

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

A tongue-in-cheek guide series ;)

Someone Took My Idea in a Meeting and Even Got Applause

**How to Claim Credit, Reclaim Your Voice, and Respond
When Others Take Credit for Your Work Without
Starting an Office Civil War**



**We've got a problem. But relax.
It can be solved—and we'll even have something to laugh about.**

Someone Took My Idea in a Meeting and Even Got Applause

How to Claim Credit, Reclaim Your Voice,
and Respond When Others Take Credit for
Your Work Without Starting an Office Civil
War

Max Paradox

PROBLEM? RELAX. YOU'VE GOT THIS!

ISBN: 978-83-8483-554-8

CONTENTS

INTRO	5
Chapter 1 - Your Idea, Someone Else's Name: What Actually Happened?.....	11
Chapter 2 - Why Your Idea Suddenly Becomes Brilliant When Someone Else Says It	20
Chapter 3 - How Your Idea Travels Through Five Departments and Loses Your Name Along the Way	31
Chapter 4 - Anger, Silence, and Revenge: How Not to Lose Twice Over the Same Idea.....	41
Chapter 5 - Stop Apologizing for Your Idea Before Anyone Has Heard It.....	52
Chapter 6 - Stop Being the Free Idea Department for Someone Else's Career	62
Chapter 7 - Everyone Saw It. Why Did Nobody Say Anything?.....	73
Chapter 8 - The Office Rumor Mill Won't Give You Your Credit Back.....	83
Chapter 9 - That Was My Idea: How to Reclaim Your Voice During a Meeting Without Making a Scene	95
Chapter 10 - Talk to the Person Who Took Credit: No Interrogation, No Pretending Nothing Happened	106
Chapter 11 - The Email After the Meeting That Remembers More Than Everyone in the Room	118
Chapter 12 - You Did the Work, Someone Else Got Promoted: How to Make Your Contribution Count Where Career Decisions Are Made	129

Chapter 13 - When Your Boss Takes Credit for Your Idea: Protecting Your Work When They Control Your Career	142
Chapter 14 - Agree on the Credit Before the Applause: How to Share Recognition in a Team Project	152
Chapter 15 - When Talking Doesn't Work: How to Escalate Credit Theft Without Becoming the Office Enemy	165
Chapter 16 - Nobody Remembers Who Had the Idea: What to Do When You Have No Proof.....	176
Chapter 17 - When the Whole Company Takes Credit for Other People's Work: How to Protect Your Career in a Broken Culture	188
Chapter 18 - Stop Auditing Every Compliment: How to Stay Visible Without Constantly Fighting for Credit	199
Chapter 19 - What If You're Getting Applause for Someone Else's Idea? How Not to Become the Person You Used to Resent.....	211
Chapter 20 - You Don't Have to Win Every Meeting: How to Reclaim Your Work, Your Peace, and Your Own Rules.....	222

INTRO

The first time you see your idea on a giant screen at a company-wide meeting, you feel a little burst of pride. There it is: the solution you spent three weeks developing, complete with the process diagram you revised six times because someone kept insisting the arrows were confusing. The executive presenting it looks delighted. Your coworkers are nodding approvingly. Then comes the sentence: "When I came up with this approach, I knew we had an opportunity to do something different." You stop smiling. Apparently, somewhere between your laptop and the executive presentation, your idea acquired a new parent. Nobody informed you about the adoption. There wasn't even any paperwork.

You look around the room, wondering whether anyone else has noticed. A colleague who helped you test the solution avoids eye contact. Your manager applauds enthusiastically. Someone whispers that the presenter is probably getting a promotion. Meanwhile, you're trying to decide whether to raise your hand, walk out, or ask the IT department if the presentation has an option to display the original creator. Unfortunately, the software appears to support animations, transitions, and embedded video, but not basic professional justice.

The worst part often comes afterward. You replay the moment during your commute, in the shower, and while supposedly enjoying dinner. You invent brilliant responses that would have made everyone recognize the truth immediately. In one version, you calmly correct the presenter. In another, you produce undeniable evidence and

the entire leadership team falls silent in admiration. By bedtime, you've mentally delivered a closing argument worthy of an international tribunal. In real life, however, you said nothing. And now you're wondering whether the silence made you look as though you agreed.

