

[www.ptindia.com](http://www.ptindia.com)  
**MEMBERS AREA**

**'RC DAILY DOSE'**  
**Volume 16**

**Instructions :** The **RC Daily Dose** is a set of 20 excellent RC practice questions, with detailed solutions. Normally every day, one such set will be uploaded into the MEMBERS AREA. These are PDF files and can be saved on your computer. Enjoy!

**PASSAGE – 1**

Look forward, not back. It is surprising how often we simply react to what someone else has said or done. Two people will often fall into a pattern of discourse that resembles a negotiation, but really has no such purpose whatsoever. They disagree with each other over some issue, and the talk goes back and forth as though they were seeking agreement. In fact, the argument is being carried on as a ritual, or simply a pastime. Each is engaged in scoring points against the other or in gathering evidence to confirm views about the other that have long been held and are not about to be changed. Neither party is seeking agreement or is even trying to influence the other.

If you ask two people why they are arguing, the answer will typically identify a cause, not a purpose. Caught up in a quarrel, whether between husband and wife, between company and union, or between two businesses, people are more likely to respond to what the other side has said or done than to act in pursuit of their own long-term interests. "They can't treat me like that. If they think they're going to get away with that, they will have to think again. I'll show them."

The question "Why?" has two quite different meanings. One looks backward for a cause and treats our behavior as determined by prior events. The other looks forward for a purpose and treats our behavior as subject to our free will. We need not enter into a philosophical debate between free will and determinism in order to decide how to act. Either we have free will or it is determined that we behave as if we do. In either case, we make choices. We can choose to look back or to look forward.

You will satisfy your interests better if you talk about where you would like to go rather than about where you have come from. Instead of arguing with the other side about the past—about last quarter's costs (which were too high), last week's action (taken without adequate authority), or yesterday's performance (which was less than expected)—talk about what you want to have happen in the future. Instead of asking them to justify what they did yesterday, ask, "Who should do what tomorrow?"

Be concrete but flexible. In a negotiation you want to know where you are going and yet be open to fresh ideas. To avoid having to make a difficult decision on what to settle for, people will often go into a negotiation with no other plan than to sit down with the other side and see what they offer or demand.

How can you move from identifying interests to developing specific options and still remain flexible with regard to those options? To convert your interests into concrete options, ask yourself, "If tomorrow the other side agrees to go along with me, what do I now think I would like them to go along with?" To keep your flexibility, treat each option you formulate as simply illustrative. Think in terms of more than one option that meets your interests. "Illustrative specificity" is the key concept.

Much of what positional bargainers hope to achieve with an opening position can be accomplished equally well with an illustrative suggestion that generously takes care of your interest. For example, in a baseball contract negotiation, an agent might say that "\$5,000,000 a year would be the kind of figure that should satisfy Henderson's interest in receiving the salary he feels he is worth. Something on the order of a five-year contract should meet his need for job security."

Having thought about your interests, you should go into a meeting not only with one or more specific options that would meet your legitimate interests but also with an open mind. An open mind is not an empty one. Be hard on the problem, soft on the people. You can be just as hard in talking about your interests as any negotiator can be in talking about his position. In fact, it is usually advisable to be hard. It may not be wise to commit yourself to your position, but it is wise to commit yourself to your interests. This is the place in a negotiation to spend your aggressive energies. The other side, being concerned with their own interests, will tend to have overly optimistic expectations of the range of possible agreements. Often the wisest solutions, those that produce the maximum gain for you at the minimum cost to the other side, are produced only by strongly advocating your interests. Two negotiators, each pushing hard for their interests, will often stimulate each other's creativity in thinking up mutually advantageous solutions.

The construction company, concerned with inflation, may place a high value on its interest in keeping costs down and in getting the job done on time. You may have to shake them up. Some honest emotion may help restore a better balance between profits and children's lives. Do not let your desire to be conciliatory stop you from doing justice to your problem. "Surely you're not saying that my son's life is worth less than the price of a fence. You wouldn't say that about your son. I don't believe you're an insensitive person, Mr. Jenkins. Let's figure out how to solve this problem."

