

“Applied Emotional Intelligence and Influence - How to Achieve Results in Competitive Professional Environments”

**A session designed for women attending the Joint Colloquium of the
Cochrane & Campbell Collaborations**

Denver - Colorado, USA

October 2010

Presented by Ms Amanda Phillips – APA Training & Development, Australia.

www.apatraining.com.au

As the ability to negotiate and influence aligns strongly with the overall aims of this Colloquium, this session is designed to provide practical tools and insights into approaches we can use to analyse and plan for more informed and (hopefully) more successful outcomes in negotiations.

Key content includes:

- Establishing the application of emotional intelligence (EI) in challenging work environments;
- Identifying the skills, knowledge and approaches that will support women in influencing and negotiating in professional settings;
- Identification of the planning stages for building influence in professional environments where politics, power and networks have an enormous impact on decision making;
- Focusing on the communication strategies that support improved influence and negotiation including reference to key models with practical interpretation and application to the particular context of the women contributing to and driving the future of the Collaboration.

As research into emotional intelligence (EI) and linked areas of interest have expanded, so have our options for understanding more about ourselves and how we can engage with and impact on others. This session and this supporting document will focus on what we can do to strengthen our abilities to influence decisions by improved negotiation planning and applying emotional intelligence to situations where decisions need to be made in professional settings.



Our first step is to confirm the basics of emotional intelligence (EI). *EI describes the ability, capacity, skill to identify, assess, manage and control the emotions of one's self, of others, and of groups.*

Different models have been proposed for the definition of EI and while there is ongoing debate about how the term should be applied, the ideas generated by the discussions provide us with new ways of assessing how we engage with others in professional settings. The model claims that EI includes four types of abilities with further expansion on the concept by identifying an alignment with leadership traits or domains within the book "*Primal Leadership*" by D. Goleman, R. Boyzatsis, and A, McKee (2002).

1. ***Perceiving emotions***: Self Awareness including the competencies of emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence.
2. ***Using emotions***: Self-Management including the competencies of emotional self-control, transparency, adaptability, achievement, initiative, and optimism.

Mastery of traits/domains one and two: which the authors describe as personal competence, depends heavily upon listening to one's self, becoming aware of one's emotional state, values, standards, and impact upon others. It also relies on seeking and receiving ongoing feedback from multiple sources to continue self development and insight.

3. ***Understanding emotions***: Social Awareness including empathy and organisational awareness, and the ability to recognise and meet the need of others.
4. ***Managing emotions***: Relationship Management including inspirational leadership, influence, developing others, being a catalyst for change, conflict management, and teamwork/collaboration.

Mastery of traits/domains three and four, which the authors describe as social competence, flows from empathic listening and resonating to others' thinking to develop one's thoughts and actions. This ability can enable a leader to provide both unified and individual senses of direction and purpose for their area or organisation. Empathic listening is a skill that requires a basic level of understanding along with regular practice.

NOTE: Another model of interest is the *Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence* proposed by researchers Peter Salovey and Jack Mayer (1997).



With the core principles of EI confirmed, we'll now look at the essential contemporary aspects of assessing, planning and responding to situations where we are (or want to be) active in decision making.

Most of us are constantly involved in influencing others in one way or another. The more successful we become at recognising and thinking through situations – the more we can consider how we would ideally deliver our responses and not just our reactions.

Some situations may involve very structured negotiations; others may be less formal examples of negotiation leading to decisions being made and alliances being formed. It's important to recognise that influencing is always a part of negotiation and will have a bearing on the eventual decision or outcome.

Negotiations are part of situations as diverse as:

- Meeting to discuss how a job will be done and who will be involved
- Resolving a problem or communication breakdown at work
- Asking for a change to work, authority or a new opportunity
- Discussions on what resources will be allocated or what direction will be followed
- Determining the focus or priority in a project or area of work
- Gaining recognition for contributions and input.

When you look at the above list, you realise you are involved in decision making every day and you're also using negotiation skills every day. We also need to be aware that there are varied levels of decisions we are trying to impact on - from situations which require subtle influencing or may involve a structured planning to prepare for a full scale negotiation.

