Meeting notes and shared resources for the SoBA Lab Meeting on Social Equality
9th June 2021

Moving Forwards

- If you do not know someone's pronouns, or they don't make them visible, we should default to they/them/their
- If you want your pronoun to be known, make it visible on Slack and/or Zoom and/or other platforms. You can also email out to Emily with your pronouns if we decide to make pronouns visible on the website.

Synopsis of the meeting.

Pronouns

The suggestion was made that by putting our pronouns visible (e.g., on our Zoom names, on our websites) we are normalising talking about pronouns. We are also making space for trans and other individuals to feel comfortable verbalising their pronouns. This developed into a deep discussion around:

- Should we do this publicly (e.g., on the website) or just internally (within zoom)
- Is it something which should be private, or public?
- Are there issues around assumptions observers of the public page would make, and is there a political statement involved in choosing to display or not display pronouns? Are there concerns about allyship?
- The safety of publicly displaying pronouns, and how it might be better to do it privately first (e.g., via zoom).
- The flexibility of pronouns, and how they may change (and we should be accepting of that)
- What the "default" pronoun is - how we assume (due to language and social norms that it is he/she but actually our baseline should perhaps be "they/them"?)
- Use they/them/their unless someone makes it clear otherwise. Having a default would remove uncertainty as the onus of making pronouns known is often put on the individual themselves.

Diversity in Research

We spoke about the privileges of researchers, and how we can make our research more accessible, representative, and less driven by the "WEIRD"! Historically, academia has marginalised under-represented communities and enforced problematic and harmful views.

- How can we contribute as researchers? Think about representation in our samples. Should we be changing/modifying our research methodologies? What about qualitative research? Collaborations with other labs? Renting out rooms to test participants in that are more accessible? Beyond practicing qualitative methods for a more inclusive research, we can also address your biases in our papers, address the inclusivity limitations of our sample(s) and address our population accurately to what it represents. We can follow up on our findings, studying them with different populations and open room for discussion about findings within the settings of race, gender, culture, etc.

- How can we make the voices of the participants known, and really give them a platform to inform research and its directions? How can we have more diverse representation without adding to the burden of the underrepresented? How can we amplify voices without taking up the working time of diverse individuals? (e.g., giving them more tasks, putting them on committees which don't have results, and taking time from their work). How can we have more POC and disabled individuals on committees (editing, in universities…)?

- Speaking about how the Psychology Department at Glasgow lacks accessibility - no ramps or lifts to facilitate participation of the disabled.

- What can supervisors do to support their students and amplify their voices? Support careers, and provide facilities. We all should be aware of systemic issues, in addition to our own individual biases.

- The concept of "authenticity" - how can we be authentic to our true self without feeling uncomfortable/unsafe? Our image of research is influenced by who we are exposed to, and surround ourselves with. So it is comforting to see the range of individuals being authentic within the lab.

- Spoke honestly about past mistakes, and the importance of speaking out against injustices we see. But also about how we should listen to, read about, and amplify the voices of others. This could be by actively seeking out one group to focus on, or trying to cast the net widely in terms of who we follow and surround ourselves with.

Resources and contributions by lab members on Slack before the meeting.

Resources

Racial Inequality

https://news.stanford.edu/2020/06/24/psychological-research-racism-problem-stanford-scholar-says/

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1745691620927709

Gender/social justice within academia

"Transforming the Ivory Tower"

Critical Race Theory.

https://sobots.slack.com/files/UCD12L2CC/F023VRWNJ3C/crt_raceinamerica.pdf

Micro-aggressions

https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-the-american-philosophical-association/article/how-to-take-offense-responding-to-microaggression/D99C6911798EE6702072C4115066DF57

Pronouns

https://twitter.com/sabahzero/status/1400077034760642560?s=21

https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2018/09/19/why-asking-students-their-preferred-pronoun-not-good-idea-opinion

https://www.mypronouns.org/sharing

Under-representation/privilege/euro-centric views

https://unherd.com/2021/05/what-oxford-taught-me-about-posh-people/?utm_source=pocket-newtab-global-en-GB

Understanding Eurocentrism as a Structural Problem of Undone Science

https://www.nature.com/articles/537450a

How to listen with intention

https://www.amazon.co.uk/dp/B08B5QRV5X/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1