Having someone else receive credit for your work hurts for reasons that extend beyond wounded pride. Recognition can influence who gets invited into important conversations, trusted with challenging assignments, recommended for promotion, or considered capable of leading a project. When colleagues consistently associate your achievements with somebody else, your professional reputation can become disconnected from the work you actually perform. You may be solving difficult problems while another person becomes known as the one who solves difficult problems. That is a rather unfortunate division of labor, especially if compensation follows reputation rather than effort.

But there's an uncomfortable complication: not every case of misplaced credit involves a scheming villain. Ideas rarely arrive in perfectly sealed packages bearing their creator's signature. People develop proposals through conversations, combine suggestions, refine one another's thinking, and sometimes reach similar conclusions independently. A colleague might repeat your point because they genuinely agree with it. A manager might present a team achievement without realizing that the wording makes it sound like a personal invention. Someone else might deliberately remove your contribution from the story because they know exactly how valuable the credit could be. These situations can look remarkably similar from the audience's perspective, yet they call for different responses.

That distinction matters because anger, however justified, is not particularly good at identifying motives. Anger notices an injustice and immediately wants to appoint a prosecutor. It doesn't always check whether the case involves deliberate deception, careless communication, or an innocent misunderstanding. If you accuse a coworker of stealing an idea when they were simply building on a shared discussion, you can damage a relationship unnecessarily. If you repeatedly dismiss intentional misrepresentation as an accident, you can leave an important professional problem unresolved. Learning to recognize what actually happened is more useful than assuming either the worst or the best about everybody.

Perhaps you've already tried being the bigger person. You told yourself the work would speak for itself, that good managers eventually recognize genuine talent, and that asking for credit would make you seem insecure. There is something appealing about this approach. It allows you to remain gracious while imagining that the universe maintains an accurate spreadsheet of everybody's contributions. Unfortunately, the universe has not demonstrated much interest in preparing performance reviews. Busy organizations rely on incomplete information, imperfect memories, and the stories people tell about results. Excellent work can remain invisible if the people making decisions never learn who did it.

Or perhaps you've tried the opposite. You've considered copying senior leaders on every message, documenting every conversation, and announcing your involvement whenever a project is mentioned. That strategy offers a certain sense of control, but it can also turn ordinary collaboration into an exhausting exercise in reputation

management. You shouldn't need to approach a brainstorming session as though you're entering a negotiation over international territory. Guarding every thought can make you reluctant to share ideas at all, which defeats one of the main reasons teams exist.

This book is about finding a workable middle ground. You'll learn to communicate your contributions clearly without turning every achievement into a personal advertising campaign. You'll learn how to recognize the moment when a meeting begins rewriting the history of an idea, and how to bring the facts back into the conversation without making everybody wish they'd taken a sick day. We'll look at practical ways to establish ownership of work, discuss contributions with colleagues, handle difficult conversations, and make sure the people assessing your performance have a reasonably accurate picture of what you've accomplished.

Some situations require more than a well-chosen sentence. What happens when the person taking credit is your manager, and that manager also influences your salary, assignments, and future opportunities? What if several people contributed to the result, but nobody agrees about who originated the concept? What if you have no written evidence, the other person is considerably more influential, or previous attempts to clarify matters have failed? Real workplaces contain power differences, competing priorities, and relationships you cannot simply abandon because a conversation becomes uncomfortable. Practical advice must account for those realities rather than pretending everyone can confront everyone else without consequences.

You will also have to examine your own habits. Maybe you introduce carefully researched recommendations as

"just a random thought." Maybe you give colleagues complete solutions when they've asked for a little help, then disappear before the work is presented. Or perhaps you find it easier to praise everyone else than to describe your own contribution accurately. None of these habits makes you responsible for somebody else's dishonesty. They can, however, create unnecessary ambiguity about work you deserve to have recognized.

Here's one small distinction worth considering immediately. Saying, "I developed the initial proposal, and the team helped refine it," is not the same as declaring yourself the sole genius responsible for everything good that happened afterward. You can acknowledge collaboration while remaining visible within it. You can correct an inaccurate claim without humiliating the person who made it. And sometimes you can decide that a minor oversight isn't worth pursuing, without surrendering your right to respond when the stakes are genuinely important.