NOTE: There is always the danger of getting into a negotiation (and sometimes even a conflict!) and not realising it until you are in the middle of it. Not all negotiations are signposted as such.

Many negotiations take place with one of the negotiators unaware that they are in a negotiation, and that they have, perhaps, significantly conceded their position to another party. If this happens, and you are the unaware party, you are immediately at a disadvantage. And consequently, the results will probably be less favourable for you than they otherwise might have been.



ESSENTIAL FACTORS AND QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER IN DECISION MAKING:

When decisions are being made in organisations it is likely there will be a number of factors that will impact on who is involved in the decision making process and also which direction the decision will follow or support. Consider the following factors and the aligned questions that are designed to extend the understanding of what each factor implies.

KEY FACTORS	KEY QUESTIONS TO ASK
Always consider the history or background to a situation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did this situation come about? • Who was involved and what are the potential “politics” to be aware of? • What has occurred in the lead up to the negotiation? • What are the politics involved – internal, external, organisationally etc? • What are the drivers or forces that have lead to this situation and opportunity for decisions to be made?
Timing of decisions is always important.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why now? • What will the impact of the decision (whichever decision is made) be on the current environment? • What’s the possible timeline for implementation – with what result?
Identify the power players and key individuals involved in the negotiation or decision making.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is involved? • Who is in the foreground (obvious) of the decision making? • Who is in the background (covert/hidden)? • What do we know about the participants? • What do we know about their interests in the outcome? • What do we know about their style and what influences their decision making?
Clarify your team and their roles and contributions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will we establish our credibility and role in the negotiations? • Who will gain most advantage by presenting our options or views? • Who should be providing what information? • Who will make decisions or offer alternatives/compromise during the process?
Identify potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is likely to align with whom – and why do we think that?



alliances or sponsors for your position.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who could we lobby to increase our support or numbers? • Who could be our “champion or sponsor”? • How should we approach them?
Identify the dependencies between the key participants/players.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the alliances between individuals and/or areas? • Why are they all here? • Are there missing decision makers and what is the impact of their non attendance? • Who is likely to align with whom – and why?
Identify the issues relating to the decision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the issues under consideration? • What are the priorities or most important issues relevant to the decision?
Research the situation and the major data/facts that will impact on the outcome (information and fact base).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What data is known and available? • What other data could be useful to influence the decision? • What are the pieces of data that will gain the greatest impact and best result with this group?
The environment always counts in negotiations, influence and decision making.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where will the negotiation or discussion be held? • What are the implications of the location? • Where should we be positioned and with whom? • How can we ensure we are seen and heard (particularly relevant for women in majority male forums)?
Consider your goals and your resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you (or your area/team) want to achieve? • What are your needs? • What are you able/willing to give up – including the minimum you can settle for & the maximum you can provide towards meeting the other person’s needs in terms of support and assistance? • What are their goals? • How much time and/or money are you able or prepared to devote to the



	<p>negotiation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the possibility of a partial solution, should a total solution not be feasible?
Identify the right information and examples to support your negotiation or preferred decision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the positions that you feel are important? • What are the positions that the other parties will/might take? • What are the interests of both parties? • What interests do we/could we have in common? • How can you strengthen shared interests? • What are the best examples/stories you can prepare – remembering that your aim is to bring the other parties to your option or recommended decision? • What are the right media options or methods to use to support your case (visuals/graphs/images etc)?
Identify and plan your response to areas of concern or points of conflict.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the major differences in the way we view the issues, including the trade-off alternatives which are open to both of you. • Are there points of potential conflict? • Why are these concerns and how will we respond? • Can we neutralise concerns or issues – and how?
Identify the possible outcomes and plan for these outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are all the possible outcomes? • What do I/we most want to happen? • How can we influence this decision or result? • What do we least want to happen? • How can we limit the chance of this happening? • What are the other alternatives? • What is the “least” we can settle for? • What is our BATNA or EATNA (Best/Estimated Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement) • What is the plan if we need to halt discussion as the progress is not suitable?
Clarifying the next	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What record needs to be kept?



phase is critical in the decision making process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who needs to confirm that the outcome is correct and clear?• What are the key messages we want to leave the negotiation with?• What "sign off" or approval is needed in what format – and by whom?• What follow up is needed – what happens next?
---	--



CONDITIONS THAT WILL IMPACT ON YOUR CHANCES OF IMPROVED OUTCOMES FOR NEGOTIATIONS & DECISION MAKING:

If you are looking to impact on key decisions in your area you can plan, prepare and practice to support your approach. A vital part of your preparation is to assess the conditions that make success in negotiations more likely.