Contributions

Emily

My contribution for possible reading/consideration/discussion is this pair of articles published a week or so ago in the Economist - really really interesting perspectives on Critical Race Theory, a term that I heard bandied around a lot, but didn't understand well. I guess my biggest takeaway from these articles is that it's freaking complicated (how could it be otherwise?) and CRT has unwelcome and unhelpful aspects I know I didn't fully understand or appreciate before. https://sobots.slack.com/files/UCD12L2CC/F023VRWNJ3C/crt_raceinamerica.pdf

Te-Yi

My contribution for the equality discussion is this article about racial inequality issue in the current psychological field:

https://news.stanford.edu/2020/06/24/psychological-research-racism-problem-stanford-scholar-says/

I always feel very lucky to be able to work in the lab that embrace diversity, but meanwhile, I appreciate that the status quo of racial equality issue in science might be unsatisfactory, and more systematic changes are required to alter the inequality status in science/the world…The paper that this article is based on is a good read as well (if you have the time~):

Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. Perspectives on psychological science, 15(6), 1295-1309. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1745691620927709

Katie

My contribution - There are a couple of things I've noticed within the past few months, but have been ongoing really…

1. **As a lab, I wonder if & how we should find a way to make our preferred pronouns known?**

    · I realised a quite a while ago that I do not know what everyone's preferred pronouns are (e.g.. she, he, they…).

    · I once made an error as a result, and it sticks with me to this day. (Although, it makes me more mindful of assuming someone's pronouns…, which is a good thing I guess!)

    · I haven't known how to bring this up, and whether it is my place to announce someone else's pronoun. Or whether it's okay (if someone uses the wrong pronoun for someone) to correct them. I'd love to discuss this topic more!

2. **I wonder if we could do more as a lab to make our presentations more inclusive.**

· At the moment it feels like we sometimes race through out presentations (without being mindful of our audience and their knowledge/needs).

· I wonder how we can create an atmosphere where people do feel more comfortable to speak up if something isn't right (e.g. the font is hard to read, or the person is presenting at a pace which is a bit quick).

· I think the problem stems from not knowing each other's needs, the weirdness of video conferencing, and rushing to complete talks within a short time.

· I appreciate we are all learning, and strapped for time, but even a minute at the start could help - e.g. "This font Ok? This colour-scheme read-able? I have this many slides, does that sound alright? Please do x if you have a problem. I will take breaks after x number of slides to answer Qs". **(It would be great to think about what else would be helpful!)**

Aside - I recently did an "Inclusive Practice" lecture (and a LinkedIn learning course) as part of recent teaching and it was SUPER INSIGHTFUL. lots of knowledge about different needs, and the different tools/methods that can help. **Perhaps as a lab, we should encourage people to take part in short training like this?** I knowwwwwww it takes time, but in addition to allowing people to better understand our work, it improves how we present ourselves to the public and scientific community in general.

Although training is great, this is probably something we should regularly check in on really… rather than a one off event then return to business as usual. Perhaps we need an "Inclusivity Officer" in the lab (incase things do slide) or similar! ooH! haha But saying that though, we should make this a priority as individuals really. As everything we do is working towards presenting our work (words, verbally, wherever!)!

Emily

A perennially timely topic- just read this tweet thread this morning -https://twitter.com/sabahzero/status/1400077034760642560?s=21 [about pronouns]

Nate

Hi Katie - this is something I have been thinking about lately - and also the topic of my contribution which I will add here. Keen to discuss more at lab meeting. Complexity seems to be a common challenge/barrier for most issues concerning inclusion - what is 'best practice' seems to change as our understanding of the issues change (which I am sure is a good thing). Also, what is considered best practice for one stakeholder may be interpreted as destructive or hurtful for another. I'm sure I've always known this, but implicitly, I think I have also fallen into the trap of over-generalising the lived experiences of individuals (who I personally respect) as representing all, or at least most, from their respective communities. Recently, I watched a transaction unfold

on Twitter between two well-respected academics on the issue of pronoun sharing. Both, as far as I could tell, were/are passionate about promoting the wellbeing of the LGBTQIA+ community. However, they did not share each others' views on this particular issue - although their motivations were otherwise aligned - and the conversation became hurtful. It made me appreciate the complexity of the issue, how little I knew, and how difficult it can be to talk about these issues - especially for those personally impacted. I want to understand the arguments for an against pronoun sharing a little (a lot) more. I've been thinking about this more ahead of the upcoming teaching semester. Uni creates the unique context where a diverse collection of strangers are forced to work and learn together, and learning requires individuals to be vulnerable when sharing opinions or asking questions.

