

[00:00:00](#)

But Bob and I first met in late 1999, um, um, actually I was originally, I met him because I thought I was going to employ him, uh, get him to give us some advice when I was still working in the, in the corporate world. Um, and then when I found out that, uh, the work that he was actually doing, he was, uh, you know, in the early stages of, you know, essentially turning those into, you know, training programs, corporate training programs to allow people to become a little bit more influential and persuasive. That kind of intrigued me. And then the job that I was doing, I got made redundant from, so I kind of thought, well, I should get into this full time. So Bob and I started a collaboration in early two thousands. Um, and then we wrote yes together in 2007 and 2012, uh, we published work together, conducted research together for close to 20 years.

[00:00:53](#)

Uh, we go to each other's well, I went to his son's wedding, he came to my wedding, uh, you know, and Joe and Joe. Um, so I, I gave a talk at university college London where Joe was doing his masters five years ago now. Joe. Yeah. Must be. Yeah. And, and, and Joe counts. We also said, you know, I really liked the work that you and Shalini do. Is there any chance we could have a job with you? And, uh, so this project came up during the summer, uh, just after Joe would finish his dissertation. And, um, we, uh, I said, well, why don't you have a little go with this? You know, someone wants some insight about applying Bob's principles that'll give you an opportunity to, you know, need to get an understanding of how much you know about the work we do and, and, and how much that translation, I think often, you know, the understanding of science and the understanding the application to practice, it was quite a chasm there off.

[00:01:47](#)

So Joe did. And it draws in a really good job at that. Um, an incredibly accomplished job for someone who was so young at the time. He's old. He's old man now, day to day. So, so joy Joe joined us, um, Baba. Maya's consulting company shortly afterwards, works for three years with us, got involved in a number of programs and projects. Um, and then was always, I think, destined to go back to UCL to complete his PhD, which is I think in the final year of or 18 months. Um, we've, yeah, originally, yeah. Um, and, and coast supervised, uh, for part of the time by none other than casts. So, um, Oh my gosh. Yeah. So connection to the founding fathers of the behavioral science era that we're in now is unsurpassed. I say can rightfully will be in the future. A world renowned behavioral sciences himself. And, um, we're working together. We, we got that opportunity to, um, you know, start writing messengers and, uh,

[00:03:01](#)

you know, that that became all the stuff that's going on in the world at the moment. And that's exactly who we listened to and why we've been influenced by these people. And so that's the story. I, well, I think this is really cool. I, I just, that introduction makes me feel really excited about having Joe on record. You know, in this first, yeah. I mean we aren't buffers, but we're some of the first, and so that's, that's pretty cool. Um, yeah, we, we, we've got lots of rabbit holes to go go down there, but

[00:03:33](#)

we, you know, uh, you know, our connection Cialdini is obviously we, we, we interviewed him, but it was just so interesting cause we are at a couple of

conferences with him and you know, all the big names that come out of these conferences, they come in, they present and then they, they come in, they do their presentation. They maybe stay for 15, 30 minutes afterwards and then they Hightail it out there. Bob sat there both, both different conferences. He is a full time, sat in the crowd, taking notes, taking notes, soaking in all the research, which was just so it felt real. It felt really real to us, you know. And so that was, that was our introduction to, to Bob and, and, and, uh, really loved, uh, everything that he's [inaudible],

[00:04:15](#)

you know, um, I've, I've heard a number of people say that, um, you know, I, I mean I have an incredibly, um, important relationship with Bob. Uh, you know, we're more than just partisan collaborators, but I've actually heard people say that, and I'm going to be, I'm going to be biased, but he's, he's not just a brilliant, innovative, world-leading researcher. He's a genuinely wonderful, authentic guy. He really is. In fact, we caught up with him, uh, leaving. We happened to be checking out of the hotel at the same time on the last morning of a conference we were attending in New York city. And, um, and we're just living together and we were just making polite compliments, you know, because we adore him, you know, and, and he just engaged in a conversation. We had three blocks to walk to get to the conference and we just chatted it up the whole way. It was just so, it was like, wow, this is really happening.

[00:05:18](#)

He was normal. You know, I was reminded. Um, so, uh, so when the first time Joe came over to ASU with me to meet Bob, um, I think Joe got a similar impression to, you know, just the open arms and the welcomeness. But what was funny is, um, a few months ago, Bob was over in London and, uh, uh, Joe's girlfriend Lauren, who is also actually a very accomplished psychologist. She works for Ipsos Mori, you know, Ben page and everything. And she apparently she wrote, she wrote her undergrad thesis on Cialdini's work. And so when, and so Bob said, let's go to Dana and Laura is, I think Lauren is like, Oh my God, I'm so Joe. Yeah. Joe and I kind of saw that as an opportunity to go, Lauren, you know, Bob's a university professor, you know, if he hears that your thesis was about his work, he's going to want you to defend that over dinner.

[00:06:22](#)

He is, he is ruthless when it comes to people defending interpretations of his work. You sure as hell. But I've got this right. Lauren, you're in trouble otherwise. And she's like, and he couldn't have been anything more opposite, but we did have a laugh at Lauren's expense. So good. It is, it is so fun to catch up with the year. So, um, so we're, you know, a couple of things. This is not a gotcha. You know, uh, obviously you guys know the, the, our approach, it's uh, to kind of open up some topics, have a conversation, go down some rabbit holes, uh, and we want to make sure that we cover things that you want to cover and not cover things that you don't want to cover. You know, we got this lovely list from the publicist and ask these stupid questions and frankly, they're not super questions, but uh, but we've, we've also talked to enough people who have published books that are just really tired of, of certain topics. So, so maybe let's start with before we actually get into the show and is there anything that

you just are like are tired of and just like, no, don't want to talk about that or anything that's anathema.

[00:07:35](#)

Anything we have, any no go, no go topics, very happy to, to kind of be led by you guys from what you find interesting. Okay. Yeah. And yeah, I've listened to enough of the behavioral cruise podcasts to know that, you know, you guys will ask what you think is appropriate and where the conversation takes us. So don't feel, you know, please don't feel restricted by a set of prepared questions that are, that are publicists, I don't even remember what those questions are. Questions, they're just, they're just, they're an overview of, of the book and various different things.

[00:08:09](#)

So, yeah, but it's all, it's all good. So anything that, so is there anything that in specific that you do want to make sure that we just touch on and we can always come to that at either the beginning or at the end, so that you think is going to be good for our listeners and good or anything new that you want to talk about? It doesn't even have to be from the book. I mean, we're going to talk about the book, but yeah. Anything. Yeah. Okay. Well a couple things come to mind. Joe's okay. If I go first and then you, so I guess, um, so yeah, I guess probably he's a well educated, knowledgeable audience that understands the size they, they're coming to you, you know, to understand what the latest, you know, insights and behavioral science. Also, these are people that read the books. Um, you know,

[00:08:56](#)

particularly the, the kind of what I regard as the kind of the doorstep set of required readings, knowledge, prediction, irrational, yes. Those kinds of things. So it might be worth, I mean a conversation about how this book came about and what the different swing messengers is and, and all the others. Um, and, and how it came about because essentially that kind of Avaya lunch, lunchtime conversations that Joe and I used to have where we would be saying things like, how can someone say that? And it be believed, how can, how could it possibly be the case? There's someone can just outwardly lie and people's approval and trust the who goes up, you know, what, what is it about this world that we're living in today that it doesn't seem to matter whether the facts are facts, whether the truth is also it or what, or, or, you know, these kind of ignorant people can come along and just say something and there will be a certain set of the population that will embrace that message and, and kind of be act on it and be influenced by it.