1. **Identifiable parties who are willing to participate.** The people or groups who have a stake in the outcome must be identifiable and willing to sit down at the bargaining table if productive negotiations are to occur. If a critical party is either absent or is not willing to commit to good faith bargaining, the potential for agreement will decline.
2. **Interdependence.** For productive negotiations to occur, the participants must be dependent upon each other to have their needs met or interests satisfied. The participants need either each other's assistance or restraint from negative action for their interests to be satisfied. If one party can get his/her needs met without the cooperation of the other, there will be little impetus to negotiate.
3. **Readiness to negotiate.** People must be ready to negotiate for dialogue to begin. When participants are not psychologically prepared to talk with the other parties, when adequate information is not available, or when a negotiation strategy or process has not been clarified, people may be reluctant to begin the process.
4. **Means of influence or leverage.** For people to reach an agreement over issues about which they disagree, they must have some means to influence the attitudes and/or behaviour of other negotiators.
5. **Agreement on some issues and interests.** People must be able to agree upon some common issues and interests for progress to be made in negotiations. Generally, participants will have some issues and interests in common and others that are of concern to only one party. Parties must have enough issues and interests in common to commit themselves to a joint decision-making process.
6. **Will to settle.** For negotiations to succeed, participants have to want to settle. If continuing a conflict is more important than settlement, then negotiations are doomed to failure. Often parties



want to keep conflicts going to preserve a relationship (a negative one may be better than no relationship at all), to mobilise public opinion or support in their favour, or because the conflict relationship gives meaning to their life. These factors promote continued division and work against settlement. The negative consequences of not settling must be more significant and greater than those of settling for an agreement to be reached.

7. **Unpredictability of outcome.** People negotiate because they need something from another person. They also negotiate because the outcome of not negotiating is unpredictable. For example: If, by going to court, a person has a 50/50 chance of winning, s/he may decide to negotiate rather than take the risk of losing as a result of a judicial decision. Negotiation is more predictable than court because if negotiation is successful, the party will at least win something. Chances for a decisive and one-sided victory need to be unpredictable for parties to enter into negotiations.
8. **A sense of urgency and deadline.** Negotiations generally occur when there is pressure or it is urgent to reach a decision. Urgency may be imposed by either external or internal time constraints or by potential negative or positive consequences to a negotiation outcome. If procrastination is advantageous to one side, negotiations are less likely to occur, and, if they do, there is less impetus to settle.
9. **No major psychological barriers to settlement.** Strong expressed or unexpressed feelings about another party can sharply affect a person's psychological readiness to bargain. Psychological barriers to settlement must be lowered if successful negotiations are to occur.
10. **Issues must be negotiable.** For successful negotiation to occur, negotiators must believe that there are acceptable settlement options that are possible as a result of participation in the process. If it appears that negotiations will have only win/lose settlement possibilities and that a party's needs will not be met as a result of participation, parties will be reluctant to enter into dialogue.
11. **The people must have the authority to decide.** For a successful outcome, participants must have the authority to make a decision. If they do not have a legitimate and recognised right to



decide, or if a clear ratification process has not been established, negotiations will be limited to an information exchange between the parties.

12. **Willingness to compromise.** Not all negotiations require compromise. On occasion, an agreement can be reached which meets all the participants' needs and does not require a sacrifice on any party's part. However, in other disputes, compromise - willingness to have less than 100 percent of needs or interests satisfied may be necessary for the parties to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

13. **The agreement must be reasonable and implementable.** Some settlements may be substantively acceptable but may be impossible to implement. Participants in negotiations must be able to establish a realistic and workable plan to carry out their agreement if the final settlement is to be acceptable and hold over time.