Here is a blog piece that raises concerns with making "state your pronoun" practices in get-to-know you sessions in class problematic (https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2018/09/19/why-asking-students-their-preferred-pronoun-not-good-idea-opinion). Others (and this is the main argument I have been exposed to until now) have argued that we should make pronoun-sharing common-practice so that there is no longer a need to ask or assume. I.e., normalise sharing by sharing your own - which seems to make sense to me (https://www.mypronouns.org/sharing).

There are other arguments however against the normalisation of pronoun sharing - most notably highlighting the danger to personal safety that this might pose to those who are not "out" yet - but then I guess that still provides the individual with the choice and context to choose their pronouns - whether it be a choice rooted in their identity, or current need for safety. I'm keen to discuss this more - and be directed to other data/arguments/suggestions or personal experiences.

Maki

I hope mine isn't totally off the mark… but I am lately realising that I have been in denial about prejudice or unconscious/unintentional bias which I have been receiving or at least perceiving in my life in the UK so far. It's not nice or cool, even just to think one is on the receiving end of these things, has been my attitude so far. But I actually think I need to process these things so that I can take part more fully and meaningfully in our stride for social equality. The attached article is written by someone whom our society may consider an unlikely person to go to university. It resonates with a surprising and shocking acuity with my experience of attending a British university many years ago, as a foreigner who even had trouble asking for a glass of water (because the English consonants, 'l' and 'r' are not in our sound system in Japanese, so back in those days, I couldn't even tell if people were saying grass or glass!).

https://unherd.com/2021/05/what-oxford-taught-me-about-posh-people/?utm_source=pocket-newtab-global-en-GB

The critical tone towards so-called 'posh' people in the article hit me as my own issue suddenly and I had to think what I wanted to do about it. I did sense back then that people struggled to accept someone like me could attend a university. Unlike the author in the article, when I received a first class degree, I tried hiding it for fear of being provocative, but deep down, yes, I did feel like I proved them wrong. These are powerful feelings which can carry all things that are more likely to divide rather than unite people.

My current thought is that it's important to face one's own bitterness from the past and try not to carry over biases received/perceived in the past to new people and make assumptions based on their social, cultural or racial aspects. Otherwise, such mental states are the vehicle of hostility. So here, I am just sharing my realisation that I am not clean or innocent myself but also my hope that this is a meaningful start.

I recently received this card from one of my kids (I think the message was a random choice by her!)- it's not always easy to be or to feel different. A society which is trying to address social equality needs people striving to do things to change them. It's equally important that there is receptiveness in our society. I think such readiness may include strength and confidence in ourselves and in our society that we will/should be accepted and respected as we are.

Jean-Noel

I have a few things really. Not to sound egregious but a lot of what is mentioned on our social equality statement applies to me and I feel I have valuable insight for the session! It brings comfort knowing that I am a part of a lab who is making a conscious effort to have these discussions. As I have said before, I truly feel welcomed in this lab and I feel like my place is equally valued and thought of as others, but to have the conversations on these things rather than to assume that my peers understand me and my communities' experiences, both positive and negative, is so important and greatly appreciated!

1. It has been a really weird year for me but I have grown a lot as an individual. The growth has been enlightening in some ways as I have received a diagnosis for ADHD and Ehlers Danlos Syndrome, but still painful because these are things I've struggled with my whole life. To now have these recognised is bittersweet because I now know that I am not making things up and that is validating. However, it does hurt knowing what I have gone through and how much I didn't have to suffer through if I was believed and listened to in the first instance, or that teachers were able to see my difficulties not as a character flaw, like me being lazy or mindless, but that I am working with a mental and physical condition. I am guilty of this myself but conscious effort to listen to the individual and to not make assumptions on value/intent based on how much they're working, the amount of work they're able to put out, what time they're in the office, etc etc is important. Whilst it might not be visible they may be struggling with something, a diagnosis should not be the criteria for which we believe and give grace for others!

