Phil: Hello and welcome to the Emotion at Work podcast, where we take a deep dive into the human condition and today's episode is a mix of listener request and geeky excitement. So one of the things that I've been talking about and having a few conversations on Twitter especially with Mr Nicky is his Twitter handle, Nick Ribeiro, is the idea of impression management. So our guest today is a professor at Manchester Metropolitan University, she knows more about everything than I could ever possibly dream to know.

Dawn: I'm not sure that's true but thank you.

Phil: Well I don't know, you do amaze me with your knowledge. Also somebody that I've known for nearly six years I think now, having first met in a training venue in central London in 2011. She's already spoken anyway, so let me introduce properly Professor Dawn Archer.

Dawn: Thank you for that lovely introduction and thank you for inviting me onto your podcast.

Phil: That's all right, I'm very excited to have you, partly because we've done some research together, so you were my supervisor for my MSc project and we've done some...co-authored a paper off the back of it which I'm very excited about. Hopefully, fingers crossed, that gets accepted. But also you were the person that introduced me to a lot of the stuff that we're going to talk about today, so in terms of...

Dawn: It's my fault.

Phil: Well, yes, but I'm pleased that it's your fault, I'm happy that it's your fault in that way, so that works for me.

Dawn: Well see whether you disagree once we've finished the podcast.

Phil: Yeah, I hope so and the other thing we need to be really careful of today is time because you and I can talk about this stuff for a long time, so we'll have to make sure that we bring it back if we're starting to get over the two hour mark, that might be a bit too much.

Dawn: Okay.

Phil: One of the things that we want to talk about today is impression management but before we go there I like to do something...it was introduced by Georgie Nightingale, so she was on Episode 4 of the podcast and is also somebody that Dawn knows, where we ask a different question to get a different conversation to begin with and then we can bring it back afterwards. So my question for you then, Dawn, I haven't prepared you for this so you don't know what this question is going to be is, what have you craved this week?

Dawn: Chocolate. And the reason is I've hit that point where you have to make more of an effort in life and so I've bought myself a series of DVDs, which some people might have heard of called PiYo. So it's a mixture of Pilates and yoga and she's fun to watch to be honest, she's an incredible woman with lots and lots of vitality. So when you're doing this she's also encouraging you to eat well. I do try and eat well but every now and again I want some chocolate. You see you wanted a very academic answer...

Phil: No, chocolate is fine. What type of chocolate?

Dawn: Good question. I don't like dark chocolate. So I like milk chocolate, I like truffle chocolates, white chocolate is lovely. Any chocolate that the grandchildren might have that looks tasty because they're eating it would be lovely. So basically I'm not that fussy so as long as it's not dark chocolate.

Phil: So I've been craving sugar for the last few days. For about, I think it's about two months now I've been on a refined sugar free diet. So I would say 80-90% of what I eat doesn't have any refined sugar in. So it's got lots of natural sugar in so fruit smoothies and stuff like that but bread that's sugar free which is actually quite hard to find, you'd be surprised how hard it is to find sugar free bread. Yeah, refined sugar free. So yesterday I was having a challenging day and so I decided to feed my sugar craving and I ate a 119 gram bag of Giant Cadburys Buttons and I felt both better and sick afterwards as a result.

Dawn: I was going to say did it help you to feel better?

Phil: Yeah, it did but my body is not used to having that much sugar in one go so it was a bit like whoa where's all this sugar come from?

Dawn: Did you have masses of energy or did it go the opposite way?

Phil: No, I was really low in energy so I think that was why I was craving it. I was really, really low in energy yesterday finding lots of things difficult to do, so I felt more energy for I guess the usual sugar rush and then crashed afterwards. But the sugar rush was to get me through putting two children to bed and I used that to get me through putting two children to bed and then I could crash knowing that they were in bed and asleep, and I didn't have to do anything else I could just let the crash happen and be okay with it.

Dawn: Just make an excuse to stay on the settee then?

Phil: Yes, absolutely. So we're talking about impression management today. My opening question then what have you craved this week, what impressions does that manage do you think or how do you think that might affect people's impression management in response to a question such as this?

Dawn: Well the first thing it did for me because it's different people's expectations and impressions being managed. So for me it was quite fun and given that you mentioned Ms Nightingale I thought okay that's such a typical question of her.

Phil: I primed you did I?

Dawn: Yes. So some of it was me making associations. I think in terms of impression management if it's beyond me and it's for your audience they start to see me less as the kind of person you introduce me to as and more as someone that, oh look she almost sounds human she wants chocolate too. So it gives you and me an opportunity to determine whether or not it's much more informal type chat or do we take it the other way. Obviously what you're anticipating is what do I say in response to that kind of question, am I someone who will open up a little bit? Am I someone who will go more formal? There's lots and lots of things attached to that one question which I think is quite good for a podcast like this.

Phil: Thank you I'll take the compliment as well.

Dawn: Without the moderation, quite good.

Phil: Because we've had a few questions like that. So the one I asked in the last podcast that we broadcast was what makes the perfect travel partner and again I think...or was it a good...it might have a been a good travel partner actually as opposed to perfect, I think again they create two different impressions. I guess then if I was to summarise, would it be fair to say that impression management is something that people can do in response to say a question but also impression management can be done in a question that's asked as well?

Dawn: Absolutely. Impression management is...if we're talking about strategic impression management and we'll come back to why I've said that in a minute, we're talking about goal directed activities. So we're doing something for a reason and impression management in that case is about controlling the information that we're giving in order to influence the impressions of in this case an audience. So you can do lots of different things as part of impression management and you can aim it at lots of different things as well. It might be that you want to shape your audience's view of this conversation or of each other. And there's lots of other things you did even before the question which signalled that we knew one another, that we've worked together. So there was lots of other clues in there for the audience as well that begins to influence how they see how we interact together. But it could also be about one another, we could be doing impression management for self presentation reasons as well, which then means your information about yourself is in order to get people to see you in a certain way or have a certain attitude towards you. You do that by giving information about yourself and that's something else you also did as part of your introduction.

Phil: I did. So there are a few things in there then. First we talked about being strategic, where you're trying to achieve a goal or aim, but also then latterly you talked about its links with self presentation. I guess if I try and put myself in the audience's shoes then I wonder if I want to try and extrapolate maybe some of those terms a little bit more. So if I go back to the strategic bit then. You said if we treat impression management as a strategic thing, that implies or presupposes that impression management can be not strategic?

Dawn: I think that a lot of the time, especially because I think most of your podcast is devoted to thinking about emotions in workplaces. In workplaces it's probably the case we're thinking about how we're coming across more than in maybe more familiar settings like at home or in the pub, or at church, wherever it is that we congregate. But then even in the workplace depending on who you're with, it will be those times when you're not actually thinking that much about how you're coming across. So that's how people make faux pas for example, they're not thinking about something and then suddenly something happens and then they are very aware of what kind of impression they're making. I think we have to allow for the fact that sometimes we influence people's perceptions and we don't mean to. Lots of times we're influenced or trying to influence people's perceptions and we're doing it deliberately. So strategic helps us to indentify when do we put some thought into it and therefore choose particular tactics?

Phil: Impression management then is something that we do all of the time and sometimes that may be conscious or deliberate or strategic and sometimes it may not be?

Dawn: For most of the people who write on impression management they're normally talking about situations where there's at least some thought in it. What I'm allowing for is that you will sometimes put much more thought into it and sometimes less thought into it. But at some level you have thought about how to dress yourself, how to wear your hair, whether or not you're going to wear jewellery, whether or not you're going to wear perfume? So at some level we are aware of how we come across to others and our actions, whether they're because of habit or for other reasons are shaped by us wanting to make a certain impression.

