



Episode 10 – Emotion at Work in Everyday Talk Chatting with Dr Jessica Roberts

Phil: Hello there fair podcast listeners and thank you for downloading this Episode 10 of the Emotion at Work podcast. I was reading a piece this week which said most podcaster don't get past episode 7 so I guess I've achieved that goal. I hope you like what I do on this podcast. I work really hard to (a) get some really interesting guests and (b) put some really useful content out there. If you do like what we do on this podcast, I'd be really grateful if you could leave me a review. If you can head over to iTunes or wherever you get your podcasts from and leave us a review to tell us what you think of the podcast, that would be amazing. I'd be really grateful. Those reviews help me make the podcast as good as it can be, but also help other people find us so if you could do that, that would be great. I also wanted to share something as well. We had a previous guest on this podcast called Georgie Nightingall. She runs an organisation called Trigger Conversations and they are about changing up meeting new people so that you have more meaningful conversations more quickly. She wants to really get rid of and get past that superficial stuff to have more meaningful conversations to build real connections. She puts together extraordinary evenings. Trigger is turning one soon (on 16 October) so she is having an event in London and you can find details of that at www.triggerconversations.co.uk. If that interests you, and you are in or around London on 16 October then I would heartily recommend heading along to one of Georgie's events there. The question that I ask our guest this week is taken from the menu of questions that Georgie puts together at one of her Trigger evenings. It's a worthwhile place to go. Let's get back to the podcast, Episode 10, with somebody that I wanted to get from the start of putting this podcast together. She is the co-author of one of my favourite books and I get quite excited in this one. So sit back, relax, here we go. And it is, believe it or not, Episode 10.

Phil: Hello and welcome to the Emotion at Work podcast where we take a deep dive into the human condition. Today's episode is looking at emotion at work in everyday talk. We've already had on this podcast a couple of different guests talking about *talk* if I can use the word *talk* as many times in a sentence. We've had a forensic linguist talking about the intersection of language and law and we also got her to talk about formulaic language. We also had another guest that came on to talk about some of the rituals that we have in conversation, how conversation can be quite ritualised and her work in changing that up. And this podcast is going to continue to look at language and more specifically looking at spoken language and what it can tell you about identity. Our guest today is a researcher and lecturer at Loughborough University and is the author of one of the most thumbed books in my bookcase. One of the other podcasts I listen to is by a guy called Tim Ferris and one of the questions he asks his guests a lot is "What book have you gifted the most?" and the book I've gifted the most is the book of our podcast guest today. I know that she had a really busy summer and teaching is going to start soon so I'm very grateful to have her with us today, so I'd like to welcome this week's guest to our podcast which is Dr Jessica Roberts. Hi Jessica!

Jessica: Hi!

Phil: How are you doing?



Jessica: I'm all right, thank you.

Phil: Good, good. Normally on a podcast like this we get the guest to tell us a bit more about themselves and that would come out as we work our way through the conversation but one of our previous guests whom I mentioned earlier on talked about the rituals in conversations. So rather than do this standard opening I thought I'd go for a different question if that's OK with you.

Jessica: All right.

Phil: Fab. The question that came to mind for our discussion today is what makes a great travelling companion?

Jessica: Oh, wow, that is a good question. Let's see. I think it depends on the person. If I were to answer for myself, it has to be somebody who has a sense of humour about things and doesn't get too upset when things don't go their way.

Phil: OK. Are you thinking about travel plans within that or just generally?

Jessica: Just general approach to life. So even if you shrink it down to a single thing that you do somewhere you travel. Let's say you go up to dinner and you don't get exactly the table you want, the service is not quite as fast as you want, the food doesn't look exactly right. The person that I am with has to be able to roll with that and still have a good time without every little upset ruining the experience.

Phil: OK. I like that. For me it's someone who is happy to just do nothing.

Jessica: Ah, yeah.

Phil: Because I find that I do lots of things in my life, but travelling is one of those where I just like to sit and soak up or drink in depending on the metaphor you want to use the surroundings that I'm in. And it's something I don't get to do as much when I travel now and it's not just to do with having kids. One of my favourite things I ever did was when I went to Rome with my wife and we just sat in Piazza Navona for about 5 hours and we just sat, and people watched. We didn't really talk to each other that much actually. We just sat, and she drank coffee, I drank beer. It was great to just be there and just enjoy all the surroundings and everything that went with it. So that would be something that is important to me, that it's OK to just to sit and be with the surroundings that you're in.

Jessica: Yeah. That's actually why I like to travel alone a lot.

Phil: Oh really?

Jessica: Yeah.

Phil: So is travelling something you do? Is it a big thing? Is it a part of what you do?

Jessica: It's a huge part of my work and it's probably one of the most important priorities of my life. It's the main thing I spend money on. Sometimes I don't have money to eat properly in the week, but I will travel, by God!

Phil: And what has been your favourite (I don't know if the word *favourite* is the right word actually, but I can't think of any other) place you'd been to in the last year or two?

Jessica: Oh, goodness. Well I don't know if it's favourite but a recent place that I'd been to that I hadn't spent much time in before was Hawaii. It was in the summer, so I properly took time off and I didn't do any work which is unusual for me. Usually I work through my vacations as well so that was really nice.

Phil: And you gave me the link now, so I will link back into work. As a researcher and someone who's interested in language and identity, do you find yourself catching what's happening and how people are interacting with each other while you are away as well?

Jessica: Constantly, yes. It's not the case that I do that because of the research I do. I think it's that I do the research that I do because I had that tendency already.

Phil: Ok. That was one of the things I was interested in. When did the fascination for your area of speciality start?

Jessica: It's been with me for a long time. One thing that I remember is when I was young if I did something wrong sometimes I would try to work out why I'd done it wrong and I'd realise that it would be because I interacted in an incorrect way either from some politeness rule or because of age differences and as I got older I became fascinated with language. I always loved reading and I would develop these incorrect theories about words and how they evolved and of course I had no idea of what I was talking about or thinking about, but I was just fascinated with language and language development and language variation and that's how I ended up looking into things like communication and linguistics.

Phil: Wow. One of the things that always fascinated me, and I don't know since when (I can't put an age on it) but I know I was young enough to realise the severity of the trouble I was in. The minute I got called Philip John which is my middle name, then I would know that was a pragmatic marker of "You are in trouble". I remember modulating my responses depending on the way I'd been summoned if that makes sense. I knew how much leeway I had or the amount of urgency I would need to give to attending to or being present where I was asked to be present depending on the way I was summoned.