There will be no promise that every colleague becomes fair, every manager becomes observant, or every company suddenly develops an excellent system for recognizing contributions. Some workplaces have deeper problems than any individual communication technique can solve. What you can develop is a more reliable way to assess situations, protect your interests, respond proportionately, and keep doing valuable work without carrying an invisible courtroom around in your head.

Because the goal isn't to win every meeting or collect more applause than everyone else. It's to know what you've contributed, make that contribution reasonably visible, and respond when someone presents a different story.

And if your next brilliant idea receives a standing ovation, it would be nice if you didn't have to spend the entire celebration explaining that you're actually the person who came up with it.

Chapter 1 - Your Idea, Someone Else's Name: What Actually Happened?

At 8:46 on Tuesday morning, an announcement appears in the company chat. "Congratulations to Marcus for developing our new customer escalation process!" Beneath the message is a photograph of Marcus smiling beside the department director, followed by several enthusiastic comments and an impressive collection of digital applause. Rachel reads the announcement twice. She designed the escalation process. She interviewed the support team, identified where urgent cases were getting stuck, tested alternative procedures, and prepared the recommendations that became the new policy. Marcus attended two planning meetings and helped coordinate the launch. Apparently, somewhere during those meetings, the project acquired a different creator. Rachel checks the announcement again, just in case her name has been hidden behind a particularly enthusiastic thumbs-up emoji.

The announcement is especially frustrating because it is almost correct. Marcus genuinely helped launch the process, and the company has good reasons to celebrate the improvement. Rachel isn't upset that he received recognition for his contribution. She's upset that his contribution has apparently expanded to include work she remembers doing herself. She wants the record corrected, but she doesn't know whether Marcus deliberately misrepresented the project or someone in corporate communications misunderstood his role. These possibilities matter. One suggests dishonesty, another suggests carelessness, and a third might reveal that the project's

responsibilities were never explained clearly enough. Before Rachel decides how to respond, she needs to establish what actually happened.

That sounds obvious, but feeling wronged and understanding precisely how you've been wronged are different things. When someone else receives applause for your work, your mind rarely begins with a calm assessment of the available evidence. It tends to leap directly to the emotional conclusion: "They're taking credit for everything I do." The conclusion might reflect a genuine pattern, but a single incident cannot establish the entire pattern by itself. Your frustration deserves attention. It doesn't need to become the final verdict before you've examined the facts.

What exactly belongs to whom?

Workplace ideas are rarely as neatly attributable as a finished painting with a signature in the corner. They can begin with a complaint from a customer, develop through a conversation between colleagues, acquire substance during someone's analysis, and change significantly before implementation. Several people may make indispensable contributions without performing the same kind of work. Confusion begins when the organization treats all those contributions as interchangeable and then assigns the resulting achievement to whichever person happens to be announcing it.

Consider a fictional product team developing a simpler subscription cancellation process. An account manager notices that customers frequently contact support because they cannot find the cancellation option. A designer proposes a clearer navigation structure. An engineer identifies a technical limitation and develops a workable alternative. A project lead secures approval and coordinates

the release. Who deserves credit? Potentially all four, for different reasons. The account manager identified the need, the designer developed a proposed experience, the engineer created a feasible implementation, and the project lead organized delivery. Calling the entire outcome one person's invention would erase information about how the work actually happened.

This distinction also protects you from claiming too much. Perhaps you suggested improving a particular procedure, but another employee developed the detailed method that made the improvement possible. Your initial contribution matters, yet it doesn't automatically give you exclusive ownership of everything that followed. Equally, someone who subsequently managed implementation doesn't become the original creator simply because their role involved greater responsibility or more meetings. Accurate recognition depends on describing contributions rather than competing to become the sole owner of a shared achievement.

A useful question is not merely "Whose idea was it?" but "Which part of the achievement is being attributed incorrectly?" You may have identified the problem, developed the main concept, produced the supporting analysis, or made the final implementation work. These are distinguishable contributions. When you can name yours precisely, you no longer need to argue that the entire project belongs to you. You're identifying an actual discrepancy between the work performed and the story being told about it.

Three explanations that can look identical

Imagine hearing a colleague recommend a policy remarkably similar to something you suggested last week.

Your first interpretation might be that the colleague borrowed your idea. That is possible, but there are at least three different explanations worth considering before you respond.

