

# NOTES

## PROLOGUE

xi **Even if you had nothing in common with Felix:** Felix Sigala spoke to me on the condition of anonymity. Details—including Sigala’s name as well as specifics about his career—have been changed to obscure his identity. The FBI was presented with fact-checking inquiries regarding the events described. The Bureau, citing the agency’s press policies, declined to comment beyond confirming general details.

xv **“The single biggest problem with communication”:** The provenance of this quote, like many great quips, is somewhat murky, but it is widely attributed to George Bernard Shaw.

## CHAPTER ONE: THE MATCHING PRINCIPLE

3 **a case officer for the Central Intelligence Agency:** Jim Lawler spent twenty-five years as an officer with the Central Intelligence Agency and is still bound by pledges of confidentiality on a number of topics. Though he spent many hours sharing his experiences with me, he did not, at any time, divulge confidential information. As a result, some of the details in his story have been changed, were

described to me only in general terms, or were confirmed by other sources. Yasmin is a pseudonym. Lawler did not specify which nation Yasmin came from, saying only that it was “an oil-rich country hostile to the United States.” Lawler also declined to identify the nation where he was stationed, saying only that it was “an alpine nation in Europe.” If you are interested in learning more about Lawler’s experiences, please allow me to recommend his wonderful espionage novels: *Living Lies* and *In the Twinkling of an Eye*.

4 **“who truly understands him”**: Randy Burkett, “An Alternative Framework for Agent Recruitment: From MICE to RASCLS,” *Studies in Intelligence* 57, no. 1 (2013): 7–17.

8 **a flurry of research**: Marta Zaraska, “All Together Now,” *Scientific American* 323 (October 2020): 4, 64–69; Lars Riecke et al., “Neural Entrainment to Speech Modulates Speech Intelligibility,” *Current Biology* 28, no. 2 (2018): 161–69; Andrea Antal and Christoph S. Herrmann, “Transcranial Alternating Current and Random Noise Stimulation: Possible Mechanisms,” *Neural Plasticity* 2016 (2016): 3616807; L. Whitsel et al., “Stability of Rapidly Adapting Afferent Entrainment vs. Responsivity,” *Somatosensory & Motor Research* 17, no. 1 (2000): 13–31; Nina G. Jablonski, *Skin: A Natural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

9 **“Why people ‘click’ with some people”**: Thalia Wheatley et al., “From Mind Perception to Mental Connection: Synchrony as a Mechanism for Social Understanding,” *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 6, no. 8 (2012): 589–606.

9 **“to connect with each other, against all odds”**: Wheatley, here, is quoting the author Michael Dorris.

9 **scholars at the Max Planck Institute**: Ulman Lindenberger et al., “Brains Swinging in Concert: Cortical Phase Synchronization While Playing Guitar,” *BMC Neuroscience* 10 (2009): 1–12; Johanna Sanger, Viktor Muller, and Ulman Lindenberger, “Intra- and Interbrain Synchronization and Network Properties When Playing Guitar in Duets,” *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* (2012): 312; Viktor Muller, Johanna Sanger, and Ulman Lindenberger, “Hyperbrain Network Properties of Guitarists Playing in Quartet,” *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1423, no. 1 (2018): 198–210.

10 **the electrical impulses along their skin**: Daniel C. Richardson, Rick Dale, and Natasha Z. Kirkham, “The Art of Conversation Is Coordination,” *Psychological Science* 18, no. 5 (2007): 407–13. In response to fact-checking inquiries, the author of this study, Daniel Richardson, said that while these kinds of physical behaviors have been documented by scientists, “those are not specifically effects that I have personally proved in my own lab. I have discussed these effects before in review papers, or introductions to my own related experiments (on eye movements or body movement coordination, for example).” Sievers noted that while we do see

these kinds of alignments in collaborative activities, researchers are uncertain about the direction of the causality.

**10 Sievers found other studies:** Ayaka Tsuchiya et al., “Body Movement Synchrony Predicts Degrees of Information Exchange in a Natural Conversation,” *Frontiers in Psychology* 11 (2020): 817; Scott S. Wiltermuth and Chip Heath, “Synchrony and Cooperation,” *Psychological Science* 20, no. 1 (2009): 1–5; Michael J. Richardson et al., “Rocking Together: Dynamics of Intentional and Unintentional Interpersonal Coordination,” *Human Movement Science* 26, no. 6 (2007): 867–91; Naoyuki Osaka et al., “How Two Brains Make One Synchronized Mind in the Inferior Frontal Cortex: fNIRS-Based Hyperscanning During Cooperative Singing,” *Frontiers in Psychology* 6 (2015): 1811; Alejandro Pérez, Manuel Carreiras, and Jon Andoni Duñabeitia, “Brain-to-Brain Entrainment: EEG Interbrain Synchronization While Speaking and Listening,” *Scientific Reports* 7, no. 1 (2017): 1–12.

**10 a long and convoluted tale about her prom night:** Greg J. Stephens, Lauren J. Silbert, and Uri Hasson, “Speaker–Listener Neural Coupling Underlies Successful Communication,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107, no. 32 (2010): 14425–30; Lauren J. Silbert et al., “Coupled Neural Systems Underlie the Production and Comprehension of Naturalistic Narrative Speech,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, no. 43 (2014): E4687–96.

**10 “extent of speaker-listener neural coupling”:** Greg J. Stephens, Lauren J. Silbert, and Uri Hasson, “Speaker–Listener Neural Coupling Underlies Successful Communication,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107, no. 32 (2010): 14425–30.

**11 we must connect with them:** J. M. Ackerman and J. A. Bargh, “Two to Tango: Automatic Social Coordination and the Role of Felt Effort,” in *Effortless Attention: A New Perspective in the Cognitive Science of Attention and Action*, ed. Brian Bruya (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press Scholarship Online, 2010); Sangtae Ahn et al., “Interbrain Phase Synchronization During Turn-Taking Verbal Interaction—A Hyperscanning Study Using Simultaneous EEG/MEG,” *Human Brain Mapping* 39, no. 1 (2018): 171–88; Laura Astolfi et al., “Cortical Activity and Functional Hyperconnectivity by Simultaneous EEG Recordings from Interacting Couples of Professional Pilots,” *2012 Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, 4752–55; Jing Jiang et al., “Leader Emergence Through Interpersonal Neural Synchronization,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, no. 14 (2015): 4274–79; Reneeta Mogan, Ronald Fischer, and Joseph A. Bulbulia, “To Be in Synchrony or Not? A Meta-Analysis of Synchrony’s Effects on Behavior, Perception, Cognition and Affect,” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 72 (2017): 13–20; Uri Hasson et al., “Brain-to-Brain Coupling: A

Mechanism for Creating and Sharing a Social World,” *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 16, no. 2 (2012): 114–21; Uri Hasson, “I Can Make Your Brain Look Like Mine,” *Harvard Business Review* 88, no. 12 (2010): 32–33; Maya Rossignac-Milon et al., “Merged Minds: Generalized Shared Reality in Dyadic Relationships,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 120, no. 4 (2021): 882.

**11 synchronize as well:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, Sievers wrote that while understanding and neural alignment can be accompanied by physiological entrainment of pulse, facial expression, or emotional experience, it is not guaranteed. “It’s possible to listen to someone, understand them, and not become physiologically entrained. . . . Part of what makes both conversation and music meaningful is seeing how people change as they interact, aligning and misaligning, steering each other and being steered.”

**11 There is something about neural simultaneity:** Laura Menenti, Martin J. Pickering, and Simon C. Garrod, “Toward a Neural Basis of Interactive Alignment in Conversation,” *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 6 (2012); Sivan Kinreich et al., “Brain-to-Brain Synchrony During Naturalistic Social Interactions,” *Scientific Reports* 7, no. 1 (2017): 17060; Lyle Kingsbury and Weizhe Hong, “A Multi-Brain Framework for Social Interaction,” *Trends in Neurosciences* 43, no. 9 (2020): 651–66; Thalia Wheatley et al., “Beyond the Isolated Brain: The Promise and Challenge of Interacting Minds,” *Neuron* 103, no. 2 (2019): 186–88; Miriam Rennung and Anja S. Göritz, “Prosocial Consequences of Interpersonal Synchrony,” *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* (2016); Ivana Konvalinka and Andreas Roepstorff, “The Two-Brain Approach: How Can Mutually Interacting Brains Teach Us Something About Social Interaction?” *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 6 (2012): 215; Caroline Szymanski et al., “Teams on the Same Wavelength Perform Better: Inter-brain Phase Synchronization Constitutes a Neural Substrate for Social Facilitation,” *Neuroimage* 152 (2017): 425–36.

**12 achieved moments of supercommunication:** Sievers wrote that his research is primarily focused on how conversation creates alignment in the future, a distinction from alignment in the moment. Further, his dissertation research was on emotion perception in music and movement. B. Sievers et al., “Music and Movement Share a Dynamic Structure That Supports Universal Expressions of Emotion,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, no. 1 (2012): 70–75; B. Sievers et al., “A Multi-sensory Code for Emotional Arousal,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 286 (2019): 20190513; B. Sievers et al., “Visual and Auditory Brain Areas Share a Representational Structure That Supports Emotion Perception,” *Current Biology* 31, no. 23 (2021): 5192–203.

**12 stage an experiment:** In this study, Sievers “was interested in knowing who was better at creating consensus for being convincing,” he wrote. “And I was inter-

ested in knowing why and then trying to lay down a scientific and neurobiological foundation for understanding why people might be more or less convincing or create more or less group cohesion. . . . I wasn't thinking about, like, supercommunication. [But] I think there are people that are much better at this than other people. And it makes sense to sort of scientifically try and understand why and if we can be better at communication.”

**12 difficult to understand:** Beau Sievers et al., “How Consensus-Building Conversation Changes Our Minds and Aligns Our Brains,” *PsyArXiv*, July 12, 2020.

**14 When he dominated the conversation:** Sievers wrote: “We found that groups with people judged to be high social status showed lower neural alignment, and that high-status people used different conversation strategies, including talking more, giving orders to others, and implicitly rejecting others’ ideas. Subject 4 in Group D was rated as having high social status and this conversation did not produce increased alignment, so this feels like a good example. However, the statistical analysis doesn’t let us ‘zoom in’ on a single person, so we can’t know with certainty whether Subject 4 held his group back; other factors may have been at play.”

**15 high centrality participants:** The dialogue from study participants throughout this chapter has been edited and condensed, in some places, for brevity and clarity. In the original study, participants are referred to with coded signifiers and are not referred to, in the transcripts, as “high centrality participants.”

**15 But the most important difference:** Sievers wrote that “the high centrality participants who facilitated consensus, they did not speak more or less than others, and they directed attention to other speakers, and they did so more than the high-status people. They requested clarification more frequently. . . . They were not rated to be more influential by their group, and they were more susceptible to neural influence. . . . This ties into a larger literature on the traits that people have called high self-monitoring . . . a tendency to adapt one’s behavior to the groups that you’re in. And we didn’t measure that trait in our study, but we should have.”

**16 “How do you think this movie will end?”:** This transcript, like the previous one, was edited and condensed for brevity and clarity.

**16 “likely to adapt their own brain activity”:** Sievers, “How Consensus-Building Conversation Changes Our Minds.”

**17 Other people turned to them:** Sievers made clear that this study did not look at community leadership, and so while that is a “proposed explanation, [it is] not part of the science. . . . It could be that people become central in their social network and then other people have to talk to them, because they could have become central for some other reason, like they own a yacht or something.”

**18 if our mind doesn't align:** Sievers noted that “the localization of brain function—which parts of the brain are responsible for what kinds of behavior or thinking—is one of the most debated topics in neuroscience. . . . However, generally speaking, it appears that brain areas and networks seem to perform multiple functions (Suárez et al., 2020). This seems to be true across the brain, from neural networks to individual neurons (Rigotti et al., 2013). So, the mindsets identified in this section are likely handled by several brain networks coordinating together over time. Put simply, the brain is very complex, and any claims that just one network or part of the brain is responsible for a certain kind of behavior or thinking—or a particular mindset—is inevitably oversimplified.”

**19 we're attuned to *How Do We Feel?*:** Piercarlo Valdesolo and David DeSteno, “Synchrony and the Social Tuning of Compassion,” *Emotion* 11, no. 2 (2011): 262.