Jessica: Yes. I like to tell people that part of what fascinates me about interaction is that I don't feel like I'm naturally good at it so I felt like throughout my life I had to pay more attention to it than maybe other people and in the end I think that made me a better interactor but it also made me wonder how is it that people know how to do this thing? Why does it seem so natural, but actually there are all these things you have to learn?



Phil: And the experiences that you need to go through to get there. Like you were talking about just now in terms of the times you would get yourself in trouble or you'd commit a faux pas or something of that description.

Jessica: Yeah. I've a lot of examples of that (laughs).

Phil: I guess we talked about a few terms in there that we both introduced and maybe we should go back and explore a bit more. Earlier on you talked about politeness reasons and I think for most people politeness would be saying *please* and *thank you*, but I think there is a bit more to it than that as well.

Jessica: Absolutely, yes. There are a lot of things both in the way that you phrase how you speak and also the little words that people usually think of when they think of politeness (like *please* and *thank you*) but it's a lot more than that. You can see that language is often kind of marked or more complex when people are being polite especially in English, so rather than saying "pass the salt" you would say something along the lines of "Would you be so kind as to pass the salt?". I don't know how many people would actually say that, but that's an example of the kind of distinction and then it also has to do with tone of voice and sometimes adding things like *sir* or *ma'am* to what you are saying, so it's much more complicated than just remembering certain words and in fact you can use words that sound polite but actually do it very impolitely. If you say it sarcastically for instance and say "THANKS" really being polite. It is over simplistic to say you just add this word and suddenly you're polite.

Phil: OK. Yes, that makes sense. I can't remember whether I said this on the podcast before or not, but one of the things that my wife says to me a lot is "Are you putting the kettle on?".

Jessica: (Laughs) that's a great one.

Phil: "Would you like a cup of tea then **darling?**" With the emphasis on the elongated darling at the end.

Jessica: Yes, that's a great one.

Phil: What could be one of the reasons for doing those things that people may do then in order to be polite or impolite? When you were talking earlier on you mentioned the age differences. Can that be one of the reasons why people might do something like that? If they are speaking to someone who is older than them...

Jessica: Oh yeah. Different ages, generally status in society is something that we mark by doing politeness and so it could be that age is a part of that, it could be your position in social situations or it could be in your workplace, the person who is the boss and so forth.

Phil: So sometimes we use more politeness strategies with somebody who is superior or senior maybe is a better word than superior.



Jessica: Yes, exactly.

Phil: OK. One of the other things we touched on briefly on this podcast before is a notion of face. Does that link in with some of the aspects of face as well then, would you say?

Jessica: Yes. The use of this idea of face is actually really helpful. It comes from Erving Goffman whom you might have talked about on your previous podcasts. He described this mechanism where we are attentive to how the other person appears to the world or how they appear to the society in social situations such as when somebody says or does something wrong, like they make some sort of gaffe and we try to save their face. If we were interacting with other people, we would try to maintain our own face, the impression that we want others to get of us. And so politeness works both ways with that because it both shows a respect for the face of the other but also presents ourselves as respectable and respectful people.

Phil: So because we do those politeness things it then communicates that we are respectful.

Jessica: Exactly, and attentive, thoughtful, all these good things, yes.

Phil: OK. Is face something we do consciously then?

Jessica: Well, whether it is conscious or not, who can really know? We can't really see inside people's minds to confirm that but it's certainly something that people aren't necessarily aware of. Although if you point it out to people they would probably say "Oh yes, of course I do that". They will give some explanation but often when people first learn about the concept of *face*, they think it's not something they do all the time. They think it must be something that they only turn on when they are not comfortable or when they are with strangers or something, but actually face is something that is with us all the time. It's not something that is necessarily overt and deliberate but it's still something that could be always underlying our interactions with others even when we are very comfortable and casual when just hanging out with our friends. We still care how we appear to them and that is what *face* is about.

Phil: OK. Earlier on in my introduction I talked about the work that you do with identity so are face and identity almost synonymous with each other? Are they the same thing or are they slightly different?

Jessica: This is an ongoing conversation actually, but they are very similar, and they are just different ways at looking at something. Identity is a term that we usually use in a slightly different way to talk about characteristics of a person or how they enact themselves in a variety of ways, whereas face is a little bit more focused on the relational dimension between people.

Phil: OK. So identity almost encompasses something broader whereas face is often more concerned with the interaction that is happening there and then?

Jessica: Yes, I think that is fair to say.

Phil: OK. I'm taking this conversation to a space I wasn't going to take it but there we go. We'll just run with that because I get interested in the interlink between face and time so even though I might be having an interaction with... let's use the example from earlier on when my wife says to me, "Are you putting the kettle on?" At that moment I understand what she is trying to communicate to me is that she would like a hot beverage; normally tea but which variety, whether it's breakfast tea or herbal tea or something like that, I don't know. That statement also brings with it all of those statements she made in the past and the associated meaning that I brought with it. So the fact that I'd rather she would just say "I'd like a cup of tea" and even though I said to her in the past, "Can you not just ask me if you want one, just say, I want a cup of tea and I'll quite happily make you a cup of tea", she continues to use that indirectness or the politeness in it because my interpretation is, she doesn't want to stop me from whatever I'm doing. If I'm doing something else even if that's just watching tv or reading, the fact that then I have to stop what I'm doing and make the tea instead, she always wants to reduce the impact that she's having on the inconvenience that she might add. Yet I still bring with me all of the stuff from the past and it still makes me grumpy. It doesn't make me angry but I kind of walk into the kitchen going "Oh she could have just asked could you make me a cup of tea". Does that make sense?

Jessica: Yes, it does. I think there's a really interesting dynamic between the things that happen in the moment of the situation and the sort of histories people have with each other and that is one of the reasons that I initially got into looking at relationships primarily and the relational dimension of talk. It's precisely because I'd walk through the grocery store and see people interacting and they might blow up at each other and get into an argument over what looked to me like nothing. But of course, it's because there is a whole history there of previous interactions that they had about those things and trying to figure out an account for how you can explain that. Without all that history it's a problem of analysis in a way. You are trying to deconstruct from a single interaction what are all the things here that I can't see, and can I still make a convincing case for why they are involved in what is going on.

Phil: I'm biased because one of the things I get fascinated by is emotion so is it common for emotion to be present when those relational aspects are happening? I know that's a loaded question.