Phil: I can think of two examples where...I'm going to pick up on clothing in particular. I think of two examples where I've done that and done two of the things that you've talked about so far. So one was a faux pas and the other one was strategic. So the strategic one was I was doing a piece of work with a client where we were running a talent management programme about people who have been identified as having high potential within the organisation, and the theme of the programme was around their impact and their influence. So the extent to which the kind of impacts they had on other people and then the extent to which they were able to influence. For the first workshop, first formal workshop, and this is a financial services client, so tends to be quite formal in its dress code and some of the rules and regulations. I arrived in jeans with rips in with a t-shirt and with a pair of Ray-Bans on my face which I then lifted from my eyes to put on top of my head as I approached the security guard at the desk. As the security guard...well it wasn't the security guard, the receptionist, looked me up and down, she wrinkled her nose up in disgust at me, it was great. But that was very much a strategic choice because I wanted to create a particular impression. So because I wanted to see how people within the office and then the people that were taking part in the programme would respond to me being dressed in that way and what would do that to my credibility. Because I wanted to make a point about the extent to which you choose about the impact that you have. So similar to what you were saying just now. The second example is really similar where I was in London on a day off and I was wearing shorts, t-shirt, sunglasses, but I got a call from a client to say can you come into the office, are you in London today? I said, "Well I am yes but and if you want me to come into the office then I can." This was again in the city. As I arrived at reception a lady came and approached me and said, "Do you want me to sign for something?" I said, "Pardon?" She said, "Do you want me to sign for something, have you got a delivery or something to drop off?" I said, "Oh no

I'm here to see the Managing Director." Again this was a surprise and then a look up and down moment where she was like, "What Steve?" And I was like, "Yeah Steve." "Oh, okay," and then she went off and found him and came back. Similar attire I guess but with the different levels of deliberateness that goes with it.

Dawn: In one case you were making yourself available at a time that wasn't opportune for you. Did you tell the person that okay I'm going to turn up but I'm not exactly dressed as I would normally be or did you wait to surprise him?

Phil: No, I told Steve I was in shorts and t-shirt.

Dawn: So you'd almost covered yourself because you had the permission if you like, from him, oh no, no that's not a problem. Because when we break expectations we have to do some sort of face work, and we'll come back to what face work is, in order to make sure that's okay basically. Whereas with the other example it's purely on physical appearance and you are...I'm not quite sure what you were being but you were being someone who was breaking expectations but strategically so. I'm assuming that's because you wanted to see how people respond when you walked in the room, to how open they were and all of those other things that you get from that. But absolutely we have expectations that are based on what do people look like who do 'x' and when those expectations are broken you will often see interesting facial expressions on others as they try and work out why is this person looking like that and saying who they are? So, yes, interestingly impression management isn't just about influencing people but it's also sometimes working out what are people's expectations and do we want to go along with those expectations or are we into breaking those expectations for whatever reason.

Phil: Firstly I want to congratulate both of us on the fact that we managed 15 minutes and 24 seconds before we mentioned the concept of face, so that's...

Dawn: But we didn't go straightaway and explain what it is either.

Phil: No, I know.

Dawn: Does this mean I can say what it is now?

Phil: Well...

Dawn: Apparently you talk about it a lot so everyone will know what it is.

Phil: Yeah, the people will have heard about. Regular listeners will have heard about it, long time friends of the show, to use a classic radio phrase would know, if somebody was new to the podcast then they might not, so we'll come back to that. But I also said I wanted to come back to self presentation so I'll add that to my list of things to come back. Just now we talked then about the strategicness of how you can use clothing as an example for impression management. So let's go back to the notion of self presentation then, so tell us more about self presentation?

Dawn: In terms of the difference because it's still a form of impression management, but in this case what you're doing is consciously thinking through how people or others, because it could be an organisation, are taking onboard what you want them to know about yourself. So Goffman talks about a line for example, effectively self presentation is about you shaping the attitudes and behaviours of whoever is important at that time, by you giving information to them in such a way that it enables you to present the version of the self you want to give. So that could be in an interview context you would want to give the best self or often what we call the idealised self. Because it's unusual to walk into an interview context and start telling them everything they should know about you and you can be a bit lazy on a Monday because you like to go out on a Sunday. So that might mean you're a little bit late into work and you're not really into working overtime, so they're going to have to make sure they pay you a little bit extra if they ever want you to do overtime. You don't do that version of you, whatever that version is, you do the version of self that you hope will get you the job.

Phil: Is that a form of deception then because you're not giving...you're not sharing your whole self?

Dawn: I think that most...especially as I've been an interviewer often and as an interviewer I'm very aware that I have to sift the information that I'm getting. You would understand that interviewers in front of you are wanting to give themselves the best opportunity to get the job but that sometimes means I have to account for the fact that their best version of self or their idealised self might not actually match what they're like day to day. So an interviewer's job often is to work out why is this person telling me this? One of the things I would look for, for example when interviewing people is if they use a lot of 'we' and they're describing what they've achieved I often want to go back and ask, not as directly as this, but what part of the 'we' did you do? So that I understand that they can explain genuinely what their part was. I'm also looking at that point which part do they give to someone else as their part of it. Because you don't necessarily, depending on what the job is want someone who only wants to look good themselves and isn't a team player for example. I can get a lot from listening to what people tell me and then working out questions, and we started with a question from you, but questions that allow me to gauge okay idealised self but where does that fit when I'm thinking about how you can do team work with others for example? Am I looking for complete truth in an interview? I wish I was but often it's the case that you allow for someone to use hyperboley to exaggerate slightly. But my favourite film for this reason is, I've forgotten the title, it's the one that he talks about happiness.

Phil: In the Pursuit of Happiness.

Dawn: So it's a dad who wants to have a better life for himself and his son and he's been begging to have an interview and he ends up turning up for the interview, we've been talking about clothing, he turns up for the interview in clothing that he's been painting in, he's actually slept in these clothes overnight because he ended up in a police cell for something that was nothing to do with him, and he ends up going to the interview looking awful. So probably got some of the responses that you got from the receptionist when you turned up and he has two opportunities at that point, the character Chris Gardner and this is apparently based on a true event or lifelike event.

Phil: A lifelike event, yeah.

Dawn: And he decides to...he knows in terms of impression management he's on the back foot, he's turned up for a high profile job, I think it's in finance and everybody else is wearing suits. Every time he's turned up to this company he's always been in a suit, so he's set up expectations that he's a very smart person intellectually and physically, and therefore he's earned himself the right to have a job and he now turns up looking I think he's described as a bin man in the film. So he chooses at that point he has to do damage limitation control and he goes for the truthfulness approach and he starts to say he could have used hyperboley, he could have aggregated, he could have come up with a list of all the qualities everybody wants in this kind of person and then says why he's got them. He says but there's no point in doing that. So what he's going to do basically is tell them the truth and in the film it works, and so bold choice strategies apparently work in certain situations when you want to create an impression that maybe is slightly against the one that's expected or slightly against the impression you've made up to that point. So can truth happen in interviews? Yes. Does it happen? I'd say most of the time if we allow for the fact that we've asked this person to come in and brag about themselves and talk about an idealised version of self. So we shouldn't be surprised that they might embellish some of the facts.

Phil: Does, I say does that's not actually my question because I know it does, what I'm interested in then is the way the self presentation transfers itself across domains. So we've very much talked in a face to face realm so far, using examples of job interviews and arriving at offices and that sort of thing. But if you then transfer that across to say social media, there was a blog post that really stuck with me this week, it was world Mental Health Day on I think it was Tuesday and a lady called Karen Tego did a blog post which contained a number of photos that said this is a photo of somebody who's depressed but it was somebody with a great big beaming smile. This is a photo of someone...and a sequence of photos explaining the mental health challenges that she was facing at the time and I'll put a link to that post in the show notes. But the extent to which the idealised self is projected across say social media versus what might be how somebody actually is, so the degree of self presentation and impression management therefore that goes into that always strikes me as being quite high.