**20 “about other people, oneself, and the relation”:** Matthew D. Lieberman, *Social: Why Our Brains Are Wired to Connect* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). The default mode network incorporates the medial frontoparietal network, or MFPN. Sievers wrote that “some scientists have theorized that the medial frontoparietal network is specific to social stimuli (e.g., Schilbach et al., 2008), but there is also strong evidence that its function may be much more general. The MFPN may be involved in memory retrieval (Buckner & DiNicola, 2019) and creativity (Beaty et al., 2016; Beaty et al., 2021). It may be that the MFPN is involved in generating information internally, when that information is disconnected from immediate sensory input (Buckner & DiNicola, 2019), or integrating that information with sensory information (Yeshurun, Nguyen and Hasson, 2021). Moreover, there are other parts of the brain that likely play a role in social cognition outside of the MFPN, such as the fusiform gyrus for face recognition and the amygdala for recognition of emotion in facial expressions. And so, though a range of social tasks reliably recruit the MFPN, activation of the MFPN does not always imply social cognition.”

**20 70 percent of our conversations are social in nature:** This is an oversimplification of how our brains work, but a useful one for illustrative purposes. Usually, many different parts of our brains are working at the same time, and the distinctions between these portions of our brains can be unclear.

**21 the decision-making mindset becoming dominant:** As Beau Sievers wrote, there is “evidence that strongly suggests that when people are using the same brain networks, this is no guarantee that they are in the same mindset, and vice versa.” Sievers wrote that rather than rely on thinking of certain neural networks becoming activated, it is best to use the “notion of mindset that does not require specific and reliable recruitment of single brain networks. A mindset could just be a predisposition to use one's whole brain in a particular way when presented with certain kinds of information. On this account, a brain being in a mindset is

like an orchestra playing a symphony; many symphonies are possible, but only one at a time.”

**21 Psychologists who study married couples:** Caleb Kealoha, “We Are (Not) in Sync: Inter-brain Synchrony During Interpersonal Conflict” (honors thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 2020).

**21 one prominent researcher, John Gottman:** John M. Gottman, “Emotional Responsiveness in Marital Conversations,” *Journal of Communication* 32, no. 3 (1982): 108–20. There are many different reasons couples experience conflict and tension, and many ways to overcome them. Some are described here and in chapter 5. It is also worth noting that approaches to diagnosing and dealing with marital challenges are myriad. Gottman, himself, has written extensively about the “Four Horsemen” of communication issues that can harm relationships: criticism, contempt, defensiveness, and stonewalling. In response to fact-checking inquiries, Gottman wrote that “there are several findings for the ‘masters’ of relationship: Maintaining trust and commitment, during conflict a positive-to-negative ratio equal to or exceeding 5 to 1, no four horsemen (criticism, defensiveness, contempt, stonewalling), turning toward bids for connection at least 86 percent of the time, love maps (knowing other person’s inner psychological world), expressing fondness and admiration, using softened startup, effective repair during conflict, and effective psychological smoothing during conflict, an ability to deal with the existential part of gridlocked conflict.”

**21 Happy couples ask each other more questions:** Adela C. Timmons, Gayla Margolin, and Darby E. Saxbe, “Physiological Linkage in Couples and Its Implications for Individual and Interpersonal Functioning: A Literature Review,” *Journal of Family Psychology* 29, no. 5 (2015): 720.

**24 But she didn’t seem to mind.** Lawler mentioned that his decision to play with her son while the woman was on the phone, in his opinion, was also what helped forge a connection. “That actually, I think, is what touched her,” he told me. “I did that simply because it was the right thing to do, not because I was trying to sell her any steel. It was just being human and the right thing to do.”

**27 “A case officer creates an ever-deeper relationship”:** Randy Burkett, “An Alternative Framework for Agent Recruitment: From MICE to RASCLS,” *Studies in Intelligence* 57, no. 1 (2013): 7–17.

## A GUIDE TO USING THESE IDEAS, PART I: THE FOUR RULES FOR A MEANINGFUL CONVERSATION

**30 In one study:** This project was described to me by participants on the condition of confidentiality.

## CHAPTER TWO: EVERY CONVERSATION IS A NEGOTIATION

37 **a cold November morning in 1985:** The jury deliberations in *Wisconsin vs. Leroy Reed* were filmed by television producers and portions of those recordings were eventually made into a program for *Frontline* titled “Inside the Jury Room.” For information on this trial and deliberations, I am indebted to Douglas Maynard, who was kind enough to share transcripts of the full deliberations with me (the *Frontline* program contains only a partial selection of jurors’ comments). I am also grateful to the producers of the *Frontline* episode. Transcripts are quoted nearly verbatim, though many exchanges, asides, and interstitial dialogues have not been included. I also relied upon “But Did He Know It Was a Gun?” International Pragmatics Association Meeting, Mexico City, July 5, 1996; “Truth, But Not the Whole Truth,” *The Wall Street Journal*, April 14, 1986; Douglas W. Maynard and John F. Manzo, “On the Sociology of Justice: Theoretical Notes from an Actual Jury Deliberation,” *Sociological Theory* (1993): 171–93.

39 **“not to be swayed by sympathy”:** Taken from Wis JI-Criminal 460, Wisconsin Criminal Jury Instructions.

000 **“That’s not what I was hoping for”:** This comment comes from an interview with juror James Pepper, rather than the transcript of the deliberations.

43 **Dr. Behfar Ehdaie specialized in treating prostate cancer:** For more on the work of Drs. Ehdaie and Malhotra, please see “Negotiation Strategies for Doctors—and Hospitals,” *Harvard Business Review*, October 21, 2013; “Bargaining Over How to Treat Cancer,” *The Wall Street Journal*, September 2, 2017; Behfar Ehdaie et al., “A Systematic Approach to Discussing Active Surveillance with Patients with Low-Risk Prostate Cancer,” *European Urology* 71, no. 6 (2017): 866–71; Deepak Malhotra, *Negotiating the Impossible: How to Break Deadlocks and Resolve Ugly Conflicts (Without Money or Muscle)* (Oakland, Calif.: Berrett-Koehler, 2016). In response to fact-checking, Ehdaie clarified that he felt that patients could hear him, but he was not discussing prostate cancer risk in an effective manner.

43 **doctors advise against surgery:** Laurence Klotz, “Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: For Whom?” *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 23, no. 32 (2005): 8165–69; Marc A. Dall’Era et al., “Active Surveillance for Prostate Cancer: A Systematic Review of the Literature,” *European Urology* 62, no. 6 (2012): 976–83.

43 **Active surveillance carries its own risks:** Ehdaie explained that “active surveillance aims to monitor a cancer closely and intervene within the window of cure to treat the prostate cancer. . . . Dying with prostate cancer may apply only to older and more unhealthy men. . . . We also enroll younger men with prostate cancer into active surveillance because the evidence demonstrates that these men do as well as men with initial surgery or radiation therapy because we are moni-



toring their cancer closely and can intervene within the window of cure, or the cancer will remain low risk for their lifetime and never require treatment.”

**43 he felt active surveillance was the right decision:** Ehdaie stressed that the risk associated with active surveillance is not equivalent to a 3 percent mortality and that, in fact, “studies demonstrate that there are no differences in survival between immediate treatment and active surveillance for low-risk disease.”

**45 Surveys indicate that:** According to the American Cancer Society, there are roughly 268,000 prostate cancer diagnoses per year, based on the most recent data. If roughly half of those are low-risk, and the rate of choosing active surveillance is roughly 60 percent (estimates provided by Dr. Ehdaie), then roughly 53,000 men per year are opting for surgeries that might not be necessary.

**45 opt for unnecessary surgeries:** Matthew R. Cooperberg, William Meeks, Raymond Fang, Franklin D. Gaylis, William J. Catalona, and Danil V. Makarov, “Time Trends and Variation in the Use of Active Surveillance for Management of Low-Risk Prostate Cancer in the US,” *JAMA network open* 6, no. 3 (2023): e231439-e231439.

**45 negotiate a peace deal:** The Colombia Negotiations Initiative, Harvard Law School.

**45 Malhotra analyzed:** Deepak Malhotra and M.A.L.Y. Hout, “Negotiating on Thin Ice: The 2004–2005 NHL Dispute (A),” *Harvard Business School Cases* 1 (2006).

**45 describes formal negotiations:** Malhotra, in response to fact-checking inquiries, said, “I’ve worked on many different kinds of negotiations for a long time, not just what you refer to here as ‘formal’ negotiations” and that “Dr. Ehdaie’s situation was not the first time I was dealing with something that most other people might not immediately think of as a ‘negotiation.’”

**46 task in any negotiation:** “Ask Better Negotiation Questions: Use Negotiation Questions to Gather Information That Will Expand the Possibilities,” Harvard Law School, August 8, 2022; Edward W. Miles, “Developing Strategies for Asking Questions in Negotiation,” *Negotiation Journal* 29, no. 4 (2013): 383–412.

**47 a few weeks later:** In keeping with patient confidentiality, this case was only described to me in general terms, and some details were changed to protect patient privacy.

**49 training other surgeons:** In addition to the interventions described in this chapter, Ehdaie and Malhotra developed additional methods of encouraging these conversations. For more, please see “Negotiation Strategies for Doctors—and Hospitals”; “Bargaining Over How to Treat Cancer”; and Malhotra’s *Negotiating the Impossible*.

000 **“transform how we communicate”**: Ehdaie wrote that he would describe his work this way: “We created a systematic approach using all of the communication tools adapted from negotiation theory with Dr. Malhotra. People find credibility in situations in which someone is recommending opposite their perceived bias. In this case, I wanted to make sure patients realized that I am also a surgeon (not just the AS physician) and believe strongly in surgery for the appropriate patients. However, in patients with low-risk prostate cancer, I believe that AS is the preferred option. . . . We reduced surgery by 30%. We do believe that a systematic approach using these methods helps better communicate risk to patients, strengthen patient autonomy in their decisions, and helps medical decision making across disciplines.”

50 **Numerous studies have found**: In 2018—the last year for which reliable statistics are available—only 14 percent of people who opted for a jury trial for federal crimes were found innocent. Leroy Reed was being tried in state, rather than federal, court, but the trend is similar. John Gramlich, “Only 2% of Federal Criminal Defendants Go to Trial, and Most Who Do Are Found Guilty,” Pew Research Center, June 11, 2019.

51 **“I want to listen”**: In some places, including here, the transcript of deliberations has been edited or condensed for clarity.

52 **“improve the theory”**: “History of the Harvard Negotiation Project,” Harvard Law School.

53 **Fisher, a Harvard law professor**: Roger Fisher (1922–2012), Harvard Law School, August 27, 2012.

53 **Fisher and his colleagues wrote**: In response to a fact-checking email, Sheila Heen, a professor at Harvard Law School who worked with Fisher, wrote, “Fisher pointed out that each party actually needs to have their interests met in order to say yes to any agreement, and this means that each of us should care about finding ways to understand and meet others’ interests as well as our own, if we are to find solutions to our shared challenges.”

58 **logic of costs**: The *logic of costs and benefits* and the *logic of similarities* can also be referred to as the *logic of consequences* and the *logic of appropriateness*. For more on these kinds of thinking, please see: Long Wang, Chen-Bo Zhong, and J. Keith Murnighan, “The Social and Ethical Consequences of a Calculative Mindset,” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 125, no. 1 (2014): 39–49; J. Mark Weber, Shirli Kopelman, and David M. Messick, “A Conceptual Review of Decision Making in Social Dilemmas: Applying a Logic of Appropriateness,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 8, no. 3 (2004): 281–307; Johan P. Olsen and James G. March, *The Logic of Appropriateness* (Norway: ARENA, 2004); Daniel A. Newark and Markus C. Becker, “Bringing the Logic of Appropriateness into the

Lab: An Experimental Study of Behavior and Cognition,” in *Carnegie Goes to California: Advancing and Celebrating the Work of James G. March* (United Kingdom: Emerald Publishing, 2021); Jason C. Coronel et al., “Evaluating Didactic and Exemplar Information: Noninvasive Brain Stimulation Reveals Message-Processing Mechanisms,” *Communication Research* 49, no. 2 (2022): 268–95; Tim Althoff, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Dan Jurafsky, “How to Ask for a Favor: A Case Study on the Success of Altruistic Requests,” *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* 8, no. 1 (2014): 12–21.

61 **They are now at nine votes:** The transcript is slightly ambiguous regarding this vote: One vote was not read aloud. But, based on subsequent dialogue, it appears there were three votes for guilt, and nine votes for acquittal.

62 **“when the cop pulled me over”:** This comment comes from an interview with juror James Pepper, not the transcript of the deliberations.