If they feel personally threatened by an attack on the problem, they may grow defensive and may cease to listen. This is why it is important to separate the people from the problem. Attack the problem without blaming the people. Go even further and be personally supportive. Listen to them with respect, show them courtesy, express your appreciation for their time and effort, emphasize your concern with meeting their basic needs, and so on. Show them that you are attacking the problem, not them.

One useful rule of thumb is to give positive support to the human beings on the other side equal in strength to the vigor with which you emphasize the problem. This combination of support and attack may seem inconsistent. Psychologically, it is; the

inconsistency helps make it work. A well-known theory of psychology, the theory of cognitive dissonance, holds that people dislike inconsistency and will act to eliminate it. By attacking a problem, such as speeding trucks on a neighborhood street, and at the same time giving the company representative positive support, you create cognitive dissonance for him. To overcome this dissonance, he will be tempted to dissociate himself from the problem in order to join you in doing something about it.

Fighting hard on the substantive issues increases the pressure for an effective solution; giving support to the human beings on the other side tends to improve your relationship and to increase the likelihood of reaching agreement. It is the combination of support and attack which works; either alone is likely to be insufficient.

Negotiating hard for your interests does not mean being closed to the other side's point of view. Quite the contrary. You can hardly expect the other side to listen to your interests and discuss the options you suggest if you don't take their interests into account and show yourself to be open to their suggestions. Successful negotiation requires being both firm and open.

1. *All of the following are true with respect to the passage, except that :*
  - (1) an open mind is not an empty one.
  - (2) successful negotiation is being both open and firm.
  - (3) the approach of attacking the problem and supporting the people on the opposite side is not inconsistent.
  - (4) "illustrative specificity" is the key concept.
2. *Which of the following best concurs with the author's contention, as expressed in the passage ?*
  - (1) The approach of 'looking forward' is more purposeful than that of 'looking backward' in situations of argument.
  - (2) People are not separable from the problem, attacking the problem is invariably attacking people.
  - (3) People have to cope up with inconsistency, as they cannot do anything to eliminate it.
  - (4) A sound fight on the substantive issues increases the 'likelihood' of reaching an agreement.
3. *As per the passage, a successful negotiation takes when it is done :*
  - (1) in a forceful and convincing manner.
  - (2) with commitment to one's interest rather than to one's position.
  - (3) with a purely one track mind, being closed to the other side's point of view.
  - (4) with a good amount of preparation.
4. *The principle of cognitive dissonance, as the passage conveys, is :*
  - (1) the doublespeak quality of the people.
  - (2) the incompatibility between thought, word and action.
  - (3) people's intolerance of counter situations that are unanticipated.
  - (4) the dislike of inconsistency and the act of the people to eliminate it.
5. *As per the passage, reason(s) for negotiations not being successful is/are that :*
  - (1) issues to be discussed are not spelt out well.
  - (2) exchange of words between the persons concerned contain venom and anger.
  - (3) the tendency to be defensive and not to listen to what is being said, on account of feeling personally threatened by the attack on the problem.
  - (4) None of the above.
6. *All of the following are false with respect to the passage, except that :*
  - (1) unless one puts forth ideas in a clear out manner, one's interests will not be served.
  - (2) protection and furthering of one's interests is the watchword for successful negotiations.
  - (3) a combination of support and attack works.
  - (4) a rigid and an unyielding attitude is needed.
7. *The author has adopted the style in handling the passage, which is :*
  - (1) narrative
  - (2) rhetoric
  - (3) didactic
  - (4) informative
8. *A likely source of extraction of the passage, is :*
  - (1) a chapter on 'Behavioural Science' for students of Sociology.
  - (2) a chapter on 'Ways Of Becoming A Good Citizen' from a book on Civics.
  - (3) a chapter on 'Morality And Spirituality', as part of Moral Science instruction to the school students.
  - (4) a chapter on 'Bad Manners' as part of a schedule for grooming and shaping of etiquettes.

9. *An apt conclusion that can be drawn from the passage is that :*
- (1) the power of convincing decides the Winner.
  - (2) successful negotiation requires a smart and an overbearing approach.
  - (3) successful negotiation requires being both firm and open.
  - (4) arguments sharpen a person's reasoning faculties.
10. *A suitable title for the passage is :*
- (1) How To Win An Argument.
  - (2) Attack The People, Not The Problem.
  - (3) Assertion Is The Ingredient For Success In A Negotiation.
  - (4) Be concrete, Yet Flexible, For Skilful Negotiation.