[00:09:59](#)

You know? And, and, and, and I don't think that probably a little bit of the difference, isn't it? And so far as, you know, Bob, so brilliantly disseminated, what are the features that you put into a message, right? That increased the likelihood that people will say yes to it, be persuaded by it. Um, and in messengers where what we're actually saying as well, don't just think about the message. Think about who is delivering the message. And, and, and so perhaps a common thing that I would like to come out is we've coined this phrase, the messenger is now the message. Um, you know, like, I think, you know, previously it was a Canadian guy in the 50s is the message the McLuhan work. Yeah. Um, but we're finding increasing evidence that actually the messenger

often is, is more important than the, the merits of the message itself. So that, that's something casinos,

[00:10:55](#)

well, question number two. It's interesting and we've brought up this, the story in other episodes. There was a, uh, high school graduation down in the South, relatively, I can 2017, the Val Victoria and got up quoted what he said was Donald Trump at the time and the, the crowd, you know, applauded and cheered. And then he said, Oh wait, I'm sorry, that was actually from Barack Obama. And they, and, and, and the content that, I mean, he wasn't even, I mean it was just saying who the messenger was, but the, the, the reaction to that was just so different because they thought that it was said by Trump versus said by Obama. Um, and you know, I think it highlights exactly what you guys,

[00:11:46](#)

we had a conversation, I think it was this early last year, 2019 at the London school of economics where I occasionally teach in the

[00:11:54](#)

high pro pro folk professors who are kind of like facing off with each other, arguing their point of view. And they, there seem to be a little in terms of an audience's ability to say, well, should I believe this one or that one? And then one of them turned around and said, well that bottom line is that my argument ends in this way. He's a Tottenham supporter. Why the hell would you support and listen to a top? Sorry Joe. Joe is kind of like, you know, no, no amount of rationale, no amount of, you know, peer reviewed evidence. Scientific study is going to get my point across to them. I always believed me. So let me just call open across this audience the divide and pull as the results kind of like, anyway, Joe, sorry you come in. Can you come in?

[00:12:45](#)

Yeah, yeah, sure. No, I um, I mean I think we have a kind of framing for how we talk about messenger effects can kind of get into the topic of the book and then the structure of the book is quite nice for a discussion format and then we can talk about the two parts and each of the four traits within each part. And actually, I, I think we find that takes up more time than we expect normally. Uh, are you kidding? Yeah. Yeah. I mean, just so you know, there's additional, you said as a additional things that we want to talk about and we do, you know, we collected some data on, um, the presidential democratic nominees, uh, as well as in the UK before Boris Johnson was elected. We collected some data there as well. And so it's really interesting. And if we have time, then I think it's nice to talk about that. Um, yeah. And, and yeah,

[00:13:41](#)

that would be cool. I think the PO, the political discussions are always interesting, so, okay. Uh, also, uh, you know, uh, we'll, we'll do some light editing if you, if you, uh, end up, uh, Oh, is it? Nothing. No. Okay. You know, we'll do some light editing. If you're, if you're responding to something or you want to make a point and it's not quite on, you know, sort of pitch perfect and you want to kind of go back and say, wait a minute, give me a second, let me just say that again. No problem. You know, just, uh, let's just do that and we'll, we'll go back and we'll, we'll just make those edits. So that's easy to do too. And then we did, we did the introductions, uh, and kind of our ending thing, uh,

posted option. So we'll just, we just pretty much get into it, so, yeah, if you're ready to go, you guys ready to go?

[00:14:26](#)

Very cool. Ready? All right, sounds good. Steve Martin and Joe Marks. Welcome to the behavioral groups podcast. Hey coach. Hey Tim, brought in to be here. Thank you very much for having us. We are excited. We are excited. We should actually just introduce, uh, voices. So, uh, Steve. Hello Steve. Hello there I am Steve and Joe. Joe, let's give us a hello. Hi. Cut. And Tim, I'm okay. So let's start with a speed round. All right, so I'm going to have the first one's going to use Steve. So bicycle or unicycle? A bicycle. Bicycle. All right. Joe coffee or tea or tea? Ah, of course. All right. Going back to you, you see a year without a mobile phone or a year without a laptop. Have you had to have one mobile phone? What you would, you would choose the mobile phone or get rid of? No, no, no, no. Get rid of the mobile phone. But I'd keep the laptop please. Wow. Okay. That's, that's pretty true. Okay. Here's a toss up maybe, maybe for both of you, which is more valuable trustworthiness or truthfulness. Ooh, we're going to have a conversation about that. I think that sounds good. Let's have a conversation about that. That that's a good way to get started. Joe. You look like you're kind of on the, on the verge of jumping in on that one.

[00:15:49](#)

Yeah. Well, I think it really depends on your, your perspective and what your goals are and what you're trying to achieve because I mean, we can see quite clearly, um, that trustfulness and truth, truth, uh, sorry, let me start again. We can see quite clearly that truthfulness and trustworthiness are not always the same thing where people may be clearly lying. They're getting fact-checked in court lying, and yet, uh, specifically supporters of theirs seem to still regard them in a, in a kind of high regard. Um, and, and, and trust them. So what's going on there? And, uh, it's one of these questions that seems to be puzzling society at the moment. Academics and then, you know, political commentators are baffled and, and trying to put together some explanation. And the truth of it is, is that trustworthiness was really a prediction of somebody's future. Good faith. It's not this kind of complex weighting of evidence that, uh, we use to, to assess trust to a truthfulness. You know, we're not kind of going to the bottom line of everyone's detailed sentences and trying to work out, well, does the evidence suggest that this is likely to be 40% false or 30%? What is that computation? They're not doing that we're relying on much more simple heuristics when assessing trustworthiness because it's this kind of intuitive, vague, abstract judgment that people are very good at making and have to make on very limited information very quickly.

[00:17:21](#)

Truthfulness though being the, uh, factor in that prediction of future trustworthy. I mean, if I'm looking at somebody and I'm going, all right, even if I am a believer in them or a supporter of them, and I go, well, that's not true, but I, I'll withhold that judgment and look forward to the future. Doesn't that start weighing down after awhile? And yet somehow it doesn't seem like that's happening. Yeah.

[00:17:46](#)

Yeah. No, that is true. I mean, we rely on past behavior to predict future behavior, but I think there's a few key, uh, kind of caveats to that. One is, um, you know, a lie about something seemingly kind of doesn't, uh, direct towards your core principles and values and judgments and the things that people hold you to. Uh, whereas, you know, if, if for example, uh, Boris Johnson was to turn around tomorrow and say, actually we're not doing Brexit or Trump, you know, to, to, to go completely against his core values and principles, then those people who were regarding him as trustworthy would not anymore they, but they excuse the lies that seemed sort of circum, uh, you know, sort of around the fact that, that are kind of seen as a means to an end to get to a place that actually they want to be going, that they want to see society going in. They excuse a little lie. If they think that the, the underlying core position is one that they like.

[00:18:52](#)

Well, actually I think it's the case that sometimes they'll excuse not just the little lie, but a big lie. Um, you know, there's, there's no doubt, you know, the Supreme court here in the United Kingdom, uh, you know, decreed that Johnson lie when he probes are polyamorous. Uh, back in October of last year, um, Joe, Joe and I ran a little study or survey of sorts with, with leave and remain voters. And, and the vast majority, over 75% of them. Uh, when asked, do you think that Boris Johnson lied, um, to the Queens or pro government? You know, they, they, they said yes, he absolutely did. Um, and then when we are, so how does that affect your trustworthiness? Of course, Johnson, um, it has no effect for those people that had voted to leave the European union. So it wasn't just a little light. She's a big Whopper. And, uh, um, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of people, regardless of their political of Egypt, um, you know, reckon that he lied clearly he did.

