MS-1

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Term-End Examination

June, 2010

MS-1 : MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS AND BEHAVIOUR

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, each question carrying 20 marks.

(iii) Section-B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.

SECTION - A

 'An organisation structure designed to suit its requirements through efficient groupings only, may not achieve the desired goals. Functional integration of these efficient groupings directed towards organisational objectives, therefore, assumes greater significance.'

Elaborate this statement and discuss the underlying issues with suitable examples.

- **2.** Explain the term 'Bounded Rationality'. What are the factors leading to bounded rationality and satisficing decisions ? Discuss.
- **3.** Discuss how the importance of characteristics of managerial ethos helps in maintaining culture in an organisational set-up ?
- **4.** What are the methods of control ? Discuss the policies and design choices available in control. Explain with suitable example.

- 5. Write short notes on *any three* of the following :
 - (a) Modes of conflict management
 - (b) Process of organisational change
 - (c) Types of groups
 - (d) Communication Process
 - (e) Inter personal relations

6.

Please read the case and answer the questions given at the end.

Robert, one of the field sales managers of Major Tools Ltd., and been promoted to his first headquarters assignment as an assistant product manager for a group of products with which he was relatively unfamiliar. Shortly after he had taken over this new assignment, one of the company's vice-presidents, Smith, called for a meeting of product managers and other staff to plan marketing strategies. Robert's superior (the product manager) was unable to attend, so the director of marketing, Reynolds, invited Robert to the meeting to help and orient him to his new job.

Because of the large gathering, Reynolds was rather brief in introducing Robert to Smith. After the meeting began, Smith – a crusty veteran with a reputation for bluntness – began asking a series of probing questions, which most of the product managers were unable to answer in detail. Suddenly, he turned to Robert and questioned him quite closely about his group of products. Somewhat confused, Robert confessed that he really did not know the answers.

It was immediately apparent to Reynolds that Smith had forgotten or had failed to understand that Robert was new to the job and was attending the meeting more for his own orientation than to contribute to it. He was about to offer a discreet explanation when Smith, visibly annoyed with what he took to be Robert's lack of preparation, snapped, "Gentlemen, you have just seen an example of sloppy staff work, and there is no excuse for it."

Reynolds had to make a quick decision. He could interrupt Smith and point out that he had judged Robert unfairly, but that might embarrass both his superior and his subordinate. Alternatively he could wait until after the meeting and offer an explanation in private. As Smith quickly became engrossed in another conversation, Reynolds followed the second approach. Glancing at Robert, Reynolds noted that his expression was one of mixed anger and dismay. After catching his eye, Reynolds winked at Robert as a discreet reassurance that he understood and that the damage could be repaired. After an hour, Smith, evidently dissatisfied with what he termed the "inadequate planning" of the marketing department in general, abruptly declared the meeting over. As he did so, he turned to Reynolds and asked him to remain behind for a moment. To Reynold's surprise, Smith immediately raised the question of Robert himself. In fact, it turned out to have been his main reason for asking Reynolds to remain behind. "Look," he said, "I want you to tell me frankly, do you think I was too rough with that kid ?" Relieved, Reynolds said "Yes, you were. I was going to speak to you about it."

P.T.O.

Smith explained to Reynolds that Robert was new to his job had not registered in his mind adequately when they had been introduced, and that is was only some time after his own outburst that the nagging thought began to occur to him that what he had done was inappropriate and unfair. "How well do you know him ?" he asked. "Do you think I hurt him ?"

For a moment Reynolds took the measure of his superior. Then he replied evenly, "I do not know him very well yet, but, yes I think you hurt him."

"Damn, that is unforgivable," said Smith. He then telephoned his secretary to call Robert and ask him to report to his office immediately. A few moments later, Robert returned, looking perplexed and uneasy. As he entered, Smith came out from behind his desk and met him in the middle of the office. Standing face to face with Robert, who was 20 years and four organization levels his junior, he said, "Look, I have done something stupid and I want to apologize. I had no right to treat you like that. I should have remembered that you were new to your job but I did not. I am sorry."

Robert was somewhat flustered. He muttered his thanks for the apology. "As long as you are here, young man," Smith continued, "I want to make a few things clear to you in the presence of your boss's boss. Your job is to make sure that people like myself do not make stupid decisions. Obviously, we think you are qualified for your job or we would not have brought you in here. But it takes time to learn any job. Three months from now I will expect you to know the answers to any questions about products. Until then," he said, thrusting out his hand for the younger man to shake, "you have my complete confidence. And thank you for letting me correct a mistake."

Questions :

- (a) What do you think was the effect on Robert and the other managers of Smith's outburst at the meeting ?
- (b) Was Smith right to apologize to Robert ? What do you think the apology meant to Robert ?
- (c) How does Smith define Robert's responsibilities as an assistant product manager ?
- (d) What is the most important aspect of the relations between management levels in this company ?