

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Term-End Examination 01191
December, 2011

MS-26 : ORGANISATIONAL DYNAMICS

Time : 3 hours

Maximum Marks : 100
(Weigh tage 70%)

Note :

- (i) There are **two** Sections **A** and **B**.
 - (ii) Attempt any **four** questions from **Section A**. Each question carries **15** marks.
 - (iii) **Section B** is **compulsory** and carries **40** marks.
-
-

SECTION - A

1. Briefly discuss the tenets of strategic alliances and the need for it. Explain how these alliances could be made to work ?
2. Explain the importance of cohesiveness in groups and briefly describe the role of motivational approach to alienation.
3. Why is decentralisation important in organisations ? Briefly discuss the dimensions of power sharing.

4. Explain the process of organisational learning and its mechanisms.

5. Write short notes on *any three* of the following.
 - (a) Boss
 - (b) Transformational leadership
 - (c) Cross-cultural Dynamics
 - (d) Types of power
 - (e) Business Ethics.

SECTION - B

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

On Tuesday morning at 6:30 a.m., two young auto workers, disgruntled over failing to get their supervisor fired, scaled the 10-foot fence of a power control area, shut off the power and closed down a Transpower Corporation assembly line. They simply took matters into their own hands when the union's grievance procedure did not work fast enough to satisfy them. For 13 hours thereafter, Subhash and Satish carried on their protest in the six-by-seven foot facility known as the power cage, as fellow workers shouted encouragement.

This dramatic protest ended in victory with the delivery to the power cage of a signed statement from the plant manager, officially reporting that the supervisor had been fired and that there would be no reprisal against the protesters. Subhash and Satish were carried from the plant on the shoulders of their fellow workers. They were back in the plant working as spot welders the next day, but the fired supervisor, Grover, was out of his job, although he hoped to get another job with the company.

Grover, who has four children and who was fired for "personnel violations," claimed the

action was unjust. In explaining the events that led to the power cage protest and his subsequent firing, Grover said that production on the assembly line had been chronically below quota before he was named supervisor. At the time Grover was made supervisor, the plant manager had plainly told him that his job was to improve the production rate, and production had, in fact, improved markedly in the short time that he was supervisor.

Grover said his firing would set a damaging precedent. "The company's action creates a situation where the operations of the plant are subject to the whims of any employee with a grudge," he said. This possibility was emphasized by the comment of a union leader who said there were other conditions in the plant that needed improving—such as the cafeteria food and relief from the more than 100-degree heat in the metal shop. Moreover, the leader said, there was at least one other supervisor who should be fired. His manner implied that the successful power cage protest would facilitate attaining these ends, too. The union leader's final comment was that two men on an unauthorized wildcat strike had clearly accomplished the same thing as a full blown strike.

While commenting to a news reporter about the power cage strike, the two auto workers

reportedly said, "We knew we were going to win. When you cut the power, you've got the power. Every minute we were in there was costing the company money, and we weren't going to leave. It showed the power of the workers to control the company,"

The protest at the Transpower plant cost the company the production of 900 to 950 automotive units valued at Rs. 8,000 each and one reliable supervisor, according to newspaper accounts.

As the plant manager began to prepare a report on the power cage protest for his superior, the division Vice-President, he reviewed the events of the day, the decisions he had made, and the implications for the future. He wondered if the situation might not have been dealt with more effectively.

Questions :

1. Did Subhash and Satish actually have as much power as they claimed to have ?
 2. What other alternatives did the company have ? How good were **these** alternatives ?
 3. What will be the long-term consequences of the company's decision ? What did the company gain or lose by this incident ?
-