## **A GUIDE TO USING THESE IDEAS, PART II: ASKING QUESTIONS AND NOTICING CLUES**

68 **researchers at Harvard:** Michael Yeomans and Alison Wood Brooks, “Topic Preference Detection: A Novel Approach to Understand Perspective Taking in Conversation,” Harvard Business School Working Paper No. 20-077, February 2020.

70 **Researchers at Harvard also looked:** Ibid.; Anna Goldfarb, “Have an Upbeat Conversation,” *New York Times*, May 19, 2020.

## **CHAPTER THREE: THE LISTENING CURE**

80 **Epley was just the person:** For more on Nicholas Epley’s fascinating research, please let me recommend his book *Mindwise: Why We Misunderstand What Others Think, Believe, Feel, and Want* (New York: Vintage, 2015).

81 **The key to starting:** For more on research into asking questions, let me recommend Alison Wood Brooks and Leslie K. John, “The Surprising Power of Questions,” *Harvard Business Review* 96, no. 3 (2018): 60–67; Karen Huang et al., “It Doesn’t Hurt to Ask: Question-Asking Increases Liking,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 113, no. 3 (2017): 430; Einav Hart, Eric M. VanEpps, and Maurice E. Schweitzer, “The (Better Than Expected) Consequences of Asking Sensitive Questions,” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 162 (2021): 136–54.

84 **“I had to sit with that”:** Epley wrote to me that some of the most powerful conversations after the second drunk-driving incident also occurred with his par-

ents. “It hit me like a sledgehammer during this time that I had the capacity to really ruin my life. I stopped drinking immediately . . . including all through college . . . and have not been drunk a single time since.”

86 **Psychology journals noted:** Rachel A. Ryskin et al., “Perspective-Taking in Comprehension, Production, and Memory: An Individual Differences Approach,” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 144, no. 5 (2015): 898.

86 **“perspective taking”:** Roderick M. Kramer and Todd L. Pittinsky, eds., *Restoring Trust in Organizations and Leaders: Enduring Challenges and Emerging Answers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

86 **“constitutes a vital skill”:** Sandra Pineda De Forsberg and Roland Reichenbach, *Conflict, Negotiation and Perspective Taking* (United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2021).

87 **psychology textbooks had it wrong:** Epley wrote that “I wouldn’t say that ‘perspective-getting’ ever struck any of us as particularly insightful. It seemed ridiculously obvious.”

88 **focused on perspective getting:** Tal Eyal, Mary Steffel, and Nicholas Epley, “Perspective Mistaking: Accurately Understanding the Mind of Another Requires Getting Perspective, Not Taking Perspective,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 114, no. 4 (2018): 547; Haotian Zhou, Elizabeth A. Majka, and Nicholas Epley, “Inferring Perspective Versus Getting Perspective: Underestimating the Value of Being in Another Person’s Shoe,” *Psychological Science* 28, no. 4 (2017): 482–93. Epley said that “By perspective-taking, you’re trying to imagine what’s on the mind of another person, trying to put yourself in their shoes and see things from their point of view. Perspective-getting is when you actually ask them what’s on their mind, and what their point of view is, and you just listen to what they have to say. When I use the term ‘perspective-taking’ scientifically, typically what I mean is what psychologists are asking people to do in an experiment—to take somebody’s perspective, imagine trying to see things from their point of view. It’s all in-your-head mental gymnastics. ‘Perspective-getting’ is asking them what they think about X, Y, or Z, and then listening to what they say. You’re getting their perspective from them. Those are two very different things.”

89 **a series of questions:** Some questions from the Fast Friends Procedure have been edited for brevity. The full list of thirty-six questions is:

1. Given the choice of anyone in the world, whom would you want as a dinner guest?
2. Would you like to be famous? In what way?
3. Before making a telephone call, do you ever rehearse what you are going to say? Why?
4. What would constitute a “perfect” day for you?
5. When did you last sing to yourself? To someone else?
6. If you were able to live to the age of ninety and retain either the mind or body of a thirty-year-old for the last sixty years of your life, which would you

want? 7. Do you have a secret hunch about how you will die? 8. Name three things you and your partner appear to have in common. 9. For what in your life do you feel most grateful? 10. If you could change anything about the way you were raised, what would it be? 11. Take four minutes and tell your partner your life story in as much detail as possible. 12. If you could wake up tomorrow having gained any one quality or ability, what would it be? 13. If a crystal ball could tell you the truth about yourself, your life, the future, or anything else, what would you want to know? 14. Is there something that you've dreamed of doing for a long time? Why haven't you done it? 15. What is the greatest accomplishment of your life? 16. What do you value most in a friendship? 17. What is your most treasured memory? 18. What is your most terrible memory? 19. If you knew that in one year you would die suddenly, would you change anything about the way you are now living? Why? 20. What does friendship mean to you? 21. What roles do love and affection play in your life? 22. Alternate sharing something you consider a positive characteristic of your partner. Share a total of five items. 23. How close and warm is your family? Do you feel your childhood was happier than most other people's? 24. How do you feel about your relationship with your mother? 25. Make three true "we" statements each. For instance, "We are both in this room feeling . . ." 26. Complete this sentence: "I wish I had someone with whom I could share . . ." 27. If you were going to become a close friend with your partner, please share what would be important for them to know. 28. Tell your partner what you like about them; be very honest this time, saying things that you might not say to someone you've just met. 29. Share with your partner an embarrassing moment in your life. 30. When did you last cry in front of another person? By yourself? 31. Tell your partner something that you like about them [already]. 32. What, if anything, is too serious to be joked about? 33. If you were to die this evening with no opportunity to communicate with anyone, what would you most regret not having told someone? Why haven't you told them yet? 34. Your house, containing everything you own, catches fire. After saving your loved ones and pets, you have time to safely make a final dash to save any one item. What would it be? Why? 35. Of all the people in your family, whose death would you find most disturbing? Why? 36. Share a personal problem and ask your partner's advice on how they might handle it. Also, ask your partner to reflect back to you how you seem to be feeling about the problem you have chosen.

**89 "a practical methodology":** Arthur Aron et al., "The Experimental Generation of Interpersonal Closeness: A Procedure and Some Preliminary Findings," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 23, no. 4 (1997): 363–77. As Arthur Aron noted in response to a fact-checking inquiry, students helped collect data in this experiment.

**89 "We have taken great care":** The full quote is "We have taken great care in matching partners. Based on our experience in previous research we expect that

you and your partner will like one another—that is, you have been matched with someone we expect you will like and who will like you.”

**91 if a question was likely:** These questions come from the first study in “The Experimental Generation of Interpersonal Closeness: A Procedure and Some Preliminary Findings,” which was focused on establishing small-talk conditions.

**91 reveal vulnerabilities:** It is worth noting that there are some downsides to revealing vulnerabilities. As Margaret Clark, a psychology professor at Yale, said: “In general, it’s absolutely correct that you are not going to get people being empathic or giving you the support that you need, unless you’re vulnerable and revealing your needs and feelings and so forth. People need that in order to provide support. I can be vulnerable with a friend who really cares about me. However, there are circumstances where it’s very unwise. The most obvious one is if the other person doesn’t care about you and could use that information to take advantage of you rather than support you. You’ve got to read if the other person cares for you correctly. In the early stage of a relationship, vulnerability is good, but revealing too much too soon can go wrong. There’s a pacing to it. In developing relationships, you do want to be vulnerable *and* you want to maintain some self-protection.”

**91 emotional contagion:** Kavadi Teja Sree, “Emotional Contagion in Teenagers and Women,” *International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Trends* 7, no. 2 (2021): 917–24.

**92 “10-week-old infants”:** Elaine Hatfield, John T. Cacioppo, and Richard L. Rapson, “Primitive Emotional Contagion” in *Emotion and Social Behavior*, ed. M. S. Clark (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1992), 151–77.

**93 In a separate experiment:** The one-at-a-time study mentioned in this section was not conducted by the Arons. In a fact-checking discussion, Arthur Aron clarified that subsequent experiments have revealed two things: First, one of the major factors influencing interpersonal closeness is whether someone believes the other person likes them. Second, responsiveness and reciprocity—rather than just self-disclosure—is the predominant factor in establishing a sense of closeness. “Feeling like your partner is responsive to you is a huge factor,” Aron told me.

**94 thirty-six questions are effective:** Arthur Aron wrote: “What we know today is that the key thing is that this provides an opportunity for each party to provide meaningful responsiveness.”

**94 “Reciprocity is nuanced”:** Professor Clark of Yale elaborated: “When my husband had a medical problem, a cousin of mine provided lots of support and didn’t talk about his own problems at all. A couple of years later, his wife got sick and he called me and was revealing what was going on and how upset he was.

And *then* I provided the reciprocal support—two years later. The rule is not reciprocity in the moment, it's being responsive to each other's needs, and that responsiveness going both ways."

94 **"they are more likely":** Jacqueline S. Smith, Victoria L. Brescoll, and Erin L. Thomas, "Constrained by Emotion: Women, Leadership, and Expressing Emotion in the Workplace," in *Handbook on Well-Being of Working Women* (Netherlands: Springer, 2016), 209–24.

96 **people tended to ask:** Huang et al., "It Doesn't Hurt to Ask," 430. In response to fact-checking questions, Michael Yeomans, one of the researchers on this study, said that the "paper was about follow-up questions—that build on topics that go deeper." For more on topic starters, please see Hart, VanEpps, and Schweitzer, "(Better Than Expected) Consequences of Asking Sensitive Questions," 136–54.

98 **"that's sometimes enough to get":** It's important to note that though deep questions can undermine some stereotypes, to rid workplaces of double standards requires sustained effort and examining structural causes of bias. Heilman stressed that simply teaching people to ask a certain kind of question, alone, is not enough. For more on how to undermine these prejudices and stereotypes, please see chapters 6 and 7.

98 **"Follow-ups are a signal":** Michael Yeomans is now affiliated with Imperial College London.

99 **a few specific questions:** These questions have been edited for brevity. The full list of questions can be found in Michael Kardas, Amit Kumar, and Nicholas Epley, "Overly Shallow?: Miscalibrated Expectations Create a Barrier to Deeper Conversation," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 122, no. 3 (2022): 367. For this version of the experiment, the questions included: 1. For what in your life do you feel most grateful? Tell the other participant about it. 2. If a crystal ball could tell you the truth about yourself, your life, your future, or anything else, what would you want to know? 3. Can you describe a time you cried in front of another person?

99 **Epley suspected:** Epley elaborated: "I think what our data suggests is that the runway up to the more meaningful questions can be a lot steeper than you'd guess. . . . Treat somebody as a close friend—that's kind of the heuristic that I take from our work."

99 **chance to test his theory:** Epley emphasized that "we design experiments to *test* hypotheses, not 'to show' or 'to prove' anything. Designing experiments 'to show' a result or 'to prove' a belief is what propaganda looks like. So, I would say, I wanted to test our theory, with data, that deeper conversations would be more positive than people expected." He also wrote that, although emotional contagion is one of the mechanisms making deep conversations powerful, there are other

mechanisms that may be even more impactful, “such as reciprocating trust in each other, which builds over time, while also really learning meaningful things about the other person through the content of the conversation. That’s what really builds connection.”

100 **Epley later reported:** Kardas, Kumar, and Epley, “Overly Shallow?,” 367.

101 **Dozens of other studies:** Huang et al., “It Doesn’t Hurt to Ask,” 430; Nora Cate Schaeffer and Stanley Presser, “The Science of Asking Questions,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 29, no. 1 (2003): 65–88; Norbert Schwarz et al., “The Psychology of Asking Questions,” *International Handbook of Survey Methodology* (2012): 18–34; Edward L. Baker and Roderick Gilkey, “Asking Better Questions—A Core Leadership Skill,” *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 26, no. 6 (2020): 632–33; Patti Williams, Gavan J. Fitzsimons, and Lauren G. Block, “When Consumers Do Not Recognize ‘Benign’ Intention Questions as Persuasion Attempts,” *Journal of Consumer Research* 31, no. 3 (2004): 540–50; Richard E. Petty, John T. Cacioppo, and Martin Heesacker, “Effects of Rhetorical Questions on Persuasion: A Cognitive Response Analysis,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 40, no. 3 (1981): 432.

101 **“questioners assumed”:** “The Case for Asking Sensitive Questions,” *Harvard Business Review*, November 24, 2020.