[00:19:58](#)

Um, the relative trustworthiness of Johnson wasn't tainted at all with his supporters because fundamentally his lies serve an underlying goal that they had all signed up to. So sometimes we are willing for them, for people to lie to us, provide us the kind of lie that goes in the direction that we ideally want in document, which is kind of a form of confirmation bias in some ways, isn't it? That we're, we're just, we're so, uh, attached to finding something that supports and confirms what we already believe or, or want to believe that we're willing to forego things like the truth. Yeah. I guess what's the, the, the amplification here though, cut and Tim is the fact that, um, you know, confirmation bias often is, is done in private often, isn't it? This is like, you know, we, we, you know, the posts that we only need to admit confirmation bias to is ourselves. We don't have to do it publicly, but in this instance we're actually asking, people know, that's been quite clear. Yes, he lied. I recognize the lies, but I still think that that's pretty extreme version of confirmation bias when people are willing to publicly state that.

[00:21:06](#)

Yeah. Well, and this is, this is one of the tenants that you guys talk about in your book, right? So messenger is a, as is the new book that you guys have just come out with. It is, uh, by fantastic. We haven't it a topic of ours at our top 10 made our top 10 for 2019. So congrats on that. Not that that means anything except for 10 trends that we have. Um, but no. So tell us a little bit about how did, how

did messengers come about? What was, what was the impetus for, how did you guys get that kernel of an idea?

[00:21:41](#)

Well, perhaps I'll, I'll start and then Joe, you should, uh, you should come in. Um, so Tim, you know about me and you know about my, um, my longterm allegiance with Bob Cialdini. So I, I've been an influence and persuasion researcher for quite a few years now working, uh, you know, under the stewardship of Bob Cialdini. Um, and one of the things that, you know, we, we've increasingly noticed these last few years is Bob did a just an incredibly brilliant job of disseminating what are the factors that go into a message that increase the likelihood that someone will say yes to it. Um, but Joe and I would recognize, you know, you know, we've got, uh, an office here in London. We, you know, a behavioral scientists. We'd often have lunch together and we come up with these examples of where people would say something that really made little sense. Yet people were still being engaged with it.

[00:22:39](#)

And so we wonder what this is kind of interesting here is it's not just what you put into a message. There's something here about who delivers the message that seems to be having a significant, in fact, we'd go so far as to say an increasingly significant influence over whether it gains traction. And all of us have experienced this in our everyday lives. We've all had a situation where, you know, we've had an idea, we go to the office, you know, we tell a colleague about this idea or mention it to a, you know someone or they look at us in that strange way. They think, nah, that's really not a good idea at all. And yet a couple of days later someone else comes along, says the exact same thing and I can see you laughing here.

[00:23:20](#)

Familiar? Yeah. Someone says the exact same thing and all of a sudden the same audience that rejected roundly, your suggestion two days ago are enthusiastically embracing the exact same idea when it came from someone else called me. The message that is carrying sway here. There must be something about the quality of the messenger, the trait or feature of the messenger that's allowing people to say, well to hell with the content that probably matters less. Now if this person is saying it, then I'll follow it. And what we found was, well, was there a, an experience, it almost sounds like certainly your observation and your, uh, your ability to kind of look at the human condition and, and see this incongruity is, is a catalyst. Right? But I'm wondering, Steve, was there a specific experience that just really grabbed you and said, Oh man, we've got it.

[00:24:16](#)

We've really got to tell this story. Well, it seems like every single day in the newspapers there seems to be some sort of headline that says, you know, X said, Y believes that, uh, and you think, well, actually, really? Is that true? I mean constantly, I, there's been at least hundreds of dozens of times, I'm sure, where I'd presented an idea or come up with some concepts over the years and people have looked at my, no, I don't think about, and then suddenly, you know, a couple of weeks later you go, actually, I'm sure I said something about that. And then, and then, and then it gets just the, there was something scientifically

intriguing about this as well because, you know, one of the things that Joe and I did early on when we were having this discussion was to say, well, there must be tons of research out there looking at this. And actually there is, there's six, seven decades of, you know, largely social psychological research, but in other fields of behavioral science as well.

[00:25:21](#)

But what was really interesting to us is that no one had really synthesize that information. Um, you know, in a way that Bob Cialdini did with the social influence theory, you know, it was actually back back to the late, no, actually, early 1980s when a couple of researchers came up with their, you know, a five characteristic model of what makes a good messenger. Um, and of course, you know, that 40 odd years that's actually passed since then, you know, extraordinary amounts of new research has been conducted, not just standard social psychological research but you know, behavioral, economic research, neuro multicolor information and neuroscientific research as well. So that was kind of like the, the platform for us to say, well, there's, there's an opportunity here to kind of really delve into this and see what comes out. And, and, and we've, we think we've done is sort of like, to think we've done is come up with a, perhaps a more contemporary, uh, updated version of who, uh, society listens to or is more likely to listen to, um, who they likely to reject. And, and the reasoning why. Um, and at no point drought throughout the book to Joe and I ever really consider the merits of what's being said, the content of the message, where we're just interested in why can this person, this messenger deliver this in a way

[00:26:44](#)

that it gains traction. And someone else comes along and says the exact same thing on the same audience will reject it. Sounds crazy. But yeah, it was, it was so great. Uh, one of my favorite aspects of the book is, is this beautiful confluence that you've always got going of anecdotes and tremendous amounts of research and, and so much as, as you mentioned, is contemporary. You know, you're not relying on the studies from 1983. Um, of course, if they were groundbreaking and they're still hold up then absolutely was you, you referenced them. But the references are just terrific, uh, with, with the magnitude and the, and the variety that you go to as you, as you said. And I think that that's, that's one of the things that really makes this book different from a lot of other stuff on the market, uh, today. So, uh, when it comes to, to our listeners, I just want them to think about, wow, you're, you've got all your drawing from a wide variety of different fields and really building a case in a, in a cogent and sophisticated way. And it's entirely readable. You know, it's just really fun to read to so and so. So we had, we had a lot of fun. Okay. But I want to get back to the Marshall McLuhan, uh, comment. This whole idea of, uh, the messenger. I mean, in, in the 1960s Canadian Marshall McLuhan said the medium is the message and, and you guys are kind of claiming that sort of is dead, that the new model is the messenger, is the message. Is that, is that a fair, is that a fair statement?

[00:28:08](#)

Yeah. I don't think I'd go so far as to say the old model's dead, replace it with our new better model. Scrap that. I think certainly medium matters and you



know, there's great evidence showing that face to face communication, for example, can be up to three times more persuasive than an email. Um, because there's kind of the direct directness of it. You, you speak in somebody, you see their humanity, you have the social obligation, not to say no in the face to face interactions, much easier to go somebody, uh, on a text or email. There's a lot going on. Um, and, and similarly, um, you know, we're, we're in this world now where there's all kinds of mediums like, um, on, on Twitter and in the news you have kind of information being presented rapidly and in very short amounts of characters. Um, and you know, exactly, which is a nice, lengthier, more detailed, uh, chat version. I prefer, I think, but, um, I think that still matters. Um, but I think in conjunction with that, uh, is, is the kind of neglected side of the messenger. Um, and uh, specifically the kind of traits that make an effective messenger. Yeah.