Jessica: Yeah (laughs), I think emotion it's a resource. It's a thing that we can present and perform for people in order to do something in the interaction. When we want to be taken seriously, for example, we might raise our voice in certain ways that are associated with anger. If we want to have sympathy, we might allow our voices to tremble a bit more in ways that are associated with vulnerability and sadness. It's not the case that we are all doing this in some hyperconscious intentional way, but these are resources that we absorbed and learned how to deploy much more strategically than we realise.

Phil: I just wanted to go back for a second to when you said that emotions are a resource that we can perform. And it's the *perform* bit that got my attention so tell me a bit more about that.

Jessica: What's interesting about emotion is that people tend to see emotion as something that is purely physiological. It starts in your body, you have no control over it, it sort of overtakes you and

floods out of you as Goffman would say, but often emotion can be deployed in a way that actually has a function and we see for example in people who are crying, they tend to stop crying at points when somebody else would interject and you see this with very young children so it's not something that people would learn to do really late in life or after they had hundreds of interactions, it's something that little kids would do. They would do the crying trying to get the attention and as soon as they can tell that their parents are about to speak, the crying quietens down. It's something you can test out later maybe with your own kids if they are still in their crying phases.

Phil: Well, the youngest is 4...

Jessica: There you go!

Phil: So we get faux crying.

Jessica: Well, a faux cry might just really be a cry that hasn't been learnt to do very convincingly yet as opposed to cries that happen out of pure pain. But even that it's still a surprisingly learned response compared to what we think it is.

Phil: I've never thought about it in that way. I've never thought about crying and the allowing space for the interjection. I've thought about it in a lot of other ways, but I haven't thought about it from a crying point of view, actually.

Jessica: Yeah. It's a fascinating thing and in a way, it makes it even more interesting when you do see situations where people are crying so hard that they almost literally can't speak because it crossed over into something else at that point but that's very rare. Most of our social lives are filled with the kind of crying that actually we have much more control over than we might realise.

Phil: Do you think and/or are you aware of any reasons that... let me just think about that for a moment. I suppose I am bringing some personal experience into it. If I'm crying and then I noticed somebody is attending to that in whatever way, I got their attention, or they stopped what they are doing, or whatever that is, I wonder if there is a communicative sequence that leads up to me leaving the gap for them to speak.

Jessica: Yeah. Usually it's the same way as any kind of sequence in interaction where you sort of design what you are saying and then you can tell when it's a relevant moment for somebody to respond to you and all sorts of things like crying, laughing, whatever, they're still part of that sequence.

Phil: Yeah. I get quite fascinated with things like turn taking, how people share the floor with each other. I especially like news announcements. I know I chuck a lot of terminology I like to talk about, but you just got me thinking. I've never considered it in the interaction around crying before. So that's something for me to think about, that systemicness then. Again I've thrown a few terms around so let's pick up on one. Let's go for news announcements because I said I liked them. Because I find the interaction between surprise as an emotion (and I'll leave that to embroil for a moment and I'll come back to it) and news announcers, the interaction between news announcers

and surprise and faux surprise very interesting. If I think about the work by Paul Atkins (I'm a huge fan of his work), his research has suggested that surprise is to do with something occurring that is sudden and unexpected. Now if we then link that with the idea of news announcement, and please correct me if I get this wrong, in a lot of cases people will pre-announce that they have some news to share with things like, "Are you sitting down?" or "I've got something on my mind" or "This strange thing happened to me today". You've got that pre-announcement and then if I link this to the people who go "ah!" or "really!" or "wow!" or those sorts of things, is that genuine surprise? Because that can't be sudden and unexpected anymore because you knew something was coming. I guess what it is may still be unexpected, but I find that quite interesting. Is it a surprise or not?

Jessica: That's the great thing about a pre-announcement because it basically tells the other person you better react to this with surprise (laughs).

Phil: Yeah. You need to be surprised by that.

Jessica: Yeah, yeah. Which is a really good way to ensure that the other person is going to give you some kind of response that you want. You can imagine somebody not doing any kind of preface or any indication. I don't know how this might happen, let's say they're texting saying "I'm pregnant", right? And then the other person is asking themselves, "Is this is a good thing? A bad thing? What's going on?" Because if you don't know the person very well you might not know and so saying "The greatest thing happened to me" or "You'd never guess" and using certain tone of voice and so forth, it helps the other person out so that they can respond in a way that you were hoping, maybe, and get the conversation in the direction you want as supposed to stopping it short and going "Oh, now it's awkward".

Phil: Because you have those associated paralinguistic things, don't you, those non-verbal bits that will tell you if the "are you sitting down" is delivered with a great big smile and slightly excited tone or if it's delivered with something different.

Jessica: You're right. Exactly.

Phil: So news announcement is one example. What other examples? A lot of my listeners are in the workplace so what other sequences might they spot in the interactions that they have? Some common ones.

Jessica: There is invitations to do various things. If you want to ask somebody to do something, whether it's in the workplace or for a social engagement, usually that will also have some pre-sequencing going with it. You'd say "Are you free Friday" or "Do you have some spare time later today" and then you get some sort of request or invitation either to do something or maybe to go with you somewhere. And usually again that pre-sequence is a really nice way of getting that person to be on board with a possible thing that is coming up. When somebody says "Are you free later today?", you know that they are about to make a claim on your time in some way, so you can already start to anticipate that and that helps you formulate a response.



Phil: So this might not be on the conscious level but is there some complicit safe facing stuff happening?

Jessica: Yes, I would say face definitely is. According to Goffman anyway, face is an explanation you can apply to all of these things potentially, yeah.

Phil: Ok. I've got something that I want you to do that might take your time like I want to have an hour of your time to record a podcast, I'll then use the pre-invitation. Did you call it the pre-invitation?

Jessica: Yeah or pre-request.

Phil: Pre-request, that was it. But then I'll judge based on the way you might immediately respond to that request and modulate how much of your time I might ask for.

Jessica: Exactly.

Phil: So if your response is "ooofff, yeah, I've got some time, yeah", I won't ask for an hour anymore. I'm only going to ask for a half an hour (laughs). And any others? So we've had pre-requests, news announcements, any other common ones?

Jessica: Yes. There's a gazillion. This may be a slightly boring one in a way but the most common one probably is just greetings. Any time you open an interaction with anyone whether it's service encounter or telephone call or seeing a friend you usually have to do this interesting exclamation of the fact that you're opening a conversation before you do anything else and that needs to be reciprocated in some way so that you can move forward. And this is something that I sometimes forget to do in certain situations. I will commonly write an email and then stop before I send it and go back to the beginning and then add a greeting because I forgot to add that part. And that's doing a little bit of politeness work recognising that people expect to be greeted and not just treated like machines that you're going to give instructions to.

