Phil: Hello and welcome to the Emotion at Work podcast, where we take a deep dive into the human condition and as regular listeners will know I am big fan of research and I'm a big fan of evidence and that is how my guest today came onto my radar. I was reading a fascinating paper on expressing emotions and how the appropriateness of that expression can impact as social outcomes for those expressing the emotion. So the social side of expressing emotion I think is an underdiscussed one in the workplace. I've think I've said on this podcast before that whilst the narrative of bringing your whole self to work and being truly authentic is for me it's a bit idyllic of the sentiment behind it I get, but I'm not quite sure that it really accounts for all the implications of doing or not doing that. So that's where I thought this particular episode and my particular guest today would be really interesting to get on, because he's really interested in the social nature of emotions and how does all of that work come together? Anyway, enough from me, let's get our guest on the air. So welcome to the Emotion at Work podcast Arik Cheshin. Hi Arik, how are you?

Arik: Hi, it's good to meet you.

Phil: I'm delighted to have you here as well, I am very, very excited about our recording today. For the listeners when Arik and I had our conversation pre record, I came off air thinking oh man there's so much research he and I can do together, this could be so much fun. So I'm very excited about what we're going to get into on the podcast today, I think it's going to be a really great listen. So as per usual for this podcast then I'm going to open up with an unexpected yet innocuous question. So my question for you today then, Arik, is what food or what dish brings you that warm hearty feeling?

Arik: Ooh hearty feeling. Well you said food, the first thing that came into my mind is pineapple which is my favourite fruit.

Phil: Pineapple?

Arik: Yeah, and I can eat pineapple with anything, it can be with meat, chicken, it can be on pizza, it can be just straight out fresh or with chocolate. I'm not sure that's exactly what you're after with the warm feeling. I guess the warm feeling and the home would be probably chicken soup because it brings the memories of house and home, and grandparents, and getting together, and holidays, and family. I guess chicken soup [laughs].

Phil: Okay. Now I might have to end the podcast now because you mentioned pineapple on pizza and that is just a big no in my world.

Arik: Oh wow [laughs].

Phil: No, I cannot stand pineapple on pizza, there's a really close friend of mine who I've known since I was like 12, her favourite pizza is ham and pineapple and whenever we go out she just has it, irrespective of wherever we are. Even if it's not on the menu she'll ask if she can have a ham and pineapple pizza. I just cannot get my head around it, it's just no, oh no, even the thought of it makes

me go [cringe sound]. So pineapple and chicken soup, I like those two things. So when you have that chicken soup then, because I suppose what I'm interested in and part of the reason that I chose my food based question was because of the expectations around emotion expression that come around food. So I chose warm and hearty food because I am imagine that when you put that first spoonful of soup in your mouth, there's an emotional expression that goes with that, would that be fair?

Arik: Yeah, but I think it's much more than that. For me chicken soup represents this Friday night, usually as a Jewish person it will be a Friday family dinner after we light the candles, the tradition and then we have the chicken soup. It's much more than even the taste and the emotions the chicken itself or the soup itself brings, it's much more about for me it's a warm feeling of there's family around, it's now holiday time, weekend time and time to enjoy the moment. It's a different type of dinner, it's like much more festive and family. So it's a warm feeling of belonging, of having your loved ones around you, of having family with you. So that's that internal feeling that I get when I think about that type of dish and food. I don't think I'd ever order it, chicken soup, outside of either my wife's chicken soup or my mother's chicken soup or my grandmother's, it's not something that I would ever order outside when I go out. So it's much more a feeling of belonging and feeling of caring, and relaxing, and family.

Phil: I think for me the closest thing I could get to that would be the quintessential British Sunday roast, where everybody's around the table, and for anyone who's vegetarian or vegan then apologies for what I may go on to say, the smell of the meat roasting, especially if you're doing a shoulder of lamb or a brisket of beef or something like that, where the smell it just takes over the whole house and then everybody comes together. What you described there about it being quite festive and having a sense of belonging and those sorts of things. Yeah, that's Sunday roast for me. Interestingly my wife says that I've ruined Christmas because I make such good Sunday roasts, that when we have Christmas dinner which is like just a posh Sunday roast, she said it's just like having a Sunday roast that you always make. Apparently we're going out for Christmas dinner this year so it's different.

Arik: Well I think you should add a pineapple to the roast [laughs].

Phil: No way [laughs]. What are you trying to do me so early in the podcast, disgraceful? For me food and emotions are interesting in both the way that you described the meaning it has for you, but also this idea that I know you're interested about the appropriateness of the expression. Especially when I used to go to other people's houses for dinner, I would always be a bit cautious about how did I have to play that first mouthful of food, when somebody has served you food, and it might be delicious but there's a risk that you could overplay it or it might not be very nice but how do you enough so that whatever that emotional response you give is appropriate? How do you consider the appropriateness or the inappropriateness of it?

Arik: Well that's a tricky one, you put something in your mouth everyone is looking at you, they want to get your response. You have to be appropriate as you were saying. That's a tough one, yeah.

Phil: Because it was something that came up in a previous episode with Emily Hofstetter, she's a linguist who's interested in what she calls non lexical vocalisations, which is those mms and ahs, that first mouthful of soup, of chicken soup that you have and you go mmm and then all of the meaning

that comes with it. How did you get interested in this appropriateness of expressions of emotion then, where did that come from for you?