[00:29:23](#)

This is the kind of second part of where Steve was leading into. So I, I guess we were thinking about this phenomenon that happens where, you know, I see all the time hanging around with Steve. People will take on board exactly where he says, if I say it, then they don't. But, and, and you know, you, you do feel like a Cassandra in that case. And the question is, well, what makes somebody a good, effective messenger or Cassandra? And that knowledge is, is perhaps relevant to improve one's own kind of communication and persuasion skills. Um, but also, you know, and helpful in helping us to spot where we might be listening to somebody, not based on the content of that message or the kind of wisdom of it. Um, but in fact just because of who they are. So, so the, the, the book is really dedicated to examining the factors that make us receptive to our messenger.

[00:30:19](#)

And we divide it into two parts. So we have status treats, um, and connectedness treats. So status is essentially on, and, uh, we, we described through one of four routes, um, and essentially gives people, uh, some kind of value that means that they're worthy of being listened to some way that they're, they've got themselves ahead of us, um, and so are useful. They can meet for kind of powerful allies or fisbos, um, and connecting us, on the other hand, you know, they're, they're not really trying to get ahead. In fact, the opposite. They're trying to kind of get along with us. We see them as a friend, somebody to cooperate, cooperate with, um, they show us kind of benevolent intent. Um, and, and, and so, yeah, we, we kind of look at these two broad categories of messenger and dive deep into, well, how do you earn yourself status?

[00:31:11](#)

How do you own yourself connectedness. Um, and that really is the kind of layout and structure of, of the book. One of the, one of the interesting studies that you brought up that I find that was just fascinating for me, cause I would not have anticipated, like, I guess I'd might've anticipated it, but it was the jaywalking study, uh, that you mentioned that, you know, they, people who were better dressed, uh, more people would follow them and J walk than people wearing denim. Uh, various different pieces of it. And so it's status from that perspective takes on a whole lot of other roles as opposed to just the

oppositional status. Right. There are other, other markers that, that kind of identify that. Can you talk a little bit about,

[00:31:55](#)

yeah, absolutely. And, and, and what that's actually doing that in that case, that uniform or that business suit for want of a better word, is sending a signal about someone's status within a society. Um, and, and often, you know, we're in this situation, particularly these days where it's becoming increasingly hard, difficult to kind of navigate our ways through all the information that's presented to us, all the data off of it, often very conflicting data. And so, you know, we'll often replace that question, what is the right thing to do here? Um, with a question about, well, who looks like they're doing what the right thing to do is here and I'll just follow them. And, and you know, that idea that, you know, three times as many people. And by the way, this was a study that goes back to the mid sixties, you know, three times as many people were willing to follow someone wearing a suit into traffic against the red lights against the law.

[00:32:56](#)

Um, then the same person dressed in, in a, in a denim jacket. Um, and, you know, and, and we find that it's not just, so the message here isn't just don't put a business suit on Rodan and denim denim jacket. It's what those cues are. You know, we, we find similar with, with cars, you know, um, wonderful study, the Anthony Dube, uh, run in San Francisco all those years ago where, you know, he, he wants you to understand how quickly someone would hurt their haul if a car in front had actually kind of broken down at a crossroads. And he found that the status of the car mattered, even though people were much more inclined to think that they, they'd hoot quicker at a high status car. They hooted much, much quicker at a low status car. Um, so these, I guess, features of status in this instance, it could be a status that that communicates our competence.

[00:33:44](#)

Uh, or in the case of the car communicates perhaps our socioeconomic position. They're, they're important. We use these pieces of information to determine whether or not, uh, if someone then says something or makes a recommendation or acts in a certain way, whether they're worth following. It's one of the reasons why, you know, when you meet someone for the very first time, one of the first questions you can ask is, well, what do you do? Essentially what you're actually saying is where are you on the socioeconomic hierarchical status compared to me? That's what's really going on there. So these are, and we'll use them for proxies to determine whether or not someone is worth listening to or not.

[00:34:22](#)

I grew up in a, in st Louis and uh, in st Louis with the arch. Yes. And, uh, the, the, the people from st Louis don't ask, what do you do? The first question they ask is, where did you go to high school? And that is the socioeconomic peg that that drives all the further discussions because it identifies whether you went to a public school or a private school and, and, and what part of town you grew up in. And if it was a, it was a, an all, you know, single gender or, I mean there's all kinds of, uh, boxing and segmenting that happens with the answer to that question. Yeah, I think it's fascinating and it allows us to quickly answer that question. Do you have status over me or am I connected with you? Um, you

know, are those two, what we call hard and soft traits that Joe was talking about a few moments ago? Well, let's talk a little bit, we talked a little bit about status and I know there's a bunch more there, but connectedness, so, so what is it about connectedness and what w what, what did you find out about how that influences how people perceive the, the message that people are sending? Yeah, I guess the equivalent question would be when you meet somebody for this first time, Oh, who do you know? I also know them. You realize that you have these mutual connections. Another

[00:35:38](#)

one that's very common and, and kind of natural to us. Um, and really it's, you know, it's serving to find that connectedness between the two and find where we have similarities. People we share in common, who we perhaps, hopefully like, uh, if, if we've decided somebody maybe is connected to people we dislike, maybe we're gonna associate them negatively. Um, but essentially it's trying to, you know, form that, uh, cooperative allegiance with somebody else. And, you know, we're humans. We, we form bonds very quickly and easily. It's kind of a fundamental desire of humankind to do that because we work better together. Um, and, and could achieve goals that we just couldn't alone. So, uh, we, we look for certain signals of benevolence such as warmth and, uh, and trustworthiness, um, that are incredibly important to then decide who we're likely to listen to and not.

[00:36:32](#)

Um, and, and so for an example, uh, of, of warmth and, uh, you know, we can see it in, uh, in all manners of areas. It seems to be those who are able to show a kind of kind positivity, uh, and, and rapport with other people. They show that they care about the other, um, they express concern for their, for their welfare. Um, these people are, you know, doing much better in various areas in, in terms of, uh, you know, the labor market where they often kind of will, will work better together and more productively with others. They, they'll kind of be rewarded fevers more often and even get hired more often. Um, you know, one of the number one tips for a job interview is to kind of make eye contact, smile, be polite and uh, and courteous and, and you know, these are kind of trivial factors in a way. When you think about the experience skills that we really look for when we're thinking about hiring somebody, um, but they matter a great deal. I wonder how much, uh, what part of these both sides of traits, both the status and the connectedness are anthropological. How, how, how

[00:37:40](#)

are they ingrained in our DNA, do you think? Well, some of them are, in fact, actually this might be a good opportunity to actually lay out what the four traits of the face. It's true in the messenger on the four traits of the connected messenger. And then we can talk to each of those. So, so we find it's, as Joe said, that there are these two broad categories of messengers. We have hard messengers that seek to signal their status and they do that through their socioeconomic position. So how rich and famous they are, the second is their competence. So here, you know, are they, or do they appear to have some perceived expertise or experience or training that would, um, make them a good person or a good, uh, messengers or follow these dominant dominant messages? Are those that seek to get over? They

[00:38:36](#)

seem to get ahead. Um, can I just stop for a second because are you picking up all this background? Yeah. And yes, I can, I can hear Joe's Mike, since it sounds like it's attached to your, uh, you're actually using the mic on your laptop. Is that right? Is that not good idea? Uh, well it's, it's, it's not a great idea for a conversation. What we can do, I'll, I'll, I'll edit all that out. Actually we can, we have different channels since we'll have, we'll have different recording tracks. I'm just going to, I need some lag as well, so I was going to try and move it into a bit close to the router. Apologies, apologies for the interruption in flow, but that's okay. Yeah, super, super easy to, you know, cut here and cut there. Okay, great. Um, and sorry. Yeah, steep for ruining your float. So I, I do also have some headphones, uh, the hands free. You can use the mute. You can be used to these folks and Connie, I can use some mute while you're speaking as well. That's not a bad idea too. Alright, let's pick up. Go ahead. Yeah. Well what made you want to just start over?