Phil: OK. And I guess those things would be modulated as well by the relationship that individuals have with each other. Depending on how well people do or don't know each other, there may be more or less of an inclination or a need to add some of those things in?

Jessica: To some extent that's true but I don't know that it always lines up in the way that you expect it to. I think a common thing is that we assume that people we feel closer to will forgive us a lot more but actually sometimes the people we are close to will demand the most. One of the things that I learnt painfully over the years is that with my partner when he comes home, I have to stop what I'm doing and ask him how his day has gone. And that's something that I explicitly had to teach myself because otherwise I would just keep working and maybe eventually say "Are you hungry?" or something. I might give him a hug, but I would not do that ritual of seeing how a person's day had been, stopping what I'm doing and making sure I'm attending to them. There is a whole kind of ritual you have to go through to reaffirm the fact that yes, you're focused on this relationship and that is



more important than anything else that is going on. So I was not going to be let off the hook for that particular thing.

Phil: I find an example like that really interesting from the perspective of you've got one individual who would perceive the non-communication (if that's an all right label to give it) as something to be frustrated by or annoyed at and then for another, it's just OK because there is no negative meaning to it. It just is what it is type thing. Because we talked a little bit earlier on about how a talk or interaction can be a way to perform and/or inform people about emotions that we are expected to do, or we want them to do, I then got interested in does emotion shape talk or does talk shape emotion? Or is it a bit of both?

Jessica: I think it's definitely a bit of both. As I was indicating earlier, I think we tend to overemphasise the idea that emotion shapes talk, and I like to look at how talk is actually shaping the emotion but it's a reciprocal relationship, so they are working together really.

Phil: And I guess that can come down to specific language use as well.

Jessica: Oh, yes.

Phil: If I think about a workplace instruction I had in the last couple of years, I was asked to do some thinking on a project or a challenge that the organisation had, and I came back with my thinking and the response I got was "Phil, we are not trying to boil the ocean here" ...

Jessica: (Laughs) what does that mean?

Phil: It would involve a lot of energy to boil the ocean. It's a massive task.

Jessica: Ah, I see. I've never heard that phrase before.

Phil: OK. And as a metaphor it really kind of knocked me for six and I found myself a mixture of angry, scared and sad altogether wrapped up into one. Because I was annoyed both with the statement and myself. I was annoyed with the statement because you're disparaging my work and I was annoyed with myself because I got it wrong. I know that's always subjective, but I got it wrong because I've done the wrong thing. I was then scared because I've done the wrong thing and how is that then going to impact my credibility or reputation. And then also sad at the loss of time that I put in to do it but also at the fact that I hadn't delivered on what the other person wanted from me. And I remember the person that made the statement was then really surprised at my response. "Oh, no, no, no, I was just saying that you had taken your thinking a little bit bigger than what I needed it to be." And I was like no, that is a complete contrast. First, I was boiling the ocean and now you're just saying you're thinking just a little bit broader than you needed to be. And then I was confused. Well, what is it? Is it this or is it that?

Jessica: Yeah. Did you receive that in writing or was it a face to face conversation?

Phil: It was a face to face conversation.

Jessica: That is really interesting because you would think that if somebody meant it tongue in cheek, that would come across in the way that they've said it.

Phil: Yeah and it didn't (laughs). It really didn't.

Jessica: (Laughs) the sort of puzzle of human interpretation is that you never know exactly how somebody really intended something. Communication is exactly something we have to do because we can't read each other's minds, so you'll never really know whether they meant it that way or not or if they merely backtracked and realised maybe I came across too strong and need to modify this in some way.

Phil: Yes, I agree. Because that feedback loop can only work with the information that is available in those circumstances. What could have been meant in an innocuous way and genuinely meant with no malintent behind it, I heard as a real strong challenge to the effort, energy, work and everything else that I put into it. I'm sure I brought with me some historical stuff. I'm sure there were some occasions that I had in the past when I'd done similar pieces of work and it hadn't hit the right spot for want of a better phrase and I was recalling all of those aspects as well I would imagine, I don't know for sure.

Jessica: Right. I think that this really opens up two ways that can help with interaction. When we are reflecting on our own interaction, one thing is whenever you say something to think through all the possible ways the other person could interpret it. So rather than just saying oh, I intended this therefore they are going to take it that way, you can say from the perspective of another person is this going to be/could this be taken the wrong way? Can I ensure that that's less likely and they will hear what I meant to say? And from somebody else's perspective as well, the person hearing the statement on the other end, what are all the interpretations that I could make of this rather than just the one that seems to strike me right off the bat? Because I think it's absolutely the case that when people misunderstand each other it's often because they jump to the first reaction, they head to a thing without stopping and thinking "ooh, maybe there are other ways that I could see this".

Phil: And you talked about misunderstandings in one of your recent papers, is that right?

Jessica: Yes. And something related to what I was just saying is that we can also strategically misunderstand each other or use misunderstanding not as something that is a simple "oh, I didn't literally understand" but you can kind of act or present yourself as though you didn't understand somebody else.

Phil: Tell me more about that.

Jessica: One thing that I've always been interested in is disagreement and conflict and usually I look at very little kind of conflicts and one of the things that misunderstanding can do in a conflict is that it can treat what is going on not as a conflict but rather as something where you have simply misunderstood what the other person is saying. It's a way of getting out of having to disagree about something so I think it's something you can use if you're in an interaction that you don't want to go

sour or you're in an interaction where you don't need to go off on this tangent and go into an ideological argument about it but you can kind of just act as if it was a simple misunderstanding. We just used different words or I think we're talking about the same thing but we really just don't hear each other. There's lots of different things people can say that suggest that they don't really disagree but that they simply don't understand each other. And sometimes that's what you need to do because not all battles are worth fighting.

Phil: Yes, true. And what you (I mean those in the interaction there) are doing is a reframe and that could be from a few different perspectives. It could be from an emotion perspective. I've had many conversations in my time where someone's come to me and said so and so sent me this email, have a read of it, so and so said this to me, what do you think? And the difference is this is out of the interaction, so it's post, it's happening and then often I'll do some of that reframing work. I'll say OK, that's how you've heard it or that's how you've received it, what else could they mean when they say that. Could there be another interpretation of that?

Jessica: Yes.

