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English and Power: doing intervention and research at the same time

Abstract

English and Power is a corporate learning and development programme and a process for doing sociolinguistic leadership research.

At a practical level, the workshop helps women leaders strip back the meaning in meetings and interactions and develop a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics of power and how this is established, maintained, and challenged. In terms of research, the preparatory and workshop activities elicit linguistic data about professional identities and about the lived experience of influence, inclusion and exclusion.

In this paper I explain the steps and activities involved in the English and Power programme in detail, concentrating first on the intervention as a learning and development event. I then go on to give an overview of the sociolinguistic analysis of the data from the four programmes run in conjunction with the Professional Women’s Network in Spain between April 2013 and July 2014. Finally I ask how far it is possible to do intervention and research at the same time. [161 words]

Introduction

My doctoral work, which takes linguistics as its analytical perspective, sets out to study the relationship between language, power and performance in multinational corporations, and in particular how this impacts upon the conversational space in which women are able to enact leadership. I am interested in understanding to what extent cultural and gendered patterns of workplace interaction (re)produce a “cycle of exclusion”
which reinforces mono-cultural practices and continues to prevent women from accessing the most senior positions in multi-national corporate settings. Research in both Management and Linguistics illuminate this issue and I draw on both. However, in order to engage with managers about how their linguistic choices constrain their leadership opportunities, I have developed research methods which are, at one and the same time, practical and immediately applicable development interventions in their own right.

In this paper I explain the steps and activities involved in the English and Power programme, concentrating first on the intervention as a learning and development event. I include a literature review which introduces my theoretical framework and go on to give an overview of some key sociolinguistic theories I believe to be relevant both to this study and to leadership research in general. I then give an overview of the sociolinguistic analysis of the data from the four programmes run in conjunction with the Professional Women’s Network in Spain between April 2013 and July 2014. Finally I ask how far it is possible to do intervention and research at the same time.

Context and research questions

The context for the study is the challenges facing women managers in multi-national corporations. I am interested in the language choices women make in international management meetings and how these influence the professional identities they bring to their leadership and management practice. Central to this are the opportunities for influence and inclusion and how these are reflected and constituted in workplace talk. In this study I focus on how professionals describe their experience of influence and power in corporate conversations and I am particularly interested in identifying specific sites where conversations of inclusion and exclusion are enacted. Thus for this study my research questions are:

1. How do women talk about their experience of influence, inclusion and exclusion in the workplace? In particular, what meta-linguistic and meta-pragmatic references feature in their talk?

2. To what extent is it possible to do relevant leadership development and rigorous sociolinguistic research at the same time?

These questions are not without their methodological challenges.
Firstly, questions about the personal, and often hidden experience of women, how they are able to exert influence, how the conversational balance of power might be nudged, and where the most productive sites of intervention lie, can be tackled theoretically by drawing on critical approaches to management and language theory. The bald “critical” aspect of this with its overtly political, emancipatory agenda is not usually welcomed as a relevant practice for also tackling corporate learning problems. This makes access a major issue. My approach has been to design a learning intervention which also generates research data.

Secondly, why turn to sociolinguistics to shed light on leadership issues? There are many descriptions of what constitutes leadership, but as Guthy and Jackson point out in their critical review of cross-cultural leadership:

But however you define leadership, it is not an inert or passive concept. Charismatic leadership, servant leadership, quiet leadership, all of these approaches involve in some way or another the notion of taking initiative, inspiring commitment, mobilising action, promoting legitimacy or exerting influence. (Guthy, E and Jackson, B 2011 p165)

And all of these are linguistically performed. In fact, leaders get things done through talk. There are two aspects to this - the linguistic and the social. How leaders establish rights and how they define and direct relationships draw on both. Hierarchy is interactional and created in asymmetrical patters of talk but we cannot make sense of what is happening in these leader-follower relationships, without a rich understanding of the social context for this talk. By providing a methodological connection between the linguistic and the social, sociolinguistics has the potential to offer avenues of exploration for leadership research and practice, and in particular for doing both of these at the same time.