14. **External factors favourable to settlement.** Often factors external to negotiations inhibit or encourage settlement. Views of associates or friends, the political climate of public opinion or economic conditions may foster agreement or continued turmoil. Some external conditions can be managed by negotiators while others cannot. Favourable external conditions for settlement should be developed whenever possible.

15. **Resources to negotiate.** Participants in negotiations must have the interpersonal skills necessary for debating and influencing and, where appropriate, the money and time to engage fully in dialogue procedures. Inadequate or unequal resources may block the initiation of negotiations or hinder settlement.

NOTE: The preceding points are adapted from the 2010 "**Handbook of Global and Multicultural Negotiation**" by Christopher W. Moore and Peter J. Woodrow.



GENDER AND INFLUENCE:

Below is a list of characteristics that support the successful management of oneself and of the sometimes emotionally charged negotiations and in influencing decisions. It will help you identify potential that you already have, as well as areas where you could improve.

See if you can decide which of the following areas you still need to work on:

- Tolerance for stress
- Patience
- Listening skills
- High level of observation skills to recognise how others are responding/engaging
- Tolerance for conflict – emotionally resilient
- Sensitivity to the needs/wants of others
- Willingness to compromise in order to solve problems when necessary
- Willingness to analyse and research issues thoroughly/planned
- Have well thought out and accessible examples/data/stories to support your points
- Ability to quickly identify interests and positions
- Identification and preparation around issues/conflict areas for all parties involved
- Commitment to a win/win philosophy
- A positive attitude to others and the outcome
- Ability to endure personal attack and ridicule without much damage
- Open minded
- Ability to be heard and recognised as an important contributor
- Has a high standard of communication skills
- Practice and prepare your approach – good presentation skills
- Professionally persistent (doesn't give up easily)
- Appropriately assertive – while communicating and dealing with others
- Ability to think clearly and rapidly under pressure and uncertainty
- Applies emotional intelligence
- Aware of the process and style of the other person
- Thinks and talks about possible areas of agreement



SOME CRITICAL MISTAKES IN INFLUENCING & NEGOTIATING TO ACHIEVE DECISIONS:

- Talking too much and listening too little
- Not contributing when you should
- Arguing, being stubborn rather than influencing, educating
- Getting angry, losing your temper
- Letting emotions limit your input into decision making forums
- Not giving yourself thinking time and planning options
- Not looking at the situation from alternate points of view (essential!)
- Being intimidating, rather than persuasive – the tougher the tactics, the stronger the resistance
- Ignoring compromise – remember that you will have to give as well as get to achieve a successful outcome, particularly when the relationship is important to you or the business!
- Inadequate preparation – crucial to consider the key factors indicated in this document
- Not being positive in your expectation that the situation can be improved. If you feel it will be a disaster or that you will lose etc – you may find you have added towards a negative outcome rather than a positive one as that's what you were thinking about!
- Ignoring/avoiding conflict. You have to learn to accept it & handle it well and resolve it.



SUMMARY:

All of us – regardless of gender or culture can benefit from improving our abilities in understanding and engaging in successful negotiations. The reason this session has been developed for an all female audience is in recognition of the very real fact that women who are often underrepresented in senior leadership positions and therefore on senior decision making boards, committees and in multiple relevant forums.

If there is gender equity in the leadership in your chosen professional area or working environment - then you can only benefit by applying the strategies and approaches outlined in this document.

If the importance of planning your approach, being strategic about the decisions you want to influence and being heard on the right issues is important to you – then you and the majority of women in the world can strengthen their approach by combining emotional intelligence and clever tactics to achieve the results that will make a difference.

Facts that support the case for applying your abilities:

June 2010 data from the Australian Human Rights Commission

- Women chair only two per cent of ASX200 companies (four boards), hold only 8.3% of Board Directorships, hold only four CEO positions and make up only 10.7% of executive management positions.
- In 2008, women held 5.9% of line executive management positions in ASX 200 companies; a decrease from 7.5% in 2006. Line executive management experience is considered essential for progressing to top corporate positions.
- Women make up a third of members on Australian Government Boards and Committees.
- Despite comprising more than half of all Commonwealth public servants, women make up only 37% of the Senior Executive Service.