Arik: Well since I am interested in the interpersonal elements of emotion display and the social elements, what happens when we encounter emotions of others, really quickly it came to me that it's not just an emotion per se, but it's also the way it is displayed and the way it is presented and how other people fear, it can change the whole concept of the emotion. It's not enough to say service with a smile or be happy because there's so much that could go into the differences in how people display these emotions and how the other person perceives it. And it's just clear that there's other elements besides the discrete emotion that can change the whole meaning of the emotional display. So actually I got into mostly intensity at first and my PhD work was about differences in anger intensity and displays of anger. It was so clear to me, I can say very well that people can be angry and people can be very angry and I would completely respond differently to someone who I can see is angry, as opposed to someone who I see is really displaying anger in such a high volume, that it changes the whole setting. I guess the more that I got into the research and looking at the findings that are there about interpersonal elements of emotion, I thought this would be an interesting area that I should dig more into and get more insight about, and carving my way into that and finding actually kind of surprisingly that even though there were different projects that I was doing about displays of emotions, that appropriateness kept on coming and popping in as these explanation variables and mediator, that explains why things are going this way or the other. So it's not like okay I want to study appropriateness, I want to study emotional display, but appropriateness keeps on popping up and changing the results of the outcome that how people respond to the emotion.

Phil: So I want to come onto the paper that brought us together and I'll come onto that later, and I say later because you mentioned where it began for you with your PhD, can't say where it began, one of the earlier bits of research you did for your PhD was about the intensity then of anger and/or aggression I think it was within that one. I wonder if it might be worthwhile just exploring that a little bit more. Because one of the things I really like about your research is that you tend to wherever you can do your research in a real life applied setting and if I remember correctly that particular study, was that done in a clinical setting, was it in a hospital is that right?

Arik: Yeah, at a hospital. At a few hospitals actually but on the other hand it was all survey data research, I spent a lot of hours at the ER observing nurses and customers, clients that came in and mostly actually their escorts that come in with them and looking at the display. Actually it was because at the time there was a lot of, and there still is, it's a horrible element of people coming into the hospital and having to stand in the queue, and they're very frustrated and anxious, and then they have to wait. And there was a lot of anger and aggression that is being brought out and unfortunately even violence towards the medical staff. Just it's fascinating people coming in because they need help and nurses and the medical staff they're all very, supposed to be, very nice and kind, and caring and loving, and helping. And what they get in response is violence, it's just awful. I learnt that in the local hospital here there was a call to security to intervene once a day, that they run in to stop a person from really hurting the medical staff. And on the other hand I could completely understand this feeling of anger, because anger erupts when people are obstructed from their roles, they cannot get what they came for. You come to the ER because it's an emergency and you want to get treated and then you have to wait. Yeah, so I could get this feeling that the people were getting, the customers were getting, the

clients. On the other hand the medical staff do not deserve this kind of treatment and they were competing hypothesis. If I show you anger and frustration, will you take care of me first because you see that I'm in maybe greater danger and maybe greater pain or maybe greater frustration. Then maybe you should get me out of the area that maybe stresses out other people as well, but on the other hand you don't want to reward this behaviour because everyone will start getting angry and really quickly it all became to be about the appropriateness of the anger displayed.

It's one thing to start yelling and screaming, it's another thing to even just sit there angry and stare. I was so surprised that the nurses when you ask them are there angry people here? They were like, yes, everyone here is angry, the moment they walk in the door they're just angry and frustrated, they don't have to display anything, we know, we see it in their faces, without them even explicitly starting to yell or anything, we can see that they're angry. And actually there's work by Deanna Geddes and Callister that talks about the dual threshold of anger and what got me fascinated was the topic and it talks about not displaying anger is bad for organisations. If people feel anger but not express it and it's not visible to the others to see, then no one can take care of this goal that is being obstructed. No one knows that there's been an injustice to this person, no one knows that this person is feeling bad, that something's wrong. And no one can address it and he's frustrated or he keeps it inside and no on sees and that's not good for the organisation because the problem is not being dealt with. And then if it is visible then others can see it and understand, okay, I see there's a problem, there's something wrong, this person feels that there's been an injustice or maybe they've been wronged in some kind of a way or there's something that's stopping their goals. Then I can attend it.

But if the person crosses the line they become then problem and they become the annoyance and not the reason it started, that's bad for the person and for the organisation because the person cannot get an answer, a remedy to their concerns and problems. I'm thinking back of my own experience living cross culturally between the US and Israel how anger is seen so differently in the US than it is in Israel and things are not tolerated in the same way. I got into trouble by raising my voice too high at times in the US and not getting the same response that I got back home in Israel and realising how this appropriateness level is changing and shifting from situation and to context. And appropriateness is really the key for the outcome you will receive, you might get ahead in line if you raise your voice a little bit and show some discomfort, or you might get tossed out of the place because you crossed the line.

Phil: So one question I was going to ask is, where's the line and does it change according to context? Thinking absolutely in my head thinking it does, where that line is must shift from context to context, whether it be a cultural difference as you were talking about there between the US and Israel or whether it be, depending on how you're getting angry at, if you're getting angry with a colleague versus or a peer, versus getting angry at. If you're expressing that anger with a peer versus or compared with expressing that anger to a superior, versus or contrasting with expressing that anger to a subordinate. I can imagine each of those different things then will change where that line is or where the appropriateness is for that. So just sticking with what you did in the hospitals then, so what was the outcome then? Because if we're interested in the social impacts of expression of emotion then, so you said depending on how you expressed it, it could get you tossed out or it could get you moved up in line. So in that particular setting where was the line and what were some of the social

outcomes that would happen for individuals as a result of either going over the line or just getting to the line or being below the line?