Dawn: Very high. It's a nice link actually to what face is, very simply face is a behavioural mask, it's the...we have to manage conversation when we interact with one another and when we do that we often put on masks that suit our role. So faces is no more than putting on a face that suits the role or suits the situation. Now what's interesting about your example is that it suggests to the audience that we're in a society where mental health is such that we don't talk about it and so people feel for one reason or another that they therefore put on a mask and a mask in this case was the smile.

Phil: I always struggle with the idea of a mask for explaining face partly because I don't like the connotations that it brings, so the...but the only other way I've found to explain it and I don't think I've ever shared this actually, have you ever watched the Lego Movie?

Dawn: Yes.

Phil: You know the police officer who...

Dawn: Oh, the one who has two sides to his face?

Phil: Absolutely. So that's the way that I describe it, I can't say the way because I don't always do that but that's a way I describe it, in terms of saying the face is always yours so there are some people that do avidly pretend to be somebody else, they take on complete other personas, use other names and all those sorts of things. But for the majority of people in interaction in day to day life each face that you take is your own face it just changes depending on who you're with, where you are and what you're talking about. I like to use The Lego Movie as a way of describing it as opposed to thinking about it as interchangeable masks because there's connotations that masks have that I think for the majority of time that I'm exploring face or face work with people that I work with that I'm not sure if those connotations are true.

Dawn: I think though we should allow for the fact that sometime it's a mask, so in the example of the picture it's a mask, someone's trying to hide sadness or mental health issues. They talked about depression behind a smile. And so masks also allow you to think about actors taking on roles and sometimes we might feel as though depending on what our roles are that we're doing different things. If I think about some of the roles I have, I'm a mum, I'm a nana, I do consultancy work, I work at a university, I teach, I train and so there's lots of different roles and sometimes it can be helpful to, as you say, put on that face as opposed to another face, so that I'm staying within role if you like or doing what actors do. I would also say as well that the connotation itself is picking up on whether something like deception is inherently evil. I think if we're open about what deception actually is, deception is deliberately behaving in such a way that we give one impression when we know something else is true. We can do that for mal intent purposes and therefore lead to severe negative consequences for others. But we can also do that for altruistic purposes, so it isn't necessarily that the deception is wrong it's the motivation behind the deception that we might regard as wrong or right.

Phil: I get that and there are times where it helps to do that. I remember on the last podcast that's gone out with Jessica Roberts from Loughborough Uni, she talked about in some of her research it's a conflict. People use misunderstanding as an out, as a way to get out of a conversation they'll say they misunderstood when they may not have misunderstood, actually they just wanted to...they decided that conflict isn't one that they want to have now, isn't one they want to have at all. So they frame something as a misunderstanding, as a way to get out of it.

Dawn: In our case if we wanted to link it to face we'd talk about it saving face and we could do the saving face for ourselves because we don't want to have an argument and we could also argue that we're saving the face of the other because we're giving them an out as well as ourselves an out. Because we're not saying they have to listen to anything more than us just apologising. Actually it's quite a neat way of getting out of some things by saying it's my fault I've misunderstood sorry about that.

Phil: I thought you were trying to say this when actually you were trying to say that.

Dawn: Yeah.

Phil: You talked about when you were saying we can't ignore the fact that some people do put on masks. Within that section when you were talking then you also talked about maybe thinking about it as an actor. One of the things that if I remember my references correctly, there's me doing some impression management before I speak, is Goffman talks about things being foregrounded and backgrounded. So you've listed all those things earlier on about being a mum, a nana, a consultant, someone who works at university, interestingly you didn't call yourself professor which I find interesting. But what can happen at different times is things can be foregrounded or back grounded. So you can choose what to put in the foreground, so you can choose to say right I'm going to bring these aspects of myself to the fore because these are the things that right now I want you to see and I'm going to leave other things at the back. So if I may, I'm trying to think of a recent example to make a current...I'll come back to it in a minute, but it could also be that other people will pull things to the foreground that you don't like or you don't want to be in the foreground at that particular moment in time. So one of the things that sticks out for me in that one is, I was at a children's birthday party, so my wife and I are godparents to three children, it was one of their birthday parties and there was, I don't know, ten, fifteen other adults there. I'd introduced myself as a trainer who specialises in people and communication and left it at that. Ang, my good lady, told everybody what I actually do and the studies that I was completing at the time, which then prompted a huge change in interaction style in the way that the people interacted with me. Because they then found out that I studied deception, that I specialise in reading and analysing behaviour and all that sort of stuff. It completely changed the way that I could interact with those other people and I didn't want those parts of my face foregrounded in that situation. Ang was doing it because she was proud of me, she's proud of what I was doing and the studies that I was completing and the fact I was soon to graduate from my master's and all this sort of stuff. But from a selfish point of view I was like, no, I don't want people to see that right now, that's not what I want at a kid's party.

Dawn: I liken that to, sometimes I will use the prof title and sometimes I won't and sometimes I'll tell people...it's getting harder now that people know what I do, but when they didn't I used to describe it in really general terms, not least because I'm really interested in people and if they end up knowing what you do they think you're doing it to them all the time and then don't want to talk to you. I much prefer to talk to people and that means asking them what they do and again for some people titles, so titles are a form of impression management and they also are a form of influence, so they're linked with the authority principle. In some situations you can understand why they would work really well and in some cultures in particular they work really well. But in other situations and other cultures they can have an adverse effect. So I think some of the impression management and self-presentation is knowing your audience. It's not just knowing your goal and knowing what is it that you want to achieve right now, but knowing your audience. But equally the example that you've just given I really like because it explains to us that communication isn't as easy as we think it is. When you read the impression management books they provide all the techniques and strategies and they're always neat examples. And with the research I do I know it's really messy because you'll have well intentioned people like Ang who want to brag about their husbands who suddenly put a different slant on something. And so it's allowing for the world to be messy, allowing for workplaces to be messy, allowing for the fact that just because you want to do 'x' doesn't mean everybody else shares that desire. So your impression management might need adjusting if you're doing impression management because it's not quite coming across as well as you hoped. Or you might decide that actually this level of strategy isn't the right time and what we should be doing is focusing on rapport.

Or you might decide you just don't want to cooperate and it's not up to you to have to work this hard. All of those things feed into how people actually interact in a workplace setting.

Phil: I was going to say something and you've...and what you've just said there made me think of something else as well. So let's go for recency first rather than primacy. So you mentioned about people won't cooperate anymore, so that's building on this idea of the cooperative principle, yes?

Dawn: Uh huh.

Phil: Do you want to tell us more about that?

Dawn: How technical do you want me to be?

Phil: Be as technical as you like.

Dawn: Some very clever person called Grice decided to try and explain it is how we manage to cooperate most of the time with one another. He identified a cooperative principle that basically tells us that there's a reason why it's worth us paying attention to other people and assuming that the information they've giving is relevant, that it's just enough information to be understood. That it's not been said in such a way that you can't actually work out where someone's going with it and it's the truth. Those four underpinning principles are identified as maxims so we have a relevance maxim or a relation maxim which is the be relevant to quantity maxim which provides the right amount of information, not too little that you can't understand, not too much that you don't know where it's going. Which then feeds into manner that you say something and he talks about the cases, you say something in such a roundabout way everybody's forgotten what the point was and then the truth. The one that mattered to him greatly was underpinning all of them is the truth, this idea that for most communication most of the time it works for us to assume that we're being told the truth. So if we ask for directions it makes sense that we don't have to stand there and say do you know what is this person lying, are they pointing us the wrong way? And then that fits in if you know your psychology to the notion of a truth principle or a truth bias, that most of us most of the time not only assume that people are cooperating with us but they're also telling us the truth.