December 2009 data from the Harvard Business Review

Hermia Ibarra and Morten Hansen studied the leadership of the 2,000 of the world's top performing companies, they found only 29 (1.5%) of those CEOs were women, an even smaller percentage than on



the Fortune 500 Global list (2.5%). Only one woman, Meg Whitman, former CEO of eBay, made it to their top 100 CEOs list. In the U.S., women comprise 57% of all college students but only 26% of full professors and only 14% of University presidents. Despite being nearly 50% of law school graduates, women make up only 18% of law partners and only 25% of judges. Only 9.4% of jobs of Vice-President or higher are occupied by women according to a study completed by Catalyst Corporation.

Additional 2010 information from international organisations including:

- In 2009 women on average accounted for less than 18.4 % of members of parliament. At all levels and in all sectors fewer women than men are part of decision-making processes. (Inter-Parliamentary Union - IPU)
- Worldwide, women earn on average only 84 per cent of what men earn in formal waged work. However, large numbers of women are concentrated in informal and precarious work, associated with low and unstable earnings. (International Trade Union Confederation - ITUC)

2010 information from the United Nations on Power and Decision-Making

- Globally, women held 19.1 percent of seats in single/lower chambers of parliament in May 2010, compared to 11.3 percent in 1995.
- Only 28 countries have achieved the 30 percent target for women in decision-making positions set in the early 1990s.
- In early 2010, only 15 Heads of State or Government were women.
- Quotas and other temporary special measures, applied in areas such as electoral systems, and corporate and civil service recruitment processes, have played a significant role in increasing the number of women in public life.
- Serious challenges persist to women's full and equal participation in senior decision-making positions, including negative stereotypes about women's leadership roles, lack of commitment by political parties, inadequate funding and training for women candidates and government officials, and high levels of violence and intimidation against women in public office.



AN ADDITIONAL RESOURCE TO SUPPORT YOUR THINKING AND PLANNING:

As diversity and cultural differences can significantly impact on the considerations relevant to negotiation and influence, here is an additional resource adding to the perspectives and realities around decision making and

Information adapted from "*Cultures and organisations: software of the mind*" (Revised and expanded 3rd ed.) Hofstede, Geert; Hofstede, Gert Jan (2010).

Gerard Hendrik Hofstede is an influential Dutch organisational sociologist, who studied the interactions between national cultures and organisational cultures. Hofstede's study demonstrated that there are national and regional cultural groupings that affect the behaviour of societies and organisations, and that these are persistent across time. Hofstede (et al) has found six dimensions of culture in his study of national work related values. Replication studies have yielded similar results, pointing to stability of the dimensions across time and the 2010 edition continues to inform and challenge our views on culture and diversity.

The dimensions are:

1. Small vs. Large power distance

How much the less powerful members of institutions and organisations expect and accept that power is distributed unequally. In cultures with small power distance (e.g. Australia, Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand), people expect and accept power relations that are more consultative or democratic. People relate to one another more as equals regardless of formal positions. Subordinates are more comfortable with and demand the right to contribute to and critique the decisions of those in power. In cultures with large power distance (e.g. Malaysia), the less powerful accept power relations that are autocratic or paternalistic. Subordinates acknowledge the power of others based on their formal, hierarchical positions. Thus, Small vs. Large Power Distance does not measure or attempt to measure a culture's objective, "real" power distribution, but rather the way people perceive power differences.

2. Individualism vs. Collectivism

How much members of the culture define themselves apart from their group memberships. In individualist cultures, people are expected to develop and display their individual personalities and to choose their own affiliations. In collectivist cultures, people are defined and act mostly as a member of a long-term group,



such as the family, a religious group, an age cohort, a town, or a profession, among others. This dimension was found to move towards the individualist end of the spectrum with increasing national wealth.