**Literature review**

**Theoretical Framework**

My theoretical stance is framed by Leadership and Management Learning. Some relevant debates here are around the diverse experiences and practices of women leaders (Stead and Elliott 2009), the performative
accounts of gender (Gatrell and Swan 2008), and the social construction of leadership (Grint 2005). Moving away from development practices which reduce social complexity to convenient lists of competences or cultural and gender differences is also an important theme (Guthy, and Jackson 2011). These themes chime with academic debates in Linguistics particularly with respect to gender identities. Gender and language scholars theorise the performance of gender (Eckert and McConnel Ginet 2003, Baxter 2006, Marra et al 2006) as identities and practices rather than fixed notions of self. As a whole both bodies of work take a critical perspective on organisational activity and understand learning as situated in everyday social practice (Lave and Wenger 1991). Although critical management scholars are interested in the fine detail of local practice (Alvesson and Karreman 2000), and current academic debates focus on such situated practice (rather than consciousness) as the site of learning, there is little in the way of detailed linguistic analysis of how such situated learning might be understood as being situated in talk. My research aims to develop some of this linguistic detail.

**Relevant Theories**

**Methodology**

In this study I take the position that language is not independent of context, interests and human agency. Bloemart and Rampton (2011) in their work on Language and Superdiversity consider key theoretical and methodological developments in sociolinguistics - or as they prefer, linguistic ethnography - which connect on many levels with developments in critical leadership theory (Collinson 2011). What interests me about their position is that by foregrounding situated action, they treat meaning making as a relational process thereby lending a rich and empirically robust toolkit of procedures for examining quotidian leadership practices. Their concern in bringing “an ethnographer’s sensibility to the apparatus of linguistics and discourse analysis” is that:

“Intense scrutiny of textual and discursive detail discloses the ways in which widely distributed societal ideologies penetrate the microscopic world of talk and text, how ideologies have a palpable mundane reality”

Bloemart and Rampton (2011) p 11
In addition to this methodological stance, there are other sociolinguistic theories I believe to be relevant both to this study and to leadership research in general. For this study I am particularly interested in language and identity and in intercultural communication.

Language and gender identities

There is a common interest in the fluidity of identities across Leadership Studies (Ford 2006) and Sociolinguistics (Marra and Angouri 2011). From Linguistics more emphasis is placed on the range of linguistic resources from which professionals construct multiple identities moment by moment in talk (Angouri and Marra 2011) as the concern of linguists in the field is to consider the fine detail of talk at work (Holmes 2006) and what part this plays in the moment-by-moment construction of gendered professional identities. The critique of second wave feminist positions of the immutable nature of gendered speech styles (Cameron 2007) and the work of the Wellington Language in the Workplace Project which reports evidence of the different linguistic choices made by female and male leaders (Holmes and Stubbe 2003a) typify current sociolinguistic concerns about language and gender identity.

Intercultural Communication

Intercultural communication (IC) is a broad sociolinguistic church where concepts about languages, societies, cultures, mental processes and communicative structures are contrasted and contested. Traditionally IC has been concerned with failed communication, and has focused mainly on miscommunication, face saving and face repair (Rehbein 2013). One among many approaches to describing communication “troubles” across cultures has been to take the perspective that what counts as polite and impolite in a given culture can be characterised along a series of dimensions (House 2010). Similarly, many studies in management draw on the same normative approach (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner 1997) Both bodies of work draw on the enormously influential “cultural dimensions” of Gert Hofstede (1991). More recent work across the disciplines moves away from essentialist and reductionist positions and towards more dynamic, discursive perspectives, and a more critical approach to examining who evokes culture and for what purposes. (Piller 2009, Guthy and Jackson 2011). From this perspective culture is an interactional process rather than a stand-off between alien realities.
Gaps

From a theoretical perspective there is a gap in the literature between Management and Linguistics. Critical Management and Leadership scholars are interested in both organisational “Discourse” and the fine detail of local practice (Alvesson and Karreman 2000), but there is little focus on language itself. From Linguistics there is a growing body of work which examines gender identity and leadership from a professional discourse perspective (Mullany 2007). Here is the detailed analysis of natural workplace interaction which could so well illuminate the debates, methodologies and concepts of leadership and management theory and practice, adding linguistic detail to how leaders construct themselves through their talk. There is however, less in the way of critical examination of the nature of leadership. Sociolinguistics is able to bring theoretical and methodological scaffolding to help breach this gap, but it can only do so if it can first be heard across the disciplines as having something of importance to contribute to leadership studies, and secondly if it is also seen as relevant in the corporate world.