#### CHAPTER FOUR: HOW DO YOU HEAR EMOTIONS NO ONE SAYS ALOUD?

104 **“the man would take forever”:** In an email responding to fact-checking questions, Prady provided further detail: “Specifically it was that despite his mathematical genius (he was capable of doing things like converting from decimal to hexadecimal in his head), he was unable to process the phrase ‘quality of service.’ The formula for a tip is 15%–20% depending on ‘quality of service.’ Despite his mathematical prowess, he was unable to evaluate the *human* factor present in ‘quality of service.’ In fact, we once suggested he always tip 17½% and he pointed out that the odds that the service was *exactly middling* were infinitesimally small, and that 17½% would ensure he was nearly always over or under-tipping.”

105 **Computer programmers, they decided:** In response to a fact-checking inquiry, Prady explained, “The decision to not make them computer programmers was twofold. First, in the time that had passed since my time in the software industry, it had evolved from garage start-ups to big Microsoft-sized businesses, and we didn’t want the characters engaged in business. Second, the specific work of programming, which involves staring at screens and typing, is difficult to depict



on television and might be boring for the viewer.” Prady felt strongly that it should be emphasized that the vocation of programming, itself, is not boring, “Nothing could be further from the truth—programming is exhilarating.”

**105 be the kind of people:** For background on *The Big Bang Theory*, I am indebted to Jessica Radloff, *The Big Bang Theory: The Definitive, Inside Story of the Epic Hit Series* (New York: Grand Central Publishing, 2022); “There’s a Science to CBS’ *Big Bang Theory*,” *USA Today*, April 11, 2007; “Why the *Big Bang Theory* Stars Took Surprising Pay Cuts,” *Hollywood Reporter*, March 29, 2017; “TV Fact-Checker: Dropping Science on *The Big Bang Theory*,” *Wired*, September 22, 2011; Dave Goetsch, “Collaboration—Lessons from *The Big Bang Theory*,” *True WELLth*, podcast, June 4, 2019; “*The Big Bang Theory*: ‘We Didn’t Appreciate How Protective the Audience Would Feel About Our Guys,’” *Variety*, May 5, 2009; “Yes, It’s a *Big Bang*,” *Deseret Morning News*, September 22, 2007.

**106 “you have an entire lifetime”:** *The Big Bang Theory*, season 3, episode 1, “The Electric Can Opener Fluctuation,” aired September 21, 2009.

**107 “People’s emotions are rarely”:** Daniel Goleman, “Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More than IQ,” *Learning* 24, no. 6 (1996): 49–50.

**107 shot the pilot:** “*The Big Bang Theory* Creators Bill Prady and Chuck Lorre Discuss the Series—And the Pilot You Didn’t See,” *Entertainment Weekly*, September 23, 2022.

**107 Were the physicists innocent:** Prady said that “I think the audience was protective of [Sheldon and Leonard] and felt that the characters around them, especially Katie, represented danger for them. We were surprised at how protective test audiences were of Leonard and Sheldon.”

**108 Their body language:** Judith A. Hall, Terrence G. Horgan, and Nora A. Murphy, “Nonverbal Communication,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 70 (2019): 271–94; Albert Mehrabian, *Nonverbal Communication* (United Kingdom: Routledge, 2017); Robert G. Harper, Arthur N. Wiens, and Joseph D. Matarazzo, *Nonverbal Communication: The State of the Art* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978); Starkey Duncan, Jr., “Nonverbal Communication,” *Psychological Bulletin* 72, no. 2 (1969): 118; Michael Eaves and Dale G. Leathers, *Successful Nonverbal Communication: Principles and Applications* (United Kingdom: Routledge, 2017); Martin S. Remland, *Nonverbal Communication in Everyday Life* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2016); Jessica L. Tracy, Daniel Randles, and Conor M. Steckler, “The Nonverbal Communication of Emotions,” *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 3 (2015): 25–30.

**108 lulls us into ignoring:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, Professor Judith Hall of Northeastern University said that this process of “overlooking” nonverbal signals is complex, “as many nonverbal signals and leakages do penetrate, nonconsciously, into our brains. We might choose to ‘ignore’ something while the

cues have actually been registered at a nonconscious level. Then, of course, sometimes we do actually miss cues.”

**108 psychiatrist named Terence McGuire:** I interviewed Terence McGuire in 2017. He passed away in 2022, and as a result was not able to participate in fact-checking for this chapter. For fact-checking purposes, the contents of this chapter, as it applies to NASA and McGuire, were shared with NASA, which confirmed some details but declined to comment on specifics regarding candidate interviews, and with McGuire’s daughter, Bethany Sexton, who confirmed the details in this chapter, including the methods McGuire used in analyzing candidates. In addition, I spoke to numerous people who worked with McGuire, as well as people who have worked with NASA in screening astronaut applicants. I am also indebted to: “This Is How NASA Used to Hire Its Astronauts 20 Years Ago—And It Still Works Today,” Quartz, August 27, 2015; “The History of the Process Communication Model in Astronaut Selection,” SSCA, December, 2000; T. F. McGuire, *Astronauts: Reflections on Current Selection Methodology, Astronaut Personality, and the Space Station* (Houston: NASA, 1987); Terence McGuire, “PCM Under Cover,” Kahler Communications Oceania.

**109 had been relatively brief:** Soviet cosmonauts had done much longer missions.

**109 Reagan ordered NASA:** “History and Timeline of the ISS,” ISS National Laboratory.

**109 “advent of the space station”:** McGuire, *Astronauts*.

**109 “social intelligence that involves”:** Peter Salovey and John D. Mayer, “Emotional Intelligence,” *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* 9, no. 3 (1990): 185–211.

**110 had found that this despondency:** “It’s Not Rocket Science: The Importance of Psychology in Space Travel,” *The Independent*, February 17, 2021.

**110 mission control’s tone of voice:** Schirra had said, prior to this mission, that he intended to retire. In response to fact-checking inquiries, Andrew Chaikin, a historian of space travel, said, “The basic fact is that Schirra had a strong belief that during a flight the mission commander—that is, himself—was in charge, not mission control.”

**112 Robert Provine had started:** Robert R. Provine, *Laughter: A Scientific Investigation* (New York: Penguin, 2001); Chiara Mazzocconi, Ye Tian, and Jonathan Ginzburg, “What’s Your Laughter Doing There? A Taxonomy of the Pragmatic Functions of Laughter,” *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing* 13, no. 3 (2020): 1302–21; Robert R. Provine, “Laughing, Tickling, and the Evolution of Speech and Self,” *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 13, no. 6 (2004): 215–18; Chris-

topher Oveis et al., “Laughter Conveys Status,” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 65 (2016): 109–15; Michael J. Owren and Jo-Anne Bachorowski, “Reconsidering the Evolution of Nonlinguistic Communication: The Case of Laughter,” *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 27 (2003): 183–200; Jo-Anne Bachorowski and Michael J. Owren, “Not All Laughs Are Alike: Voiced but Not Unvoiced Laughter Readily Elicits Positive Affect,” *Psychological Science* 12, no. 3 (2001): 252–57; Robert R. Provine and Kenneth R. Fischer, “Laughing, Smiling, and Talking: Relation to Sleeping and Social Context in Humans,” *Ethology* 83, no. 4 (1989): 295–305.

112 **“naturally occurring human laughter”**: Robert R. Provine, “Laughter,” *American Scientist* 84, no. 1 (1996): 38–45.

113 **“immediate and involuntary”**: Provine, *Laughter: A Scientific Investigation*.

115 **tell when people felt aligned**: Gregory A. Bryant, “Evolution, Structure, and Functions of Human Laughter,” in *The Handbook of Communication Science and Biology* (United Kingdom: Routledge, 2020), 63–77. In response to fact-checking inquiries, Bryant said that “listeners could distinguish between friends laughing together and strangers laughing together. . . . I think it’s a reasonable speculation that people are detecting alignment in some sense, but technically the task was just to detect friends versus strangers. Our interpretation was more general, which is that friends are more aroused when engaged in conversation, reflected in their genuine laughter, as opposed to the lower arousal volitional laughter more common between strangers. Listeners are highly sensitive to it. I do like the idea that people are looking for evidence of attempts to connect.”

115 **“mood,” or what psychologists**: This use of words *mood* and *energy* in this context, though conforming to dictionary definitions, does not align perfectly with how those words are sometimes used by research psychologists. Lisa Feldman Barrett, a professor of psychology at Northeastern University, explained that “‘mood’ is described by two properties, valence and arousal. Mood is not a synonym for valence. We use ‘affect’ to mean properties of consciousness, whether or not a person is emotional. We use ‘affect’ as synonymous with ‘mood.’ Some scientists use ‘mood’ to refer to moments of feeling that are not emotions, which they define as not linked to events in the world. I think that is incorrect, because a brain is always processing internal sensations, which gives rise to . . . your feelings, in conjunction with sense data from the world.” For more on these topics, please see James A. Russell, “A Circumplex Model of Affect,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39, no. 6 (1980): 1161; James A. Russell and Lisa Feldman Barrett, “Core Affect, Prototypical Emotional Episodes, and Other Things Called Emotion: Dissecting the Elephant,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76, no. 5 (1999): 805; Elizabeth A. Kensinger, “Remembering Emotional Experiences:

The Contribution of Valence and Arousal,” *Reviews in the Neurosciences* 15, no. 4 (2004): 241–52; Elizabeth A. Kensinger and Suzanne Corkin, “Two Routes to Emotional Memory: Distinct Neural Processes for Valence and Arousal,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101, no. 9 (2004): 3310–15.

115 **feeling positive or negative:** While some psychologists use the words *positive* or *negative* in this context, Barrett argues that a more appropriate framing “is ‘pleasant-unpleasant’ . . . ‘Positive’ or ‘negative’ . . . can be descriptive (like *I feel good*) or it can be evaluative (like *it’s good that I feel this way*). . . . So it’s really ‘pleasant,’ ‘unpleasant.’”

116 **your brain has evolved:** Dacher Keltner et al., “Emotional Expression: Advances in Basic Emotion Theory,” *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 43 (2019): 133–60; Alan S. Cowen et al., “Mapping 24 Emotions Conveyed by Brief Human Vocalization,” *American Psychologist* 74, no. 6 (2019): 698; Emilian R. Simon-Thomas et al., “The Voice Conveys Specific Emotions: Evidence from Vocal Burst Displays,” *Emotion* 9, no. 6 (2009): 838; Ursula Hess and Agneta Fischer, “Emotional Mimicry as Social Regulation,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 17, no. 2 (2013): 142–57; Jean-Julien Aucouturier et al., “Covert Digital Manipulation of Vocal Emotion Alter Speakers’ Emotional States in a Congruent Direction,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113, no. 4 (2016): 948–53.

117 **match someone’s mood:** Barrett said that mirroring can be counterproductive if what your interlocutor needs is *instrumental support*: “I was trained as a therapist, like, a million years ago. But what a good communicator does is they figure out whether the person wants empathy, or they want instrumental support. If the person wants empathy, then you mirror them. If they want instrumental support, then you try to counteract what’s happening to them. . . . If I try to calm my daughter down when she just wants me to be empathic, it will be bad. On the other hand, if I’m empathic with her when she needs me to be instrumental, it might make things worse. . . . So a good communicator tries to figure out, do they want empathy or do they want an instrumental support? . . . In the lingo, we call it pacing and leading. When I was the therapist, I would pace the person first. I would actually match their breath, and then I’d slow my breath down and then they would slow theirs down. So first I would entrain them, and then I would manipulate my own signal and they would manipulate theirs too, because they’re already synced with me.”

120 **McGuire suspected:** It is worth noting that McGuire’s approach was informed by his interest in the “Process Communication Model,” which attempts to identify someone’s personality type by examining how they communicate. McGuire’s daughter, Bethany Sexton, in response to fact-checking inquiries, wrote that the approach described in this chapter “was something that Terry used not

only with the astronauts but throughout his practice for decades. Additionally he formed a very keen relationship with a colleague named Taibi Kahler, PhD. At the time Taibi was studying transactional analysis and had put together a psychological and behavioral model called process communication. When Terry learned of Dr. Kahler's work, they connected and became fast friends. Terry used Taibi's model in the analysis of the astronauts. . . . Terry felt the model was so powerful it enabled him to assess the astronauts in a matter of minutes based on their word choice, mannerisms and ways of expression."

123 **NASA selected the class:** "90-006: 1990 Astronaut Candidates Selected," NASA News; "Astronaut's Right Stuff Is Different Now," Associated Press, October 13, 1991.

124 **"I was so close":** Radloff, *Big Bang Theory*.

125 **"Significant improvement":** Some dialogue was excluded for brevity and appropriateness.

129 **"the audience went wild":** Radloff, *Big Bang Theory*.

129 **"characters you like":** "Emmy Watch: Critics' Picks," Associated Press, June 22, 2009.

