



## Walk the Talk

### Radio for Agile Minds

<b>Shelley</b>	<p><b>It's that time of the month when we welcome Nick Anderson to the studio.</b></p> <p>Nick is Senior Partner for Professional Development Services – The PDS Group</p> <p>Affiliated with ROCG Business Transition Specialists. Over the last 20 years Nick has helped many house hold names like Turner Construction, Qwest Telecommunications and Royal Bank of Canada to impact bottom-line results through changing people's alignment within their organization, with their customer's and their partners.</p> <p>Each month Nick chooses a topic related to the business world in West Michigan focusing on the transitions this economy is going through</p> <p>Welcome....What have you chose for us this month?</p>
<b>Nick</b>	<p>This is the third in my series to help people assess how good their interactive skills are. Last month I introduced the research based model that led to many useful insights into how to create and manage effective meetings. I covered the impact of Filter and Amplifier meetings which was the name we coined in the research we did to distinguish the different ways in which ideas or proposals were managed. This week I am focusing on looking at a certain type of person</p>

	<p>who is difficult for many to handle or feel comfortable with.</p> <p>Typically, you will either work with one of these people who naturally behave this way <b>and</b> certain situations where people change the way they behave often without realizing it.</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	<p>How do you recognize you are dealing with one of these mysterious people (☺)</p>
<b>NICK</b>	<p>Well, let's look at one aspect of behavior – Reacting. It's a group of behaviors which you can choose to use. Each of which when used repeatedly have certain effects n the people you interactive with for better or worse.</p> <p>Let's take the first – Supporting someone's ideas or position – most likely response</p>
<b>SHELLEY</b>	<p>Supportive, likeable...(add you own)</p>
<b>NICK</b>	<p>Yes that's right. Secondly, there is disagreeing with someone's ideas or positions...?</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	<p>Well, I could see them as negative if they are aggressive or defensive...</p>
<b>NICK</b>	<p>That's interesting....funnily enough people don't see people as high in disagreeing as necessary negative...because they are rational, seen as more objective...if they stick to a person's proposals or ideas NOT the individual themselves So, if the get defensive or aggressive they are not disagreeing they are defending/attacking. No surprises as to how such emotional people are viewed by colleagues and family members, for that matter.</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	<p>OK, so who's this mystery people... high</p>

	disagreer, defend/attacker?
<b>Nick</b>	No, this person is called the LOW REACTOR; they use lower levels of all three behaviors. In both their verbal and non-verbal behavior, they show very little reaction to others
<b>Shelley</b>	So, they are very quiet individuals?
<b>Nick</b>	Not necessarily. They may for example have high levels of Initiating and Clarifying behaviors. The only thing they avoid is Reacting.
<b>Shelley</b>	Why is this Low Reactor a problem?
<b>Nick</b>	They give very little feedback about whether or not they approve of points you present. This tends to make people feel uneasy and people tend to handle them badly. Even experienced sales people, for example find it difficult to put their case convincingly when they are faced with somebody whose lack of response makes it hard to judge the effect they are having. One salesperson summed up the difference between high disagreeers and low reactors. "You know where you stand with someone who is prepared to disagree. What makes it hard with the Low Reactor is that he doesn't even disagree" Some research to back up this comment was in the famous Xerox research one element of which looked at this very point. The research showed that while high disagreeers are harder to sell to that hardest were the Low Reactors.
<b>Shelley</b>	How much different were sales people's success rates?
<b>Nick</b>	It was quite striking. The researchers looked at calls which advanced to the next stage or a deal was signed. For average reactors salespeople were successful about 11 out of 20 sales, whereas selling to high disagreeers only 8 out of 20 and finally Low

	Reactors only 3 out of 20 sales.
<b>Shelley</b>	That's a big difference...did they find out why selling to Low Reactors was so difficult?
<b>Nick</b>	It turns out that there are five common traps people tend to fall into when trying to persuade a Low Reactor. Let's see Shelley if you have experienced any of these... 😊
<b>Shelley</b>	Ok Go ahead... I am sure I have fallen into at least one and not realized it
<b>Nick</b>	That's an excellent point...most people don't know what's happening to them ... other than this person seems awkward to deal with. The first trap – Losing control over your speaking pace. Because people lose confidences in front of Low Reactors they do two things, either they Talk faster to get to something that will spark interest or the Run out of things to say due to the lack of reaction. For example sellers normal speech rate was 119 wpm whereas it was 138 wpm when selling to Low Reactors and the number pauses, you the Ummmm's went over double. In fact the number of redundant words significantly increased as well like "Well, you see...what I meant to say..."
<b>Shelley</b>	(REACT with your experience then ask) I bet this doesn't apply just to sales situations?
<b>Nick</b>	Quite right, job interviews is another good example of finding Low Reactors – more situational – Interviewers know they are not supposed to SP or DS
<b>Shelley</b>	Fascinating, what's the second trap?
<b>Nick</b>	Losing sequence during presentations – this was common in any situations where someone needs to make a verbal presentation. If either the decision maker is a LR or they are

	<p>evaluating and making a big decision presenters will tend to jump around or lose sequence. In a study of 23 managers we did back tracking occurred over 50% more and "jumping the Gun" occurred 3 times as much</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	<p>REACT then say OK 2 down 3 to go?</p>
<b>Nick</b>	<p>Yes, and in third place, Over-Reacting, most common and most dangerous. Over-stating to get a reaction.</p> <p>In a study of trade union officials and their management counterparts, n=28, we actually observed real life labor negotiations and listened for emotionally charged statements.</p> <p>The differences were stark when the low reactor was on either side of the neg table – nearly 50% more.</p> <p>In another study of salespeople, selling to LR's led to a drop in factual statements and overstatements went up from 4% average to 13% with LR's also untruths (lies☺) 3% to 1%</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	<p>Well it confirms that sellers do lie on occasions</p>
<b>Nick</b>	<p>Yes, BUT, so does the general population...some of the time</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	<p>REACT then ask OK... two more to go,...what's number 4</p>
<b>Nick</b>	<p>Asking fewer questions than usual. Asking more questions than usual is a good thing to do with LR's – to find out where you are if nothing else! ESP "How do you feel about this point?"</p> <p>Unfortunately 80% people say they should ask more questions yet only 30% actually do.</p> <p>In one sample of 196 sellers questions feel by a third to half</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	<p>REACT then say OK, What's the fifth trap?</p>
<b>Nick</b>	<p>Giving too much information, in selection interviews, law courts and other places where low reaction is normal people often come away</p>

	<p>having given a great deal more information which they would have wanted. In one study, sales people gave 50% more feature statements</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	REACT then ask...do we all fall into these traps?
<b>Nick</b>	<p>No. Some people are more susceptible than others. Trap 1 pace 10-15% 2 sequence 25-30% 3 over reacting/stating 55-60% 4 fewer questions – 75%-80% 5 blab 75%-80%</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	REACT then ask What proportion of the population are LR's?
<b>Nick</b>	<p>That's difficult to say ethnicity and cultural differences – Scandinavians vs. Italians. What I can indicate is the bigger the decision someone is making the lower their reactions levels. In selling different sizes of machine we saw the LR rates rise from 18% to 46% and when people are making the decision for someone else as opposed for themselves it goes from 16% to 47%</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	React Then Ask – How do you define Low Reactors?
<b>Nick</b>	<p>Less than 10% behaviors but its clouded by reaction levels being higher in one-to-one situations, so for groups 7% and the other problem are for those people who just don't say much</p>
<b>Shelley</b>	Tip of the month