Arik: What we did was painted scenarios based on my observations and interviews with staff and we changed who the displayer was as far as age, so it could have been an elderly person as opposed to a young person. I thought that this will make a difference because the younger person might be more threatening, that they're angry and they might even become violent. Surprisingly that did not change anything in our results. But then the other elements we looked at was either just staring angrily at the staff as opposed to starting to yell or bang on the desk. And then we even tried to do a controlled condition when there was no display at all, there was just people coming into the ER that had been waiting for a while and then we asked the staff how angry do you think they are? So the only difference between the scenarios was that this difference in the way anger was expressed and where the controlled condition with no expression. I thought we would get this maybe intensity linear curve that goes a straight line, that increases, but what we got was that even though those who did not display any emotion in our scenario, the staff saw them as being angry in a mild way. So on a scale of one to seven, they're above the mid point of 3.5. So the staff sees anger there inherently enters the situation and because they see that we could not really get this variance in the degrees of anger intensity. So we only got two levels of mild anger and high anger, so it was like silent anger of staring and or just waiting and then there was loud anger, which was yelling and pounding on the desk. Those were the two levels of anger.

And what we saw was that the high, the violent, the more loud anger was deemed as inappropriate and that led the staff to report that they were more likely to call security, remove the person, and move against this display of anger. And when the anger was in a silent mode, lower intensity, it was more likely to lead to positive outcomes to the displayer. When it was appropriate it led to positive results, when it was inappropriate it led to negative results. Yeah, so when I share it with my peers, they I shared it with my peers they were like no, the louder we scream the more get, and I'm like you'll be surprised actually it's not the case. I'm sure it varies by cultural like we were saying, in competency settings and there might be people who are a little bit more tolerant to this than not. But on average, once a display crosses the line then it's bad, it's bad for everyone, it's bad for the person, it's bad for the organisation. Because their anger might be justified, it might be the correct feeling it wants you to have when they were being harmed and there's injustice. But the intensity and the inappropriateness of the display takes away from the ability to address the situation of the problem and you have to address this person who's acting rudely and inappropriately, and takes all the attention away from the situation, from what caused it.

Phil: Yes, I agree context and things shape it hugely. I also think I'm pretty sure, and I'll let you tell me whether this is echoed in some of your findings, sometimes it can be about the way that you justify the expression as you go alongside it. So for example recently I've been trying to get some information from somebody who I used to be a customer of and despite multiple attempts to get this information I am yet to receive it. So what I found was if I list the catalogue of, I don't know, inadequacies or failures that the company has made, and then I express how angry I am about the service that I received, I got a better outcome to that than I did in a previous interaction where I rang up already wound up, already quite angry, and just went straight in with, "Right come on, you guys haven't

delivered this for me so I want it and I want you to help me get it, I want you to help me get it now," type thing.

Arik: This reminds me of a wonderful word from my colleague Professor [inaudible 00:25:22] he did work exactly on that, on customers coming in when the service was failing and they show exactly what you're talking about, they're saying when it's clear that there's been an injustice and everyone understands that there was a failure in the service, there's no need for you to add emotions to it and anger to it. But when it's ambiguous and it's not clear and you don't know it's the fault of the company, then the anger is used as information and the people get more, the customers get more in the from of compensation when they do that. When it's clear that you've been wronged there's no need to add emotion but when it's ambiguous then this emotion displays information. Because if I'm the customer service and I understand that you're wrong, I would want to correct it, but if you add insult into it and start yelling and acting up, and being angry about it, it turns me off. I'll correct it because I know you've been wrong you're correct. On the other hand if it's not clear to me and I'm not sure if this is our fault or not but the person is pissed off and he's angry, and he's yelling, I tend to feel that okay, I use that as a cue, as information that we've probably have wronged this person and they should get some kind of a compensation.

Phil: So we've mentioned a few different papers so far, I have introduced the anger and aggression one and then you mentioned one about the dual threshold of anger and then you mentioned that one just now. Because one of the things I like to do for all of my listeners is to put links to references in the show notes, which is the written notes that go alongside each of the podcasts that I've put together. So would it be possible for you to send me over a list of all of the different papers that we worked our work through so that if the listener wants to find out more then we can find signpost them to the papers if that's okay?

Arik: Of course, I'd be more than happy to do so. Some of them you need some kind of a library access because they're academic…

Phil: Yeah, they're paywalled, yeah, I get that. I know sometimes that's the case. If I've got the citations sometimes if I use my Google search perimeters I can sometimes find a PDF version of it somewhere, maybe a preprint rather than the actual paper. But, yeah, if we've got a list of references then at least we can signpost…

Arik: But actually I'll give you a tip, I think that sometimes I get requests from people saying, could you please share this paper with me? I can't think of any researcher who would not be more than happy if you Google them, find their email and write to them and say I'm interested in your work, I'm sure they'll be happy to share their paper with you. So that's a tip.