[00:39:45](#)

Do you want to just start with the four reports rates and we'll start talking when it's great to be on this podcast. Thanks for inviting us. Okay. I'm not that far. Not that far.

[00:39:59](#)

Yeah. Well, I think they all linked to some of these evolutionary factors. Um, but perhaps before we talk about that, it might be a good idea just to set out what those four traits within the, you know, hard messenger domains and the four traits within the messenger domain is. So as Joe suggested earlier, so you know, hard messengers are these messages that seek to essentially establish some sort of status over their audience before they deliver a message. And they do this in one of four ways. They do it through their socioeconomic position. So essentially how rich and famous they are. Uh, we follow the lead of those that we see perhaps as rich and famous as a good signal of whether or not we should listen to someone, uh, competence or, or perceived competence. The extent to which someone, uh, sounds like an expert looks like an expert is an expert, uh, can influence our reaction to their message.

[00:40:52](#)

Dominance is the third one. Doneness is an interesting one because very much I think, uh, uh, a personality trait, you know, a dispositional characteristic. These are the kind of messengers that just, you know, they have the attitude that they need to win at all costs. Everything is a competition. I'm not interested in collaborating with you. I'm interested in being dominant over you or you know, almost kind of like coercing you into some sort of, uh, uh, receptivity to my message. And we all know characters like that. And one or two names come to mind immediately. And the fourth trait is his attractiveness. You know, sometimes there are people have been, you know, blessed genetically and because of their good looks, they're there, their symmetry, their youthfulness. And interestingly, that average notice as well is one of the characteristics of attractiveness. Um, we, we may be more predisposed to listen to them.

[00:41:50](#)

And so if you think about attractiveness, you think about perhaps dominance from a certain perspective. Those are, um, you know, arguably kind of more ingrained evolutionary, uh, in, in their nature, whereas, you know, anyone I

guess could through their hard work, become an expert or you know, become rich or famous. Um, so those perhaps are more societal endorsed or, or games. And then by contrast, the connected, uh, effects are warm, you know, those Joe's already spoken about those that seek to, you know, uh, you know, signal that the Netherlands rather than their status over others. Vulnerability as a second one. One way that we can sometimes, you know, arrange for people to listen to us is to express some sort of vulnerability or weakness that we actually have or a disadvantage that can often engage and connects people to us. Trustworthiness is the third one, kind of where we started out.

[00:42:42](#)

I then finally charisma. Chris was a really interesting one. That ability to, you know, essentially connect with an audience in such a way that, you know, there's almost like a unifying goal that you engender people towards. And what's really interesting about charisma from a scientific perspective is it was only a short while ago, 2016 I think it was when the, the social scientific community actually agreed upon, um, a consensus for an agenda of what charisma actually is. So those are the four hard force off the facts and we consider them not I am one or I am the other, but more it was kind of dial that, you know, depending on, you know, they're signaled in the right way and at the right time in the right context can significantly increase the likelihood that a message will be, uh, listened to and accepted regardless of its merits or truthful.

[00:43:33](#)

Yeah. Well, and it was interesting too, because you talked about in the book you talked about sometimes that some of those things given the context backfire, right. And so that there were, there were examples of this where, I can't remember the exact, I think it was Safeway, the grocery stores or if that was the one, I'm not sure where they, they train their, their people to be, um, you know, smile and, and be, be forthcoming and all of this kind of thing. And yet there was some backfire in how people interpreted that and various different things. So context matters in this matter, doesn't it?

[00:44:09](#)

Yeah. And in that particular example, it was particularly a female attractive service who started to then get harassed because the male customers just took it as a, come on. They thought, this lovely lady is being very flirting with me because I, she obviously is into me. I'm going to give her my number, Terry, I'm sorry, where, where our minds go. And yeah, little did they realize that actually she was being forced to make eye contact and smile and, and if she didn't would suffer some sanctions. Um, so there's an example of where, you know, a certain kind of very rough and rigid way of trying to implement these messenger effects can indeed backfire and result in lawsuits and in the extreme case. Um, but you know, in each chapter I think we try and kind of put forward the, um, costs and benefits and you know, there from an evolutionary perspective, it's likely to happen that, you know, otherwise we would have all evolved to be the same way.

[00:45:15](#)

Um, there's going to be some benefit to, to certain traits and some costs or other traits at times. Um, specifically, uh, with regards to kind of dominance and warmth or vulnerability, this, this kind of trade off a lot of the time, um, where

you can kind of take a harder versus a softer approach. And actually, uh, you know, some of the very interesting recent research coming out and from Denmark has been showing that this, uh, context, uh, really affects when we listened to dominant types. So particularly in times of kind of social conflict, competition and anxiety, uh, we see people are much more likely to want to elect to dominant type of leader who can kind of be combative and then leader lead their group in a fight. Um, whereas in kind of calm assurances times and we prefer a soft messenger who is able to, you know, cooperate with others, make alliances, um, get people to, to collaborate. Um, and, and yeah, it's, it's, it's very intriguing as to, uh, as to those kinds of contextual factors. Well, when these traits might be useful and when less, I guess it's probably, Steve, did you want to add to that?

[00:46:23](#)

Yeah, I think so. I don't think it would be lost on a number of your listeners, probably a lost number of them that, you know, these don't and characters, um, how they essentially provoke a context and an environment of uncertainty and anxiety and, um, you know, an unrest knowing that doing so allows that predisposed dominant character to almost kind of step up and be the hero to solve the very conflict that they actually created in the first place. So, um, that, that, that

[00:46:59](#)

you look at both of our countries, you'll get both of our countries than in the past elections that have happened. And you can kind of eat, you can go to that, you can go that a lot of the anxiety that has been developed out, uh, particularly in, in the U S uh, you know, in, in the whole immigration component, which, you know, for many years immigrants were viewed as a very positive info impact on, on our country. And, and the message that got shifted there and then, uh, as you said, Donald Trump, uh, or you say that, but Donald Trump,

[00:47:30](#)

I think you just said it, but [inaudible] table. Yeah. So that, that anxiety around that and kind of built on that. And he has a, I would, I would say a very domineering, uh, persona. So,

[00:47:43](#)

yeah. Well, so yeah, what's really interesting is, I mean the UK and uh, and the U S are probably the obvious examples, highly individualistic generally, but you see it happen in collective cultures as well. So I'm thinking here about Brazil and thinking about China equal, they have similar situations where they've got, you know, very dominant characters as leaders that will often point to, you know, unrest, conflict, challenge. Um, so essentially the just summarize their personality and, and, and, and the want and need for it. So, yeah, it's not a Northern hemisphere thing or in this instance, it's very much, I think in this instance, a human characteristic to a woman to kind of seek out those, you know, dominant assured messengers when, when we feel anxious saw or afraid.

[00:48:37](#)

Yeah. I want to do just, excuse me if I could, Joe, I just wanted to do a quick check. Are we, uh, do we need to wrap up at the top of the hour?

[00:48:46](#)

I'm good. I'm good for another 30 minutes.