Phil: They asked you to do a piece of work, you did it and then they said I didn't want you to boil the ocean, what else could they have meant by that?

Jessica: Yes, exactly (laughs).

Phil: What else could be happening? What else could be going on? And from a discourse analysis or conversation analysis (I get confused which one as they are slightly different), would they be classed as a repair? Is that using misunderstanding as a repair?

Jessica: Yes. Repair can be on understanding. You can repair things that are not necessarily about content misunderstanding. For example, if you just didn't hear somebody. But yes, one thing you can repair is a misunderstanding. Or you can purport to be repairing a misunderstanding when actually you might actually be dodging an argument.

Phil: And what other sort of repairs are there then? You said you can repair understanding.

Jessica: And hearing. If somebody says something and you literally don't hear it, you can ask them to say it again. Or you can also repair speaking. When people restart or reformulate what they are saying or when you ask somebody else to re-explain something because you didn't quite understand it.

Phil: And a *repair* is a linguistic term where there has been some form of misunderstanding or the communication hasn't been as clear?

Jessica: Yes, it's meant to fix troubles in the progress of the sequence that you are trying to make happen. It's the kind of thing that you need to fix before you can move forward.

Phil: OK. I'm really interested in the strategic use of misunderstanding because by saying it you're implying that you need to fix something. You need to do a repair but your reasons for doing so are different to the action of doing it so you're doing your repair because you want to get out of that conversation or it's not somewhere you want to go or it's not a battle worth fighting. So you are repairing but for more strategic reason than transactional reasons.

Jessica: Yes, I guess you can look at it that way. One of the examples that I have in the paper is where some friends are having dinner and one of them is relating a conversation. Am I allowed to swear on this programme?

Phil: You are, yes.

Jessica: One of the people in the interaction is claiming that she overheard two people interacting and one of them said "Fuck me" to the other person and she presents it as if it was a request for sex and these two people are married to other people not to each other so it's supposed to be a funny thing but it's a little bit taboo and dicey in the context of that conversation. But the other person in the interaction who is one of these people she is claiming had this interaction says "No, no, no, I said fuck *me*" so she reframes it and repairs into something that is more like an expression of dismay because she found that they were out of line. And all of the people in the interaction basically collaborated to make it as a mishearing or a misunderstanding on the basis of having misheard these two words rather than a disagreement about things like people's relationships or having to get into whether these people are attracted to each other or not. They avoid having to deal with what could be a difficult, awkward conversation by just saying "Oh, no, no, you misheard that".

Phil: Ok. That's a good example, thank you. One of the things that I talk about is the use of strategic ambiguity. Part of the work I do is about emotion but also about deception as well. And for me there is a big spectrum of deception and in that example, you'd just given have they really just complied, has it been a complicit reframing of the truth to something that is more socially acceptable.

Jessica: Yeah, absolutely (laughs). I think that's most of social life, to be honest (laughs).

Phil: Yes, I think, as always, putting those linguistic markers in... (laughs). On a podcast with a linguist the matter analysis of language is just insane. Because deception oils the wheels. It just does. Right at the start of this podcast we talked about greetings. Off air I mentioned to you how I'm struggling with some health issues at the minute but yet when I asked how you were, and you asked me how I was on this podcast, you mentioned you were OK, and I said I'm OK. I am but I'm not.

Jessica: There's a famous work by Harvey Sacks called "Everyone has to lie". It's a section of his lectures and it's exactly about the *how are you* question and how you have to say a certain thing in social situations no matter what the actual facts of the matter are.

Phil: Yes. And they work, and they have that social lubricant next to them because they allow people to interact and transact smoothly but that's not necessarily always true.



Jessica: Sacks makes that exact point that in a close relationship where the context of the conversation is *we are here to have a serious conversation*, you'd absolutely never let off the hook for saying "I'm fine". Especially if it was clear you weren't.

Phil: And I think about some of the more formal conversations that might happen in the workplace; they're called different things in different context, but I suppose we might have formal 1-2-1 discussions with your manager or members of your team or performance reviews or appraisals. That exchange of *how are you* and *I'm fine* in the office or around the rest of the team could work in that way but then if you change the context and you put in one of those other settings, a 1-2-1, a meeting with just the two of you in an office or walking around the lake or on a park bench or wherever it might actually be that context then changes the *rules* (I don't know if this is the right word).

Jessica: The expectation.

Phil: I get fascinated by the notion of allowable contributions where the context defines what you are and aren't allowed to say and sometimes you have very formal ones like in a court room or in a job interview. If we think about job interviews as an example, in general you're not allowed to ask questions of the organisation who is interviewing you until the end. If mid interview you were to ask a question of your interviewers, then that would most likely be a faux pas unless there has been some explicit consent at the beginning to say if you've got any questions at any time then just ask. But generally speaking you're not allowed to make that contribution until the interviewer(s) have exhausted all of the questions that they wanted to ask and then you're allowed to do so.

Jessica: Yes, exactly.

Phil: And then if I think about mapping that out to other interactions, especially in groups or teams, say team meetings or support meetings, I get fascinated by who is and who isn't allowed to contribute on what. I was a fly on the wall once in an organisation where the HR Director started talking about the financial performance of the organisation and the Finance Director took a huge affront to that. "You can't talk about the numbers, you can't talk about the P/L and that sort of thing" because in their perspective on it, they are the contributions that the FD makes, the HR cannot talk about them or present them.

Jessica: Yes. A lot of that stuff is very implicit even in more formal organisations. It's not like there is somewhere written in your job description, you just have to learn sometimes because somebody tells you or takes you aside or you learn by doing it wrong and seeing how people react.

Phil: Have you ever committed any faux pas that you looked back on and thought "How did I not know?"