Phil: Most definitely and that's one that I use a lot, if I can't get hold of the paper then I'll contact them go and hi I really like this paper but I can't find it or I can't get it and would you mind sending me a copy? I'd definitely echo that, so fair listener if there's a paper you can't get hold of then we are giving you permission to go and contact the author, fingers crossed the author doesn't go hang on why have I got all of these people contacting me to say can I get a copy of your paper please?

Arik: I think it's a compliment, that's the way I see it, if people write and say we're interested in your work, what could be a greater compliment.

Phil: So your PhD research then was looking at the expression of emotion in that hospital setting and the methodology was so you observed what was happening, you created some scenarios, surveyed the staff within the emergency room or the emergency department to say how would you respond to these different types of expression of emotion? What other contexts have you done your research in? What other workplaces or workplace settings have you done some of your research in?

Arik: I tried to combine between lab and field but actually part of my graduate work I also did a project on emotion in virtual teams. We actually created in a lab affecting where students came in, they were told as part of this company, they have to work together but they cannot talk to one another, they can only use the computer and type in whatever they need to communicate with the other team members. It was an interdependent cooperative task, so they had to communicate with everyone and they did not know that one of the three people there was a confederate.

Phil: Ah, you put a stooge in.

Arik: [Laughs] Exactly. And they actually had to alternate them. There were a bunch of confederates we had, so that people won't be too suspicious. We gave them a list of words to use, sentences that the team made regarding the task and they had a task of either displaying anger or happiness via the task. What we were after was seeing if emotions were spread in this theme and medium that was only text based, where the nonverbal cues are very limited. So there's no facial displays and tone of voice etc, only text and would it be mimicked and spread to the whole team just because of one person, it was a four person team. It was amazing how quickly it happened, how messages just one person sending this negative message and then the other person receiving it and sending it to a completely different other person, his negative tone, his negative messages or messages or on the other hand happy messages. We used self report of the participants before they came into the lab and after they left regarding their emotions and they did change based on the conditions, the emotions spread and it was contagious. They came into the lab feeling one emotion and left just because one person feeling a different emotion. So that's completely different because it was all in the lab and the confederate that we created. I try as far as methodology to do both, go into the field and to the lab. It's not always easy to get access to organisations and I've had some failed attempts unfortunately. But I keep on trying at every opportunity I have and I'll be more than happy to take and be inside an organisation and see how it is in the real world and the real setting. If not I try to create scenarios or experiments that hopefully are observable. I enjoy that because it gives you a lot of freedom to control things and really text for specific manipulations and isolate noise and see that your effects indeed what's causing this.

My ideal project would be combining both and actually we talked about the intensity of the anger but one of the fun projects I had was actually moving away from anger, because it seemed so obvious to me that high intensity anger would be a bad thing. And we looked at happiness and sadness expressions and we looked at it in the sense of the service provider, so this was work with Adi Amit and Gerben van Kleef, and we looked at how service providers display either happiness at varying levels of here's the product, go ahead, this is what you asked for, I'm happy to give it to you. This is

the product I'm so happy that you can get this product, the intensity, often the same with a situation when you don't have the product and you say oh I'm sorry we don't have that product, I can offer you a replacement, a different thing? That was varied on intensity as well and we did that both in the lab and in the field and we found that a high intensity regardless of happiness or sadness, impacts how people perceived the service, service provider and even the product, and the use of the product was impacted by this intensity. So the high intensity was deemed inappropriate again which led to worse outcomes to the organisation, to the service provider.

Phil: Is there a pattern emerging here then, so if we revisit what we've discussed so far, so the high intensity or the loud anger that you talked about in the hospital setting, that led to less constructive outcomes for the individual. I don't think you've used the phrase constructive so I've now implanted the constructive frame on it, sorry. And then you said that high intensity happiness or high intensity sadness led to less constructive outcomes for the individual…

Arik: For the displayer.

Phil: For the displayer, thank you. So is there a pattern then? If you do any emotion at a great, and maybe I'm trying to make too big a generalisation, is there a pattern that any emotion if it is done at a high intensity leads to a less constructive outcomes for the displayer?

Arik: That's a nice question because that's exactly what we tried to do, we wanted to see if there was a situation where the high intensity would be appropriate and would be fitting in or lead to a good outcome? And so far we've failed to do that in the lab but I'm sure, I'm confident that there are settings where the high intensity would be fitting and appropriate. Therefore I don't think the intensity is, that the mechanism behind it I think it's the appropriateness that is driving the effect. Because if I was told that I won the lottery and I'd be just happy, that will be odd, that would be inappropriate, that would be a strange display of emotion. Or if I, god forbid, hear terrible news and I just be almost sad but not really intensely sad, that would be inappropriate and unfitting. You see the progression in the work that got me to write a theoretical paper, that I was actually invited to write and someone connected the dots for me, they said well look at this, you should write about this element more broadly and connect what you have done and others to a more theoretical model. Yeah, it definitely made sense to take a little bit of a broader perspective and not just focus on the specific projects we had and the incidents where we looked at your anger, happiness, sadness, etc, but to try to find an overarching model that explains why outcomes differ?

Phil: Did you manage to create one of those, did you manage to create that theoretical model?