[00:48:51](#)

Okay. Yeah. Joe. Okay. Okay. Cause I want, I, I'm really liking this, this conversation. Um, but I still want to get to music cause we're going to actually, and talk a little bit about music too, as always does. Yes. Uh, so, uh, so let's, let's, let's, um, so I want to keep going on this, this political stuff. You guys have had been doing some, some new, you have some new observations to share, right?

[00:49:16](#)

Yeah. So we, as Steve mentioned, we did the kind of UK election, uh, and, and specifically looking at trustworthiness in the context of, uh, uh, Boris Johnson program parliament. But we also kind of measured the other politicians, uh, on, on all of these messenger treats that we left. Um, and there was some kind of interesting patterns and it kind of largely, uh, supports previous, uh, theory showing that, you know, liberals are more likely to kind of tend towards warmth and, uh, softer traits and, uh, conservatives kind of powering ahead with more dominant, uh, harder traits. Um, and, and you know, that was actually, uh, I think very robust at that, that at that finding. Um, but we've done it here in the UK and we've also been looking in the U S of the, uh, democratic party, uh, elections, the for the, for the nominee. Um, and again, you know, it's, it's just fascinating to see these kind of patterns emerge in ways that are kind of somewhat predictable but actually paint a much more nuanced picture of what's going on than just the kind of one line approval rating I'm looking at specific traits is, it's just much more informative if you have the right traits to be looking at.

[00:50:30](#)

Um, and so in particular there, then we find, uh, you know, Joe Biden and then Bernie Sanders listed as, you know, the most prominent candidates that very well known. They've got that name recognition, which does carry a lot of weight. Um, the, the, you know, the, the heavyweights, they're credible. Um, but actually then Biden's doing far less well on other very important traits including, um, competence and trustworthiness. Um, where he does well is warmth. So that's kind of interesting. And fits again with this old man's stereotype of you're kind of warm but incompetent grandfather. Um, and, and funnily Bernie Sanders doesn't have that. It doesn't suffer from that same stereotype. He, he's, he's, uh, seen as competent, charismatic. He's, you know, uh, doing pretty well according to our messenger treats. Um, but you know, it's gonna be perhaps a disadvantage that he's, you know, the risky choice and coming from a more extreme political position. So that's a, you know, an example where the messenger and the message, you know, really, you know, might have to align

[00:51:45](#)

the, um, if chaotic times tend to produce more dominant styles, uh, in the, in the leaders. Uh, and it's still a very chaotic time. Is it possible that the liberals are missing the boat on this?

[00:52:01](#)

Mmm, yeah, quite possibly, but

[00:52:04](#)

I th I think there's, that needs to be some, uh, on, I recognize the primary start pretty soon. Um, but I, I think there will need very, very quickly to be some sort

of coherence or, or coalesce around, uh, a central appealing message. Um, you know, there's seven or eight candidates still. There's quite a disparity in terms of the, the centrality or the extreme left of their message. So, um, yeah, I think a combination Joe's exactly right. As you know, the right messenger, but also that kind of consensus about what the right message is is, is, is going to be important. Um, and a good backstory as well actually, interestingly, um, you know, we, we wrote about this a couple of months ago, um, that, you know, often, you know, our ability to connect to and being willing to kind of listen and support a messenger is often contingent on the backstory that actually, uh, they, they tell. And so I, you know, I think there's probably, um, some work to be done there and some opportunity as well. Uh, you know,

[00:53:08](#)

Oh, I'm sorry to interrupt. Is that backstory about connectedness more than, or is it, does it, does it matter if it's that hard part or is it that soft part that is, is there or again, is that contextual? I'm just trying to imagine that, you know, I would think the backstory would to be one of relatedness that, that connected. I feel like I understood. They understand me. I understand that. Yeah.

[00:53:34](#)

I, I agree. I mean concert, you know, a group of behavioral scientists. So context, but I, I think you're exactly right about that. Um, so when in the book we talk about the importance of a back story and, and that's actually, um, we, we account for that in the vulnerability chapter and actually we, we cite evidence that shows that, you know, for example, in things like talent shows, you know, um, America's got talent, you know, these kinds of things. Um, that often the, it's not just the, the skill and the competence of the performer, it's their, their ability to connect to the Orleans cause they have an interesting backstory or sometimes kind of like a, uh, uh, a vulnerability to that backstory. You know, they came through difficult times. They, you know, uh, overcome significant challenges early in their life. You know, some commentators have actually gone so far as to actually say the, the, the talent actually doesn't count for as much in the likelihood for them winning a, a competition as, as a good compelling, connected backstory. Um, so very, very much a vulnerability in that context. Yeah.

[00:54:44](#)

Do you think it makes a difference whether the backstory is provided in advance of the performance or after?

[00:54:53](#)

I, yeah, I would think that the, uh, you, you want to frame it in advance so that people come in and the way that they process it is takes on a whole new different meaning rather than having to retrospectively process what you've just heard. Um, it kind of primes you've, uh, ready for something that you're about to air. Um, but you know, I think it is interesting. I think there's some very, very good work, um, on the different types of backstory and when each will be effective. So the typical one being the kind of underdog backstory of the kind of, you know, two guys working in a basement or a garage or something within, make this multimillion dollar company. Um, and, and that evokes a lot of compassion. Um, and, you know, it's makes them relatable. It's the success story



of coming from nowhere, um, as opposed to just, you know, having it handed to you on a plate.

[00:55:48](#)

Um, and, and so in, in, uh, in some of the studies that have been conducted on this, then they find that people who are, uh, kind of, um, more compassionate mindset or particularly kind of lower power groups, um, like to hear this kind of underdog story. Um, whereas people who are kind of at the top of, you know, specifically prime to feel pride in experimental studies, um, like a kind of top dog. They're, they've, they, they go more for a hard kind of character. Um, and you know, I think Donald Trump's an interesting one because you see him kind of trying to pull both of these, why

[00:56:24](#)

he was saying, I got a small loan and made myself, I'm a kind of self made millionaire. Of course, the reality was he was always a very rich individual. Um, and, and, you know, flaunting his business, his successes, um, to, to show how on top of is how kind of competent and, and, uh, high profile, high positioned.

[00:56:47](#)

It's a fascinating, he's a fascinating example in that instance of where fame, riches, crowd out competence and experience. Um, you know, and, and actually, you know, there's another, there's a really interesting, uh, guy, Zach Tamala actually he's at Stanford. He actually did his PhD under, under Bob Cialdini, and he's actually done research that actually shows that, that often audiences, you know, when faced with this dilemma, who should I follow? Who should I support? Who should I listen to? The very often, uh, potential can actually be a much more compelling reason to listen than the reality of someone's experience. And you wrote about that in the book to a certain extent. That actually explains some of the reason why, um, you know, to some, you know, Trump was this compelling leader. Um, you know, he didn't have a day of experience in terms of public service, whereas Clinton, you could argue was probably the most qualified presidential candidate ever that run for office. And maybe that's something about Trump, maybe his potential just made him a little bit more interesting. Um, and with that, you know, infamy and, and rich, uh, resources that he actually had that, as Joe said a few months ago, really does speak to that more kind of conservative type of, you know, I've, I've got success on my side, you know, I'm big and rich. I think maybe that combination of things just worked out well, um, and served him, um, served him well in that instance.