3. Masculinity vs. Femininity

The value placed on traditionally male or female values (as understood in most Western cultures). In so-called 'masculine' cultures, people (whether male or female) value competitiveness, assertiveness, ambition, and the accumulation of wealth and material possessions. In so-called 'feminine' cultures, people (again whether male or female) value relationships and quality of life. This dimension is often renamed by users of Hofstede's work, e.g. to Quantity of Life vs. Quality of Life. Another reading of the same dimension holds that in 'M' cultures, the differences between gender roles are more dramatic and less fluid than in 'F' cultures; but this strongly depends on other dimensions as well.

4. Weak vs. Strong uncertainty avoidance

How much members of a society are anxious about the unknown, and as a consequence, attempt to cope with anxiety by minimizing uncertainty. In cultures with strong uncertainty avoidance, people prefer explicit rules (e.g. about religion and food) and formally structured activities, and employees tend to remain longer with their present employer. In cultures with weak uncertainty avoidance, people prefer implicit or flexible rules or guidelines and informal activities. Employees tend to change employers more frequently.

5. Long vs. Short term orientation

Michael Harris Bond and his collaborators subsequently found a fifth dimension which was initially called Confucian dynamism. Hofstede later incorporated this into his framework as long vs. short term orientation. This dimension refers to a society's "time horizon" or the importance attached to the future versus the past and present. In long term oriented societies, people value actions and attitudes that affect the future: persistence/perseverance, thrift, and shame. In short-term oriented societies, people value actions and attitudes that are affected by the past or the present: normative statements, immediate stability, protecting one's own face, respect for tradition, and reciprocation of greetings, favours, and gifts.

6. Indulgence vs. Restraint

Through work with Michael Minkov, a sixth dimension has been specified. It recognises that at the societal level, happiness is associated with a perception of life control, with life control being a source of freedom and of leisure. Societies with high means for Indulgence tend to co-mingle work and social activities, and



generally have a less “serious” attitude toward work than societies with high means for Restraint. This can significantly impact on how relationships are built and how influence and decisions can be achieved.

NOTE: These cultural differences describe averages or tendencies and not characteristics of individuals so always use the ideas represented in the dimensions as a source for reflection and information – not as a rule book for approaching people.



REFERENCES:

1. The Emotional Intelligence Quick Book by Travis Bradbury and Jean Greaves (2005)
2. Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion by Robert Cialdini (2007)
3. Influence: Science and Practice by Robert B. Cialdini (2008)
4. How to Influence: The Art of Making Things Happen by Jo Owen (2009)
5. Influence: Science and Practice by Robert B. Cialdini (2000)
6. Influence Without Authority, 2nd Edition by Allan R. Cohen and David L. Bradford 2005)
7. Words That Change Minds: Mastering the Language of Influence by Shelle Rose Charvet (1997)
8. How to Make an IMPACT: Influence, Inform and Impress with Your Reports, Presentations and Business Documents (Financial Times Series) by Jon Moon (2007)
9. Yes! 50 Secrets from the Science of Persuasion by Noah J. Goldstein, Steve J. Martin, and Robert B. Cialdini (2007)
10. The Science of Influence: How to Get Anyone to Say Yes in 8 Minutes or Less! by Kevin Hogan (2004)
11. Voice of Influence by Judy Apps (2009)
12. Getting to YES by Roger Fisher and William Ury (1991)
13. You can negotiate anything by Herb Cohen (1980)
14. Negotiating Skills by Ann Halpern (1992)
15. Essentials of Negotiation by Roy Lewicki, David Saunders, Bruce Barry and John Minton (2004)
16. Primal Leadership - learning to lead with emotional intelligence by Daniel Goleman, Richard E. Boyatzis, Annie McKee (2004)
17. Emotional Intelligence: key readings on the Mayer and Salovey model by John D. Mayer (Author), Marc A. Brackett (Editor), Peter Salovey (Editor) (2004)
18. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind – by Geert Hofstede, Gert Jan Hofstede and Michael Minkov: Revised and expanded 3rd Edition. (2010)
19. Handbook of Global and Multicultural Negotiation by Christopher W. Moore and Peter J. Woodrow. (2010)