Arik: Yeah, that's exactly the paper that I've written, so looking at how emotional display links to the outcome of others as they see it. So the inappropriateness is the key to determining the outcome. It's not just about the happy/anger/sad whatever, the discreet emotion that you're displaying, it's about appropriateness and then I go on writing down what determiners inappropriateness of display. Like you were saying the displayer, if it's your boss, if it's your subordinate, your co-worker then the intensity is a big part of it. Most of the time the high intensity is inappropriate especially in the work setting and then it's also about the context and lots of the medium and the using the emotions. So one of the projects that I've loved doing is the work Glickson and evidently where we looked at

smileys. So in digital communication we found that using a smiley as a first impression cue is actually bad for the person using it as opposed to a smile which is a very good way of making a good first impression. So smiles lead others to perceive you as being warm and competent but smileys they do not make you feel warmer and make you seem inappropriate when it's a business setting. Make you seem incompetent actually and the mechanism is this appropriateness for display. If you're writing about a more social gathering that's more non formal, then the smileys can be okay, they can be tolerated and they can be appropriate. But if you're writing about some kind of a business corporate setting, either joining a new team or welcoming a new team member or anything of that sort, then that smiley would not be as a smile and would then cause you some trouble or harm and people will see you in a different light.

Phil: That's fascinating. One thing I do I know you did a TEDx talk where you talked about that particular study, so I'll make sure I put a link to that in the show notes as well. Can we explore the theoretical model a little bit more then, what were the, I don't know what to call them, the variables or the components then that people need to think about? Because I'm putting myself in the listener's shoes now then and thinking all right, well so far then Arik and Phil you've explored that the intensity of the expression of an emotion can have an effect on or have an impact on the social outcome that I may achieve, as the displayer. It's not quite as cut and dried as the more intense the expression the less constructive the social outcomes are for me as the displayer, although there may be some context and situations where having a high degree of intensity maybe appropriate. So I suppose if I was in the listener's shoes I'd be thinking well what are some of those variables or some of those aspects then that say why emotion displays could be deemed as unfitting or inappropriate?

Arik: So in the paper I discuss three characteristics, one is the displayer themselves, so we talked about that as far as if it's the manager as opposed to the customer, but there are also elements of gender that come into play, where it can be deemed inappropriate for various emotions to be displayed because of gender roles. Unfortunately this is still the case in many cultures and many places that females will act in an angry manner would be seen more inappropriate than when a male who will display it. Or on the other hand feeling sad and even shedding a tear would seem inappropriate for a male and more appropriate for a female, and would lead to outcomes based on that gender role and the appropriateness of the display and this is about the display of themselves. Therefore then the characteristic of the display, which we talked about the intensity level, but there also could be, which we also mentioned, is this digital display that is face to face, as opposed to an emoji that tries to come into play, emotional display. Which could change the way if it's appropriate or not because of the setting and how it's displayed, so the medium plays a role. Of course there are contexts of when and where it is displayed? One of the important elements is that authenticity of the display and I can put that as a topic that needs to be discussed maybe separately. Because usually they come aligned, the inappropriateness in authentic displays, but this is not always the case.

Inauthenticity is somewhat of a sidenote that people need to be aware of, when people see an emotion as authentic and inappropriate, then it definitely would lead to a negative outcome. But sometimes if the people are displaying an authentic emotion but are trying to be appropriate you might forgive them, you'll still get a positive outcome because people see the effort being made to display the emotion. But I think the other element that came into play is part of me building on the emotion of social information model of Professor Van Kleef and expanding it and looking at elements

of incivility and civility in the space of emotion and it's mostly about the process and the outcome. So the emotion and social information model talks about how we draw inferences from displays of emotions of other people. They give us cues about the situation, like if we thought we see an angry customer, we understand something has been raised, something is wrong. Or Professor van Kleef has shown it in negotiation settings how when someone displays anger that the counterpart understands okay maybe I have gone too far and I should lower or limit my demands. Or when they display happiness on the other hand they get an excuse that the person is happy and therefore they can maybe ask for more and gain more from this negotiation, maybe they can raise their price.

But the other element of the model talks about the effective route which leads to this more emotional response to the emotion display. So if someone displays an emotion I might catch it as contagious like I mentioned in the virtual team context, but I could get an emotion from someone displaying anger at me, I might be offended and feel bad and I might feel threatened by the anger or it could lead to other emotions which would impact my response. According to the ESI model the inappropriate displays will be dominated by effective reactions. So when someone displays an emotion that is not appropriate and fitting to the situation, according to the model the person is more likely to respond or the response will be driven by the effective reaction the person receives. But I claim in this paper that there is another element of this inappropriate display and that is inappropriate display that could be civil or an inappropriate display which could be uncivil. I could respond with a smiley which would be inappropriate but it will be civil. And I think that that I argue and I hope I convinced it in my paper, that these would actually lead to more inferences. I am not driven by my effective reaction to the displayer but I see this as an odd display, it's unfitting, it's inappropriate, it's just not a big display, but it's not uncivil, it's not rude, it's not offensive in any way. And therefore I draw inferences that this person is incompetent or this person is not aware or does not understand the situation. That is the rue that is given and it's based on inferences more than emotion reaction. Whereas civil and uncivil displays of emotion if it's inappropriate then it's more likely to get me emotional and the effect route is probably going to be the one that will deem my response and lead to my response and take precedence over my inferences or my cognitive route in such a sense. I hope that makes sense?