Jessica: (Laughs) all the time. There are two famous ones for me (*famous* in my own personal life). The first one happened when I was very young where I was in the back yard and my mother was speaking to a neighbour and I saw that the neighbour's bra was visible through the back of her shirt. I thought somebody does not want to have their underwear visible so I walked up to them and I tried to be polite because I knew about politeness and how you should be interacting so I waited for

a chance to speak and then I said as politely as I possibly could, “Excuse me but your bra is showing” and my mother got very angry at me and thought that was quite rude and I was very upset. I couldn’t figure out what I’d done wrong and I look back on that and I think that’s probably where my interest in every day morality began. What are these sort of rules that we have to follow in order to be seen as good people? How do we protect the sanctity of other people’s identities by treating them in the right way and how is it that something that seems good to one person seems like an affront to another? So that’s one very early gaffe I had but you might forgive me because I was four. The second one is when I had a long conversation with somebody at a party over the course of probably almost an hour and a big part of that conversation was about the fact that he couldn’t eat sugar. About an hour later we were cleaning up the party, we were helping put things away and there was a cold plate of cupcakes left and I held out the plate to offer him the cupcakes and he made this expression of dismay and said “You’re mean!”. And of course, in that instance I realised what had happened. I had forgotten the content of the conversation in that moment and I’d done something I thought was kind but actually is a kind of cruel thing to do to somebody who can’t eat sugar and I still don’t know how I could have responded in that conversation in a way to save it. Because either way I was in a dilemma. If I admitted that I had forgotten, that I had actually forgotten a whole section of a conversation that really I should remember and yet if I didn’t admit that, then I was being a jerk so it was lose-lose.

Phil: Because the risk is whether you’ve forgotten that important thing about me as an individual or have you forgotten the whole conversation.

Jessica: Exactly.

Phil: You didn’t pay any attention to me at all for that whole hour that we were talking, or you are just a meany.

Jessica: Yes, I think about it all the time still.

Phil: You reminded me about one of mine which is also about holding out food. There was somebody I used to work with who said they were allergic to bananas and I was like “really? You can’t be allergic to bananas. What a load of rubbish that is”. So one day I ate a banana and I put it in a plastic cup on my desk and then 24 hours later when that banana was particularly smelly she came down and she sat at the desk behind me and I turned around to face her and she still had her back to me and I said “Emma just turn around a second” and I shoved this cup with the 24 hour old banana in it right under her nose.

Jessica: Oh no!

Phil: And I knew I was being a bit mean, but I thought I was being mean and a little bit funny and oh my goodness me, it took me at least three weeks to repair that. Profuse apologies because I didn’t think it was a thing. I just thought she **said** she was allergic to bananas.

Jessica: To me this is actually the fundamental problem of communication. People are different, and we have such a hard time putting ourselves in other people’s places that we can’t quite believe how



different people can be. Even down to really tiny things. You probably know who David Mitchell is. He has a YouTube programme called David Mitchell's Soap Box where he just rants about random things.

Phil: No.

Jessica: Oh, he's so funny.

Phil: I now want to go and find him.

Jessica: You should. One of the rants he goes on is how people have differences of preference and he starts out saying oh, I understand that people have different preferences and tastes. I love bacon and you don't like bacon, ok. People have different tastes. But then he talks about how there are certain kind of tastes he just cannot believe, and he thinks it's wrong. On certain movies if you don't agree with me, you're just wrong. He won't permit it. And then he comes around to saying actually deep down I feel this way about food as well. I don't feel that it's actually possible for anyone to dislike bacon. It can't be possible. And likewise, it's not possible for people that actually like rhubarb. You must be lying to me. And I think he's really onto something there. There is a little bit of something in us that we almost suspect people must be lying if they're not seeing the world in the same way we are, and I think that even though we're talking about something very tiny when we talk about food or even something like allergies, it has implications for everything. Basically, the fundamental challenge of humanity is getting past that weird thing inside of us that can't quite believe that somebody can be different in a really serious way.

Phil: And if I think about that in the context of the workplace as well, then I wonder if the workplace is even harder too. Especially (I don't know if it is especially) I'm thinking back to occasions when two people have the same job title so essentially their job is the same, but they might go about it very differently. And there is a need for others (I'm using *others* in a broad way as I've had experience of many differences). Going back to a manager who sees two members of their team who have the same job title go about it differently and therefore both should do the same. It could also be that if you've got person A and person B, person A does it this way and person B does it differently and they compete with each other to get the other one to conform to their way of doing whatever they are doing, whatever the job is. I guess what I'm saying is that in the workplace you are often put into a box hopefully of the work that you do and that then forms part of your identity and then others will identify things with the box that you are in. If you are a finance director or if you are a road cleaner, if you are a bin emptier, if you are a security guard, whatever that role is that you've been given as part of your job, others will project expectations onto that and then if you act out of line with those expectations even though what you're doing may be appropriate and achieve the same outcomes or goals, it can be viewed as dissent or inappropriate or whatever other labels can go with that.

Jessica: Or it can even be that people around you feel insecure in some way or reflect negatively on their own way of doing things especially if what you are doing is not as common or accepted. Maybe they're doing the job in just the right way for them but because they see somebody else doing it in another way, they start to doubt themselves and then that can lead to problems and then it will

need further work. I think that there is a big conversation in the academic world about academics working too much or working too many hours so there is a huge backlash against that and now it's all about making sure you're not working too much and definitely going off email at certain times of day and definitely taking weekends off and that actually doesn't necessarily work for everyone but what you really want is the accommodation of variation and the ability for people to choose their own way of doing things. Sometimes it feels like in certain workplaces there is such a drive towards standardisation.

Phil: Yeah.

Jessica: I definitely don't agree with it.

Phil: I'm now going to take us all the way back to something we were saying earlier (I can't remember the question) to Brian Levinson and all that notion around positive face wants and negative face wants. Whilst in a way it's quite reductionist and over simplistic if you think about some of the discussions and narrative happening around the work place such as find out what you're good at. There's a phrase that then gets dictated around the conferences that I go to which is "Find out what somebody is amazing at and then get out of their way" and that one sentence is summing up what Brian Levinson was about in terms of positive face wants being, "Attend to what I'm good at and notice the good things about me" and negative face want is, "I want to be unimpeded in what I do". In a non-academic sense it summarises those notions all together whereas the standardisation actually goes against both of those. It fights against both recognising an individual for what they personally bring, but also goes against giving them some freedom and autonomy to crack on with what they do.

Jessica: Yeah.

Phil: Part of the prep for my podcast one of the things I wanted to explore is *stance* if that's OK and so could you define *stance* for me if that's all right?

Jessica: Stance is a sort of display towards a particular something. It could be a display towards a person, towards a topic, towards a situation, towards things in a social situation and it's a display of what our interpreting the interaction would take to be somebody's attitude or opinion or general perspective.

Phil: OK. And in talk how can *stance* be indicated?

Jessica: Oh, goodness, lots of ways. Para-linguistics like you mentioned before, emphasis on words so you can display a sceptical stance towards something by emphasising "**Did** you do that?". It displays a little bit of a doubt or you can do it with particular words. Another way of displaying doubt would be to say "apparently" even without the tone of voice or "allegedly" allows for some doubt and of course there are also non-verbal things like your facial expression like raising your eyebrows in the world of scepticism and doubt. This would be true for any kind of display of any kind of stance.

