We talked about one for example like power. Are there any other myths or misrepresentations that you think would be useful to address?

Derek: Yes, absolutely. I mean the whole point about discussing banter, I guess, it's that thing which appear to be offensive language are not always bad but by the same token, things which appear to be positive language which you would actually identify with the social notions of positive and politeness does not necessarily mean it's good. There are many cases in which people can use politeness to signal very clearly or to subtly suggest anything other than a polite attitude towards somebody else and there are many documented cases of this not only in fictional drama but in real life where people are potentially what we may call overly polite and it's obvious to others that they are being challenging by using over politeness and there are many cases of that. The interesting thing about that is who is ever going to complain about somebody being overly polite to them?

Phil: Yes, absolutely. I've had it in the past where the requests for assistance or requests for work to be completed responded with things similar to "yes, sir, of course, sir" type thing but said in a way it implies a sense but actually with an undertone of dissent behind it.

Derek: Yes, absolutely. I occasionally receive these things myself. One of the favourites is from one of my actual most senior members of staff. If I asked them to do something which I suspect may not necessarily be otherwise popular with him and his team as they might actually like, he has a

particular habit of saying “well, you’re the boss”. And I’ve never actually tackled him about whether he is being sincere. This might be of interest as well because I suspect there is a level of permissible subordination behind that. You know what, his team gets their heads down on some of the rare occasions when I ask them to do something they might not otherwise want to do, they do it effectively and why would I want to rock the boat?

Phil: Yes. That’s a good example. I like that. Ok. Beyond Clare then, are there any others which would be a good guest to track down to get on the podcast?

Derek: Absolutely. If you’re interested in notions of politeness and impoliteness from an additional perspective, then I would suggest professor Jonathan Culpepper whom I mentioned earlier, Dr Clare Hardaker absolutely for trolling online and combating against trolling online up to and including basically how trolling is actually dealt with in various social media sites as well as the real world. If you’re interested in looking at cross-cultural notions of politeness, then Julian House or Yongliang Huang would be really good in those particular perspectives.

Phil: Would you be able to message me to make sure I get the spelling correct?

Derek: Yes, that’s all right. I can send you contact details. There’s any number of colleagues that you could find for any number of areas. If you’re interested in looking at notions of language, politeness, identity and interaction, then Pilar Garces-Conejos would be really good. I can send you details. And notions of (I would find it interesting but not sure your podcasters would) how you do politeness in what’s known as Maori and Pakeha relationships (that’s Maori and early European settlers in New Zealand), how politeness between what are now seen as equal partnership cultures growing forever closer together. There are colleagues at University of Wellington in New Zealand that are working on research in that area. There are any number of things and any number of people I can put you in touch with for any number of aspects if you want to look at cross-cultural, intercultural, notions of power, notions of trolling. Let me know. I could spend an hour talking enthusiastically and at length about my research colleagues globally but if any regular podcast listeners have any particular interest on what they might want to see, if they let you know and you let me know, Phil, I’m sure that there would be somebody who is doing quality research and that I can put you in touch with.

Phil: Well, there you go then, fair listener. There’s an open invitation for you to suggest some areas around what Derek and I talked about today that we can explore some more. I was going to be really cheeky and use your family abbreviation for a moment there and I caught myself and thought “no, I won’t, I won’t, I’ll be good!”

Derek: Yes, we’ve had a really friendly conversation, let’s not ruin it.

Phil: Yes, let’s not spoil it [laughs]

Derek: Don’t misfire banter!

Phil: In that case then, I’ll bring the podcast to an end and I’ll say Dr Bousfield, thank you very much for your time today. It’s been a wonderful conversation. I’ve really enjoyed it and it would be really



helpful to pull apart and also put back together the three key notions we talked about today – banter, impoliteness and power, so thank you.

Derek: It's been absolutely my pleasure and please call me Derek.

Phil: Wonderful. Thank you, Derek.