Phil: Absolutely it does and it links in with some other areas that I've explored in the past on this podcast and I'm really fascinated with it, because for me when I read the paper and you were talking about the civility and uncivility, it got me thinking about the notions of politeness/impoliteness and/or verbal aggression when we're starting to get into more the sociolinguistics type of disciplines. Also then where that sits in terms of strategic ambiguity. I would argue that the use of an emoji maybe unintentional but it could be strategic. It could be strategic in a way of leaving enough ambiguity there to let you draw the inference that you want to draw. So I can leave it ambiguous as to whether I'm being civil or uncivil and I hope that you'd land on civil rather than uncivil and thinking about the way that could be interpreted. So you talked about three in terms of characteristics that are displayed or the characteristics of the display and the characteristics of the context. And not that it's any of my business to add to your theoretical model but I would like to anyway, so one of the other aspects that I think is important is the clarity aspect. You talked earlier on if there's the clarity of injustice in somebody's anger then, it makes it easier for a complaint handler to take the actions that the displayer may want to have. But I also think that you can use ambiguity or if there's clarity of one end and ambiguity at the other, I think the more clear a displayer can be in their expression of the emotion,

makes it easier for somebody to judge the appropriateness of that. Whereas if somebody is being ambiguous about it, it's harder for them to judge the appropriateness of that.

So to try and bring that to life a little bit, I stayed in a hotel once where when I arrived the reception was unmanned, so I had to get one of the bar staff to check me in. And then there was a problem with my room because I arrived late everybody had left, there was nobody on reception, there was nobody left in the bar, the restaurant had closed down, and I couldn't close my window. It was like a patio door kind of thing, so the patio door was open so I barricaded it shut because somebody theoretically could have come into the room. So when I went to check out in the morning I got asked how my stay was, I said, "Oh it was spectacularly bad." And she said, "Pardon?" Her response was, "Oh good, oh pardon?" Because she thought because I opened with spectacularly it was good but because I said it was spectacularly bad and then she wasn't sure what to do with that then. For me I was being strategically ambiguous because I was deliberately breaking the script as to how that interaction should have gone. So that interaction should have gone, how was your stay? It was great, thanks. Oh, wonderful, we can check out. And I broke the script and left it in such a way that it wasn't really clear because I wasn't overtly or explicitly angry, but I was also being clear that I wasn't happy either, and she didn't know what to do with it in that way. I think that's, I think anyway, something about the clarity that is being brought by the displayer that can then moderate the degree to which the behaviour or the action might be interpreted or the emotional display sorry, could be interpreted as appropriate or inappropriate.

Arik: I agree, the emotion first of all needs to be identified, if people have encountered an emotion and there is various degrees here of people's emotional intelligence and their ability in seeing emotion, recognising emotions. Like you're saying your script of where we expect emotions in certain ways and when they're not displayed in a certain way, it can throw some people off and other people might just glance at it and not notice anything at all. I guess bringing it to a timely mask wearing COVID time where you can't see the face of the people in front of you, we can see their eyes and me feeling really strange, I am smiling now, can they see that I'm smiling? It's tricky, we get a lot of information from emotional cues, some of them are unconscious and if we can't recognise the emotions we're missing basic elements in our communication and interactions with others. You're completely right in that element of recognising the emotion, that has to be the first place. There could be differences there and actually what I'm working on currently which relate to in group and out group displays and biases we have about others that might impact which emotions we recognise in others and what others do as well. We have various biases as far as expectations on which emotions people should display in specific setting and might be reading more emotions that are not even there in settings, just because of expectations and because of biases etc.

Phil: When you were talking about the characteristics and the display you mentioned gender, for me I'd definitely add ethnicity into that, any other cultural aspects that could come into it as well. You mentioned towards the start of the podcast that you're Jewish, and that then brings different expectations with it doesn't it. That just brings a set of expectations that will then shape what people may or may not think of as being appropriate within that as well.

Arik: Uh huh, yeah. There's a culture that is also not only based on ethnicity and different countries but also in broad context.

Phil: Yeah, the organisational culture as well definitely.

Arik: Yeah, and we found that there is also communication cultures that developed based on the available mediums that people have to communicate. It's where during a pandemic and we're working with [inaudible 00:59:10] and some people working from home and some people are working at the office and some people are only available at night because they were schooling kids and they can only answer in the evening and others can talk on the phone. Communication norms and communication culture changes and what's appropriate to share and how you share stuff differ between teams, and might cause more divide, even though we are already deciding by not being able to be in the same physical space, but we also develop different ways of communicating information which changes the way we present various elements to one another. And adding emotion into that mix could make it an even greater concern as far as miscommunicating what the person is trying to say and reading into various elements and cues that people use when they write an email and add three question marks as opposed to one.

Phil: Yeah.

Arik: That can change the tone and what people perceive and feel about it, but it very much could be based on the norms and the culture that was developed between the people in that work setting.

Phil: Definitely. So what I'd like to do is to start thinking about I guess a, so what, element then. So we've talked about a number of different aspects and if again I put myself in my listener's shoes then, they might be thinking then so what do I do with this then? What strategies or what approaches or what do I do with that? So what I'd like to do next is to get you to say what hints or tips or what recommendations would you make for the people out there that are either in teams that are working within the COVID-19 pandemic and these emotional expressions are going to be happening all of the time. So what can people do with what we've talked about today?

