



Walk the Talk

Radio for Agile Minds

<p>Shelley</p>	<p>It's that time of the month when we welcome Nick Anderson to the studio.</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</p>
----------------	---

	<p>month?</p>
<p>Nick</p>	<p>This is the forth in my series to help people assess how good their interactive skills are. This series is based on research of common commercial interactions that has led to many useful insights into how to create and manage effective meetings, deal with those who are most difficult to persuade – Low Reactors. This week I am focusing on those behaviors we all use most.</p> <p>Clarifying Behaviors are those which exchange information, facts and opinions and, of course clarification. For Today we will consider, the four main behaviors which when used to observing meetings led to practical insights for anyone who is dreading attending yet another meeting this week ☺</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing Understanding- checking to see if an earlier contribution has been understood • Summarizing – restating in a compact form previous discussions or events • Seeking Information – seeks facts opinions, feelings or clarification from others • Giving Information – offers facts , opinions or clarification to others <p>Over the years these four main categories have been developed into behavior groups especially Seeking the Behaviors which have led to some of</p>

	<p>the most important research on successful persuasion which I will cover in a later program.</p> <p>But, for now I want to help the listeners diagnose their meetings and how too much, too little or the wrong balance can waste time and often make meetings very frustrating and ineffective</p>
Shelley	Which of these four behaviors do we tend to use most?
NICK	Usually the most common of all the behaviors we are discussing in this series will be Giving Information. In some cases this can be as high as 50%
SHELLEY	What happens when you get over that level?
NICK	<p>The first thing participants' ratings change negatively is when a meeting has a high level of GI is Time Wasting. It happened when everyone in the meeting wants to add yet another reason, anecdote or opinion as to why an initiative should or should not be pursued. All of which tend not to help the decision making process</p> <p>The second rating the increases is that the meeting is Confusing and Divergent – This is especially true where TU & SUM are low. People often say things like it was like “swimming in syrup”. Points become disconnected, the meeting wanders and meeting participants become</p>

	<p>confused. You know when this happens 'cos you will have another meeting to decide what was decided at the last meeting – which I am sure Shelly you have never been involved in – right☺?</p>
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>Lions, Chamber, WGVU – give examples - ☺☺</p> <p>I have been in meetings where people drone on about themselves which feels they are trying to puff themselves up – do you have any research to say what is going on when this happens?</p>
<p>NICK</p>	<p>That's a good point...anyone who is a high information giver is frequently seen as less interested in others views than putting forward their own. This also often means they try to push their own proposals. When everyone does is high on GI it feels like there's a whole set of mini meetings going on each not really connected with any other</p>
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>What about Seeking Information – when a meeting is high in this behavior what tends to be the result.</p>
<p>Nick</p>	<p>Firstly it would be rare for SI to exceed GI. In fact participants will perceive a meeting is high in SI if it exceeds half the amount of GI. When this happens though ratings change in three ways principally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fostering interest in others views – it's like they see it as stimulating interest in others views

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convergent & Focused – When SI is high connection between each successive point is likely to be clearer. This is because SI either explores a point already made which then creates a connection to the previous contribution or asks for another point. These meetings also tend to be focused. • Time Saving – you would think that meetings with a lot of questions would take longer to resolve issues than those with fewer questions – this is not the case. There is a positive correlation between people’s perception of whether a meeting saved time and the volume of SI
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>OK, so that’s Seeking and Giving Information – where to next...</p>
<p>Nick</p>	<p>Testing Understanding which explores understanding of previous contributions. It ties down and clarifies points which may be unclear or ambiguous. As importantly is to check that people are seeing things the same way. When levels are high, people rate the meeting as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair – a fair hearing • Clear – close to SUM • Rational – vs. levels of DA <p>Summarizing – a compact restatement – be careful- It’s not extended repetition or introducing new material under the umbrellas of</p>

	<p>“summarizing”</p> <p>High SUM Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure • Clarity • Control
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>These last two behaviors seem to perform similar functions in terms of clarifying and organizing what has been discussed. So, What happens when both these are high?</p>
<p>Nick</p>	<p>Good point! Research was carried out to correlate the number of misunderstandings and misinterpretations that occurred after the meeting with the amount of TU &SUM during the meeting In all 49 Meetings were so observed in those 297partiipants.</p> <p>N those low in TU & SUM there were significantly more errors and omissions in people’s accounts of the principle decisions agreed to in the meeting. As meetings differ in length the researchers took TU & SUM as a percentage total meeting behavior.</p> <p>The findings are rather disturbing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <2.5% - TU SUM Average 4.3 errors or omissions • >10%+ U SUM – Average 1.2 errors or omissions

Shelley	So, what recommendations would you make?
Nick	To get a clear understanding and consensus on what was decided ten approx 1 in 10 behaviors needs to be TU or SUM
Shelley	How can listeners get better control of their meetings in terms of clarifying behaviors?
Nick	<p>If you look at the current condition of your meetings, ask yourself what you need to do differently;</p> <p>Not making enough of the brains round the table – so you want to create more curiosity of what the lower contributors have to say. Then use Testing Understanding where such a person reacts non-verbally e.g.</p> <p>“Joan, you seem to be shaking your head about Peter’s last point – Am I right?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another tactic is being straight forward BI by Seeking – <p>“Joan, in our experience what do you see as the pros and cons of Peter’s position?”</p>
Shelley	What if I am frustrated with going over what was covered in previous meeting?
Nick	Certainly Sum will help, but if you are not the Chair you will need to make a Proc Prop