## CHAPTER FIVE: CONNECTING AMID CONFLICT

132 **the lockdown was over:** Jeffcoat told me the lockdown was caused by an altercation near the campus, but not on it.

132 **daughters to a movie:** Earlier that year, a gunman in Aurora, Colorado, had opened fire in a theater, killing twelve people.

132 **a figure in the fight for gun control:** Jeffcoat prefers the term "gun safety" to "gun control."

133 **final season of *Lost*:** The final season of *Lost*, in case you were wondering, was great.

134 **Roughly half the nation:** Charles Duhigg, "The Real Roots of American Rage," *The Atlantic*, January/February, 2019; "Political Polarization," Pew Research Center, 2014.

134 **Roughly four in ten:** "Political Polarization and Media Habits," Pew Research Center, October 21, 2014.

134 **Over 80 percent:** Jeff Hayes, "Workplace Conflict and How Businesses Can Harness It to Thrive," *CPP Global Human Capital Report*, 2008.

134 **"Peace is not the absence":** This quote has also been attributed to Gandhi. Its original provenance, like many oft-quoted statements, is somewhat murky.

**135 event Jeffcoat had agreed:** The organizers of this project included Spaceship Media, Advance Local, Alabama Media Group, Essential Partners, journalists from various newspapers, and others.

**135 conduct an experiment:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, John Sarrouf of Essential Partners wrote, “I would say that the question at hand is whether we could sufficiently steep participants enough in a two-day dialogue experience and skill building to have them continue the conversation online for a month and keep the same kind of open and complex exchange that we were able to build in person.”

**135 the vast majority of Americans:** “The Vast Majority of Americans Support Universal Background Checks. Why Doesn’t Congress?” Harvard Kennedy School, 2016.

**135 Large majorities support bans:** “Polling Is Clear: Americans Want Gun Control,” *Vox*, June 1, 2022.

**135 “Everyone is so focused”:** Sarrouf clarified that he believes “there is a lack of trust of one another and . . . the language we have to discuss this issue pulls people further apart.” His hope was to “illustrate the power of structured, intentional communication to repair trust, build relationships on mutual understanding, and generate the resilience to forces of polarization needed for collective action.”

**136 Sheila Heen, a professor:** Heen is a coauthor of one of my favorite books on communication: *Difficult Conversations: How to Discuss What Matters Most* (New York: Penguin, 2010).

**138 “acknowledge the emotions”:** Heen elaborated that “the deeper problem is a relationship problem, spurred by how we each feel treated by the other. This involves feelings, to be sure, but the feelings are a symptom rather than the problem. . . . The deeper problem is how we feel treated by the other person. And that’s producing frustration, feeling alone or misunderstood and dismissed. . . . I think that for people who tend to say ‘you just shouldn’t be emotional’ they’re missing that actually it’s how you’re treating the other person that is the issue and possibly is a solution.”

**139 furious and sad and worried:** Heen added that it’s not just whether or not people in conflict admit their emotions, but also how they do so. “It could also be that they’re *both* saying that they’re furious and they’re both just blaming each other. They’re not getting to ‘okay, I’m listening, let me try to understand why you’re so mad.’”

**140 no less important goal:** Sarrouf described his goals this way: “Creating a space where what is invited from people is their deep listening, curiosity, desire to understand and be understood and experience a different way of engaging this

topic; and teaching participants communication skills.” Sarrouf also emphasized that all the organizers’ goals were explained to participants before the event began.

141 **“sense of psychological safety”**: Dotan R. Castro et al., “Mere Listening Effect on Creativity and the Mediating Role of Psychological Safety,” *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* 12, no. 4 (2018): 489.

142 **expose their emotions**: Sarrouf explained that while feelings are part of this dialogue, “my point is to get them to talk about reasons. I want to hear about their stories. I want to hear about the values that underlie their beliefs. And I want them to talk about the complexity of their beliefs. Emotions are just a part of what comes out when people talk about those. . . . I don’t want anybody to expose an emotion that they’re not comfortable exposing. What I want them to do is to tell us a story about themselves rather than having other people tell a story about them, which is what we do to each other when we’re in conflict. I have a story about you, and you have a story about me, and those stories are usually inaccurate. And this is an opportunity for you to re-author your own story.”

142 **looping for understanding**: I first learned about *looping for understanding* from the journalist Amanda Ripley in her wonderful book *High Conflict: Why We Get Trapped and How We Get Out* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2021). During the communication training in Washington, D.C., organizers did not refer to this technique as *looping for understanding*, or teach it as such, but rather taught a more general approach. Sarrouf explained that he calls his approach “full-spectrum listening” and that it is often used in “an exercise where four people get together. . . . You tell a story and three people are listening to you. One of them is listening for what happens, you know, the facts of what happened to you. The second person is listening for your values, and the things that you most care about in that story. . . . And the third person is listening [for] what emotions are coming through for you. . . . And then each of the three people listening reports back what they heard—and not just tell them whether they heard it right or not (although yes, there’s definitely a little bit of that). More of what they’re doing is actually learning from the three people who listened about themselves—things that they didn’t even know were true for them, but because people were listening so deeply to them on different channels for different things, they came away with new insights about their own experience. . . . If you can learn to listen to all of the different messages that people are sharing when they speak you can actually learn not just the facts about their lives, but what’s important to them, about what’s important in their lives, what relationships they had, what their emotional journey was like, their commitments, their dilemmas.”

143 **The goal is not to repeat**: G. Itzhakov, H. T. Reis, and N. Weinstein, “How to Foster Perceived Partner Responsiveness: High-Quality Listening Is Key,” *Social*

and *Personality Psychology Compass* 16, no. 1 (2021); Brant R. Burleson, “What Counts as Effective Emotional Support,” *Studies in Applied Interpersonal Communication* (2008): 207–27.

143 **“beginning of a conversation”**: The researchers in this paper were studying conversational receptiveness, of which techniques like looping for understanding can be considered a component, but not the totality of this approach. The full quote from this paper reads: “Using field data from a setting where conflict management is endemic to productivity, we show that conversational receptiveness at the beginning of a conversation forestalls conflict escalation at the end. Specifically, Wikipedia editors who write more receptive posts are less prone to receiving personal attacks from disagreeing editors.” Michael Yeomans et al., “Conversational Receptiveness: Improving Engagement with Opposing Views,” *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 160 (2020): 131–48.

145 **Heen teaches approaches**: Heen wrote, “I think that there are really three purposes for looping (or skillful active listening). 1. To help the talker better understand themselves (!). In a complicated conflict, I explain my perspective to you, but when you summarize it back to me, I often think, ‘Well, yeah, but there’s more to it for me. . . . It’s also that . . .’ So as the talker, my listener is helping me sort out a bunch of layers of why this matters to me and what my own interests and concerns and feelings are about it; 2. To help the listener better and more fully understand (I sometimes ask each side, ‘What do you think the other side doesn’t “get” about your perspective?’ and once explained, the listener actually says, ‘Oh, gosh, yeah, I didn’t get that part of it’); and 3. To let the talker *know* that the listener understands more fully—which also SHOWS the talker that the listener cares enough about the issue, and about the relationship, to work hard to get what’s most important to them. So looping is doing all of this work, which is why it can so dramatically change the dynamic when it is done—and reciprocated—with sincerity.”

145 **began in a curious way**: Sarrouf wrote, “What is described here is the first of three questions that were asked and responded to in the dialogue experience: 1. Could you tell us about a life experience you’ve had that has shaped your perspective or beliefs about firearms? 2. What’s at the heart of the matter when you think about the role of firearms in our nation? 3. In what ways do you experience mixed feelings or feel pulled in different directions on the issue? Where do you find some of your values bumping up against other values as you think about this issue? We have people go around the circle answering these questions and then we open up the conversation to have them ask people questions of genuine curiosity. The purpose of the questions of genuine curiosity is to deepen understanding, follow curiosity, invite nuance and complexity, not just clarity.”



149 **about 8 percent:** “How and Why Do American Couples Argue?” YouGov-America, June 1, 2022.

149 **when it finally occurred:** In response to fact-checking questions, Benjamin Karney wrote that “it is accurate that the associations between marital conflict, as observed in the lab, and concurrent marital satisfaction, change in marital satisfaction, and divorce, is significant but not that strong. That means that, on average, couples who experience more conflict are at higher risk for poorer marital outcomes, but that still leaves plenty of couples who fight a lot and are perfectly fine for long periods of time. Why? Because the quality of couples’ conflict is not the only thing that matters to their feelings about the relationship. It is just one element in an array of variables (including personality, family background, external stress, financial status) that also contribute to understanding how marriages succeed and fail.”

149 **found about similar issues:** Though it is generally true that couples argue about similar issues across demographics, there is research indicating that impoverished couples argue more about the stressors that accompany poverty, and that couples with specific problems—including medical or addiction issues—argue with greater frequency about those issues. Moreover, Karney emphasized that “a lot (virtually all) of this early work was conducted on relatively affluent, white couples. We are learning lots about conflict in recent years by expanding our focus beyond these samples, studying couples from lower-income neighborhoods. One finding: The way couples handle conflict is powerfully affected by factors that partners cannot control. Couples often cannot choose the sources of their disagreements, or the severity of them. It takes a lot of privilege to be able to choose the timing of your conflicts, and to have the time to process conflicts at all. We have also learned that teaching couples to have better conflicts is very hard to do, and that getting better . . . does not always improve relationships, especially when those relationships are challenged in other ways that the interventions do not touch. The wisdom of Integrative Behavioral Couples Therapy is not that it teaches self-control but that it encourages accepting your partner as a whole person with a history and limits.”

150 **Benjamin Karney, who:** Karney wrote, “My understanding of this literature is that there were significant differences between satisfied and distressed couples in how they approached [discussions about disagreements]. For one thing, distressed couples exchanged more negative behaviors with each other than satisfied couples did. For another thing, some research using a ‘talk table’ approach that separated the intent of each partner’s behavior from its impact found that satisfied and distressed couples did not differ in the intent behind their behaviors, but differed a lot in the impact of those behaviors. That is, in satisfied couples, intentions matched impact, but in distressed couples, intentions did not predict impact.”

**151 more in control:** It is important to note that control is just one factor that influences couples' conflict. Karney wrote, "There is a whole lot going on in couples' conflicts, and struggles over control are one slice. . . . It's not just one thing that is going on when couples disagree. . . . Conflict arises when each partner wants something different, so whenever there is conflict, each partner is trying to get the other person to change or compromise. You can call that control, or you can call that trying to get what you want."

**151 session taped by researchers:** Transcripts were shared with me on the condition that the identities of participants, as well as other specifics that might reveal identities such as the location of the conversations, remain confidential.

**155 "when everyone feels in control":** Stanley wrote, "If I get a couple to structure a bit, slow down, and get pretty behavioral about how they are talking with turn-taking and listening (and cutting out the swipes), people calm down fast and the good stuff comes out. A couple can get to enacting all the great good stuff."

**155 plenty of ugliness:** Quotes from the Facebook discussion throughout this chapter include both posts made on the private Facebook page devoted to this group, as well as direct messages that were shared with me by participants.

**155 called each other idiots:** Sarrouf wrote, "One of the flaws of the design was that we brought six times more people into the group who were never really trained or oriented to our work. . . . I think it became harder when people who did not have the experience came in. The people we did train used some of their skills to help others, but it was not the same."

**156 "models of curiosity":** "Dialogue Journalism: The Method," Spaceship Media; "Dialogue Journalism Toolkit," Spaceship Media.

**156 speak with civility:** Sarrouf wrote that moderators also worked to "re-emphasize the purpose of the engagement. So purpose is very important to us. We would remind people that purpose is to help understand one another, and to learn from each other, rather than to try to convince each other. That's a huge element of the work, so you'd step into reemphasize purpose. You'd step into re-emphasize some of the communication agreements that were laid out which are also there to support people and their purpose. And maybe some of the skills that we learn like, you know, listening to understand, speaking to be understood, asking what is a genuinely curious question. Let's remember to ask genuinely curious questions, rather than gotcha questions or rhetorical questions."

**156 struggles for control:** As this chapter notes, there were multiple dynamics, beyond struggles over control, that disrupted the online conversations. As Sarrouf wrote in response to fact-checking inquiries, these other factors included marginalization of some participants; instances when participants did not adhere

to communication agreements the group had struck; and other patterns that prevented an open and diverse conversation. He wrote: “The purpose is to create an equality of speaking, invite people to speak to the point, help people who are listening hang in there.”