Arik: Well first of all awareness is a big key, the emotions that you see around you can provide you with lots of cues and lots of information of what's going on. So use them, don't glance over emotions they have a powerful impact on others and the way they see the situation and the setting. Try to maybe use that to your advantage in a more strategic way, at least in the sense of being aware that you might be assessed as this being an inappropriate emotion. Maybe think a little bit before you display the emotion, try to maybe regulate them and think beforehand about this maybe hard conversation you have that's about to come with your colleague or your spouse or co-worker or customer, you know what's going to more or less be the tone of the conversation. Maybe trying to think of which emotions would be the more beneficial in that setting, what will this display do to the other person in the conversation? Maybe you need to display that anger, maybe that's the only way to go about the situation because you've been wronged, but then say, okay, I don't want to cross the line, I want to be on track and be appropriate about my anger. Sometimes it might be very explicit to say I am angry, but saying it in a soft tone that is not screaming and yelling might be better for the displayer. Of course you can't say, oh I am angry and nonchalant and yelling softly. But saying it in such a way that the other person understands that you're serious, you're angry but you don't have to yell and scream and raise your voice. Then they get the cue and you don't risk being inappropriate and

crossing the line. I would say a lot of observation looking around and seeing how other people are doing what they're doing. We only know when a norm is being broken, what is the norm when we break it? When we see other people acting out in a way that is inappropriate. That's the only way to really understand that oh, mm, I was not aware that I acted in such a way that was not fitting and appropriate.

So a lot of observation and mimicking and seeing what others are doing and trying to blend in, if that's what you want, unless you maybe you want to shake things up and acting in ways that will be maybe inappropriate, but sticking out and showing people that something's not right. And that there's good elements even in displaying negative emotions. I think this is what I stuck with the paper is not that emotions are bad or good, as far as the emotion itself, it might feel better or feel good but when we're talking about communication and interaction, it's about what is the outcome to the displayer, this is the main argument that I'd like to make. So if we think about the outcome you would get from displaying this emotion and who you're displaying it to and what's the context and what is the intention? Because you could reap a lot of gains from displaying the correct emotion and providing the correct cue to others. Or maybe even changing their effective reactions to their mood, their emotions to your benefit. It's not that I'm being cynical here and trying to be strategic and thinking about our internal feelings and how we express them, and being very cognitive and oriented about that. But just be aware that they can be used and they can be useful and maybe you need to think more about the correct and appropriate emotion for the situation. Be aware of the power of emotion and how you can maybe regulate the emotions that you think are inappropriate or try to control them in such a manner that would lead you to a positive outcome and your surroundings.

Phil: I agree, I think there's a risk that by giving that thought and strategy to what's this interaction I'm going to be having? How am I feeling about it already? How might I feel about it at the time when I'm having this interaction? What are my goals? What are my outcomes? What is it that I want to achieve? There's a risk that that comes across as though it's being overtly manipulative for personal gain. To a certain degree, yes, but for me it's about thinking how can I make this interaction constructive? My working definition inspired by something that Paul Ekman wrote about one of his books called Emotions Revealed, is this idea of emotions being constructive, that they build relationships and they build trust, and build collaboration. If by building that trust and relationship, and collaboration I get an outcome that I want, then great. But it's not at the expense of somebody else. So, yes, it's being strategic but it's not being strategic for self gain over others. It can be but there's a risk that when you say I'm being strategic that that comes across as oh, well you're just in it for yourself. Well, yes and no. So because if I can just express these emotions appropriately then not only is that better for me, it's better for the person that I'm interacting with. Because it doesn't cause that effective reaction that you talked about earlier on, that then causes that person to call security or whatever that might be. Or to feel the fear that gets them to the point where they feel like they need to call security because they've deemed my actions to be a threat in some way or another. So, yeah, definitely.

I also think there's something in it for when you talked about the computer mediator communication study that you did, where you had your confederates talking about different types of emotions that go with it. I see that happening a lot at the moment because there is so much computer mediated communication going on. So if you feel yourself writing that email when you're going to, not

necessarily full on keyboard warrior, where you're smashing the keys, but where you feel that emotion is there. One of the strategies that I often recommend to people I work with go back and reread the message that you've been sent, and then label all of the emotions within it. Label the different emotions that you think that person is expressing in what they're doing and then make a decision to say do I want to take those emotions on? Or what do I want to do with those emotions? Do I want to take them on? Do I want to acknowledge them? Do I want to respond? Do I want to mirror and respond in the same way with the same emotions? What do I want to do with them? But that first action of naming each of those emotions that are being expressed helps you with the awareness of what that is doing for you emotionally and then gives you more choices as to what you want to do with those emotions in response.

Arik: Exactly. The other thing I would actually say is taking advantage in a way of this element of the medium where communicating with. So you're not face to face in front of the person, you can read a little bit, read again, read on the emotions as you were saying and be aware that you're not there to fill in the blanks like you would be in a face to face interaction with a smile, the tone in which you're saying it. And there's work that talks about negativity bias and emails that everything that you write that is negative and people read it, it becomes in theme more negative for the observer, for the person who's reading. They read more negativity into it as opposed to the positive emotions that are displayed by text and email are seen as less positive and more mundane and norm, and not showing that much of a positivity element. So the textual form of email communication is already in a way has this limitation that things seem more negative. So softening the tone a little bit maybe and trying to add more cues that provide a softer tone and don't be harsh in the email because it would feel much more harsher than you intend to those who receive it.

Phil: I'm going to wrap us up then if that's all right?

Arik: Sure.

Phil: So is there any guests that you think I should go and seek out? Is there anything you think I should go and seek out to try and get on the podcast Arik?