2. From the above I have had to reconcile what it means for me to be Black in academia and how I would like to make this profession meaningful and effect more tangible, positive change. I think after last summer I felt passionate about pursuing efforts that were more direct in action to help those of marginalised communities. However, I know that the position I am in is incredibly privileged and I can do just as much work from where I am and where I will go. Without rambling, Deborah Gabriel writes two books about her experience as a Black woman in academia, with her most recent one "Transforming the Ivory Tower" a relevant read for this lab as it discusses the issues with gender and social justice within academia and how this should be tackled. Not all of it is relevant but I would suggest the read, as she also talks about how she has been able to make change within her remit as a mentor and a science teacher.

3. The make-up of academia won't change tomorrow, but many things can still be done now! For example, I think it's important to note that whilst addressing the homogenous nature of participant pools is important, it is not sufficient on its own – some attention should be drawn to researchers themselves. Because of this I've grown a large amount of respect for qualitative psychology. I know in quant, we operate on the idea of being objective and setting up a study to reduce the influence of ourselves, the space, and the participants in order to measure the subject of interest. However I don't think it's great science if we don't acknowledge the researcher and who they are – the researcher's experiences, biases, knowledge etc will influence what questions they ask, how it will be asked, what literature will be looked at, how it will be presented, and so on. Coupled with the fact that not everyone has access to that level of education or position, there is a lack of diversity in the people who are in this position to be asking the questions and conducting the studies. Ideally it wouldn't influence the research but in the interest of open science, surely that information is important?

I raise this because in an upcoming conference, researchers put forward questions that are important for the field and society at-large, and I saw things like 'how do we improve moral behaviour using robots'. My first thought is that this dangerous because morality is a non-universal, subjective and malleable concept that is applied depending on the person and the situation. This would lead to questionable results and interpretations if (valuable) efforts were made to increase BIPOC representation in studies as opposed to mostly WEIRD participants, but also, questions like this are put forward and answered by mostly Western, White, cis straight males. Not an inherently bad thing, but the experiences of those in these positions aren't universal. Research labs that are diverse and collaborate with others internationally are great for this, but I think that qualitative psychology's effort to account for the researcher within the context of the research makes for ethical and worthwhile science.

Laura

For my contribution, I would like to share a chapter from Decolonizing the University by Gurminder K. Bhambra, Dalia Gebrial, & Karem Nisanciolgu. This chapter, Understanding Eurocentrism as a Structural Problem of Undone Science (by William Jamal Richardson), speaks about the many ways in which eurocentric views dominate academia and the harm done to individuals and communities but additionally how it stagnates and harms science by repressing important voices and views. I wanted to touch on two (of the many) points in this chapter that struck me the most.

"Undone science is understood to be a systematic occurrence that is embedded within relationships of power and influence within and around academia....The concept of undone science allows scholars to speak about marginalisation outside of a narrative of simply higher quality projects winning out over lower quality projects and instead focus on the power relationships that determine what quality is and what scientific pursuits are important or not important."

I have often heard the argument - in many contexts even outside academia - that higher quality work will always win out and the best candidate will win "regardless of their race/gender/ethnicity/sexual orientation/disability" but it's much more complex. Who decides what is "higher quality" or what is "important"? Who makes the decisions to offer grants, faculty positions, tenure? These definitions and decisions are still predominately made by white (and mostly, male) eurocentric academics. Very recently, there has been a tenure battle at University of North Carolina where tenure was denied to Nicole Hannah-Jones - who was a well-accomplished journalist and faculty member even before receiving her Pulitzer Prize for the 1619 Project. How many voices and ideas have been (and continue to be) suppressed by eurocentric thinking in academia?

"Much of the silence Stanley noted is connected to respectability norms that are dominant in Western academe. By respectability norms, otherwise known as professionalism, I mean the ways in which academics are influenced to engage in disagreement and dissension in certain prescribed ways that often allow already dominant and abusive behaviours to continue largely unabated."

I was really struck by this discussion in the chapter on respectability norms dressed as "professionalism" and how they serve to silence views that challenge eurocentric curriculum and viewpoints in academia. It is something that I have noticed in and outside of academia but only more recently been able to better identify and have language to describe now. I can easily see how these eurocentric views deeply affect mental health and additionally often force marginalized people to either conform to eurocentric views or leave/forced out of academia all together (which is also discussed in this chapter).