Methodology

The corporate context

In order to work with these ideas and interests in multi-national corporations, I have had to develop a different way of talking about what I am doing. I explain that I am working on power in interaction, doing practical research into the underlying dynamics of gender, culture and language at work. I am then able to discuss clients’ interests from a corporate perspective and show how the project illuminates patterns of conversations which affect the performance of multi-cultural management and leadership teams. It is usually very clear to people that what gets talked about, and the way it gets talked about determines what gets done. The power to influence outcomes in meetings where breadth of perspective is required lies not only in personal skill; it comes also from awareness of and competence in the subtleties of interaction - and especially in a more thorough grasp of how power and opportunity are mediated through talk. Looking through the lens of language can offer those in leadership roles an understanding of how it is possible to re-structure who gets to
speak, who gets to interrupt, how new ideas are brought in, how consensus is collectively understood, who gets to take decisions and ultimately how actions are sequenced and co-ordinated.

The example of English and Power

I base my empirical study on intervention research, which I define as work which offers value for my corporate clients while also generating data for my research. I am interested in understanding how professionals talk about their experiences. I want to know what people foreground in the recounting of their stories of influence. Is it gender? Nationality? Culture? Professional practice? Status? English language competence? A blend of these? (Spencer-Oatey, 2000, Angouri and Marra 2011b). To this end I have designed a programme addressing influence, language and power which is targeted at female managers transitioning into more senior roles. At a practical level, the workshop helps them strip back the meaning in meetings and interactions and develop a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics of power and how this is established, maintained, and challenged in talk. In terms of research, the preparatory and workshop activities elicit metalinguistic and meta-pragmatic data about professional identity and the experience of influence and inclusion. This in turn helps me understand how the participants perform their (gendered) identities to enact power (Holmes, J 2006, Mullany 2007) and also to determine which conversational strategies best enable them to engage in international managerial practices.

Data collection

The English and Power programme is designed for groups of up to ten participants per group. From a learning and development perspective the process is focused on specific challenges and problems raised in a series of preparatory tasks. Firstly participants are invited to describe one or two situations where, when using English at work, they felt lacking in power or influence. They are then asked to set aside thirty minutes for a telephone coaching conversation to explore these situations in more detail. Taking this approach means that the workshop itself can be designed to address the specific issues and challenges raised by its participants. During the call each participant identifies her most pressing challenge and this, along with the analysis of
the written work serves to design individualised “tips and expertise” which are distributed before the workshop so people have time to put them into practice in their working environment. This “expertise” is then brought to the face-to-face workshop. The methodology for the workshop is based on brief episodes of meta-linguistic and meta-pragmatic input which follow (rather than precede) a series of short meeting simulations in which the language employed and interaction patterns at play are used as the context and content for learning. To support group practice of alternative patterns of interaction I introduce a number of conversation tools (Deering and Murphy 2003) which may be a simple as placing a small pile of lego in the middle of the the table and giving the instruction, “Every time you take a turn, take a brick”. Such tools make patterns visible, and therefore discussible. The workshop concludes with further activities aimed at exploring options and developing new discursive strategies.

Which of these data matter for doing sociolinguistic leadership research?

From a research perspective the programme provides three data sets - the written reflections about the experience of language and influence at work, notes taken during the one-to-one telephone conversations, and the workshop data which comprises hand written notes combined with voice recordings of the workshop. For the purposes of this assignment I draw upon the written reflections. These provide narrative descriptions of events, thoughts and feelings, as well as conversational ambitions and particular responses to the challenges facing these women managers in their working environments.

In this study I am interested in analysing the sociolinguistic data which can shed light on women’s experience of influence, inclusion and exclusion. The written reflections offer a glimpse of what stands out to them about the linguistic tasks they are facing, and of these, which concerns and challenges matter most. These data are self-reported accounts of the linguistic detail of leadership talk, by which I mean the conversational moves which create, or negate, the space where leadership can occur.