[00:58:27](#)

I think it's, I think it's interesting because you talked about the backstory and he had the apprentice for how many years, which was almost this, this, you know, television backstory about him that he was able to actually curate and to a certain degree, control the message that was going out about who he was and the type of person he was to, you know, position that in, in a, in a way that I think probably to your point, uh, impacted a certain contingent of the population to, to view him in a certain way. Absolutely. Okay. You teed up this idea of, um, we were talking about America's got talent or you kick out talent, uh, and the underdog story. I wanna I wanna get a little closer to the musical side of the discussion because I can't resist and, and I also can't resist because

- [00:59:22](#) Steve did give me a thumbs up when I mentioned music earlier. So that's just, I'm just going to take that as a very positive sign. Go. Um, so, uh, so let's, let's start with sort of a softball. I kind of want to get into the, is there any kind of correlation between the hard and soft things and what's on your playlist? But let's just start with what's on your playlist. What, what Joe, why don't you start, what, what are you listening to right now?
- [00:59:46](#) Um, well, you know, I'm, I'm a sucker for Spotify is discover weekly algorithm. Um, once you give it enough data, it just seems to generate amazing hidden gems. Um, most of them are, my playlist are kind of soul funk, uh, kind of songs. Um, so Betty Swan is one of the hidden gems of discovered, um, a kind of solely sixties, uh, singer who, who, you know, has actually really depressing life story when I looked into it. But the music is just incredible and she just doesn't seem to have been recognized for it at all. Um, so as Betty is spelled, kind of funny. It's B, E double T. Y. E H
- [01:00:26](#) I think it's Betty tonight. Okay. One of my recommendations where she from, from the U S she has, she's interesting that, that, that sounds cool. Well, who else? Who also are there other, do you like the classic funk or the classic soul? Do you go back to the 60s?
- [01:00:45](#) Yeah. Know a lot of sixties, uh, stuff. I mean, yeah, Otis Redding. Um, is is a good example, um, of, of one of these classic cases. I'm trying to think who else. Um,
- [01:01:01](#) would it be on my list? Any of the, uh, is it possible that you might like print or any of the famous Minnesota musicians that came from around our neck of the woods?
- [01:01:11](#) Yeah, absolutely. I mean, Prince is a classic.
- [01:01:16](#) Okay. Yeah. Steve, how about you? What's on, what's on your playlist?
- [01:01:19](#) Well, I'm, I'm, I'm, I'm kind of, as I'm getting older, I'm finding myself, uh, kind of summarizing my playlists a lot more. I'm, I'm more likely to listen more and more to music that I've listened to over the years and kind of open myself up to, to new things, which is probably not a good thing. You know, I'm, I'm somebody's kid of the 80s, so I love the new romantic stuff. Um, probably my favorite band of all time would be, uh, the electric light orchestra, you know, people's Eagles of course. Um, and actually the, the band that I've seen most recently, which, you know, who I'd seen a number of times before who just seem to get better and better, the older they get is new order. So I'm a massive fan. I'm a massive new order fan. Um,
- [01:02:02](#) I think you're speaking Kurt's language on that one.
- [01:02:06](#) Um, and I did that. I, I was introduced to something recently, so it's new to me. I'm probably, I mentioned this, you know, Oh my God, they'd been going for

years and years, but, um, I again, it was Spotify. I came across a band called the baseball, um, who essentially they do covers of really, really big selling pop hits, you know, Brittany Taylor Swift, you know, friends, Abba, these kinds of things. But they do it to a kind of like jazz, you know, base kind of type of background. It's just the base will say they do these incredible covers of ridiculously popular pop hits. Um, and they're brilliant. Um, you know,

[01:02:48](#)

it will make sure that they're included in the show notes because that's, that's sounds like a very interesting recommendation as well. Uh, and, and of course we love hearing about new music. Um, okay, so, so what about this hard versus soft? Is it possible that your playlist might be dominated by, by the more chaotic, uh, types of singers, uh, uh, more dominant singers versus underwriters that are going after a backstory and connectedness?

[01:03:15](#)

No, I just wonder whether or not the selection of your music, um, determines, uh, in that moment in time, whether you are setting out to be a hard messenger or a soft messenger.

[01:03:26](#)

That's where I was going. Cause I'm looking at, I'm thinking about my playlist and I have some very hard angry music as we've talked about. And yet I have some very soft melodic tie, you know, various different pieces. And I'm like going, all right, so do I take on a different, uh, you know, persona as, as each of those guys and, and anyway, uh, yeah,

[01:03:47](#)

yeah. Joe, Joe, you have a thought on this?

[01:03:50](#)

Well, no, I was just thinking personally. I mean all my music is very happy. I'm very much in the soft camp. Um, but actually it's interesting because happy is not necessarily soft. I mean, I think you'd think of an acoustic guitar kind of ed Sheeran, um, you know, some of the, or even a Dell, some of these kinds of sad songs, they're still soft. I wouldn't describe them as hard songs. Um, so maybe happiness and positivity was not, uh, I mean my, my playlists are all very positive and uplifting. Um, but for maybe that's not a symptom of soft and trying to get into the nitty gritty of why music is hard, messenger was off messenger. Steve,

[01:04:31](#)

I want to go back to new order. Right. Cause cause again, this is actually music I can talk about where most of the time Tim can dominate this conversation but you know, joy division, you know, prior to that and they were really, I mean if you listen to, to joy division's lyrics and even the music, it was, I mean, you know, talking death then a whole bunch of, of down in new order when, you know, they, they came and, and uh, you know, rebranded the band. Um, uh, you know, kind of as the, as the outfall after, um, uh, you know, and they, they kinda came with a more poppy, you know, funds kind of sound and, and had a different perspective. And, and you know, from that, I wonder if that, that hard versus soft element was a key key piece there. At least for the primary songwriter. Yeah,

[01:05:25](#)

yeah, yeah. I think you could be onto something there. You know, the, um, you know, that that predisposition, the, the, the, the Ian had towards the more kind of, you know, much more melodramatic, kind of almost depressive type of, um, kind of music. And then Bernie summer comes in and you know, it's a lot more, you know, percussion trained guy who's more upbeat and then I guess, you know, that

[01:05:51](#)

I had to put deeper into it, but yeah,

[01:05:56](#)

kind of like a late seventies, 78, 79. So the, the electronic era starts to come in. So, you know, um, you know, tracks like CS, like Carson and ultimately, you know, blue Monday and, you know, and the rest kind of, they, they probably didn't have that technical capability in the, in the mid seventies when, when Georgia division were leading. And so, yeah, it was probably probably a, you know, a combination of those things. What's interesting to me about music and messenger effects though is, is think about how it works in reverse. So how often these, uh, quite well known musician musicians are listened to on subjects that they have no right to talk about. Um, and I mean there's actually a recent example, um, of, uh, you know, in China there was a significant challenge that the health boards in China had to deal with when, uh, a pop star, a Cantonese pop star claimed on WhatsApp that, you know, anyone that received the flu vaccine, there was a 90% chance they'd actually get the virus. Um, you know, so there's someone that's like well known, you know, in the public spotlight, you know, rich and famous but has no medical training and no right to say those kinds of things, but it's being believed in that instance. So, yeah, you, you, you've, you've kind of talked about messenger affects, applied to music, um, but actually the musicians and their undue influence sometimes when it's not warranted is going in the other direction. So there's a, there's a connection there as well,

[01:07:25](#)

but we see that all the time with any famous actress, actor, you know, musician and various things that you guys even wrote. I mean, think about Taylor Swift and you know, her, her, uh, impact on the midterm elections and various different pieces. So, which is again, fascinating to me. And, and going back to, there was a, there was an ad in the U S I don't know if it was ever played over in, in, um, uh, the U K for many years, which was an actor who was, you know, promoting a medical kind of thing. And he said, I'm not a doctor, but I play one on TV. Right. And so, you know, going back to your, your traits, right. He doesn't have confidence, but yet he, you know, he's, he just has this acting thing yet they're trying, I think to build some of that competence by saying I played a doctor on TV to, to make that connection.

