

# **Acting sovereignly in discussions and interviews: Ready to play in front of an audience**

*// By Dr. Matthias Nöllke*

Recklessness in front of an audience can be trained. Learn what makes you likable and what you better avoid, how to respond to catch questions and reject allegations.

## **Are you allowed to interfere with the other?**

Accomplishment lives from reacting directly to an attack. In a discussion with the audience, however, it is often the case that each person delivers his or her speech and the other person has to remain silent. He then has the opportunity to comment on the accusations, attacks, claims.

This tacit agreement has something for everyone, everyone should be allowed to spread his arguments unmolested, that's only fair, and yet there are two possible disadvantages for you:

1. Before you speak, it's about something else. No one really knows what you're referring to now. You seem like someone who lags behind the discussion and wants to turn back the wheel - that does not suit well.
2. A repetitive response comes from the fact that she gets out of the situation. Each delay reduces its effectiveness. If you wait for it to be your turn, you can make your remark the same.

## **Be sparing with interruptions**

What, then, when a repentant response comes to your mind while the other one is talking? Can you just interrupt this? They may. However, only if your remark is really real. Because you have to weigh whether the thing is worth it. If you land a hit, then no one asks if you were at all in line.

On the other hand, you undoubtedly break the unwritten rules. So, if your comment is not so sparkling, shoot an own goal. On top of that, you can not complain now if your counterpart now interrupts you. Some "old hands" know how to use such mistakes masterfully.

Even if you always come up with repetitive replies, leave it in one or two interruptions. Otherwise, you will not be ready to hit, but will be stingy and obtrusive. At all, you must

be careful not to push the other one too much against the wall.

## **Beware of the "Niedermachern"**

In discussions, we want one thing above all: one's own arguments should be brilliant, the arguments of the opponent of the discourse, on the other hand, are to be made manifest in their entire gaps. This, of course, makes us very happy when the other knowledge gap is revealed, cramped, helpless or right-handed.

Finally, we collect points. It is, of course, triumphal, if you catch the other with a self-contradiction, and indeed one that your listeners also understand. Then you almost won.

Almost, because you are well advised to prepare. Above all, beware of so-called "Niedermachern", remarks that completely "settle" your counterpart. Such "Niedermacher" fall back on you very easily. Even if your adversary is discredited once and for all, it may not benefit you in any way. On the contrary, the public resents your behavior. It will make your opponent impossible, but you too.

## **Never go to the last**

They will reap a much more striking success if the audience is impressed with the impression that the other has comparatively mildly come away. This implies that the other person must never appear completely weak. When he has talked about his head and collar, do not trample on him for God's sake, but help him, strengthen him, praise him. You will think you are very fair and objective. And in a sense this is true.

### **Tip:**

It is not advisable to provoke your conversation partner too pushy. The stronger your provocations, the more sympathy you pay.

## **"Will you please excuse me?"**

By far the most common sentence that comes up in discussion is, "Will you let me finish, please?" Yes, it can certainly be predicted on certain roundtables. The higher the proportion of politicians, the more likely this magic mantra falls.

First of all, there is nothing wrong with this sentence. Everyone has the right to present his view of things. It goes without saying that one speaks to the end and that one does not need to tolerate comments and malicious interruptions. An unequivocal "Now it's my turn!" Ensures that you enforce your right.

Unfortunately, in many discussions there is a veritable "Auseritis". The saying "Will you please excuse me?" is used for two purposes, both equally questionable:

- to get more speaking time,
- to put the other wrong.

You should not put up with both. Whenever "Auseritis" spreads, you should act.

### **Punish the other: Let him talk it out!**

The most effective remedy for "Auseritis" is simply not to interrupt the other, not to interrupt it, even if, in your opinion, it is telling the greatest nonsense. In that case, he has to spend all his speaking time on intellectual property and that's not so easy. He repeats himself, his reasoning is lengthened and - what a gnawing for you! - he starts to contradict himself.

A famous writer once said that no sensible person could speak five minutes at a time without contradicting each other. There is certainly something to it. So sit back, open your ears, and listen to what your counterparts call together.