I feel like I am not articulating this as well as I would like or conveying the complexities that were so much better discussed in the chapter. It contains very poignant and relevant points to

academia so I highly highly recommend it and I am very happy to talk more with anyone interested!

And for anyone interested in learning more about the complex history of explicit and implicit racism in America during the 20th century - I want to plug, "The Warmth of Others Suns" by Isabel Wilkerson. It is so insightful and a masterful weaving of storytelling and American history through the lives of three real people. It is a huge book but I couldn't put it down!!

Kohinoor

Here is my contribution for the discussion on social equality:

1. I read this collection of articles in Nature a while ago - https://www.nature.com/articles/537450a. You don't have to read all of them: the gist is that "the bad news is that trend seems to be towards wider inequality, fewer opportunities for those from more disadvantaged backgrounds and a subsequent smaller pool of people and talent for research to draw on. From the United Kingdom and Japan to the United States and India, the story is alarmingly consistent." Five years since reading these articles, the question of "So how can we make science more accessible to all those who would like to get into it?" still remains a question (and perhaps will always remain so). It made me also more deeply acknowledge the place of privilege I come from even being able to be in academia and work in a lab that has discussions on social equality (not to mention (not directly related but still important) the incredible privilege I have in my own country when it comes to the effects of the pandemic).

2. In the last year, I have given a lot of thought to the term 'diversity' as well and its usage. The term "diverse" is often misused as a shorthand for populations that are under-represented. But putting everyone or a wide range of very different people under one term 'diverse' erases the racial, gender, and disability characteristics that we actually want to take into consideration – othering the very people we want to include. We need to be careful about the terms we use and how we seek to define them – whether it is in day-to-day conversation, in research, or in communication (including terms like diversity, inclusion, and representation).

3. Following on from what some of you have already said and what I have also thought about this last year, I am especially keen to discuss about 'complexity' being a challenge for most issues concerning inclusion – the dynamic nature of inclusion, and the fact that "best practice" not just for a stakeholder but also for an individual is an absolute personal/individual choice, and therefore, very subjective makes issues around inclusion extremely sensitive (this includes the discussion on whether or not we should disclose our pronouns, and whether we should correct others when they use a wrong pronoun for someone else).

4. On a personal level, a lot of discussions for me in the last year have centered around open science and what it means for feminist ECRs as well as researchers from geographically diverse regions. I have come across some (ignorant if I may say so) assumptions that somehow

research from more geographically diverse regions is *all* bad, and how the "western" institutions need to somehow "educate" the more developing countries of the world.

5. I have consciously made the decision to include more diverse populations when recruiting participants, and following on discussions we had last year about demographic questions, I have tried to be "inclusive" and sensitive in the way questions are asked about gender, race, and ethnicity in my surveys. But there is so much more that can be done. Coming from a place of privilege (I know I repeat this, but for me it has hit really hard during this pandemic although I know I was aware of it before), I know it's really important to speak about issues centering around inclusion and to contribute to them actively and I am trying to do that through both my research and dance.

Terry

Recently, I had the opportunity to read and discuss the 2021 book 'The Ethics of Microaggression' by Regina Rini as part of an equality, diversity and inclusion reading group at Birmingham.

I would like to share with you a short passage from the book, in which the author makes reference to a very striking metaphor first developed in the 1980s to illustrate the nature and effects of microaggressions:

"Marilyn Frye's influential account, oppression places people in a characteristic 'double bind', where their choices are constrained in many ways by social expectations. Metaphorically, Frye has it, being limited by oppression is like being trapped in a birdcage:

If you look very closely at just one wire in the cage, you cannot see the other wires. If your conception of what is before you is determined by this myopic focus, you could look at one wire, up and down the length of it, and be unable to see why a bird would not just fly around the wire any time it wanted to go somewhere … It is only when you step back, stop looking at the wires one by one, microscopically, and take a macroscopic view of the whole cage, that you can see why the bird does not go anywhere; and then you will see it in a moment. … [O]ne can study the elements of oppressive structure with great care and some good will without seeing the structure as a whole, and hence without seeing or being able to understand that one is looking at a cage and that there are people there who are caged, whose motion and mobility are restricted, whose lives are shaped and reduced.