159 **“hard to metabolize”**: Heen added that this process can take a long time, because “our own views shift over time, and as we integrate how the other person sees it into our own perspective, our own perspective changes.”

159 **“I am beginning to lose interest”**: This is an edited version of the entire quote, which reads, in its entirety: “I am beginning to lose interest in this group. There is nothing to talk about. Nobody is interested in changing their mind. You either believe in the most fundamental human right there is—the right to defend one’s self, family, community, and country—or you believe in the denial of that most fundamental right and the concentration of arms and monopolization of force in the hands of the political elite and their minions. I know that my mind is set on the issue, and that yours probably is too. That’s OK. I appreciate the civility here, but I guess in the end I will see you at the ballot box.”

159 **“I’ve used these skills”**: These quotes come from multiple polls conducted by Essential Partners.

160 **“used to be intolerant”**: Sarrouf wrote, “I think the thing to understand here is that it is less about some people rising above and others not, and more about building patterns and tendencies that make it more likely to choose to listen openly and ask honest questions than not. . . . I think we know and have known for a long time that we have tools and structures to help people talk about very difficult topics. . . . We learned that as people move to an online space with some good grounding training and awareness, communication agreements, good moderation, supportive journalists who contribute some balanced reporting, [and] a few people like Melanie and Jon who are really bought in, [then] you can make a better conversation.”

### **A GUIDE TO USING THESE IDEAS, PART III: EMOTIONAL CONVERSATIONS, IN LIFE AND ONLINE**

168 **Numerous studies have shown**: Tim Althoff, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Dan Jurafsky, “How to Ask for a Favor: A Case Study on the Success of Altruistic Requests,” *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* 8, no. 1 (2014): 12–21; Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al., “How Opinions Are Received by Online Communities: A Case Study on Amazon.com Helpfulness Votes,” *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web*, April 2009, 141–50; Justine Zhang et al., “Conversations Gone Awry: Detect-

ing Early Signs of Conversational Failure,” *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 1 (July 2018): 1350–61.

168 **When we criticize:** Zhang et al., “Conversations Gone Awry”; Justin Cheng, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Jure Leskovec, “Antisocial Behavior in Online Discussion Communities,” *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* 9, no. 1 (2015): 61–70; Justin Cheng, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Jure Leskovec, “How Community Feedback Shapes User Behavior,” *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* 8, no. 1 (2014): 41–50.

## CHAPTER SIX: OUR SOCIAL IDENTITIES SHAPE OUR WORLDS

175 **these drugs without question:** Dewesh Kumar et al., “Understanding the Phases of Vaccine Hesitancy During the COVID-19 Pandemic,” *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research* 11, no. 1 (2022): 1–5; Robert M. Jacobson, Jennifer L. St. Sauver, and Lila J. Finney Rutten, “Vaccine Hesitancy,” *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 90, no. 11 (2015): 1562–68. Charles Shey Wiysonge et al., “Vaccine Hesitancy in the Era of COVID-19: Could Lessons from the Past Help in Divining the Future?” *Human Vaccines and Immunotherapeutics* 18, no. 1 (2022): 1–3; Pru Hobson-West, “Understanding Vaccination Resistance: Moving Beyond Risk,” *Health, Risk and Society* 5, no. 3 (2003): 273–83; Jacquelyn H. Flaskerud, “Vaccine Hesitancy and Intransigence,” *Issues in Mental Health Nursing* 42, no. 12 (2021): 1147–50; Daniel L. Rosenfeld and A. Janet Tomiyama, “Jab My Arm, Not My Morality: Perceived Moral Reproach as a Barrier to COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake,” *Social Science and Medicine* 294 (2022): 114699.

175 **“social identities”** References to *social identity* as a monolithic concept sometimes overlook the impact various identities can have. For instance, someone’s race might have a much greater impact on their life than their gender, and so it is important to recognize that, while *social identity* is a useful term for capturing this concept, it, alone, is often not sufficient. Similarly, the concept of intersectionality, or “the interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage,” is an important component of understanding social identities, as further endnotes explain. For help in understanding these concepts, I am indebted to Kali D. Cyrus, MD MPH, an ABPN-certified psychiatrist and assistant professor at Johns Hopkins Medicine, who reviewed these chapters and offered suggestions to make them more robust and inclusive.

176 **“our membership in social groups”**: Joshua L. Miller and Ann Marie Gar-  
ran, *Racism in the United States: Implications for the Helping Professions* (New York:  
Springer Publishing, 2017).

176 **all of us have a social identity**: Michael Kalin and Nicholas Sambanis,  
“How to Think About Social Identity,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 21 (2018):  
239–57; Russell Spears, “Social Influence and Group Identity,” *Annual Review of*  
*Psychology* 72 (2021): 367–90.

176 **influence our thoughts**: Jim A. C. Everett, Nadira S. Faber, and Molly Crock-  
ett, “Preferences and Beliefs in Ingroup Favoritism,” *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuro-*  
*science* 9 (2015): 15; Matthew D. Lieberman, “Birds of a Feather Synchronize  
Together,” *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 22, no. 5 (2018): 371–72; Mina Cikara and  
Jay J. Van Bavel, “The Neuroscience of Intergroup Relations: An Integrative Re-  
view,” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 9, no. 3 (2014): 245–74; Thomas Muss-  
weiler and Galen V. Bodenhausen, “I Know You Are, but What Am I? Self-Evaluative  
Consequences of Judging In-Group and Out-Group Members,” *Journal of Person-*  
*ality and Social Psychology* 82, no. 1 (2002): 19.

176 **One famous experiment**: Muzafer Sherif, University of Oklahoma, and In-  
stitute of Group Relations, *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave*  
*Experiment*, vol. 10 (Norman, Okla.: University Book Exchange, 1961).

176 **Other experiments have demonstrated**: Jellie Sierksma, Mandy Spaltman,  
and Tessa A. M. Lansu, “Children Tell More Prosocial Lies in Favor of In-Group  
Than Out-Group Peers,” *Developmental Psychology* 55, no. 7 (2019): 1428; Sima  
Jannati et al., “In-Group Bias in Financial Markets” (2023), available at [https://  
ssrn.com/abstract=2884218](https://ssrn.com/abstract=2884218); David M. Bersoff, “Why Good People Sometimes Do  
Bad Things: Motivated Reasoning and Unethical Behavior,” *Personality and Social*  
*Psychology Bulletin* 25, no. 1 (1999): 28–39; Alexis C. Carpenter and Anne C.  
Krendl, “Are Eyewitness Accounts Biased? Evaluating False Memories for Crimes  
Involving In-Group or Out-Group Conflict,” *Social Neuroscience* 13, no. 1 (2018):  
74–93; Torun Lindholm and Sven-Åke Christianson, “Intergroup Biases and Eye-  
witness Testimony,” *The Journal of Social Psychology* 138, no. 6 (1998): 710–23.

176 **that intersect in complicated ways**: It is important to note that  
intersectionality—how someone is impacted by numerous identities that tran-  
scend binary pairings, and how those intersecting identities can expose people to  
increased discrimination and disadvantage—is an important component in un-  
derstanding the power of social identities. For more on this, please see the work  
of Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Patricia Hill Collins, Sirma Bilge, Arica L. Cole-  
man, Lisa Bowleg, Nira Yuval-Davis, Devon Carbado, and other scholars. I would  
particularly suggest the following works, which I found helpful: Sumi Cho, Kim-  
berlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall, “Toward a Field of Intersectionality

Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38, no. 4 (2013): 785–810; Ange-Marie Hancock, *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Edna A. Viruell-Fuentes, Patricia Y. Miranda, and Sawsan Abdulrahim, “More Than Culture: Structural Racism, Intersectionality Theory, and Immigrant Health,” *Social Science and Medicine* 75, no. 12 (2012): 2099–106; Devon W. Carbado et al., “Intersectionality: Mapping the Movements of a Theory,” *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 10, no. 2 (2013): 303–12.

176 **“exaggerate the differences”**: Saul Mcleod, “Social Identity Theory: Definition, History, Examples, and Facts,” *Simply Psychology*, April 14, 2023.

177 **whenever we talk**: Matthew D. Lieberman, “Social Cognitive Neuroscience: A Review of Core Processes,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 58 (2007): 259–89; Carolyn Parkinson and Thalia Wheatley, “The Repurposed Social Brain,” *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19, no. 3 (2015): 133–41; William Hirst and Gerald Echterhoff, “Remembering in Conversations: The Social Sharing and Reshaping of Memories,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 63 (2012): 55–79; Katherine D. Kinzler, “Language as a Social Cue,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 72 (2021): 241–64; Gregory M. Walton et al., “Mere Belonging: the Power of Social Connections,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 102, no. 3 (2012): 513.

178 **more influential than others**: It is useful to note how the power granted to some identities by society—what is sometimes referred to as privilege—can impact lives greatly. For more on this topic, let me recommend Allan G. Johnson, *Privilege, Power, and Difference* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2006); Devon W. Carbado, “Privilege,” in *Everyday Women’s and Gender Studies* by Ann Braithwaite and Catherine Orr (New York: Routledge, 2016), 141–46; Linda L. Black and David Stone, “Expanding the Definition of Privilege: the Concept of Social Privilege,” *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 33, no. 4 (2005): 243–55; and Kim Case, *Deconstructing Privilege* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

178 **“nearly one-fifth”**: Matt Motta et al., “Identifying the Prevalence, Correlates, and Policy Consequences of Anti-Vaccine Social Identity,” *Politics, Groups, and Identities* (2021): 1–15.

180 **In June of that year**: “CDC Museum COVID-19 Timeline,” Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, <https://www.cdc.gov/museum/timeline/covid19.html>.

180 **roughly 85 percent**: James E. K. Hildreth and Donald J. Alcendor, “Targeting COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in Minority Populations in the US: Implications for Herd Immunity,” *Vaccines* 9, no. 5 (2021): 489; Lea Skak Filtenborg Frederiksen et al., “The Long Road Toward COVID-19 Herd Immunity: Vaccine Platform

Technologies and Mass Immunization Strategies,” *Frontiers in Immunology* 11 (2020): 1817.

181 **“math was important”**: Claude M. Steele, *Whistling Vivaldi: How Stereotypes Affect Us and What We Can Do* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2011).

181 **As he later described**: Ibid.

181 **might be the instructors’ fault**: In response to a fact-checking email, Steele wrote that he eventually determined this discrepancy wasn’t due to implicit bias because “1) we got underperformance in our lab studies when there was no possibility of implicit bias since participants took the exams alone in a lab room and 2) when you remove stereotype threat, as we did in the critical conditions of these experiments, underperformance vanished completely, making it clear that in these experiments, at least, nothing but [stereotype threat] could have caused the underperformance since removing it totally eliminated all underperformance.”

182 **hobbled by social identities**: Steele wrote: “They are not so much worrying about their actual abilities as they are worried about how they will be judged and seen and about what that will mean for their futures.”

183 **For his experiment**: Steven J. Spencer, Claude M. Steele, and Diane M. Quinn, “Stereotype Threat and Women’s Math Performance,” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35, no. 1 (1999): 4–28.

183 **“because they were multitasking”**: Steele wrote: “We know now that they don’t underperform because they are overwhelmed, they underperform because they are trying too hard, they are multi-tasking, trying very hard to do well while they are also constantly monitoring how they are doing and worrying about how it all will affect their performance and the outcomes tied to that performance.”

183 **Black and white students**: Claude M. Steele and Joshua Aronson, “Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69, no. 5 (1995): 797.

184 **“white students did a lot better”**: In response to a fact-checking inquiry, Aronson, the coauthor on this study, said, “Black students did much better when they didn’t feel that they were being evaluated by the test, whereas it didn’t matter for white students and this is presumably because there’s not a stereotype operating.” Aronson cautioned about comparing the scores of Black and white test takers, and rather emphasized that “Black students were susceptible to being confronted with a stereotyping situation: they did worse when they were reminded of the stereotype in some way or when they thought the test was diagnosing their abilities.”

184 **hundreds of other studies**: Charlotte R. Pennington et al., “Twenty Years of Stereotype Threat Research: A Review of Psychological Mediators,” *PLOS One* 11,

no. 1 (2016): e0146487. Today, Steele is the Lucie Sterns Professor Emeritus in the Social Sciences at Stanford University. He previously served as provost at both Columbia University and UC Berkeley.

**184 a stereotype exists:** Steele wrote: “It’s not that women or Blacks think they have been assigned to their group by other people. Like men or whites they just know that that is their group. They don’t have to assume anything about bigoted people assigning them to it. They simply know that there are stereotypes about their group afoot in the broader society. That’s all it takes for them to feel threatened by the possibility of being judged or treated in terms of those stereotypes when they are in a situation or experiencing something consistent with the stereotype.”