Phil: Again for a long time listener to the show they'll remember the example I've given before about somebody replying to the MD with the line, 'I'm on it.' So when asked for a direct question about will this thing be delivered on time and on budget? The response was, 'I'm on it.' To which they were playing to the truth maxim and cooperative so in terms of there being enough information to imply yes it will be but not so much information that it was overly stated. What that person was doing was using strategic ambiguity as a way of not giving the positive clear affirmation of yes but giving an indication of progress and diligence and effort to deliver.

Dawn: It's a nice example because you could argue that it's a definite flout of the quantity maxim because it actually doesn't tell us anything because what does that mean, 'I'm on it.' So we assume it's relevant and we mean it to mean that this person's got everything in hand and we're using all kinds of metaphors to explain because that's what we do as well. But technically that person hasn't said anything, which is really interesting for me because it means there's plausible deniability. When

needed because he didn't actually...he or she didn't explain what, 'I'm on it' actually meant. If they're not asked and it's accepted this is where you can do the strategically ambiguous thing like saying well I'm sorry you heard it that way but I didn't actually promise it next Wednesday when you thought I did.

Phil: No, I agree. That was my...the end of the example is that I spoke to the MD afterwards and said you need to go and check in because that person didn't give you the answer, you asked a direct question and you didn't get an answer to it. So you need to go validate what's happening. He said, "You think I need to go and ask if he's lying?" I said, "No, just go and say tell me about the project, tell me where we're at with it, go and enquire what's happening." And then it transpired that yes there were things holding it up and they were less sure whether it would be delivered on time and on budget and then changes were made and it was. But the point being about...because in the context of it which I didn't give you at the start was that question was asked as part of a meeting of the operating committee. So the individual sat there with all of their peers. So the likelihood that the individual would say no was really rare because of face. From a face point of view in that example what was being brought forward was that individual's competence face, their competence to do their job and deliver their objectives and deliver their tasks was brought to, not just like foreground it was centre stage under all the spotlights. So for the individual to say no would have been an incredibly hard thing for them to do.

Dawn: 'I'm on it' wasn't a lie which is why...it's playing with quantity, it's playing with information, it's not...and the rest of it comes out when you go through the process of working out what the message is. Which also brings into play how much we give a message versus how much we give off a message and for many of us we're hearing the message and we're not paying attention all the time to what other things are being given off because of how someone says something.

Phil: Yeah, I agree. One of the other things that you said earlier on, so I said I was going to go for recency...

Dawn: We're going back to primacy now are we?

Phil: We're going back to...well I don't think it was the first thing you said, I can't remember in which order it was, but anyway so you talked about how...I can't remember what you said now, but the note I wrote down was about how you might want to take a line but other people won't let you take, so they won't cooperate, that was where I got to, that was it. So we talked about using misunderstandings as an opt out from conflict, but you also talked about how people would cooperate which is when I then asked you about the cooperative principle. So there are times then in interaction where people will break that cooperative principle and from your experience and from your I guess research over time or from experiences that you've had, do there tends to be reasons why they might refuse to cooperate or why people might say right I'm not going to play this game anymore and not going to cooperate anymore?

Dawn: It will always, always be context specific but in terms of how we explain it if we go back to cooperative principle, you can flout the cooperative principle which means you're playing about with one of the maxims. So your example was information in order to convey a certain message. Now

some of the time we can...in fact some might argue that your example might be a violation of the cooperative principle as opposed to a flout. It comes down to what the person's intent was. When the person said that in that meeting did they want the other person to look for another meaning or were they trying to hide what was going on? Another example might help us see the difference. So if I'm in a room and I say, oh it's hot in here and the temperature is terrible, it's really, really cold you're going to look at what I've said and look at the context and think that completely contradicts. So in that case you might look around the room and see what's going on and identify an open window and know that or assume that I'm using sarcasm to try and get that window closed. Now at no point have I actually requested anything to happen I've just said something that can be interpreted in a different way because of the context. And that's how sarcasm and irony work. What happens if I'm hiding a message is that I don't want you to know, for example that I'm not telling you the truth. So I look to all intense purposes on the surface as though I'm maintaining the cooperative principle, I don't want you to look for any other meaning as opposed to the one I've said. The trick to it is looking on the surface as though you're being cooperative when actually you're not, but you want that to stay as hidden as possible because the assumption is that everybody's cooperating and everything's fine with the world. So one is hiding, you therefore violate it and you're doing it in secret. One is intentionally signalling that someone needs to look for a meaning other than what's been said.

Phil: So when somebody doesn't cooperate for whatever contextual reason that might be my interpretation or my guess then or my experience will tell me, I don't know which one of those three it is, that encumbered within that then is a face threat to...so let's say I'm having an interaction with you and then you start to refuse to cooperate on a particular point that we're talking about. That it's likely that I would interpret that as a threat to my face because you're not...as an individual because you're not willing to interact with me in a way that allows for that interaction to continue smoothly.

Dawn: It's interesting because both are to do with face, if you ask something, a question imposes on someone's face. So we talk about if you're taking a strict Brown and Levinson approach we can identify negative face and positive face. Negative face is this idea or they use the term want, want to be independent, to be free to act as we want to, to not be imposed upon and positive face is this want that would be approved off or liked and if you ask me a questions, the very fact that you ask me a question means you are imposing on my negative face, my want to be autonomous. So there is already face implications. Those face implications, most of the time we deal with because we don't think about it because we hope that the questions are such that it's a co-operative conversation but if I think suddenly choose, you know what I am not doing this for whatever reason, I could argue that I could make it know, I wouldn't use these terms because this is not normal practise in workplace settings but I could make it known that that has impacted on my negative face and that's it. I don't want to have that conversation anymore and by doing that I then affect various levels of your face because I am saying you're not a worthy person to communicate with. I am saying that you have done things, that you have imposed upon me and I am calling you out on those things. As soon as we start to be uncooperative there's lots of face that suddenly becomes much more explicit and we link it much more to potential threat. The tendency for face to be involved is there all the time.

Phil: Yeah, It's interesting you say that that might not be part of workplace communication. I don't know if I agree with you. I can think of an example where I was running a team meeting and the content of the discussions all ended up being around one individuals different objectives so we would have a discussion about topic A, and then B and then C and they were all about this person objectives and so they kept taking the actions and at one point they dropped their pad and their pen on top of it and said, "Is there anything else you want me to fucking do" and I was like wow, okay and it quite surprised me at the time because in my head I was just like, oh these are parts of your objectives, so therefore you having all these actions is just inherent in the tasks that you need to complete. Now knowing what I know about face I know that we are impinging upon the negative face once repeatedly and sequentially over the course of however many minutes that meeting was, but also not only were we asking for all those actions to be done, there's a wider implication that their work is not up to standard because if their work was up to standard we wouldn't be having the discussion and we wouldn't be needing to do additional actions over and above and beyond what they are already doing.

Dawn: Yeah just to make myself a little bit more clear, I do think those things are happening all the time in the workplace but I don't think that notions like negative face and positive face or even face are well known enough…

Phil: Oh sorry.

Dawn: To say, you know what, you are freely impinging on my negative face. I think they use other choice phrases instead which were much more to the point and direct. In terms of the workplace, one way of looking at the workplace is that we set up consequences for face, now what's interesting about it is we assume we are okay because we are paid. Where the blurring of the lines comes into play and that probably is happening in your example as well, when is someone hearing it as part of their job and when is it somehow crossing over into something else or when is it undermining them and so there is a sensitivity around face in the workplace in particular because people are adopting face according to role. So you mentioned competency face, it's going to be a biggie in a workplace setting as most of us, unless we want to be fired will want to appear as competent. We might want to appear as experts depending on what our role is. So all of those things are in play, so if someone feels as though that has been undermined or it isn't being acknowledged enough then there is consequences for our identity as well. We have linked self-presentation in impression management to face but this also has identity implications for us because it is not just our face that has been attacked, if someone is impacting on us in such a way it is making us feel incompetent it relates to our identity in the workplace.