Microaggressions are among the smallest and finest bars in the cage of oppression, so tiny that sometimes you can't clearly see even the one you are staring at. But they confine all the same, reinforcing social hierarchies by punishing those who stand out. Microaggressions are filaments of oppressive harm; brushing them off as ordinary rudeness, or victims' responses as mere hurt

feelings, amounts to looking right through the tiny bars and failing to see the structure they make up."

The bird cage metaphor has influenced how I think about systemic harms, and I would be very interested to see what you all think about it.

The book from which the above quotation is taken is quite long, but there is a shorter article written by the same author which asks the question 'What is the appropriate response to a microaggressions?' You can find it here: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-the-american-philosophical-association/article/how-to-take-offense-responding-to-microaggression/D99C6911798EE6702072C4115066DF57 .

Amol

Sorry for the late post, I have been overwhelmed by work last couple of weeks. Apologies in advance for not being able to attend this interesting call today, I double booked myself for another workshop I cannot get out of now. My small comment about researchers working in social robotics domain and something that has bothered me a lot over the past few years is the very high disparity between how much the marginalized communities in developing countries are considered in HRI research. It seems most technology/HRI research development is catered toward serving the populations in developed countries to make people's lives more and more comfortable creating a technology/digital divide between a global north and global south. From my brief research I have looked at stats and feel sorry to say less than 20 HRI studies (4 of them are my own work) have been conducted in developing countries vs thousands in the developed world. Perhaps in our future research we should be more inclusive with our work and look to impact marginalized communities in developing countries.

Henry

For my brief contribution to the equality discussion today: I've been wondering a lot recently about how much businesses, both big and small, truly contribute to the pursuit of social and cultural equality. During pride month I saw a lot of back and forth from different people about how good it is for marginalized communities to be "seen" by companies through advertising/ marketing etc. On the one hand I guess that it's better that they contribute those dollars to promoting worthy causes but on the other it's not obvious that those dollars are put to the best use if the goal really is to be progressive in that context. I can't speak to how it makes a person feel to be represented in this way since very few, if any, of these issues have affected me personally in any significant way. In light of that I was interested to hear everyone else's opinion. Particularly from those from one of these marginalized groups: do you feel that this sort of

marketing is worthwhile (if maybe just done in slightly the wrong way) or do you think it's something like a symbolic gesture that has little actual value?

Rebecca

Just a note to discuss later in the meeting today! Apologies for the late input for this discussion, but this is also a note for myself to remind myself of what to say. I think there are some real issues with representation and accessibility in the department here in Glasgow. For example, there is a lack of diversity in both teaching and research staff (some progress has been made with gender balance and representation of people with different sexualities etc) but other representation is lacking. There is also a real lack of accessibility in the physical building - for example there is no lift in the building and no ramp to get in - not only is this a problem for students, but also creates issues with recruiting participants for our samples (I know how limiting it was for you with your elderly participants Katie). I'm not sure what we as a lab can do to change such an institutional problem, but if there is an opportunity for feeding back to those who can do the most to work on these issues then maybe we can talk about the best way to move this discussion forward?

Notes and resources from and after the meeting
Guy

Didn't feel comfortable to share it but feel free to include it in your notes + the chatI used to hide my Jewish and Israeli identity due to politics and anti-Semitism. Many other Jewish and Israeli researchers in the diaspora (outside of Israel) are afraid of the consequences of saying that they are Jewish, wearing their symbols, or saying where they are from. I guess that it is important to be present and demonstrate our authenticity despite the risks so that others will know that it is safe to be part of it, and that others will feel comfortable with the presence of us in the research community.

Katie

This is the book I mentioned in the lab meeting. It focuses on (and gives tips for) active, empathetic, listening. It emphasises that the best conversations, and the greatest insights, can stem from genuine curiosity, and a complete focus on the other person (opposed to thinking about how that relates to us, or what we are going to say next). It is not specifically around inequality but WOW has it changed how I interact with others and information around me. It has been helpful in terms of general relationships, but also in working life (e.g., when speaking to participants, absorbing their responses).How to Listen with Intention: The Foundation of True Connection, Communication, and Relationships.

https://www.amazon.co.uk/dp/B08B5QRV5X/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1.