

MAY 2014

MBA 966-ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT

MARKS: 60

TIME: 3 HOURS

NOTE: PART-A CONTAINS 6 QUESTIONS OF 5 MARKS EACH AND THE CANDIDATES ARE REQUIRED TO ATTEMPT 4 QUESTIONS. PART-B CONTAINS 8 FULL LENGTH QUESTIONS OF 8 MARKS AND THE CANDIDATES ARE REQUIRED TO ATTEMPT 4 QUESTIONS, SELECTING ATLEAST ONE QUESTION FROM EACH UNIT. PART-C CONTAINS A CASE STUDY OF 8 MARKS.

PART-A

- Q1. What do you mean by Career Anchors?
- Q2. Define Empowerment.
- Q3. Discuss the sources of power.
- Q4. Discuss Kurt Lewin Model of Change.
- Q5. Discuss the role of client in bringing change
- Q6. Discuss the pros and cons of third party peacemaking interventions.

PART-B

UNIT-1

- Q1. What do you mean by Organizational Development? Discuss the interdisciplinary nature of Organizational Development.
- Q2. Discuss:
 - a) Participation and Empowerment
 - b) Strategies of Change

UNIT-2

- Q3. What are the various steps involved in Organizational Development program?
- Q4. Write a brief note on the following:
 - a) The Six Box Model
 - b) Third wave consulting

UNIT-3

- Q5. Explain third party peacemaking intervention.

Q6. Write a short note on the following:

- a) T-Group Training
- b) Behavioural Modelling

UNIT-4

Q7. Define politics. Explain the role of power and politics in OD.

Q8. Write a short note on:

- a) Ethical Standards in OD
- b) Client System

PART-C

CASE STUDY

An HR Director asked us to help resolve conflict between the HR and Finance Departments. While acknowledging that personality differences existed between the two Dept Heads, the conflict also involved several team members in each Department. The groups needed to interact on a variety of project and poor communication was impacting morale and productivity. We interviewed each Director to understand their prospective about the conflict. We also interviewed a couple of key team members from each dept. Together further advance information for the meeting we developed a short online survey for the two groups. Each person was asked to assess their group's performance and the performance of the other group on various communication topics. They were also asked to describe how they viewed themselves, how they viewed the other group, and how they felt the other group viewed them.

The data from the mini survey was summarized and sent to members of both teams a couple of days prior to the meeting. All Dept members completed an online Myers-Briggs assessment. The full day workshop began with a two hour, Myers-Briggs communications workshop with all Dept members. This helped People understand that all the preferences are needed to obtain best results and to appreciate the different preferences of their peers and leaders. We gave them information about how to communicate effectively with different types.

The rest of the morning was spent reviewing the results of the survey and breaking into small, action planning teams with HR and Finance represented on each team. The groups were asked to look at the data from each group's perspective and then develop some specific plans to improve communication.

The morning session was closed out by reassembling the entire group and asking each person to share something they personally planned to do to help improve future communications.

In the afternoon, our facilitator met for a coaching session with just the two Directors. The survey data was reviewed with them and the morning workshop debriefed. The Directors were also asked to talk honestly about what their personal contributions to other conflict issues were and to brainstorm ways that they and the two groups could begin to improve their inter-group communications. The feedback