First, the colleague may have arrived at a similar conclusion independently. When several employees are examining the same data and struggling with the same operational problem, their recommendations can overlap. If the most obvious way to reduce an unnecessary approval stage is to remove that stage, it isn't extraordinary for more than one person to notice. Being first to mention a solution doesn't prove that everyone else learned it from you. That doesn't make your insight worthless. It means resemblance alone is insufficient evidence of appropriation.

Second, the contribution may have been lost through ordinary organizational carelessness. Perhaps a manager received your analysis, extracted the recommendations, and forwarded them without explaining who prepared them. The next person assumed the sender was the author. By the time someone presented the material, its origin was no longer visible. Nobody necessarily intended to deceive, yet the final account remained inaccurate. The absence of malicious intent does not eliminate the need to correct an error that may affect your professional reputation.

Third, someone may knowingly represent your work as their own. This becomes more plausible when a person removes identifying information, explicitly claims to have performed work they didn't do, refuses reasonable corrections, or repeatedly behaves in the same way. Even here, you need to distinguish observable conduct from assumptions about hidden motives. You can establish that someone changed an author's name without proving what

they were privately thinking. Fortunately, identifying the inappropriate action is often enough to begin addressing it.

The differences between these explanations are practical, not merely philosophical. An innocent overlap may call for collaborative discussion. An inaccurate announcement may need a straightforward correction. Repeated deliberate misrepresentation may require stronger boundaries or formal intervention. Treating all three as identical can make you either unnecessarily confrontational or dangerously passive. Neither is a particularly appealing career development strategy.

Reconstruct the incident without writing a conspiracy thriller

Rachel decides to examine the customer escalation project before contacting anyone. She finds the original problem statement, her recommendations, a meeting invitation, and the implementation plan. The records show that she developed the routing criteria and proposed the escalation thresholds. Marcus later organized the rollout and trained team leaders. The company announcement, however, credited Marcus with developing the process itself. Rachel now has something more useful than a suspicion: a specific statement that doesn't reflect the documented division of work.

Notice what she hasn't established. She doesn't yet know who wrote the announcement, what Marcus told that person, or whether Marcus reviewed the wording before publication. She could invent several convincing explanations, especially the unpleasant ones, but doing so wouldn't make them true. Instead, she can approach the discrepancy itself: the announcement describes Marcus as the creator, while the underlying documents identify her as the person who

developed the process. This gives her a clear starting point for requesting a correction.

When examining your own situation, separate the event into three categories: what you directly observed, what available materials support, and what you're inferring. The first might be a statement made during a presentation. The second could include a dated proposal or an agreed assignment. The third could be your belief that the presenter intentionally concealed your involvement. All three may matter to how you understand the experience, but they don't carry the same evidential weight.

There's no need to establish a private investigation unit equipped with elaborate spreadsheets and a suspiciously serious filing cabinet. Start with the material relevant to the disputed contribution. If the question concerns who prepared a particular model, identify the records that clarify its development. If it concerns what somebody said during a meeting, check any available notes or approved recordings, while respecting confidentiality and company rules. Never assume that feeling justified authorizes you to copy restricted documents into personal accounts or access information you aren't permitted to use.

An uncomfortable complication arises when there is no reliable record. Perhaps the proposal emerged during an informal conversation, and two participants remember its origins differently. You can explain your recollection, ask what others remember, and look for independent supporting information. But an unwavering belief isn't a substitute for proof. Sometimes a dispute remains unresolved. That may be disappointing, but manufacturing certainty won't improve the situation. You can still establish clear ownership of

subsequent work rather than turning an ambiguous conversation into a lifelong contest over who spoke first.

The size of the error matters

Not every incorrect attribution has the same consequences. A casual remark during an internal discussion may disappear without influencing anything important. A misleading announcement that becomes part of a promotion package could have much greater significance. Before deciding how strongly to respond, consider where the inaccurate information has traveled and what decisions might rely on it.

Suppose a colleague forgets to mention your contribution while explaining a small adjustment to the team's weekly routine. You might reasonably decide that a private clarification is enough. Now suppose the same colleague is being evaluated for a senior position on the basis of having independently designed a major system you created. The stakes have changed. The issue involves the accuracy of information used to assess professional capability, not simply your desire to hear your name spoken.