## **PASSAGE – 2**

Much has been written about the physical Circumstances in which negotiations take place. You should be sensitive to such modest questions as whether a meeting takes place at your place or theirs, or on neutral territory. Contrary to the accepted wisdom, it is sometimes advantageous to accept an offer to meet on the other side's turf. It may put them at ease, making them more open to your suggestions. If necessary, it will be easier for you to walk out. If, however, you do allow the other side to choose the physical environment, be aware of what that choice is and what effects it may have.

Ask yourself if you feel under stress, and if so, why. If the room is too noisy, if the temperature is too hot or cold, if there is no place for a private caucus with a colleague, be aware that the setting might have been deliberately designed to make you want to conclude negotiations promptly and, if necessary, to yield points in order to do so.

If you find the physical surroundings prejudicial, do not hesitate to say so. You can suggest changing chairs, taking a break, or adjourning to a different location or another time. In every case your job is to identify the problem, be willing to raise it with the other side, and then negotiate better physical circumstances in an objective and principled fashion.

In addition to manipulating the physical environment, there are also ways for the other side to use verbal and nonverbal communication to make you feel uncomfortable. They can comment on your clothes or your appearance. "Looks like you were up all night. Things not going well at the office ?" They can attack your status by making you wait for them or by interrupting the negotiations to deal with other people. They can imply that you are ignorant. They can refuse to listen to you and make you repeat yourself. They can deliberately refuse to make eye contact with you. In each case recognizing the tactic will help nullify its effect; bringing it up explicitly will probably prevent a recurrence.

One form of psychological pressure which also involves deception is the good-guy / bad-guy routine. This technique appears in its starkest form in old police movies. The first policeman threatens the suspect with prosecution for numerous crimes, puts him under a bright light, pushes him around, then finally takes a break and leaves. The good guy then turns off the light, offers the suspect a cigarette, and apologizes for the tough policeman. He says he'd like to control the tough guy, but he can't unless the suspect cooperates. The result : the suspect tells all he knows.

Similarly in a negotiation, two people on the same side will stage a quarrel. One will take a tough stand : "These books cost \$8,000 and I won't accept a penny less." His partner looks pained and a little embarrassed. Finally he breaks in : "Frank, you are being unreasonable. After all, these books are two years old, even if they haven't been used much." Turning to the other side, he says reasonably, "Could you pay \$7,600 ?" The concession isn't large, but it almost seems like a favor.

The good-guy/bad-guy routine is a form of psychological manipulation. If you recognize it, you won't be taken in. When the good guy makes his pitch, just ask him the same question you asked the bad guy: "I appreciate that you are trying to be reasonable, but I still want to know why you think that's a fair price. What is your principle? I am willing to accept \$8,000 if you can persuade me it's the fairest price."

Threats are one of the most abused tactics in negotiation. A threat seems easy to make-much easier than an offer. All it takes is a few words, and if it works, you never have to carry it out. But threats can lead to counterthreats in an escalating spiral that can unhinge a negotiation and even destroy a relationship.

Threats are pressure. Pressure often accomplishes just the opposite of what it is intended to do; it builds up pressure the other way. Instead of making a decision easier for the other side, it often makes it more difficult. In response to outside pressure, a union, a committee, a company, or a government may close ranks. Moderates and hawks join together to resist what they may perceive as an illegitimate attempt to coerce them. The question changes from "Should we make this decision?" to "Shall we cave in to outside pressure?"

Good negotiators rarely resort to threats. They do not need to; there are other ways to communicate the same information. If it seems appropriate to outline the consequences of the other side's action, suggest those that will occur independently of your will rather than those you could choose to bring about. Warnings are much more legitimate than threats and are not vulnerable to counterthreats: "Should we fail to reach agreement, it seems highly probable to me that the news media would insist on publishing the whole sordid story. In a matter of this much public interest, I don't see how we could legitimately suppress information. Do you?"

For threats to be effective they must be credibly communicated. Sometimes you can interfere with the communication process. You can ignore threats; you can take them as unauthorized, spoken in haste, or simply irrelevant. You can also make it risky to communicate them. At a coalmine where one of the authors was recently mediating, a large number of false but costly

bomb threats were being received. These dropped off dramatically when the company's receptionist began answering all phone calls with "Your voice is being recorded. What number are you calling?"