Phil: So is stance similar to framing in a way then?



Jessica: The way that you do stance can certainly accomplish framing. Framing is something you can also do with others. You can display a stance and somebody can display a similar stance and both of you can frame a conversation as a doubt or somebody can display a stance and the other person can display the opposite stance and now you framed this conversation as disagreement.

Phil: OK. Earlier on I asked if emotion shapes talk or if talk shapes emotion, so I could use that similar approach to a question and ask if stance can shape the frame as well as the frame can shape the stance?

Jessica: Exactly. Once you have a frame that is fairly established or if you come to a conversation that's in a more institutional setting when a frame has been given to that setting, then in a way it helps you to know what the appropriate stances might be or what the available stances might be.

Phil: Yes, an example of this kind of thing is when I was in a meeting and the question was "What work have you done so far?" and I knew the person hadn't done any work so far. We were there to talk about a particular project and there were actions that individual had, and the question was "What work have you done so far?" and the pre-supposition within that was that work had been done when actually there hadn't been. And I just sat there watching where are you going to go with this one because to say you haven't done anything is going to be very tricky. It's very similar to your cupcake example earlier on. The individual knows they should have done some work on it by now, but they haven't, so do they lie, or do they use strategic ambiguity? Do they imply that they've done some work so far with things like "There's something that's been on my mind a lot recently, it's been right at the forefront of my mind and I haven't quite reached a conclusion about where I want to go with it yet so it's a good question?" Or do they go "You know what, yeah. I haven't done anything with that yet". Either way if the lie is good enough, they might go away with it but then if they admit they haven't done anything, that doesn't work.

Jessica: Yeah. It's a gamble.

Phil: I had an argument with my garage. Actually, they're not my garage anymore because I refuse to use them. I had an argument with the garage about some repairs that weren't necessary on my car.

Jessica: Oh dear!

Phil: I was listening to them going "That's just a lot of rubbish" and eventually when I got to speak to the mechanic who apparently assessed my car and that's me framing "apparently" assessed we got to the point where actually the work didn't need to be done. My car would still pass the MOT if the work wasn't done but everything was positioned as "This work must be done. It has to have the work done" and my repeated question was, "Will the car still pass its MOT if I don't have the work done?" "Well it's one of those things that is really important that your car is safe and secure." Is a lovely answer and I agree with you that those things are important but really my question was... And eventually the mechanic said no, it doesn't need to be done to pass the MOT, we recommend it being done but it doesn't have to be done. OK then don't do it then. Just pass the MOT and give me my car back, thanks very much.

Jessica: (Laughs) exactly.

Phil: I guess it's really complicated is where my head is right now. Because I was going to ask what advice you could give to people who are thinking about these aspects in the interaction that they have but we covered so many different things, we covered so much stuff that I'm kind of sitting here going that's just really complicated.

Jessica: Yeah. I think in terms of just reflecting before you say something on how this is potentially going to be taken by somebody else and then when somebody says something to you, reflecting on how they could have meant this. Especially in a difficult conversation that can be really helpful because when you're in a casual conversation the back and forward flow doesn't allow for much reflection, usually things don't go very wrong, you don't have to stop and reflect very much. But when you're having a difficult conversation, that's when you have the time to take space and people expect you to take the space and be thoughtful about what you are saying, and I think it's very worthwhile to do that.

Phil: And I guess at work especially there are lot of tricky conversations that can come up. Somebody's offended you, somebody's not done something as well as you might like or in a way different to the way you thought it was going to be or what you expected it to be.

Jessica: Yeah. And there's a little bit of a push-pull between the thing you can tell the other person wants from you and your own kind of need to display yourself as a certain kind of person and not just give in. Sometimes let's say you make a mistake and you encounter people in the organisation that want you to abase yourself with profuse apologies and so forth. Of course, you may want to apologise because naturally you made a mistake but maybe it's more important actually to move on and preserve the fact that a mistake is in the end just a mistake and you're not going to grovel. That's a choice that you have to make. This person may be annoyed at you for not having properly grovelled and maybe that causes you problems down the line but in the end, you might decide actually I'm not going to waste any more time on this. I'm going to move forward and correct things. That's better for me.

Phil: Even though I was starting to wrap the podcast up, I am now thinking I want to open another door again.

Jessica: (Laughs) go for it!

Phil: One of the things that is part of the context that in a way shapes the interaction, one of the things that I've seen recently is where an organisation will use the institutional power to affect interaction. To be more specific, the promise of further opportunity as a way of moderating behaviour and interaction I find a fascinating dynamic. The implication that at some point in the future something may happen, and you might relate your interaction strategies off the back of that. Things are happening that you don't agree with or impinge you or interfere with what you want to do or those sort of things yet the promise of something in the future means that you don't say anything about those things. You can see these things, not big atrocities that are happening, but just



small aspects that are happening. I had a conversation with somebody really recently when I said “At what point are you going to stand up for what you think? You’re telling me that is how you think, and this is how you feel about these things that are happening, yet you don’t want to do anything because you don’t want to rock the boat”. Because at some point in the future you might get this. When you do get this, do you want to be the person who does not say anything because they don’t want to rock the boat. You’re not in a managerial position now, you potentially will be and if you comply with not saying anything now, when you get in a managerial position actually the pressure will be even more on you to comply because you are part of the establishment. So do you want to be a manager that almost by not doing anything now, you are limiting yourself to not doing anything in the future.

Jessica: Yeah. That’s really interesting (laughs).

Phil: In what way?

Jessica: Because a common thing that people will say is that it’s the people who are in higher positions or who are in positions of power who have the ability to change things. They are less held back by the fact that they are low status and their situation is less precarious, so they are the ones who should be questioning stuff and challenging stuff. But actually, what you are suggesting, and I think it’s absolutely right, is that by the time you get to that point you bought into the system. I don’t know if this is going more Marxist then I meant it to (laughs) but you know what I mean. I think it’s the same for relationships. Once you made a certain move and committed yourself in a certain way then you have in a way ratified whatever the status quo was because that is what you tacitly agreed to.

Phil: And if I go all Goffmanian with it, once you’ve taken that line, that line forms part of your face.

Jessica: Exactly.

Phil: It’s there. The psychological and social pressure on you, that you yourself and others will put on you to conform with that line is really strong.

