

**MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME**

**Term-End Examination**

**June, 2010**

**MS-21 : SOCIAL PROCESSES AND  
BEHAVIOURAL ISSUES**

*Time : 3 hours*

*Maximum Marks : 100*

*(Weightage 70%)*

**Note :**

- (i) *There are two Sections A and B.*
- (ii) *Attempt any three questions from Section - A. All questions carry 20 marks each.*
- (iii) *Section - B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.*

**SECTION-A**

1. Describe power dynamics in an organisation and explain how power can be used ethically ? Cite examples.
2. Discuss the process and management of ethical counselling in organisation set ups. Illustrate with a suitable example.
3. Describe any one approach to conflict process and discuss various conflict Management styles and their relevance citing suitable examples.

4. What is perception and discuss the common errors in perception and how it can be overcome with reference to organisational processes ?
  
5. Write short notes on *any three* of the following :
  - (a) Porter and Lawler's Model of Motivation
  - (b) Corporate Governance
  - (c) Emotional intelligence
  - (d) Formal communication channels
  - (e) Groups vs Teams

## SECTION-B

6. Read the following case carefully and answer the questions given at the end :

Mr. Venkat Raman joined Southern Fertilizers Manufacturing Company in January 1987 as a Junior Operator Trainee. Within the non-executive category, the company had five levels from P1 (the lowest grade) to P5 (the highest grade). Raman joined at P2 level. After training, he was absorbed in the Ammonium Sulphate Shop as a Junior Operator. He rose up to the level of P4 in December 1991 because of his sincere and hard work. All through these years, he kept away from union activities. He never refused or avoided any job. Very often his officers used to ask him to do additional jobs which he did willingly. Gradually Raman became a handy man for all sundry assignments which others might have refused.

Since February 1992, Raman was regularly asked to perform certain duties which were actually to be done by a P5 level operator as the post in the higher grade was vacant. However, as per the company's rules, Raman was not eligible for promotion to the higher grade at that time.

Gradually, Raman started performing all the duties attached to the higher post. About this

time, Raman started taking interest in union activities. On August 8, 1993 Raman was instructed by his superior to stop one agitator pump and start another one. He was also asked to normalise the operation of the sulphate drier. Later his boss alleged that he did not attend to these jobs and neglected his normal inspection duty as a result of which tar got settled in a tank which was to remain free of tar. On August 12, Raman was instructed to attend to the breakdown of discharge feeder chain and conveyor. Later his superior alleged that he did not do this job. On both these days, Raman did not fill the section's log book which was a part of his normal duty.

On August 25, a show-cause notice was served on Raman demanding explanation within 48 hours as to why disciplinary action should not be taken against him. He replied on August 29, denying the allegations and stating that the management had fabricated the charges. As per the company's rules, he was charge-sheeted on October 18, for (a) neglect of duty, and (b) wilful insubordination and disobedience of the lawful and reasonable orders of his superiors.

Raman replied on October 25, denying all the charges and requesting the management to withdraw the charges immediately. Thereafter, an Enquiry Committee consisting of an officer

from the Ammonium Nitrate Department and an officer from the Personnel Department was set up to look into the charges. Raman was given an opportunity to produce evidence on his behalf and defend himself. The committee held 20 sittings and throughout the proceedings, Raman denied the allegations levelled against him and asserted that his boss was prejudiced against him because of his union activities.

In April 1995, the enquiry committee brought out the following points in its findings.

- (a) There was a provision in the company for paying acting allowance to those operators who acted in the higher grade temporarily for more than three months. It appeared that Raman had been demanding the acting allowance, but due to some procedural problems, he was not paid.
- (b) It could not be proved beyond doubt that the instructions were given to him and that he did not abide by the instructions given to him on August 8, 1993.
- (c) On August 8, 1993, Raman deliberately neglected his normal inspection duty resulting in the deposit of tar in the tank. The loss to the company was, however, insignificant.
- (d) Raman did not attend to the breakdown on August 12, 1993 as instructed by his boss.

- (e) Raman did not fill the section's log book on August 8 and 12, 1993 as was expected of him.

**Questions :**

- (i) Critically explain the change in Raman's behaviour.
- (ii) What would you have done if you were his immediate boss ?
- (iii) Do you feel that recurrence of such cases can be avoided by improving the motivational climate of the organisation ?
- (iv) What steps would you initiate as Chief Executive of the company ?
-