Sometimes threats can be turned to your political advantage. A union could announce to the press: "Management has such a weak case that they are resorting to threats." Perhaps the best response to a threat, however, is to be principled. "We have prepared a sequence of countermoves for each of management's customary threats. However, we have delayed taking action until we see whether we can agree that making threats is not the most constructive activity we could engage in just now." Or "I only negotiate on the merits. My reputation is built on not responding to threats."

11. *All of the following are true with respect to the passage, except that :*
  - (1) for threats to be effective, they must be credibly communicated.
  - (2) sometimes, threats can be turned to one's political advantage.
  - (3) threats are one of the most used tactics in negotiations.
  - (4) good negotiators, as matter of fact, do not resort to threats.
12. *As per the passage, pressure :*
  - (1) creates hurdles in decision making.
  - (2) accomplishes just the opposite of what it is intended to do.
  - (3) builds up pressure the other way.
  - (4) All of the above.
13. *The passage ascribed the success of negotiations to :*
  - (1) threats and pressures exerted appropriately by one on the other.
  - (2) the physical circumstances for negotiations to take place which are tailor made for the person wishing to achieve success in them.
  - (3) by not according seriousness to pressures and threats.
  - (4) the indirect influence of an eminent person who would employ the persuasive techniques to bring about a successful negotiation.
14. *Which of the following is out of place, as far as the passage is concerned ?*
  - (1) A threat is easier to make than an offer.
  - (2) A relationship can be finished off by threats.
  - (3) Threats lead to counter threats and can scuttle the negotiation process.
  - (4) None of the above.
15. *The passage has suggested a way to respond to a threat by :*
  - (1) ignoring them, considering them as unauthorised or irrelevant.
  - (2) being principled.
  - (3) informing the police and soliciting their help.
  - (4) All except (3).
16. *A suitable title for the passage is :*

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Threats And Negotiations.</li><li>(2) The Art Of Issuing Threats.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(2) Environment And Negotiations.</li><li>(4) Psychological Manipulation Of Negotiations.</li></ol>
---	---
17. *The passage is at best an extract from :*
  - (1) an article on the latest in social etiquettes.
  - (2) an analysis of successful and skilful negotiations, an aspect of Organisational Behaviour.
  - (3) the code of conduct, in vogue, in Transnational Corporations.
  - (4) a thesis propounding the psychology of a person issuing threats.
18. *The style of handling the passage is :*

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) imposing</li><li>(3) simple</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(2) abstract</li><li>(4) complicated</li></ol>
---	--
19. *Which of the following can correctly be concluded from the passage ?*
  - (1) Warnings are more legitimate than threats and are not vulnerable to counter threats.
  - (2) A good negotiator has to resort to issuing threats in order to achieve success in negotiations.
  - (3) Physical environment is least correlated to the outcome of negotiations.
  - (4) Stress is a vital factor for a smooth conduct of the negotiation process.
20. *According to the passage, a good negotiator :*

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) most often resorts to threats.</li><li>(3) shows traits of opportunism.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(2) rarely resorts to threats.</li><li>(4) is an overbearing person.</li></ol>
---	--