[01:08:17](#)

Well, yeah. And he was, I don't, I don't remind it also in that instance, in, in 2002, I think it was, there was a quite a well known survey that was published in the U S where they said, um, you know, who's the most popular president of all time, you know? And, um, and, and the number one popular president had never ever served a day in the white house. Um, it was, yeah, it was Martin sheen who played Jeff and the West way. Wow. Yeah. So, so, so there we go.

And you can probably think of, you know, 2002, 2003 some of the conflicts are actually going on and who was actually in the administration at the time, why perhaps, you know, someone as connected and as approachable and a kind of a tenured economics, Nobel prize winning professor, all those kind of messenger traits combined to make this person, wow, this is not the perhaps most noted president of all time, but the person in this instance that we would prefer to have to have. And so, and that survey, you know,

[01:09:25](#)

we talked to Bob Cialdini about music and we talked about playlists and, and Bob was quick to point out about how, how he uses self priming by, uh, uh, or, or priming in with music by making sure that when he's introduced on stage, he has a stinger, he has a interlocutory musical piece that is, uh, Aretha Franklin's. Think, and he's using think as the, as the song to get people in that just in that completely subconscious, instantaneous, uh, state of being of, I'm going to cause you to think, I, I hope to be introducing something to you that's going to be different. Do you guys use priming? Do you guys music to prime in your presentations or,

[01:10:04](#)

uh, well, in your phone, but that's a great idea. Now thinking, you know, maybe I'll play respect

[01:10:14](#)

maybe, right? Said Fred, I'm too sexy. Joe

[01:10:22](#)

want one good example recently was a Bernie Sanders after he had his heart attack, came on to ACDC back in black. Oh yeah, that was, it wasn't, he came and uh, yeah, this is, I'm back, what do they call it, his comeback or something. And he came and spoke to 25,000 people in Queens and you know, since what pretty well, I think that that's a, that that's a good point to just kind of really, you know, draw to a close of this, a back in black and right at Fred. There you go. So, Sam, Joe, thank you. This has been really informative. And I, I know our listeners will get a great deal of information from this. And again, for our listeners, please, it messengers is a great book. Where can they, where can they go out to get it is a available

[01:11:14](#)

everywhere. Yeah,

[01:11:16](#)

it's available everywhere. So all the usual online, um, books, bookstore laws, uh, it's available as an ebook as well. Um, you can go to the website and find out more. You can even, actually, there's even a free quiz that you can do that will let you know what your primary messenger traits is. Um, it takes five or six minutes entirely free. You go to messengers to book.com, uh, you also eight or nine questions that, uh, Joe and I and a couple of our research team have put together and it'll give you a profile of what your preferred messenger.

[01:11:50](#)

Great. And if they wanted to, uh, follow you or, uh, you know, get in touch with you. Is it Twitter? Uh, w how, how did, how can they get, uh, find out more about you guys?

- [01:12:03](#) Well in the U S uh, you know, they can contact either me or Bob, uh, through the influence@work.co. Dot. UK or influence@work.com website. Uh, we're both on Twitter. Um, uh, what you chose 13
- [01:12:16](#) Jerry 13 could memory. All right.
- [01:12:19](#) And I'm science of yes. Um, but you can find this once you, once you, I mean, if you Google Steve Martin once you get past that imposter of mine, yeah.
- [01:12:28](#) Um, you'll, you'll find me. I'm a kind of funny, I'm a constant source of disappointments or hotel checking staff. No, actually I, I is it kind of fun though? Like, Oh, you're, you're Steve Martin. You get that a lot.
- [01:12:47](#) Yeah. But I don't get the upgraded room afterwards. I invariably get the room next to the elevator.
- [01:12:54](#) It's been a pleasure, Steve and Joe, thank you so much for both of you taking time. This has been so much fun to talk with both of you. It's great. Thank you. Cheers. All right, so we'll stop it there and we'll end the recording there and thank you both. Yeah, it's really, thank you. So, uh, we will probably be a couple weeks. We'll, we'll publish this out and that before that we'll, we'll send it out to you and whoever else and say if you want to guys push it or you know, uh, you know, if you want to do that, do you have photos? Do you have photos that you're uh, referring to you who's your publicist didn't send bio's and stuff, but I was just wondering are there, um, cause we'll, we'll use, uh, I'll probably create a, you know, a sort of a dual photo here with the two of you, the numbers, wondering if you guys have something that you'd like to use.
- [01:13:44](#) Yeah, I've got some, I've got some stock photos of both of us. I can just follow them over with a link area. What you'd like. Is that okay? Thank you.
- [01:13:51](#) Oh, that's perfect. That'd be perfect. Steve, thanks so much. Um, both of you. Yeah. Thank you. You guys. You guys have a great day at a conference sometime soon or my, my desire actually isn't across it as a conference. I'd rather cross it a pub someplace where we actually sit down and have a beer and continue the conversation. We'll do that. Do that. Well, yeah. So you are from Soloway's, but where, where were you guys now? Where are you based? We're in Minneapolis. Minnesota. Okay. Okay. We're, we're uh, we're an hour by, by plane from Chicago. Yeah. Kind of in the, in the middle of the country. They're the Northern Joe and I are happily, uh, happy to publicly commit, but if we're ever costing anywhere near you, we'll phone you and evolves so we can have that. We can have that beer and that will be reciprocated if you guys have a couple or London. Um, we've got lots of pumps here.
- [01:14:53](#) Did we, we talked with Rory Sutherland, uh, you know, a little while ago and we had a bunch of people in England that we leave to and we need to get over there. Although he's Danish, she lives in the, in, in the UK. All of her pain is kind

of one of our old buddies, um, all of her pain in the neck. Um, yeah. Yeah. Um, well if you've ever, um, Olin and, and those, those cats, those guys, I mean, forgive me for being opportunistic, but there's, there's a few other people that are emerging now that, um, I'm full disclosure. They had kind of connected it to Joe or I or others in in some ways on the lookout for new talent, but you know, two people in particular, um, and they're young women. Um, so 25, 24, 45, um, so Helen Mankin who works for me and then Elle Copland who was, um, a research assistant for Joe in his lab at UCL.

[01:15:51](#)

They're doing some amazing work at the moment on the application of behavioral science to social mobilization and climate change. So things like animal trafficking. So if you want to plug into the kind of the broader goods, um, so, so say the Helen Mankin Caughlin cop, LAN D, um, and I can connect you. Um, yeah, I mean, so full disclosure, how long works for Bob and I, but she's just, she's incredible. Um, applied behavioral scientists, published PhD. She's a freshly minted PhD. She's a, no, she's a masters. After she completed her masters, um, at UCL cause she went to, she followed you about a year later than she tried maybe. Um, and then she finds a work for Bob and I and, um, and it's not working all on the wall. She does some great work at the moment and things like, um, in Thailand reducing bone for climate change. She's doing stuff with animal trafficking. She's, that's fantastic. Oh yeah. We're actually doing a series a that we're, we're calling new voices about the very, uh, like either people who are in their PhD programs or, or just recently

[01:17:10](#)

finished. Um, and we had some really great conversations, uh, about very, uh, just very forward thinking, uh, young researchers. Oh yeah. Yeah. I think these are great. Yeah. Yeah. I'll, I'll, I'll, I'll connect you if you're interested. That'd be, that'd be terrific. Yeah. Okay. Alright. Alright. Take care. Joe. Am I seeing you tonight? I am. Date. Okay.