Repeated small errors deserve attention too. A single omission may be harmless; a dozen omissions can gradually distort how people understand a team's contributions. If you're consistently described as the person who assists while another colleague is described as the person who innovates, that distinction can eventually influence assignments and opportunities. You don't need to treat every oversight as a career emergency to recognize that an accumulating pattern matters.

It is equally important to avoid measuring harm entirely by how angry you feel. A small public slight may sting intensely

because it reminds you of earlier experiences. A serious error in a confidential evaluation may cause little immediate emotional reaction because you haven't yet recognized its consequences. Assess the event and the feelings separately. Both deserve consideration, but they answer different questions.

Decide what would actually put things right

Once you've understood the discrepancy, define what a satisfactory correction would look like. Rachel doesn't necessarily need Marcus to deliver a dramatic confession in front of the entire workforce. She wants the announcement to reflect the actual responsibilities: she developed the process, Marcus coordinated its implementation, and the wider team contributed to the launch. The appropriate person might edit the announcement or publish a correction. That is a concrete outcome people can work toward.

A different incident might require clarification of project ownership, correction of an evaluation record, or a conversation about future responsibilities. These outcomes aren't interchangeable. You can receive a sincere apology while the inaccurate information remains unchanged. Conversely, an official correction can sometimes resolve the professional problem even if the other person never agrees with your interpretation of their behavior.

You also don't have to decide in advance that everyone involved is either completely innocent or irredeemably dishonest. People sometimes behave carelessly in one situation and responsibly in another. Someone may have contributed genuinely to a project while also overstating their involvement. Being precise about the conduct allows you to respond without passing judgment on an entire personality. You're trying to establish what happened and

what needs correcting, not write the definitive biography of a colleague's moral failures.

There are situations where this ordinary approach isn't enough. If inaccurate attribution is accompanied by threats, retaliation, coercion, or serious misconduct, consider the relevant workplace procedures and appropriate professional advice. A simple correction may not address the broader risk. Protecting your interests doesn't require tackling every difficult situation alone, particularly when the other person has substantial influence over your employment.

Rachel's next move can now be measured rather than improvised. She knows which part of the project she created, how Marcus contributed, why the announcement is misleading, and what correction she wants. She may still feel furious. That's understandable. But her action no longer has to depend on which version of an angry speech happens to be circulating through her mind.

Understanding what was taken doesn't guarantee you'll get the recognition you deserve. It does give you a stronger foundation than indignation alone. When you can identify the contribution, the inaccurate claim, and the consequence, you're no longer trying to prove that you're generally underappreciated. You're addressing something specific.

And that matters because "You stole everything I've ever done" is an argument capable of consuming an entire afternoon. "This announcement credits you with developing a process I designed" is a statement someone can actually investigate.

Chapter 2 - Why Your Idea Suddenly Becomes Brilliant When Someone Else Says It

Consider two sentences. The first is spoken by a junior operations specialist: "We could reduce unnecessary stock transfers by changing the replenishment rules for slower-moving products." The second is spoken by a regional director twenty minutes later: "We need a more targeted inventory allocation strategy, with replenishment decisions aligned to actual product movement." They describe substantially the same direction. One receives a distracted nod. The other inspires enthusiastic agreement and an immediate request for an implementation plan. The junior specialist begins wondering whether the company charges extra for ideas delivered without a senior job title.

It's tempting to explain the difference entirely through favoritism. Sometimes that explanation is justified. Organizations can contain deeply unfair hierarchies, and some people receive more attention simply because of their position, relationships, or perceived importance. But workplace communication also involves several less obvious mechanisms. An idea's reception depends on what people are concentrating on, how they understand the problem, whether they trust the speaker, and whether they believe a decision is actually possible. The quality of the idea matters, yet it isn't the only variable influencing what happens after somebody speaks.

Understanding these mechanisms won't make every meeting fair. It will help you distinguish an avoidable

communication problem from one rooted in organizational power. That matters because telling someone to "present more confidently" is not particularly helpful when their manager routinely dismisses contributions from certain employees. Equally, blaming office politics for every overlooked suggestion may prevent you from noticing improvements you could make yourself. A good diagnosis preserves both possibilities.