**185 counteract stereotype threats:** An enormous amount of research has been done on how to fight stereotype threat, with many solutions proposed and tested. For more details, I would recommend chapter 9 of Claude Steele’s book *Whistling Vivaldi*.

**185 changed the protocol:** Dana M. Gresky, “Effects of Salient Multiple Identities on Women’s Performance Under Mathematics Stereotype Threat,” *Sex Roles* 53 (2005).

**190 Qaraqosh, Iraq:** Salma Mousa, “Building Social Cohesion Between Christians and Muslims Through Soccer in Post-ISIS Iraq,” *Science* 369, no. 6505 (2020): 866–70.

**190 Hundreds of Christians:** Richard Hall, “Iraqi Christians Are Slowly Returning to Their Homes, Wary of Their Neighbors,” Public Radio International (2017).

**190 assaulted Christian women:** “For Persecuted Christian Women, Violence Is Compounded by ‘Shaming,’” World Watch Monitor, March 8, 2019.

**190 “They know what they did”:** Hall, “Iraqi Christians Are Slowly Returning.”

**191 additional players would be Muslims:** In reply to a fact-checking email, Mousa clarified that, while it is accurate that three additional players would be Muslim, at the meeting people were told only that “in the interests of making sure that members of all communities participate in the leagues, we will be randomly adding players to your team, who may or may not be Christian.” Attendees, however, realized this likely meant the additional players would be Muslim.

**191 Salma Mousa:** Mousa was aided by a close collaboration with community leaders in Qaraqosh and a research manager, Rabie Zakaria. Mousa was a PhD student when this work was done. She is now an assistant professor of political science at Yale.

**191 contact hypothesis:** Thomas F. Pettigrew and Linda R. Tropp, “Allport’s Intergroup Contact Hypothesis: Its History and Influence,” in *On the Nature of Preju-*



*dice: Fifty Years After Allport* by John F. Dovidio, Peter Samuel Glick, and Laurie A. Rudman (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005): 262–77; Marilyn B. Brewer and N. Miller, “Beyond the Contact Hypothesis: Theoretical,” *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation* (Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press, 1984): 281; Yehuda Amir, “Contact Hypothesis in Ethnic Relations,” *Psychological Bulletin* 71, no. 5 (1969): 319; Elizabeth Levy Paluck, Seth A. Green, and Donald P. Green, “The Contact Hypothesis Re-Evaluated,” *Behavioural Public Policy* 3, no. 2 (2019): 129–58.

192 **When Mousa surveyed:** Mousa, “Building Social Cohesion,” 866–70.

193 **Muslim players told pollsters:** Salma Mousa, “Contact, Conflict, and Social Cohesion” (diss., Stanford University, 2020).

194 **old rivalries and grudges:** Mousa added another context that helped ensure equal footing: All the players on the teams, both Muslim and Christian, had been impacted by the ISIS militiamen. “The Muslims in the study were mostly from the Shabak Shia community, who were persecuted as heretics by ISIS. . . . So this wasn’t a ‘perpetrator vs. victim’ dynamic per se, but rather a case of deep distrust and prejudice toward Muslims who were seen as diluting the Christian character of Qaraqosh by slowly moving into the city, and being stereotypically less educated, poorer, and more conservative. The shared displacement experience did little to bond the two groups together. Instead, the occupation hardened in-group identities, distrust, and segregation.”

196 **more than two million:** “COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiological Update,” World Health Organization, February 23, 2021.

196 **persuading people:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, Rosenbloom said that “the goal of Boost Oregon is not to convince people to get the shots. It’s to help educate them to make a well-informed decision. Yes, we’re teaching people about why they’re good and why they’re safe, but . . . what we need to do is we need to help them to get their questions answered, without having an agenda, or else we’re dooming ourselves before we start.”

196 **motivational interviewing:** Jennifer Hettema, Julie Steele, and William R. Miller, “Motivational Interviewing,” *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 1 (2005): 91–111; William R. Miller and Gary S. Rose, “Toward a Theory of Motivational Interviewing,” *American Psychologist* 64, no. 6 (2009): 527; William R. Miller, “Motivational Interviewing: Research, Practice, and Puzzles,” *Addictive Behaviors* 21, no. 6 (1996): 835–42; W. R. Miller and S. Rollnick, *Motivational Interviewing: Helping People Change* (New York: Guilford Press, 2013).

196 **subtly guides the client:** Ken Resnicow and Fiona McMaster, “Motivational Interviewing: Moving from Why to How with Autonomy Support,” *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 9, no. 1 (2012): 1–9.

## CHAPTER SEVEN: HOW DO WE MAKE THE HARDEST CONVERSATIONS SAFER?

**200 The Problem Netflix Lives With:** There are a number of missteps one can make in writing about race and ethnicity, particularly when the author is, like myself, a heterosexual white man who has enjoyed numerous advantages and privileges. One risk is failing to see insights that would be obvious to other writers. To that end, in writing this chapter I spoke to scholars of racism, prejudice, and interracial communication who were generous with their time, many of them thinkers with lived experiences of exclusion. I was grateful for their insights and asked some of them to review this chapter and give me their thoughts and suggestions. In some instances, their contributions are included in the text, or detailed in these notes. It is also important to note that while different kinds of prejudice often have some commonalities, they should not be lumped together. Racism is distinct from sexism, and from homophobia. Every prejudice—and every instance of injustice—is, in its own way, unique. Finally, in choosing how to refer to sensitive topics in this and other chapters, including how to refer to specific ethnicities, I have tried to adhere to the standards of the Associated Press Stylebook.

**201 he said the n-word:** “At Netflix, Radical Transparency and Blunt Firings Unsettle the Ranks,” *The Wall Street Journal*, October 25, 2018.

**201 another thought:** It is important to note that statements that give offense might be blatant—such as using a racial slur—but they can also be much more subtle, which some scholars refer to as *microaggressions*. For more on this topic, please see Derald Wing Sue and Lisa Spanierman, *Microaggressions in Everyday Life* (Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley and Sons, 2020); Derald Wing Sue et al., “Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice,” *American Psychologist* 62, no. 4 (2007): 271; Derald Wing Sue, “Microaggressions: More Than Just Race,” *Psychology Today* 17 (2010); Anthony D. Ong and Anthony L. Burrow, “Microaggressions and Daily Experience: Depicting Life as It Is Lived,” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 12, no. 1 (2017).

**201 Reed Hastings:** Reed Hastings cofounded Netflix with Marc Randolph.

**202 the culture deck:** For my understanding of Netflix, I am indebted to many sources, including Reed Hastings’s book, written with Erin Meyer: *No Rules Rules: Netflix and the Culture of Reinvention* (New York: Penguin, 2020); Corinne Grinapol, *Reed Hastings and Netflix* (New York: Rosen, 2013); Patty McCord, “How Netflix Reinvented HR,” *Harvard Business Review* 92, no. 1 (2014): 71–76; James Morgan, “Netflix: Reed Hastings,” *Media Company Leader Presentations* 12 (2018); Bill Taylor, “How Coca-Cola, Netflix, and Amazon Learn from Failure,” *Harvard Business Review* 10 (2017); Kai-Ingo Voigt et al., “Entertainment on De-

mand: The Case of Netflix,” in *Business Model Pioneers: How Innovators Successfully Implement New Business Models* (Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2017): 127–41; Patty McCord, *Powerful: Building a Culture of Freedom and Responsibility* (San Francisco: Silicon Guild, 2018).

202 **Netflix would either match it:** In response to fact-checking questions, a representative for Netflix said this practice does not happen as often today, and that as the company has grown and become more sophisticated, the firm does a better job of setting salaries at industry standards without employees needing to solicit outside offers.

202 **A note was sent:** In response to fact-checking questions, a representative for the company said this happens less frequently today.

204 **Businessperson of the Year:** This award was bestowed in 2010.

204 **don’t seem particularly effective:** Evelyn R. Carter, Ivuoma N. Onyeador, and Neil A. Lewis, Jr., “Developing and Delivering Effective Anti-bias Training: Challenges and Recommendations,” *Behavioral Science and Policy* 6, no. 1 (2020): 57–70; Joanne Lipman, “How Diversity Training Infuriates Men and Fails Women,” *Time* 191, no. 4 (2018): 17–19; Peter Bregman, “Diversity Training Doesn’t Work,” *Harvard Business Review* 12 (2012); Frank Dobbin and Alexandra Kalev, “Why Doesn’t Diversity Training Work? The Challenge for Industry and Academia,” *Anthropology Now* 10, no. 2 (2018): 48–55; Hussain Alhejji et al., “Diversity Training Programme Outcomes: A Systematic Review,” *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (2016): 95–149; Gwendolyn M. Combs and Fred Luthans, “Diversity Training: Analysis of the Impact of Self-Efficacy,” *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (2007): 91–120; J. Belluz, “Companies Like Starbucks Love Anti-bias Training but It Doesn’t Work—And May Backfire,” *Vox* (2018); Dobbin and Kalev, “Why Doesn’t Diversity Training Work?” 48–55; Edward H. Chang et al., “The Mixed Effects of Online Diversity Training,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116, no. 16 (2019): 7778–83.

205 **team of researchers:** Elizabeth Levy Paluck et al., “Prejudice Reduction: Progress and Challenges,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 72 (2021): 533–60.

205 **A 2021 Harvard Business Review:** Francesca Gino and Katherine Coffman, “Unconscious Bias Training That Works,” *Harvard Business Review* 99, no. 5 (2021): 114–23.

205 **Another examination of three:** Frank Dobbin and Alexandra Kalev, “Why Diversity Programs Fail,” *Harvard Business Review* 94, no. 7 (2016): 14.

205 **“the likelihood that Black men and women”:** This quote comes from “Unconscious Bias Training That Works,” and is a summary of another study: Alexandra Kalev, Frank Dobbin, and Erin Kelly, “Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing

the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies,” *American Sociological Review* 71, no. 4 (2006): 589–617.

205 **2021 Annual Review of Psychology:** Elizabeth Levy Paluck et al., “Prejudice Reduction: Progress and Challenges,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 72 (2021): 533–60. It is worth noting that among the methods that seem consistently effective at reducing incidents of prejudice and biased attitudes is “face-to-face intergroup contact” and encouraging “interpersonal conversations over time,” as researchers wrote in the 2021 *Annual Review of Psychology*.

206 **seemed as if every one:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, Netflix said that not every single employee had heard about the incident and had formed an opinion.

207 **hadn’t worked hard enough:** A great deal of research suggests that these kinds of standards, whether formal or informally applied through employee norms and comments, can disproportionately disadvantage workers from minoritized backgrounds. For more on this, please see James R. Elliott and Ryan A. Smith, “Race, Gender, and Workplace Power,” *American Sociological Review* 69, no. 3 (2004): 365–86; Ashleigh Shelby Rosette, Geoffrey J. Leonardelli, and Katherine W. Phillips, “The White Standard: Racial Bias in Leader Categorization,” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93, no. 4 (2008): 758; Victor Ray, “A Theory of Racialized Organizations,” *American Sociological Review* 84, no. 1 (2019): 26–53; Alice Hendrickson Eagly and Linda Lorene Carli, *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth About How Women Become Leaders* (Boston: Harvard Business Press, 2007).

209 **Columbia and UC Berkeley:** Michael L. Slepian and Drew S. Jacoby-Senghor, “Identity Threats in Everyday Life: Distinguishing Belonging from Inclusion,” *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 12, no. 3 (2021): 392–406. In response to fact-checking inquiries, Slepian clarified that the question about tough conversations “was just one situation out of about 29 more that we talked about.”

210 **found there were lots of things:** Slepian noted that these results draw on multiple studies and papers.

211 **escape or fight back:** Sarah Townsend et al., “From ‘in the Air’ to ‘Under the Skin’: Cortisol Responses to Social Identity Threat,” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 37, no. 2 (2011): 151–64; Todd Lucas et al., “Perceived Discrimination, Racial Identity, and Multisystem Stress Response to Social Evaluative Threat Among African American Men and Women,” *Psychosomatic Medicine* 79, no. 3 (2017): 293; Daan Scheepers, Naomi Ellemers, and Nieska Sintemaartensdijk, “Suffering from the Possibility of Status Loss: Physiological Responses to Social Identity Threat in High Status Groups,” *European Journal of Social Psychology* 39, no. 6 (2009): 1075–92; Alyssa K. McGonagle and Janet L. Barnes-Farrell, “Chronic

Illness in the Workplace: Stigma, Identity Threat and Atrain,” *Stress and Health* 30, no. 4 (2014): 310–21; Sally S. Dickerson, “Emotional and Physiological Responses to Social-Evaluative Threat,” *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2, no. 3 (2008): 1362–78.