*This text is from the book "Schlagfertigkeit (2015)" by Dr. Matthias Nöllke, published at Haufe Verlag, and was left to us for reprint.*

# **[Live] Professor Dr. Petra Jansen, Department of Sports Science, University of Regensburg: emotion control, career goals and women**

**// By Simone Janson**

Professor Dr. Petra Jansen, chair of sports science at the University of Regensburg, talks about how to control one's feelings with mindfulness, how to reach his goals and why the glass ceiling really exists.

*Professor Dr. Petra Jansen studied anthropology, anthropology, psychology and mathematics at the Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz before obtaining her doctorate in 1999 at the Gerhard-Mercator University in Duisburg in general psychology on the subject of "Cognition of Distances". 2005 habilitated you at the Heinrich Heine University in Dusseldorf in Experimental Psychology with the topic "Development of spatial knowledge". 2008 also completed a further education course in dance therapy at the Westfälische-Wilhelms-Universität Münster. Since 2008 she holds the Chair of Sport Science at the University of Regensburg. Her main research interests are the investigation of the relationship between motor skills, emotions and cognition, including from a neuroscience perspective. Her research has been funded in several projects by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and so far has been published in 120 peer-reviewed journal articles. Your future sees you in exploring the integration of the heart and mind. Prof. Dr. Petra Jansen is the mother of three adult children.*

**Mrs. Prof. Dr. Jansen, please briefly change your field of research.**

For a long time, my main interest was the study of cognitive processes in humans. Cognition involves the processes of perception, language, thinking, problem solving, and, including the processing of spatial information.

In particular, I was interested in studying the influence of movement on cognition as well as possible gender differences in cognitive abilities. Today, I am increasingly exploring the connection between body, cognition, and emotion within the context of embodiment research and the influence of mindfulness-based training.

**Can emotions be effectively controlled at all?**

Emotions can be regulated. Please introduce a small child to the cash register. It sees all the sweets and may start screaming because they would like to have them. Even an adult can hardly calm the child.

The ability to regulate emotions is not as well developed in the young child, but adults have mostly acquired the ability if you want something to react appropriately.

### **And what is more important: the IQ or the EQ?**

First of all, the IQ is the theoretical concept that has been researched for a longer time. It is certainly undisputed that the intelligence quotient is essential for solving cognitive tasks. However, Checa and Fernandez-Berrocal (2015) have shown that emotional cognitive skills are also important in human cognitive control. There are reciprocal influences, which are summarized in a recent review by Okon-Singer and colleagues (2015): "Stress, anxiety and other kinds of emotions can be profoundly influential key elements of cognition, including selective attention, working memory, and cognitive control. [...] In my opinion, it would be good to get from an "either - or" perspective to a "and also" point of view.

- Checa, P., and Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2015). The role of intelligence quotient and emotional intelligence in cognitive control processes. *Frontier Psychology*, 6: 1853.
- Okon-Singer, H., Hendler, T., Pessoa, L., and Shackman, AL, (2015). The neurobiology of emotion-cognition interactions: fundamental questions and strategies for future research. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 9: 58. doi: 10.3389 / fnhum.2015.00058

### **In recent times, there are always criticisms of mindfulness, eg by the feminist [Laurie Penny](#) or even in [Connect to Silicon Valley](#), What do you think of criticism of mindfulness?**

The criticism in the first article I think more on the "trend to self-love", the author in the end brings self-care into the conversation and the second article more on mindfulness as a kind of diet of the digital world.

Both do not describe mindfulness in my opinion. In my eyes, mindfulness means awareness at the moment. I can not find anything critical about this quest; Being with the attention where you are is what I consider an important goal for every human being. What I find critical is that many people feel that they need to do yoga, meditate, or attend mindfulness seminars. Mindfulness refers to me - and I stress for me - in addition to the presence at the moment to find their own suitable life path, it is a step to self-love. Self-love has nothing to do with wellness at all, but with the recognition and appreciation of one's own life. And I fully agree with Laurie Penny that, for example,