Arik: Oh, wow, I didn't mention her work in this talk, so I'll mention her now [laughs], so Karen Niven who's in the UK has fascinating work and interpersonal element of emotion regulation. I talked about the impact of encountering emotions, I think that's about how we can have different ways that we regulate the emotions of others. And what we can do to change and regulate emotions of co-workers or of customers in various ways and which strategies are more effective leading to the different outcomes? So in a way it's taking emotion regulation, I know you had Professor James Gross in an earlier episode, this takes in the interpersonal element of emotion regulation. I think that's a fascinating area. So Karen Niven I hope she agrees to be on, I think she will have a fabulous conversation about emotions at work and regulations.

Phil: That's brilliant, thank you, I'll definitely look her up, that's great. If our listeners are interested in more, I know we've talked about a number of different papers, so we talked about on my list I think so far the negativity bias, an email that you recently mentioned, the dual threshold of anger, the anger and aggression one that you did, the clarity of injustice one, your most recent one around

appropriateness and then I've said I'll put a link to your TED talk in as well. Would you recommend any other books or videos or anything to people if they're interested in this to go and look into some more?

Arik: Yeah, definitely, another person that comes to mind is [inaudible 1:14:50], she was actually my PhD advisor and her work in the area is seminal as far as starting this effective revolution work looking at emotional labour and ways of emotion. [Inaudible 1:15:08] would be one of the persons to look up.

Phil: Is there any particular book or paper that you would say you know what if you're going to begin somewhere then this is what you should go for?

Arik: I really enjoyed her work that talks about how emotion displays, we think about emotion and service setting. The display grows that people have as far as emotions plays and she has fascinating work that she looked at the thing of negative emotions is that you have to display at work, if you're a bill collector or if you're working in settings that you're a judge where even though you might be feeling wonderful, you need to display negative emotions and that can affect on the workers. But you also have recent work which looks at textual displays of emotion and physical emotions, which is also fascinating. I would definitely recommend this book by Gerben van Kleef The Interpersonal Dynamics of Emotions, Toward an Integrative Theory of Emotions as Social Information. Which is also a couple of years, in print four years and it really talks about all the interpersonal aspects of emotion and provides a framework that explain and just lots of examples for various studies on how emotions shape social interactions.

Phil: Fantastic, lovely. If you can send me through any links to those. I found the book so if you can send me through the links to the papers that you were talking about as well, that would be lovely, please if that's okay.

Arik: Yeah, happy to.

Phil: I found the book from Van Kleef so I found that one, so, yeah, if you can send me links to the other papers that would be grand. Okay, and just in case if the fair listener didn't catch up on it earlier on, so one of the things that we discussed and one of the things that Arik mentioned in particular was he'd love to do some applied research. So he'd love to do some research in organisations. So fair listener here is a researcher that wants to do some research with you, so if you're interested in what we've been talking about and you want to think about and find out more about how that manifests itself in the interactions that happen in your workplace, then there is an open invitation to do it here. And if people wanted to get in touch with you Arik, to either do that or to find out some more what would be the best way for them to get in touch with you?

Arik: I guess email would be wonderful, so my last name is pronounced in Hebrew Cheshin, which I know is tough to non Hebrew speakers, so it's spelt C-H-E-S-H-I-N. And the email is starts with my first initial so it's acheshin@gmail.com would be perfect. I guess you could Google me and probably find the website which has my contact information.

Phil: Fantastic, well I'll make sure I put a link to both your profile and your email address, I'll put both of those in the show notes. I now feel really bad that I pronounced your surname so poorly at the start of the podcast because in a very Anglo-Saxon way with Cheshin rather than as it would have been in a Hebrew way. I apologise at the end of the podcast for ruining your surname.

Arik: [Laughs] That's okay, I'm not the one who spelled it, I would have spelled it differently. I inherited the spelling of the name [laughs] so it's common, I'm used to it by now.

Phil: Is there anything else then, anything else that you're thinking, feeling or want to say before I close us off?

Arik: I really want to thank you, Phil, for this opportunity, I think that one of the things that I struggled with is that I try to do applied work, but I believe that most of my conversation is with other researchers, and we write articles and we go to conferences and talk about our findings which some of them are very applied. But we rarely get to really communicate them to the general public and I think what you're doing is wonderful giving this opportunity to share our findings and bring out the knowledge that we're accumulating and the academic work, and academic setting, and giving it to the general public. I wish there were more outlets like that for us to go about and discuss work and research findings, I'm doing my work not just to publish papers but to enhance knowledge and share it. This is a great opportunity so thank you for the invitation.

Phil: Oh, you are very, very welcome, it's a personal goal of mine to get more research out there in the big wide world because there's so much great stuff happening, so much great stuff going on and I think a lot of people just don't know where to go to look. And if I can give them an insight through talking with people like yourself that then gives them links to other researchers, other types of research then that works for me. And similarly if this has been a good experience for you then please let your colleagues know that I'd be genuinely more than happy to have any, if there's somebody out there doing some research in emotion in the workplace, I want them on the podcast, so please feel free to let people know if they want to come on there's an outlet available for them most definitely.

Arik: Cool, great.

Phil: In which case then I'll say thank you so much, Arik, thank you so much for being a guest on the podcast for us, we'll put all the links to all the papers and all the people that we've discussed in the show notes and just thank you so much for your time and have a wonderful rest of the day.

Arik: Thank you.