Jessica: It is. And it starts with, of course, people making impressions as soon as they see you but I think it jumps to the next level as soon as you start talking. I speak and you can hear that I’m speaking English with a particular accent and automatically there’s going to be things assumed about me and if I started speaking with a high rise intonation and ending everything as if it were a question at the end, then you would form perhaps another interpretation of me that might have nothing to do with what I believe about myself or the person I’m trying to come across as. Once that particular performance has been ratified by enough people, it is very hard to break out of it if you want to.

Phil: Yeah.... I don’t know what the right word is, I’m searching for the right word which is why I’m pausing to buy myself time and I’m just waffling on; the social dynamicness of face. I find it so fascinating that someone else can put a face on you. For a long time I was “I am my own person, thank you very much, I am who I am and I decide who I am” and all that sort of stuff. And just by saying all that sort of stuff I can tell you I don’t think that anymore because people will put me in a

face. They'll put faces on me and I'm like "Oh, I don't want that face! I haven't subscribed to that or gone along with that!" (laughs). And again sometimes it's not overt it could be a covert placing of a face. Even today for example, one of the things I talk about a lot is how I like to be quite evidence based in what I do which is why I do a lot of reading. I talk to researchers like yourself and I like to base a lot of what I do on evidence and there was a tweet that I read today with a recommendation where somebody had taken an evidence-based approach on something. I read that article, the source they were quoting, and I was "That's not a good critique in any way, shape or form; that's not an evidence-based approach. An evidence-based approach should be like this". And then I thought hang on a minute, how have I got to taking this because part of my face is about this and I've seen this that says it isn't and I don't agree with that so therefore it's a threat to that aspect of my face.

Jessica: Exactly.

Phil: Part of me wonders do I overthink it sometimes? Do I kind of think it too much? Do I read too much into it?

Jessica: (Laughs) I think for myself personally it's much better to read too much into something than not to read enough into it. If you're going to go in the wrong direction, go in the wrong direction of too much thinking. This is the thing that makes us humans as opposed to a sunflower. Let's use it.

Phil: Yes. To wrap the podcast up would it be possible for you or would you mind (there's some politeness rules in there) putting together a list of some reading that you might suggest people to do? So that can be books or articles. If you have anything that you think is particularly interesting that you would like to share, we can talk about that in a minute. One of the things I do with each podcast is to create some show notes and in the show notes there are links. If we talked about particular research or particular interviews, then we put those links in. We talked about Goffman and Brian Levinson and everyone that we talked about, I'll put in. But if you've got any extra that you think would be interesting for people, then if you ping them across to me on an email then I can add them into the show notes as well. There's a great book called "Everyday Talk" by Jessica Roberts and Karen Tracy, that's one book I'll put in. Have you got any others that you'd recommend?

Jessica: Off the top of my head what I would recommend is just looking at Liz Stokoe's work. She's one of my colleagues and she has various books and articles, but she also has a website on a particular method that she uses which she takes into organisations and helps them learn how to communicate better and it's based on conversation analysis. For people who are interested in this perspective on talk and also how that could be applied, it's a great place to look at.

Phil: Ok. That's wonderful. And that's Elizabeth Stokoe, yes? And she's Leicester?

Jessica: No. She's at Loughborough.

Phil: I will find her website and I will put a link to that in the show notes as well. Is there anything else on emotion, talk, interaction that you're thinking/feeling would like to say?



Jessica: It's an area that I'd like to do more research on. I'm actually working on potentially putting together a book proposal on emotion as an action-oriented resource, so we'll see where that goes, and I will definitely let you know how it's wrapping up.

Phil: Wow! So that's emotion as an action-oriented resource!

Jessica: Exactly. Some people and I put a panel together at a recent conference and we got a lot of interesting things out of it including some of the stuff I talked about on children leaving space for interjection when they're crying and so we're going to see if we can turn this into a book.

Phil: Was that the conference in Belfast?

Jessica: That's right, yes.

Phil: I so wish I could have gone to that.

Jessica: (Laughs) it was fun.

Phil: I was both enjoying and being jealous of the interactions that were happening on Twitter. I was like "I want to be there" but this is really great. Wonderful, thank you. Just as a quick aside and I'm not going to open another door, but have you heard of a lady called Nancy Klein.

Jessica: That sounds vaguely familiar, but I can't say.

Phil: She's written a couple of books. One called "Time to think" and another one called "More time to think". She plays with conversation. She talks about creating what's called a thinking environment and there are ten principles of a thinking environment but one of the things that she focuses on is getting people to think and speak individually. Not all the time but what she talks about in terms of being able to create environments for people to really think, is to give them freedom of space to think on their own. There are a number of strategies that she uses but one of them is called a thinking pair, the idea being that you have two roles (a thinker and a thinking partner) and you have a question that you want to answer. The role of the thinking partner is to help the thinker think so they make no contribution to the thinking. They are there to listen, pay attention, make appropriate noises, encourage, make head nods, all those communicative devices but not to interject or to add anything.

Jessica: Or at least not explicitly.

Phil: No, not explicitly. Oh no, I wasn't going to open the door. I was just going to tell you about it.

Jessica: Yes, of course. It sounds interesting and impossible.

Phil: I think you might find her work interesting.

Jessica: Yes. It does sound interesting.



Phil: As a contrast because what she tries to do is to break down those bits of communication. I'm with you in terms of the place that people make noises, the noises that they make, that contribution must signal something because you cannot not communicate but I just thought you might be interested.

Jessica: Yeah. I can imagine this being an interesting exercise to see what happens.

Phil: Yes. Let's wrap it up. So thank you very much Jessica for your time today. It's been wonderful to have you on the podcast. If you don't mind sending me those links to any books or articles that you recommend people have a look at, then I'll add them to the show notes but other than that, Dr Jessica Roberts thank you so much for your time today. It's been really great chatting to you and I really enjoyed it. Thank you.

Jessica: Thank you.

Phil: Hello there again, fair podcast listeners. You've made it all the way to the end of the podcast. So I've got a challenge for you. Within that podcast, you heard Jessica and I talk about things like how people leave gaps for speech, how some of those rituals work in conversation, how people share the floor, the way we share the conversation between us. So go back and pick a 10-minute section of our conversation and listen out for them. Go and listen out for the way that I leave space or for the way that Jessica leaves space, the way we support and encourage each other to speak. I thought it might be fun to do a little challenge. Go back and listen to see if you can hear the way that Jessica and I manage the interaction between us because it's not done on a deliberate level, but we managed to do it anyway. Ok. Thanks for listening.