**Analysis and discussion**

**Analytical frameworks**
Thirty-three participants of the English and Power programmes each completed a written reflection where they gave examples of situations where, when using English, they felt lacking in power or influence\(^1\). These were analysed twice in order to focus separately on the social and the linguistic. From the social (or leadership) perspective, three important sites of struggle are mentioned repeatedly: difficult reporting relationships, international conference calls, and missed opportunities to influence. At the same time, weaving through these episodes are what might (from a leadership studies perspective) be interpreted as “Discourses” of inclusion and exclusion. The programme participants are acutely aware that these leadership moments are enacted in talk, or from what might (from a linguistics perspective) be described as discourse.\(^2\) From this language perspective, three conversational features are identified as important elements in the construction of this inclusion and exclusion. These are language and identity, silence and turn. Both the “socio-“ and “linguistic” findings are described and analysed in this section.

The social - sites of struggle and (missed) leadership opportunity

Difficult reporting relationships

As might be expected, upward reporting relationships are frequently cited as problematic, in particular how to develop effective discourse strategies with which to enact leadership. A number of reasons are mentioned. Unreasonable behaviour from a line manager is a concern, as is defensive political behaviour. It is difficult to respond to these situations in a way which maintains a sense of dignity and self-worth, let alone actually take a lead:

“The nightmare started. I was following the “order”, sending my report to the NA Director\(^3\) and the situation became crazy. Nothing I sent him was considered complete or in good condition...I was talking with my manager every day, expending hours on investigating how I should talk with this guy, or if there was any way to skip his review, because I was suffering!!”

---

\(^1\) Appendix 1
\(^2\) Alvesson and Karreman (2000) distinguished between Discourse at the macro, organisational or even societal level, and discourse at the micro level of conversations and interactions
\(^3\) North America
The senior team member is often seen to be deliberately excluding or ignoring contributions:

“It was either Wanda, or Ben and Joaquim (the other 2 most senior colleagues in the meeting) who monopolised most of the allotted time... I also felt like Wanda quickly dismissed the only comment I did manage to push through in the entire half hour as though it lacked weight.”

And finally, the tone and pace in the conversational strategies of senior executives is seen to be very different to the discourse at lower levels in the organisation. Both the pace and the aggression cause problems and mean a new way of engaging in conversation is required:

“I also find that the corporate executive level (at least in my company) is extremely political (which you would expect) but also aggressive. Everybody questions and challenges everything, you need to be convincing but in a very fast way, to the point, people lose their patience extremely quickly.”

International conference calls

By far the most frequently cited cause for concern is international conference calls. All the participants mentioned their frustration and bewilderment with this increasingly common method of managing at a distance. For many, these conversations are unproductive, unstructured and alienating:

“On these calls we don't know each other. You never hear any other woman except me speaking. As there is no agenda you can't follow the conversation point by point.”

The participants with the most organisational power take control:

“The weekly conference-call with all the Comm & Marketing Heads in EMEA. Normally the Head of the “strongest” countries lead the conversation (Netherlands, Germany and Nordics), so there are not many opportunities to make comments or to interrupt. They talk a lot not matter if they are monopolising the conversation.”

And this means that it is so difficult to be part of the discussion, they exclude themselves:
“On international conference calls, I many times want to make a comment but cannot because either suddenly everyone talking at the same time or I am not able at all, no chance. Therefore, in the last meetings I tend not to talk unless being asked. I don’t think is the best behaviour but it is very tiring to try to speak without success.”

Missed opportunities to influence

The accounts include lengthy deliberations about how and when to speak in order to influence, and in many cases the opportunity to do so is lost. An internal self-critical monologue holds people back:

“When I participate in a forum or debate, I normally find difficult to ask questions (is this the right question to ask? How am I going to look asking this? Is the answer maybe too obvious to everybody and that’s why no one has raised this question?)...At the end, thinking of all those things, time passes and maybe is somebody else who has raised the hand and asked the question, so I lost my opportunity.”

There is acute awareness of choices about how and when to speak, and what these choices mean for the opportunity to take a lead:

“Although I have interesting point of view to express, I feel frustrated because it’s hard to get my turn. Sometimes I give up and don’t say anything. And I know you have to talk to lead the discussion or to be taken into account...”