Phil: And that overlap of faces, for want of a better phrase. I think there is a paper being submitted, a publication by Archer and Willcox around the different types of face that might be in play in the workplace.

Dawn: You've mentioned this several times (laughs). Self-presentation in impression management.

Phil: Second time…whoa whoa that was only the second.

Dawn: I was also doing impression management, but anyway in terms of representation, would you like to just mention about what that papers about a little bit?

Phil: What I am interested in then is the interplay of those different types of face. So let's say competence face is one, but second then you've got the individual sense of self, so them, what their values, their beliefs, what they stand for and this might link back into what you were talking about earlier in terms of the idealised self-aspect. You have got the relationships that they have with other people in the workplace, in particular when someone is going into an interaction with one or multiple other people they are bringing these different aspects with them. So they are bringing with them their sense of self and their values and beliefs and what they stand for, they will bring with them their competence for the role that they are there to do. So often if you are in a meeting of different people you're there because you have different roles, or different actions or tasks to complete but you also bring with that the relationships that you have with all of those people. The interactions that you have had with them in the past, but also the interactions into the future. In that paper in particular I was interested in what happens in appraisals and performance reviews. How are these different types of face addressed, where are they threatened or maintained or enhanced depending on what somebody is trying to do in the interactions that they have and what I found is that interplay of different types of face as somebody who might be trying to address one type of face but it is heard in another or they might be trying to address multiple faces at the same time. That's when interaction gets really complex. If I think about one of the examples that I use around a compliment, so you have line manager A and I have got recordings of line manager A's performance review with person one and person two and when line manager A is doing person one's appraisal or performance review, they say, "I've got some good news, I've got a note to talk to person two about their time management and attention to detail but thankfully I don't have to talk to you about that". It's framed as I've got some good news, so it is being positioned as a compliment. I think it is heard as a compliment. There's some nervous laughter in the middle, or what I am interpreting as nervous laughter in the middle but it appears to be heard as a compliment. For me it is a fascinating way of going about it.

Dawn: Not least because, I would call it face enhancement, but in terms of being face enhancement there's also potential face threat, because this is somebody who is presenting themselves. So it's an act of self-disclosure and it would be good to pick up on self-disclosure specifically but in terms of self-disclosure this person is saying, I am the type of person who will see this through. Thankfully I don't have to see it through with you. It can be heard as face enhancement, you're above that, you are doing really well, well done, but it can also be heard as, but don't slip, because if you slip I am the sort of person who will follow this through.

Phil: But it is also potentially face threat to person two. They are highlighting the deficiencies.

Dawn: It's absolutely a face threat to them. One of the interesting things about the work that we have been doing is that face work isn't just about the people who are present. It's about people who were brought in to the interaction without necessarily being physically there.

Phil: Yep and I am going to take us away from that example for a second because I think then it links into impression management and one of the things I would like to do soon is to come back to name

or to label some impression management strategies. I just want to share that. So one of the things that I think is fascinating in organisations is the way that impression management will be used to people who aren't present in the interaction. These are anecdotal examples as opposed to recorded examples where you have two people saying have you seen Cliff recently. Have you seen what's going on and everything that is happening and the way that they are looking at the minute and the way that they are acting at the minute? Have you noticed what is happening and what is going on? And the other person is going, no I have not seen that but then they are now primed to look for that and go and find that and then that gossip spreads, but what it does is it starts to create an impression of Cliff that may or may not be fair and Cliff may or may not have any idea that this impression is being created yet things are being done strategically or not to change the way that that person is perceived. So change the way that their impression is managed.

Dawn: I think it brings us to and I don't want to open this up because it is a can of worms, but just to note a lot of the fake news works on that principle. If you are interested in this kind of work you are also going to be interested in the image restoration theories for us to think about. How do we restore an image once it has been broken and that research there is work by Benoit that points to the fact that it doesn't have to be true which is why I mentioned fake news. The fact that it said and especially if it said repeatedly means you have to deal with the perception and the perception can sometimes be more strong than whether or not it's a fact and we therefore see these days people spending huge amounts of money trying to make sure that the image or the brand that they have is protected. When there is threats to it there are strategies that are in play so that they can somehow restore the image to a much safer place because the consequences to businesses in particular but also when you think about people in the public domain, huge, when someone starts a rumour regardless of whether it's true or not.

Phil: Yeah so I think about the… I was going to use one example and then another popped to mind. When I think about Tesco five years ago with the false accounting, where they had accounted for £250 million worth of revenue that wasn't there and then the subsequent image restoration that went with it both in terms of the distancing from the previous CEO and I would have to find some specific examples that I will put in the show notes. They worked hard to restore the image of that business.

Dawn: Yes, Benoit is a nice place to go and they call it image restoration repair but there is lots of different things that you will find where people have to…you can't ignore it. If you can ignore it they will just ignore it and leave it, but when they have to do something with it, he talks about how to do an apology and what makes the best apology and if you don't have to accept full blame, how do you do partial blame without sounding as you are blaming something else. So how do you do blame shift without blame shifting or sounding as though you are blame shifting. So impression management will, if you take the literature to these kinds of areas where things don't go as well as we hoped, what do we do about it? How do we make sure that we do something to repair our image?

Phil: So for any of our listeners who are in communication or PR then that may well be some interesting reading for them to do.

Dawn: I am sure they could give us lots and lots more references to add to that as well in terms of some of the techniques that they will employ because it matters to maintain image.

Phil: So one of the things that we will do is, I have mentioned the show notes a couple of times, so for the things that we have talked through I have been making notes as we have been going so that I can make sure that we put references in to where people can go to find out more information. I may pick your brains for books or papers especially if they are non-paywalled books and papers that might be useful for people to go and find.

Dawn: Okay there is a couple of things as well to pick up on which might also be things for people to think about. Self-disclosure I mentioned is one of them because there are some interesting things out there, people like Harvey have written about there is different types of self that we disclose.   A lot of people think that self-disclosure is just us sharing our true self, but self-disclosure can be a lot of different things including this idea of regret. For example if you listen to people they can give you ideas of where they are emotionally, so a "missed-self" could have been, a "cast-self" is someone along the lines of I used to be, or "self" is that notion of I should be, a "feared-self" could be I am afraid of becoming. There's all things that you could really do and the one that gives you most indication of authentic-self or true-self is someone who's talking about themselves as they really are. Often that is difficult for most of us to open up to that degree so we will revert to social-self for example, so what others think I am, which is part of impression management, expected-self, this is what I am supposed to do, this is what I hope to be and ideal-self, we have already mentioned in an interview context where you present the best version of you because that is the one that is going to be the most liked or most approved of. Can I also take it in one more direction as well just in case.

Phil: Yeah please.