## Detailed Solutions

1. **Ans.(3).** Options (1), (2) and (4) find their place in the passage. The eighth, thirteenth and sixth paragraphs uphold them. Option (3) is not endorsed by the passage. The tenth paragraph states of the inconsistency in the approach of attacking the problem, yet supporting the people on the other side. Option (3) is the one sought.
2. **Ans.(1).** The third paragraph states that in an argument, the focus should be on 'purpose' rather on 'cause'. 'Looking forward' is more gainful, purposeful than 'looking backward'. Option (1) best denotes this and is the appropriate one. Options (2), (3) and (4) are refuted by the passage as their opposites are stated in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth paragraphs respectively. Hence option (1) is the one sought.
3. **Ans.(2).** The eighth paragraph is about the secret behind a successful negotiation. It says that a strong commitment to one's interests instead of to one's position would go a long way in making negotiations successful. Option (2) best synchronises with this. The remaining options are not proper.
4. **Ans.(4).** The eleventh paragraph of the passage comes out with the theory of cognitive dissonance. Option (4) best matches with it and is the precise one. The remaining options find no mention in the passage and are incorrect.
5. **Ans.(3).** The tenth paragraph of the passage is about the impediments for negotiations to be successful. Option (3) best represents this and is the precise one. The remaining options (1) and (2) do not relate to the passage and can be discarded.
6. **Ans.(3).** The penultimate paragraph states that the combination of fighting yet being supportive, helps in reaching an amicable settlement. A point gets carried through convincingly if one understands the person in the opposite side or vice-versa. This helps in removing barriers and hurdles to reach a successful negotiation. Option (3) best aligns with this, with the remaining options turning out to be false.
7. **Ans.(4).** Clearly, it is option (4). The passage has interesting information and ideas to part. It is neither didactic, rhetoric or narrative. Options (1), (2) and (3) are improper.
8. **Ans.(1).** Option (1) is the most likely source of extraction. The passage is about the art of successfully negotiating and agreeing without causing much ripples. Options (2), (3) and (4) are not appropriate.
9. **Ans.(3).** The passage gives the knack of carrying oneself successfully through negotiations. Option (3) is the apt conclusion that can be drawn from the passage. The remaining options are not apt and can be ignored.
10. **Ans.(4).** The title for the passage should cover the theme and the contents of the passage. Option (4) best synthesises what is required for a skilful handling of negotiations. Hence it is the apt title for the passage. Option (1) comes as the next best, paling before (4). Options (2) and (3) go against the theme of the passage and cannot represent its title.
11. **Ans.(3).** The eighth paragraph refutes option (3) for the opposite of it is stated in the passage. It is therefore the one sought. Options (1), (2) and (4) find their place in the passage in the second last paragraph, last paragraph, and the third paragraph.
12. **Ans.(4).** Each of the options (1), (2) and (3) find their place in the passage. The ninth paragraph state and uphold them. Hence all of them are appropriate. However, option (4), their combination is the best pick.
13. **Ans.(2).** None of the options (1), (3) and (4) find their place in the passage. Option (2) is stated in the first three paragraphs and is the chosen one.
14. **Ans.(4).** None of the options (1), (2) and (3) are out of place. The eighth paragraph endorses them. Hence option (4) is the only one to be ticked.
15. **Ans.(4).** Option (3) does not find its place in the passage. Options (1) and (2) find their place in the last two paragraphs of the passage. Option (4), as combination of (1) and (2), best represents this and is the appropriate one.
16. **Ans.(3).** The passage is about the art of negotiating. It commences with physical circumstances as a vital factor for striking negotiations and deals with psychological manipulations ranging from having the circumstances tailor made to making the person in the opposite feel subservient through condescending behaviour and threat postures. Option (4) best represents this and is the suitable title for the passage. Option (3) is inapt whereas options (1) and (2) are partially apt, fading out before (4).
17. **Ans.(2).** Option (2) is the most suitable source of extract, for the passage deals with the tips towards being a successful and skilful negotiator, although it has come out with more don'ts than dos. The remaining options (1), (3) and (4) are not apt, for the passage does not convey anything about them.
18. **Ans.(3).** The author has handled the passage in a simple manner. The language is understandable and the contents comprehensible. Down-to-earth situations in daily life form the backdrop where the thoughts and ideas are initiated. Option (3) best denotes this. The remaining options (1), (2) and (4) are not correct and can be rejected.
19. **Ans.(1).** Option (1) is a strong conclusion which can be derived from the third last paragraph of the passage. Options (2), (3) and (4) are not conveyed by the passage and cannot be the conclusions which can be derived from the passage.
20. **Ans.(2).** The third last paragraph states that a good negotiator does not need to use the tactic of issuing threats to win through the negotiating process. Option (2) best denotes this and is the appropriate one. The remaining options can be rejected as they are not what the passage suggests.

### Answer Keys

20.(2)	19.(1)	18.(3)	17.(2)	16.(3)	15.(4)	14.(4)	13.(2)	12.(4)	11.(3)
10.(4)	9.(3)	8.(1)	7.(4)	6.(3)	5.(3)	4.(4)	3.(2)	2.(1)	1.(3)