Discourses of inclusion and exclusion

These women managers know that to cultivate enough power to influence they must feel not only capable, but also included - a legitimate participant in the conversation. Furthermore, they recognise that this sense of belonging is related to language and to patterns of interaction. If they don’t know how to interact, they often assume they are excluded. While there are some direct references to gender and how this interacts with their leadership ambitions, more often it is woven into accounts of identity and belonging alongside issues of language, culture and personal style. They are often acutely aware that inclusion (and exclusion) are constituted in conversation and that they themselves play an important role in how that plays out:
“If sometimes it’s difficult for a woman to raise her voice and have the audience listening to what she has to say, when it’s in a language other than the mother tongue, this may become an issue. You don’t want to use words that may sound impolite or too strong but you don’t want to be too soft either. Between one and the other, I would choose being soft, and that’s what makes me fail.”

The linguistic - micro-moves of leadership-in-action

This section explore the way in which the inclusion and exclusion described by the English and Power participants is discursively constituted. Three discursive features in particular can be seen to have this pragmatic effect. First, the choice of language (in this case English) has a profound effect on the performative options open to people - a different language means a different sense of self and a different range of opportunities. Second, silence and the role this plays and finally how turns are distributed and negotiated.

Language and identity

Baxter (2006) theorises the interaction of language and identity as fluid and changing. Identity from this perspective is a performance. From these data what can be seen is that the performance of this identity is bound by the language being spoken. Participants know that the language they speak changes how they are able perform as professionals:

“The sense of not be as natural as I am when speak in Spanish and the sense to loss capacity to transmit all that I have in my head. Even the sense of being less intelligent!. This affect as well to the personal connection with others, I feel not as close as I can do when speak in my language.”

There is a clearly articulated sense that when speaking English in some professional settings, they are not actually “themselves”:

“Most of my new interlocutors don’t know me personally and our interactions take place through the phone, and eventually in person. I have to demonstrate my professional value in this diverse environment, fully populated by men, without being myself... I'm just fighting, trying to demonstrate my worth again and again.”
And for some, the way speaking English facilitates particular discursive options and denies others, is striking:

“Amongst my collected thoughts on the issue there’s one recurrent theme that comes to mind. British education is quite authoritative and hierarchical so I find it hard to adopt a “management challenging position” within an English context whereas I find it easier in Spanish, French or Italian. There’s a certain tone of respect to the established structure I struggle to break.”

Silence

Silence, particularly on international conference calls, is mentioned again and again in the accounts. There is a massive literature on the pragmatics of silence and and power. In these accounts however, it is the self-censorship which stands out:

“When there is a meeting or conference call where I am not leading the meeting but would like to give my opinion to add value to the conversation. I normally struggle to be heard as I am not sure when I can start talking and often I loose the moment to talk so then is too late and the topic has been already discussed.”

And this seems to be true even when participants are openly invited to speak:

“A lot of phone calls, web-ex and telecoms - someone from the UK is speaking and perhaps 15 or more people are listening. No one says anything. The UK person will say “Any questions?” but no one speaks.”

It seems there is something about the structure of the conference call itself which prevents people from following their usual patterns of interaction and participation:

“These calls are led by our CE bosses. They speak and you can do it as well to add something relevant. Most of the participants have a similar grade than mine or lower. Only a few of them ask questions, although we are encouraged to do so. I consider myself a very participative person, but in these situations I feel weird interrupting and asking, as there is not much participation around.”

Turn
How turns are organised in conversation shapes how agendas are developed and who leads on them. It is not surprising then that turn was a recurrent theme. Two features in particular illustrate how exclusion is enacted, and the programme participants are very aware that the boundary of inclusion is policed in patterns of talk.

First, the conversational patterns of established teams are reified and thus hard to challenge or change:

“First type of meetings are very similar among them; usually the lead is on the main managers, who are used to work with one another and the interaction between them has been built along many meetings....In those cases, is very difficult to participate, even to share an opinion or ask anything.”

and second, unfamiliar and impenetrable cultural norms of interaction:

“There are very few women in meetings (at CE level⁴ I’m the only one) and I feel I don’t know “all the rules” yet...I have developed my abilities in Spanish. I can explain almost whatever and try to persuade the audience... but when it comes to English, again I don’t know the rules. I miss some business terms or more elaborated expressions. Or simply I don’t know if Anglo-Saxons are much more formal and would consider the tone stupid or inappropriate, or think there is a hierarchy that drives who cannot speak, who speaks the last, etc (different that what could exist in my culture).”