Dawn: I was just thinking your audience might be wide and varied. The other type of face work that interests me and I think especially suits what your podcasts are about is that sense of emotion because one of the ways that I think that you can think about face work is a type of emotion work and so there is two ways of doing it. You can think about face work as our attempts to manage our emotions and depending on whether we like behavioural masks or your way of identifying it, but we manage emotions as part of that process, as part of our roles, as part of our Lego man twisting from one face to the other but then we have to allow for an emotion still happening to us unexpectedly. Gothman talked about flooding out episodes and I saw one on breakfast tv recently where they started to talk about a story where a man had caught a fish, had wanted to kiss the fish so that a friend could take a picture and then apparently and this is so unbelievable, but the fish apparently didn't want to be kissed and tried to get away and jumped into the man's mouth and he ended up swallowing it, ended up very very poorly and so they were telling the story that wasn't supposed to be funny and the man had apparently had to be treated by a paramedics. He was having some sort of cardiac arrest. It was a serious thing but the situation was so funny that one of the presenters was just laughing and so the other presenter started to carry on the conversation so that would have been a case of flooding out. You suddenly experience a momentary exception outside of your role, so you are not doing a behaviour appropriate to your role and obviously as a presenter, they are supposed to keep themselves calm and collected at all times, but she couldn't help it and she started to collapse and then she got herself together again and then she ended up taking the next story. We

might burst into laughter at work because we are embarrassed by something especially if it is not embarrassing to ourselves. We might burst into tears because suddenly something's too much. We might get really really angry. Your example that you had before where the guy wants to know if you want to give him anything else to do. They're all flooding out episodes and there happening because suddenly there is too much emotion to go with our role and so our behaviour slips. Our behaviour according to our role is inappropriate and we can do lots of different things at that point. If it's the person it is happening to we have to somehow get ourselves together and we may or may not want people to come up and attend to us. It might be easier if they ignore us. As the people looking on we have to decide, oh no, what do we do, what's happening. Are we going to go over and see if they are okay which might draw more attention to the situation or are we going to leave it. Interestingly the research suggests and I think there is a lot more research needed in this area, but it suggests that most of the time the behaviour gets overlooked or it results in what we called a change in the interactional frame. So you either completely ignore it or you go somewhere else with the interaction because you can't ignore it and again maybe the type of workplace it is. The type of personalities around the room, all of those things feed into whether you ignore the person crying in the corner or you change the interaction and go and deal with it.

Phil: Yeah I have seen a whole myriad of responses from ending the meeting. So I think it was, has anyone else got anything really urgent that we have to discuss now to which everybody said no and then everybody left apart from the line manager and they stayed with the individual. I've seen just ignoring it and just carrying on. Just going on and completing the meeting without saying anything. I have seen asking them if somebody wants to leave and come back again. So a whole host of things. That flooding out creates discomfort for everybody involved irrespective of whatever the emotion is that is flooding out it creates a sense of discomfort and unease.

Dawn: But interestingly what we often see is the flooding out and we don't see where it has been built up to, but the face work is probably, if we paid more attention to the face work would see how people are seeking to manage emotions and who's seeking to do it in a way that seems to be more successful than the others. That takes us back to this idea that we give messages and then we give out. When you were talking about the receptionists deciding whether you were appropriately dressed or not you talked about, I think you said one of them had a surprise facial expression and the other one had disgust, I think you said.

Phil: That's right.

Dawn: You would think and we have to be careful because we can never be inside someone's head so we don't know for sure, so we don't know what someone is thinking or feeling. We get evidence from the different communication channels but given what a receptionists job is and I have lots of people telling me now, you are wrong, they are not like this, but the idea of a receptionist is to be helpful and to wear a nice face and to keep their voice nice and not to show disgust in particular to the people who are coming up to the desk, so that might be in that case an example of giving off something. Their words are saying one thing and their expression to you is telling something else and obviously you have mentioned being a behavioural analyst and if you're trained to look for those things you get evidence of things that someone has not intentionally given you and at which

point you then have to think about, well how do I use that evidence because technically it's not self-disclosure. It's not what we were talking about previously.

Phil: No it's not, absolutely it's not.

Dawn: So again what do we do? Flooding out, everybody can see it and it's what we do about it. When we are managing our emotions we end up giving messages versus giving off signals. Then it is what do we do? Especially in a workplace settings where there's ways of working. What do we do when we seem to be giving off either ourselves to others or picking up messages from them that weren't intended but potentially dealing with. How do we deal with them?

Phil: And I think if… and I don't know if this is fair, but I've got the floor so I will say it anyway. I had a conversation with a colleague who has moved out to Amsterdam. She was asking about the podcast and how it was going and one of the things that she said as well, I wish you'd do a podcast about difficult conversations and how you can…when you have to tell somebody that they are smelly or they've upset someone or they have done something inappropriate or whatever that is. How do you do that? I said for me there is two different things, so there is one thing where there has been a definitive incident that has occurred and one of the ways that you can do that is that you can frame it that you are talking to a particular part of their face. One of the concerns that a lot of people have, I know I used to have when I was a manger before I understood all this stuff was that somebody would take something really personally, so they would perceive it to be, what I would know language as they would perceive it to be a threat to their self-face, who they are as an individual as opposed to in this meeting you did this and that was inappropriate because… so by framing it to talk to a particular face can reduce the likelihood that it can, for want of a better phrase, so that it can bleed out, it can be heard in relation to some of the other faces. You can frame it in a particular way so it goes into that, but if it is a build-up overtime. If it is something that performance has started to erode overtime, so the issue there is people have been scared of doing face threat earlier on, so actually what has happened is you have built it up to a point where you've now got to do a big face threat where you could of addressed it by doing a smaller face threat earlier on.

Dawn: I think at that point though it is still retrievable and I think we are listening to what the person is telling us and I was thinking about active listening for something else I was asked to do and it amazes me when you look at most of the training on active listening. The bit that isn't spelt out and maybe because it is too obvious, but because it is missed I am often wondering whether people understand that is the first thing in active listening, is to listen. Most of the models, if you ever look on Google and putting Google images and look at some of the models that are used in crisis negotiation it is assumed that the first thing we do is listen, which means shut up and actually hear what the other person is saying and I think people tell us a lot of things but because we are all really busy, because we are all having to hit deadlines because there is all kinds of other things competing for our time we don't often listen as much as would be healthy for us to do so. But if we do, those people that are disaffected, those people that are struggling, those people that have seen a deterioration in their level of work will be saying things. A hook if you like, a way in to maybe not have to have a full blown face threatening moment, but be able to try and see it from their perspective. Try and see it from what the world looks like from where they are and the reason I am

saying that might be useful and I can hear my own mangers talking in their head, but if we spend time trying to see if, from their perspective we're then going to start the conversation a little more close to where they are and we could even attempt to match some of their words and that's not to stay there, so I am not talking about sympathy or doing emotional contagion and everybody feels awful, I am talking about hearing somebody enough to match and mirror a little bit and therefore move them to potentially seeing their life, their workplace, what is going on. A situation in a slightly different way which won't be the same if you just go in and decide, oh right, well I should have said it a long time ago but now the only option is for me to…I just need to say it as directly as possible. If the person will respond to directness by all means go and do directness but if this is someone who is signalling to you that actually the indirect approach will possibly work more, you'll know by listening to them and you match your approach to them if you want them to have a better experience at work.

Phil: Yeah I agree.

Dawn: But that takes time. One of the things we don't have enough of in the workplace is time. We're too busy and we assume everything has to be done yesterday and therefore the people management is suffering at that point.

Phil: I disagree. I think there is plenty of time. I think there's a false sense of urgency that's created…

Dawn: Okay.

Phil: We have eluded to some of Cialdini's Influence Principles a few times. So we talked about authority, just now you were talking about liking in terms of matching language and matching preferred approaches and that sort of thing. One of the other principles is scarcity, so I think what happens is we create an impression of scarcity and we use time as the way to do that and that then creates the lack of listening and the lack of quality and attention put into those interactions. From a personal point of view I think you end up being much more effective because you hear things and you can address things a lot earlier. Easier, quicker and it saves stuff down the line but I think there is a false sense of urgency.

Dawn: Okay whether it's false or not if we go back to what we said about perception. When I do mentoring the one thing people tell me they lack the most is time and I agree with you, there's all kinds of time management implications behind that, but if it's real so they literally don't have enough time or they are up against it or their deadlines are one after the other or it's a perception that everybody wants it yesterday and they are using the scarcity principle, either way that has to be dealt with in order for people to then move into a different way of looking at either life or their workplace setting because you can't move anybody into a new space unless they can see what they believe right now can be changed.