211 **“on multiple identities”**: Slepian noted that the advertisements recruiting participants for this study specifically sought people who had been made to feel they didn’t belong because of a social group, which likely resulted in a sample with an outsized experience of identity threat. It therefore follows that, for the population at large, the frequency of identity threat is likely smaller.

211 **identity threat**: Nyla R. Branscombe et al., “The Context and Content of Social Identity Threat,” *Social Identity: Context, Commitment, Content* (1999): 35–58; Claude M. Steele, Steven J. Spencer, and Joshua Aronson, “Contending with Group Image: The Psychology of Stereotype and Social Identity Threat,” in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Academic Press, 2002), 34:379–440; Katherine T. U. Emerson and Mary C. Murphy, “Identity Threat at Work: How Social Identity Threat and Situational Cues Contribute to Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the Workplace,” *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 20, no. 4 (2014): 508; Joshua Aronson and Matthew S. McGlone, “Stereotype and Social Identity Threat,” in *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination* (New York: Psychology Press, 2009); Naomi Ellemers, Russell Spears, and Bertjan Doosje, “Self and Social Identity,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 53, no. 1 (2002): 161–86.

212 **70 percent of participants**: In response to a fact-checking inquiry, Sanchez expanded upon her comments to note that, in her study, 80 to 90 percent of participants also said they expected important benefits from these conversations. Kiara Lynn Sanchez, “A Threatening Opportunity: Conversations About Race-Related Experiences Between Black and White Friends” (PhD diss., Stanford University, 2022).

213 **Robert Livingston**: Robert Livingston, *The Conversation: How Seeking and Speaking the Truth About Racism Can Radically Transform Individuals and Organizations* (New York: Currency, 2021).

213 **face-to-face**: Because of the pandemic, most of these conversations occurred via video conferencing.

213 **Black participants were invited**: It is useful to note that, in less formal settings, asking a Black friend to speak first about their experiences with racism might create barriers to connection. As Dr. Kali Cyrus wrote, in reviewing this chapter, sometimes a Black person is asked to share their trauma, and the “[person of color’s] experiences are put on display to be commented on, apologized for, or used in some way as an experience that is different or othered compared to

white people. . . [It is important to acknowledge] that it is not the responsibility of the Black or less privileged person to put themselves in tough conversations for the sake of unity! Because, typically, they must do this at baseline to succeed in a job or setting that is predominantly white. **HOWEVER**, there are some POC (like me), who are willing and emotionally able to participate.”

**214 prepared differently:** This is an edited version of the instructions. The full version reads: “A little later, you’ll have the chance to talk with [friend]. But first, we want to take some time to share some things that we have learned. We asked other people about their conversations about race with friends of different racial groups. We are sharing this with both you and [friend name].”

**214 easier to withstand:** Sanchez said that the goal was to “give people a framework for persevering. . . . The underlying theory is that discomfort can be helpful. So it’s not our goal to get rid of it, but rather help people see that it doesn’t have to be a barrier to meaningful conversations or relationships.”

**215 just three minutes:** Sanchez noted that, for the experimental versus control group, “there was no statistical difference between conditions in how long the conversation was. We also have no evidence yet that the content of the conversation was deeper or more vulnerable. In general, what we’ve been finding is that the conversation actually went pretty well in both conditions. Both friends reported having a positive experience, feeling engaged, and authentic in the conversation. And we haven’t yet detected significant differences in the content of the conversation.”

**216 “I can’t forget”:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, Sanchez wrote that what this Black participant is “discussing is his internal conflict about being a Black man in a white place and on one hand forgetting that sometimes, but very often being reminded of it and balancing those two experiences. [Such complexity] highlights the nature of these conversations and interracial relationships in general.”

**216 tallied their data:** Kiara Lynn Sanchez, “A Threatening Opportunity: Conversations About Race-Related Experiences Between Black and White Friends” (PhD diss., Stanford University, 2022).

**216 could be more authentic:** Sanchez wrote that the strongest outcomes occurred immediately after the conversations, when “both friends experienced a boost in feelings of closeness (from before the conversation to immediately afterward). In addition, a few months later, Black friends felt more comfortable talking with their white friends about race, and more authentic in that relationship.” She continued in response to further fact-checking inquiries: “The immediate outcomes were across both conditions, regardless of whether they got there with training, but the training had a unique benefit on Black friends’ authenticity’ and

‘closeness’ over time—this is the long-term benefit. Immediately everyone increased in ‘authenticity’ and ‘closeness’ across conditions. In the long term, Black friends in the training condition increased in ‘closeness’ and ‘authenticity.’ So just having the conversation was helpful, but in order to see long term benefits, the training was really helpful for Black friends.”

**217 prepare for discomfort:** It is important to note the difference between preparing for discomfort and fixating on it. As Dr. Kali Cyrus noted, fixation can contribute to confirmation bias.

**218 out of the conversation:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, Sanchez wrote that “identity threat emerges often without anybody ‘doing’ anything. Just talking to somebody from a different group can trigger worries that that person might see you through the lens of a stereotype (before they say a thing!). . . . There is something to be said about the power of sharing personal experiences and perspectives, but I wouldn’t say that avoiding generalizations is a surefire way to decrease another person’s identity threat.”

**219 “that’s enough”:** In response to fact-checking inquiries, Myers expanded on this statement: “One has to be actively anti-racist which means that as individuals and as a company we had to first recognize and understand our own unconscious biases and their unintended impact on our colleagues and the business.”

**219 Massachusetts attorney general:** Netflix clarified that at the AG’s office, Myers’s remit was “to increase diversity and retention within the AG’s office, sexual harassment and anti-discrimination training and enhance outreach and engagement to underserved communities in the Commonwealth, as well as advising the AG and his leadership staff.”

**219 culture deck proclaimed:** Hastings and Meyer, *No Rules Rules*.

**220 conducting employee workshops:** Myers noted that her team “came in to create a long-term strategic change process which meant we worked with our HR partners and leaders within business units to shape these strategies. Doing workshops and conversations was just part of the strategy.”

**221 acknowledged, up front:** Myers said that “most of the work is about awareness of yourself, your culture, and the culture of others and understanding how your identity, experience and culture shape your world view, your relationships and behavior and your judgments. Also learning to recognize your biases and how to check them, to notice who we might be excluding or including (consciously and unconsciously) and why, so that we can each do our job of creating an inclusive and respectful environment.”

**221 sting of exclusion:** It is worth noting that although we can all recognize the sting of exclusion, that does not mean we have all experienced exclusion equally.

Some exclusion hurts more than others, and some people, because of their social identities, experience exclusion more often, and in different ways, than others.

**221 help us empathize:** Myers wrote that “it was important for people to see that it is not just the people of color or women who have identities, everyone does, and that diversity is something that exists within all of us, since we all have multiple identities and experiences that makes each of us quite unique as individuals. However, in many corporate spaces, there is a dominance of certain identities due to historical exclusion and racism and sexism, and they become the norm by which everything is shaped and judged. . . . It’s not enough to bring in people who are different than the norm, we have to create an environment where they are respected and reflected in our teams, ways of working, language, policies, etc. . . . At all times the work is multi-faceted to create change on four levels: The personal level (how people think, believe, feel), the interpersonal level (people’s behaviors and relationships), the organizational level (policies and practices) and the cultural level (what is seen as right, beautiful, true).”

**222 describe a time:** Myers wrote that these conversations were designed to draw out comments “not only about race; it was usually about difference, any kind of difference and how they reacted to that difference. Race came up a lot but it could have been gender, disability, income, sexual orientation, accent, language, etc.”

**224 weren’t as risky:** Myers wrote that “for some people these conversations are difficult and will never feel safe. In some cases, we changed content to address concerns.” Not everyone, she noted, felt safe and comfortable.

**224 kinds of questions:** These kinds of questions can be uncomfortable, so the company had norms for when the discomfort became too much. “When someone doesn’t feel comfortable discussing something about themselves or about an issue related to one or more of their identities, we encourage them to let their colleague know that they don’t want to have that conversation,” said Toni Harris Quinerly, Netflix’s director of inclusion strategy. “As an Inclusion Team, we work hard to normalize this kind of boundary setting, so that people feel more comfortable communicating when they do and don’t want to discuss something, and so that people on the receiving end are more likely to honor and respect those boundaries. This includes letting people know that there are multiple ways to learn about experiences you don’t fully understand (e.g. finding related articles/books and/or seeking insights from other people or allies who may have knowledge or perspectives on that issue).”

**225 “If the first lesson”:** Greg Walton, in response to fact-checking inquiries, specified that the goal of an exercise like this is not creating comfort for people who already have power, but rather creating atmospheres where people can re-



flect on themselves and society, and hear others' perspectives. The focus is on finding "trainings [that] can facilitate more positive and less biased behavior." Walton, in an interview, told me that "we have to create space in the culture for people who are imperfect. We can't just have a 'gotcha' culture. The goal is to take people who are imperfect and make them into allies, rather than enemies."

225 **every Netflix employee:** Vernā Myers, "Inclusion Takes Root at Netflix: Our First Report," Netflix.com, January 13, 2021.

226 **Netflix released data:** Vernā Myers, "Our Progress on Inclusion: 2021 Update," Netflix.com, February 10, 2022.

226 **Half of Netflix's:** These figures reflect 2022 demographics.

226 **compared Netflix:** Stacy L. Smith et al., "Inclusion in Netflix Original U.S. Scripted Series and Films," *Indicator* 46 (2021): 50–56.

227 **a small number:** It is unclear exactly how many employees participated in these demonstrations. Reporters on-site estimated the number at less than two dozen. Some employees also stopped working at noon to protest the Chappelle special.

229 **Real change requires shifts:** In reply to a fact-checking email, Netflix said, "Netflix is trying to entertain the world and believes that DEI can help accomplish that goal; so it isn't just about social good and each of us learning to work respectfully with each other and take advantage of our differences, but how this will enable all of us and the business to thrive." Myers added: "Increasing representation and applying an inclusion lens to everything we do helps us to innovate and be creative. It also helps us to tell authentic and new stories that haven't been told before, [and] see and give a platform to talent that has been excluded in the past. . . . This is good for the business, and it's really good for our members and members to be."

229 **"it's the first step":** Myers stepped down from her position at Netflix in September, 2023, after five years with the company. She remains an advisor to Netflix, and was succeeded by Wade Davis.

## AFTERWORD

237 **consider his matter:** For my understanding of this study, I am indebted to: Robert Waldinger and Marc M. D. Schulz, *The Good Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2023); George E. Vaillant, *Triumphs of Experience* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012); George E. Vaillant, *Adaptation to Life* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995); John F. Mitchell, "Aging Well: Surprising Guideposts to a Happier Life from the Landmark Harvard Study of Adult

Development,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 161, no. 1 (2004): 178–79; Christopher Peterson, Martin E. Seligman, and George E. Vaillant, “Pessimistic Explanatory Style Is a Risk Factor for Physical Illness: A Thirty-Five-Year Longitudinal Study,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 55, no. 1 (1988): 23; Clark Wright Heath, *What People Are; a Study of Normal Young Men* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945); Robert C. Intrieri, “Through the Lens of Time: Eight Decades of the Harvard Grant Study,” *PsycCRITIQUES* 58 (2013); Robert Waldinger, “Harvard Study of Adult Development” (2017).

**238 Godfrey Camille:** The researchers in this project, when they have published case studies, have always referred to participants with pseudonyms and have altered biographical details to preserve confidentiality. The information included here relies upon those published reports, and thus includes names and details altered by the researchers. However, whenever possible, I have supplemented my understanding by interviewing those and other researchers, and consulting publications, both published and unpublished, to ensure accuracy.

**243 himself thinking about:** The wording of the question was: “Please use the last page(s) to answer all the questions we should have asked, if we’d asked about the things that matter most to you.”

**245 one paper published:** Julianne Holt-Lunstad, “Why Social Relationships Are Important for Physical Health: A Systems Approach to Understanding and Modifying Risk and Protection,” *Annual Review of Psychology* 69 (2018): 437–58.

**245 the researchers wrote:** Yang Claire Yang et al., “Social Relationships and Physiological Determinants of Longevity Across the Human Life Span,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113, no. 3 (2016): 578–83.