Meetings have an invisible hierarchy of attention

The formal agenda tells you what people are supposed to discuss. The actual meeting often follows a second agenda that exists mainly inside the participants' heads. The finance director wants to know whether costs are under control. The project manager needs approval to proceed. The technical specialist is worried about a problem nobody else understands. Meanwhile, someone from another department has joined because the invitation said their attendance was essential, although forty minutes have passed without any evidence supporting this claim.

When you introduce an idea, you're competing with all these concerns. Suppose the group is still debating whether a problem exists. You arrive with a sophisticated solution, complete with assumptions and expected benefits. The participants may not be ready to consider implementation because they haven't yet agreed on the underlying issue. Your proposal receives little attention. Later, once everyone accepts the problem, another person suggests something similar and appears unusually insightful.

The idea didn't necessarily improve. The audience became more receptive. This is why timing matters. A recommendation intended to guide a decision works best when people understand what they're deciding. If discussion

is still focused elsewhere, you may need to connect your proposal to the immediate question rather than presenting it as an additional topic. For example, "The transfer delays we're discussing are exactly why I recommend changing replenishment rules for slower-moving products" gives listeners a clear reason to pay attention now.

This doesn't mean you must postpone every contribution until a perfect moment arrives. Meetings rarely offer one, and opportunities can disappear while you're waiting for the group to achieve complete intellectual harmony. It means noticing which question currently has the room's attention. If your suggestion addresses a later question, make that relationship explicit. You are helping people understand where your idea belongs in the decision, rather than hoping they'll reconstruct the connection themselves.

Seniority changes that process. A director may signal that an issue is ready for decision simply by discussing it. Their position can make the same proposal seem more immediately actionable. Participants might believe the director has already considered the budget or possesses authority to approve the next step. The junior specialist's suggestion, meanwhile, can be treated as an interesting possibility requiring further investigation. That difference may reflect legitimate responsibility for decisions, but it doesn't establish who originated the solution.

The packaging can change without the contents changing

A proposal may be technically excellent and still difficult to understand. Specialists often know a problem so thoroughly that they begin explaining it halfway through their own mental reasoning. They introduce exceptions, describe unusual cases, qualify assumptions, and discuss the weaknesses of alternative solutions before listeners know

what the recommendation actually is. The audience receives a great deal of information but struggles to locate the central point.

Imagine a data analyst explaining an unusually high number of abandoned online applications. The analyst describes inconsistent fields, several categories of errors, differences between customer groups, and limitations in the available reports. Eventually, buried near the end, comes the recommendation: allow customers to save an incomplete application and return to it later. A colleague subsequently says, "Why don't we add a save-and-resume option?" Suddenly, everyone understands. The colleague has compressed the original analysis into one accessible sentence.

Compression can be a genuine contribution. Making a complex idea understandable is valuable, and not every concise restatement should be treated as theft. But clearer communication doesn't automatically transfer authorship of the underlying proposal. Both contributions can be recognized: one person identified and developed the solution; another helped the group understand it. The trouble begins when the person who simplified the message becomes known as the person who invented the entire concept.

You can reduce this risk by establishing the central recommendation before exploring its details. Begin with the proposed action, explain which problem it addresses, and identify what would need to happen next. Supporting analysis then has a clear purpose. "I recommend adding a save-and-resume option because customers currently lose their progress when they leave the application. I've examined where this happens most often and can show the

main constraints." Listeners know what you're proposing before you ask them to follow the evidence.

This structure is useful even when your evidence is incomplete. You can confidently identify a recommendation without pretending its benefits have already been proven. "I propose testing this option with a limited group before deciding whether to expand it" communicates both direction and uncertainty. Professional credibility doesn't require the ability to predict the future. It requires being clear about what you're recommending and what information is still missing.

The person speaking can change what people think they're hearing

Status influences interpretation in ways that aren't always obvious. A statement from a senior leader may be heard as a recommendation backed by experience, while the same statement from a less established employee is treated as an untested suggestion. Expertise, previous performance, and responsibility can legitimately influence credibility. The problem arises when those signals replace examination of the actual reasoning, or when someone's position determines whose contribution is remembered.

Workplace stereotypes can deepen this imbalance. Some employees experience more interruptions, more demands to prove competence, or less recognition for comparable contributions. These patterns can be related to gender, background, professional status, or other aspects of organizational culture. If the same group of people repeatedly gets overlooked while others receive credit for similar work, the issue may extend beyond individual presentation skills. Responsibility for fair participation