Phil: So now we are opening up reality paradigms.

Dawn: We are.

Phil: And we are already one hour ten minutes into the podcast.

Dawn: Have we set ourselves a time. That would be good, given that we have just talked about time, should we set ourselves a time to stop talking?

Phil: We probably should. I am deliberately not going to open up reality paradigms because I think that is a useful explanation to get you back as a guest, as a repeated guest.

Dawn: Okay I will talk about that with you willingly because I think it is important if we understand that how we look at the world seeps through our language and we can help understand much better when we are coming at it from very very different understandings of the world, but yes, it's a massive topic. We'll leave that closed. The other side of emotion work then just to finish off how face work and emotion work are linked, there's the EI side that seems to be really popular at the minute. So this notion of emotional quotient or emotional intelligence and there's the lovely altruistic side of it where you've picked up on this a lot when you have talked about your various examples. It's this idea of, if we can perceive the emotions of ourselves and others to the point of being able to use that emotional intelligence that we have to facilitate our thinking processes. So we are not in the emotion at the time and we are in what we call the refractory period and if we are going to be angry we have got enough perception about our emotions work, our own and other peoples to think about and understand what's the best way of dealing with the emotion in ourselves and/or others and that leads into managing the emotions. So that's the positive side which I think is part of face work especially in a management context where you are having to think about others. Equally if we are going to really talk about the way the world works, we also have the dark side stuff. Within the emotional intelligence literature there isn't many people that talk about how those kinds of skills and abilities can be used for self-gain. There are people like Kidul and Mayer. If you want to make those available I will let you know what the references are but they've done some interesting stuff to show how people might disguise their own emotion for personal gain and you asked for specific impression management strategies earlier. Ingratiation is the way of doing that and I will come back to different ways of doing it and then I'll say what the techniques are. You can disguise emotions, you can express emotions for personal gain and the reason that you do that is possibly because you have got more power and so you can be the boss that comes in and shouts what needs doing just because you're the boss, but you are using emotions strategically still. You might stir up an emotion in someone else and again sense giving is part of reality paradigms but making the world look a certain way or misattributing something to someone. So the gossip example fits in there. You might strategically control information you know is emotionally laden, you know if you give out that information someone is going to respond and so you use it to your strategic advantage. There's the let's all be nice to people and think about one another and let's use emotion management to aid ourselves and others so we all behave appropriately versus how do we use the same skills and abilities to actually get something for ourselves and/or for a company or for an organisation. Some of the work looks at what companies have done in order to get an advantage for example. It's not, it won't be alien to people in various workplace contexts but it isn't something that we often talk about because the assumption is we are emotion at work or emotion work is always about making it better for everyone.

Phil: So there's a couple of things I want to add to that then. So one is as well as gossip, so we used gossip as an example earlier on, I think secrets are another way within an organisation that emotions is used in a dark side way. So in terms of the and this goes back to some of the other things that we have talked about, so we bring in self-disclosure, it brings in face and different aspects of face but it also brings in impression management and it brings in some of those strategies that you were talking about just there in terms of, where you do a (whispers) "I've heard that…" and then you do a, "I'm not sure if I should tell you, or if I should tell you, oh I don't know, I shouldn't tell you but I really want to and yeah I will tell you, I can trust you…yeah, yeah, yeah you can trust me, okay" and then you tell the secret.

Dawn: Which is also interestingly enough using the scarcity principle note because it's information that's not available to everyone and it's scarce. A lot of influence goes on when we do those kinds of things.

Phil: Yeah and then what I find interesting about that then is and again playing with some of the Cialdini principles is that I've had that done on me for a reciprocal perspective and this is why I think it was strategic because the information that was shared which for me was inconsequential. I didn't think it was a big secret, something that I had heard but I didn't think it was a big secret but it was framed and made out to be this really important thing and then shortly after I was asked to share some information that I also knew was delicate and sensitive and the psychological pressure that I felt to disclose plus the pressure that I received from the other person to disclose in terms of the, come on Phil, I've told you…

Dawn: Absolutely because they went first…

Phil: Absolutely, yeah. So that reciprocalness was there and I was like I'm being manipulated. My emotions are being played with because I now have guilt, I have anxiety and these have been created by a situation that I think has been constructed and construed in such a way to try and elicit information from me that I don't want to give.

Dawn: Your choice of words is really interesting as well because we talked about influence and then we talked about being manipulated and again there's another podcast there in terms of helping work out, or tease out the differences between when something is influenced and we normally associate influence as a positive and the idea behind a lot of the research is that we influence for the good. Manipulation is normally associated with influence but its influence for self-motivated gain and then we come in to all kinds of in-between categories where we might know that it is happening to us. If we know that it is happening to us, is it manipulation? Isn't manipulation done in a secret hidden way and is it something else when someone puts pressure on us? So is that persuasion? Is it worse if someone's asking us to give information we just don't want to give? Interestingly I've been watching the news of late where someone in Hollywood has just been accused of inappropriate behaviour and the media are now asking, "Why did no one say anything?" And I've seen several interviews where people have said, "Well you knew, why didn't you say" and we had this when other famous cases have happened. Why does no one speak and there's all kinds of pressures involved, especially bullying behaviour in respect of whether we feel that we have the freedom to open up and divulge information or again there's the idea that if I know surly everyone else knows or

whose place is it and again these are all interesting things to explore. Are we a transparent workplace, are we a transparent society. Can we say things and will we feel like we are heard. Whose fault is it if someone doesn't speak when they should speak out which again is the…sometimes I watch and I think is that really what's important at this time or is it more important that we work out what's happened? Who needs support and then maybe come back to some of the issues that are being discussed right now as to how do we stop it happening again. So I am very much into how do we prevent people feeling like they don't have a voice and how do we make sure people are heard and at the same time because we mentioned fake news, we mentioned gossip, we mentioned innuendos, all of those things we need to somehow allow people to communicate that not believing everything that is first mentioned but believing enough that we go and find out whether something is true or not. We are in such a fast society these days most of us, I don't know if you know of Kahneman's work. He talks about fast thinking, slow thinking. Most of us are probably never checking what we are told. Never thinking about looking to see whether that's based in fact or not so we hear things then we repeat them. There's research in terms of meta that shows if you repeat something enough whether it's true or not it becomes that person's fact. All of these things feed into why we are easily influenced versus manipulated versus persuaded, all of those things.

Phil: And there's a spectrum in that and I do love my spectrums but we'll come back to that another day. Impression management strategies then.

Dawn: Okay, we have mentioned a few, so again if we are thinking strategic impression management and people are interested in that side of things then they might be interested in some work that Tedeschi and Melbourne did where they identify tactical impression management strategies and so they divided them up into defensive impression management tactics and assertive impression management tactics.

Phil: That's an interesting language distinction on its own. Defensive…

Dawn: Absolutely and it gets really interesting in terms of what you think people then do. Defensive, it probably comes out of this notion that we talked about that we have to repair or restore an image and so the defensive impression management tactic is a lot to do with making something right in some way. So excuse making comes under here, reasons, justifications, disclaimers. So I mentioned Benoit and the image repair strategies or image restoration strategies are part of this. How do we put something right and then you've got assertive tactical impression management which can be used by powerless and powerful. So it's not assertive in the powerful sense. So someone who has not got a lot of power might decide to use an assertive tactic like ingratiation, so they ingratiate themselves with someone. They make sure they are helpful, that they are paying compliments, they make sure that they do things in such a way to aid their boss for example. They would be ingratiation tactics. Intimidation tactics are normally associated with the much more powerful and so all kinds of behaviours fall under that, some of which we have just been identifying and then we talked about interviewing. So some of the things we might think about there is self-promotion tactics, so what do we do in order to come across a certain way in an interview. So if you think about self-promotion in an interview context you might do selective self-presentation. So that might

look like, I am going to say exaggerating and it gives the sense that I am saying people don't speak the truth and I am not saying that, I am saying we give our best side.