Politeness and impoliteness

In the accounts, inclusion and exclusion are linguistically marked by references to politeness and impoliteness. The participants are very concerned about being polite. They do not want to be “too strong or too direct”, or to be seen to be disrespectful or rude. This is not a question of courtesy; it is a question of power. They do not know how to take up the power which comes with their position for fear of causing offence or of appearing incompetent in a language which is not their own. The most important goal in the interaction is belonging; only then can one influence. The other side of this equation is the fear of being excluded - being put down, ignored or ridiculed. Even though this is in the main imaginary, it is a real enough fear to keep

---

⁴ client executive
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people silent. That these women managers are aware of the linguistic and pragmatic features of interactional work is self-evident:

“I want to go straight to the point without being rude, listen respectfully without losing my turn, understand cultural differences without losing my personality. I need to know what in English is not acceptable or appropriate, and how to keep cordiality and distance at the same time, because men often confuse kindness with other things. The rest I guess is a question of practice in a non-female world.”

Conclusion

In this study I address two independent but related questions. First I examine how the women participants of the English and Power programme talk about their experience of influence, inclusion and exclusion in the workplace. The aim of this is to develop a more nuanced understanding of the discursive space for taking leadership in multi-national corporations. I concentrate in particular, on the meta-linguistic and meta-pragmatic references which feature in their talk. I conclude that perceptions of inclusion and exclusion frame the participants’ orientation as to how and when they can intervene and influence. It appears that these social boundaries of inclusion and exclusion may be marked linguistically by perceptions of politeness and impoliteness, which are both discursively constructed and culturally specific. Further work is required on politeness and impoliteness from a broader data set encompassing different settings and countries to compare perceptions from a range of cultural perspectives. Plans are in place to run the programme in Portugal, the Netherlands, Sweden and the U.K.

Both the method and the findings have a dual purpose: to do rigorous sociolinguistic leadership research and to do relevant leadership development at the same time. There are two ways to test how far this study has been successful in answering this question - both of which look towards practice. First, the research should make sense in both the academic and practitioner communities with their different, but equally exacting tests of what counts as important knowledge. Second, the process should support learning which moves beyond reductive, difference-driven learning and development practices. The English and Power programme goes
some way to meeting this objective by taking a contextually specific, inductive approach to learning design which uncovers (rather than imposes) assumptions and beliefs about gendered and cultural discourses.

The findings, based on the programme pre-work have implications for leadership practice and particularly for the sites of learning. The programme participants identified difficult reporting relationships, international conference calls and lost opportunities for influence as important discursive sites where they struggle to exercise their leadership. Sites of struggle are also an opportunity for change, and further work should be carried out to develop methodologically coherent, critical approaches to developing leaders who are able to employ more effective discourse strategies for these contexts. [4,995 words]
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Appendix 1

Preparatory work

Your “English and Power” workshop will be focused on the specific challenges and problems you raise in the preparatory work detailed below.

There are two steps to this preparation:

1. You are invited to reflect on the topic and to describe one or two situations where, when using English at work, you felt lacking in power or influence
2. You are then asked to set aside 20 to 30 minutes of quality, uninterrupted time for a telephone conversation with Anne to explore these situations in more detail

The aim of the preparation is twofold:

1. It will provide the opportunity for you and for Anne to cover the introductory ground in a accelerated way so that in the workshop we can all, “hit the ground running”
2. It will mean that the workshop itself can be designed to address the specific issues and challenges raised by its participants.

Written Reflection

You are invited to reflect on your use of English in the context of your influence at work. There is no right and wrong here - your own experience is what counts. It is important to put some detail into the description:

• What were you trying to achieve and why?
• Who was present and what were their roles and ambitions?
• What was the conversation about and what was the interaction like? (who spoke, who interrupted, who tried to speak but couldn’t, etc)
• What was dissatisfaction about it from your point of view?

You should expect to spend between 45 minutes and an hour on this work and to cover no more than a couple of sides. You can choose to write about one situation or two shorter ones. Please write continuous prose and not bullet points.

Telephone Conversation

Anne will coordinate with you directly to allocate a 30 minute slot for the second part of the preparatory work. Please arrange to take the call on a landline and in a quiet room without distractions, preferably with a closed door.

Confidentiality
The written piece and the telephone conversations are, of course private and confidential but keep in mind that they will frame the workshop and you may be invited to share your experiences with the group. For the duration of the work (written reflection, telephone conversation and workshop) and beyond, Chatham House rules apply.