Phil: (Laughs) okay.

Dawn: So we give our best, exaggerating the possibility for positive life experiences and achievements, so that's where my, "we" example came from earlier where we talked about, "I'll ask somebody what part of the "we" are you" but in a nice way obviously. Other ways of doing self-promotion are to give something pronounced value or significance so that you emphasise its importance and it truly might have an importance within a company, for example but it's the thing that gets bragged about. You might do what's called basking in reflected glory, so someone else your associated with is doing particularly well, I think we had an example of this in the paper that we talked about where the team manager was complimenting one of the female members of staff who were doing something really really well and sort of said, take your time back and we talked about taking the time but being an acknowledgement of the personal face. But what's interesting in terms of what he was also doing, impression management terms, is by saying positive things about his team he was also reflecting in the glory that this is "his" team and that even though there is individuals in that team who are doing well, isn't it great that they have such a team manager that pulls it all together and makes sure everything works well.

Phil: And also great team manager that acknowledges and celebrates the achievements that individuals make.

Dawn: Absolutely, not afraid to share the glory whatsoever and then you might emphasis, so we mentioned the film with Chris Gardner, I think it was called the Pursuit of Happiness. He gives a long list of traits that you expect someone to talk about in an interview context and I can't remember the exact list but it's an excuse for people to go and look at the film again. The things like sincerity, dedication, responsibility. So you find a way and it's not the case that you just list them off because that would be odd behaviour. It's okay for a CV, you wouldn't do that in an interview but you'll find a way of signalling that you're a credible individual who is dedicated, who can do team work, who takes the part of their role very responsibly and you'll have all these examples that do that kind of self-promotion impression management that we are talking about and then physical appearance means that you also have to think about it, not just in terms of what you are saying but matching what you are saying to how you look and taking on that role. Ingratiation I mentioned already but thinking things like expressing an opinion that might not be yours but because you are in an interview context for example you align it, so you do your homework and work out who's there and you're allowing your opinions, your beliefs, you values to the company.

Phil: Yes.

Dawn: Because you would hope you don't want to work for a company that has opposite values but again the obvious one about ingratiation is the, doing the flattery stuff. Self-protection is more like excuses, apologise but you might then justify it. You asked me whether any of this was linked to deception. It tends to start being linked when we start to engage in what I am calling information filtering, so you provide information that makes X look good and you might miss out some

information that it might be useful to know, but it's not going to help you which is different from falsifying information. So saying things you know to be untrue. Those are all impression management tactics.

Phil: Okay, wonderful, thank you, and I guess sometimes there may or may not be any intent behind it, so if I think back to our ingratiation basking in the glory of a team meeting example, whilst that manager might be able to bask in the glory of what that person in the team has achieved that might not be their outward deliberate attempt.

Dawn: And this is where I think it's different in the workplace setting versus if we write about it in an academic paper for example, because we can point out all of these things are happening and provide evidence of it but we can't say that we knew that was that persons intent so we have to suggest these are all possibilities and we can provide scenarios where it might make more sense. So if the person given the compliment is a really bad boss but then talks about what a great team then you've got grounds to think hang on a minute. We did well in spite of you, not because of you but again, we're not inside someone's head saying well this is what they were thinking and this is what they were feeling at that point. We are looking for evidence and we are looking for as much supportive evidence as possible to say these are the probabilities and out of these it's likely that this was happening in this context but we allow for the fact that someone could have plausible deniability.

Phil: And I guess coming back to your own example of the manager, I guess that's why tv shows like The Office are so funny. You get David Brent and the character that he plays doing examples of what we have talked about.

Dawn: And I think it's because we can all think of someone…

Phil: Who could relate to it.

Dawn: Yeah that we think, "Oh my word" and it's funny because it's a caricature. It's not what works in most places, in particular work places most of the time because it just wouldn't run or you would need such a great team underneath it literally was in spite of, but I can think of people who I associate with those kinds of people but they're not always like that.

Phil: We've covered a whole host of ground and we have already left three topics to explore. Influence, reality paradigms and something else that I can't remember now so we will definitely have an episode two of Dawn Archer on the podcast. Before we pull it together though is there anything else then that you think that you're thinking, feeling or want to say about the topics that we have discussed or explored.

Dawn: I think that we touch almost at the tip of the iceberg of what we talk about so I think it's great that you offer people to go and follow certain things through and this area in particular there's a lot that relates to the workplace, but I think it is sometimes nice to look beyond the workplace and see how this might also be occurring in other places that we don't associate this kind of impression management. Just to give us a sense of, we can be doing it and we can be doing it intentionally but we might be doing it but someone else assumes we are doing it and we think very differently. The

other thing that I would be interested in is if you get feedback in terms of what's useful in the workplace. I am, as you know, very interested in taking what we are doing in academia into various professional context and sometimes that means thinking a little bit about the different languages that we use so that we know, we can find a common language or a common way of explaining things. If people air things that they think would be useful for us to think about or they think this might be useful because… or this is an area where you are not sure whether people have looked at, those are the things that would be great for me to hear about.

Phil: Okay and how can people get hold of you if they wanted to get hold of you direct?

Dawn: Well I am not very difficult to find anyway but I will put my contact details on the piece of paper where you are going to give all the references.

Phil: All of the show notes. Okay, that sounds good. Anything else then?

Dawn: I can't think of anything else unless there was something that you wanted me to say that I haven't quite managed to say appropriately.

Phil: No, no, there you go, you knew exactly what you were doing there. Yes if you can send me any references that you've got already for the things that we have pulled together, again books and if you have them non paywalled papers that would be awesome. That would be really good and I just want to say thank you really. I agree, tip of the iceberg stuff. So back in whatever year it was, I think it was 2013…

Dawn: Yeah it may have even been 2011 which is scary.

Phil: Well that was when we first met but one of the defining moments for me was when you started talking about this concept of face and face work. So you built us up into it slowly, so we started it off with the co-operative principle, then into Leaches work, then into Brown Levinson then into Goffman, so you sequenced it in nicely and there's me just name dropping and clanging stuff in to the podcast.

Dawn: Fantastic though, well remembered.

Phil: The implications for the workplace for this work are just massive. This stuff just happens everywhere and all the time without any awareness and for me it leads to misunderstandings, miscommunications, it restricts and enables people to do stuff which isn't good because we don't consider some of the facets and some of the aspects in what we do so the more I can do to help people in the workplace understand more about what's happening and what's going on and getting as thorough an understanding of that as possible, then that's what I would love to do. That would be a good thing.

Dawn: It would be a very good thing.

Phil: Thank you very much then, thank you for your time today, thank you for coming on the Emotion at Work Podcast and if anybody wants to contact Dawn. If any of our regular listeners or new listeners to the podcast, if you want to contact Dawn, all her contact details you will find in the show notes which you can get from i-tunes or where ever you get your podcasts from. So thank you very much for listening to today's episode. Thank you very much Dawn for coming on and taking part and if you want to get in touch you can find me on Twitter @PhilWillcox or you can message us through the show and if you would be ever so kind, if you have enjoyed this episode today leave us a review on i-tunes because that helps other people find this podcast but it also helps bump us up the podcast ratings too, so thank you very much and I would be very grateful if you could do that. Dawn's laughing at me, that's not fair.

Dawn: I am just thinking about how many tactics that people are listening to are thinking oh it's that, look what he did then.

Phil: Look he did ingratiation, he did this…

Dawn: Very good reasons of course.

Phil: So on that note, we'll leave it there. Thank you very much for listening and we'll be back soon.