

Roll No.

[illegible]

Total No. of Pages : 03

Total No. of Questions : 15

MBA (2012 & Onward) (Sem.-4)
ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Subject Code : MBA-966
Paper ID : [A2541]

Time : 3 Hrs.

Max. Marks : 60

INSTRUCTION TO CANDIDATES :

- 1. SECTION-A contains SIX questions carrying FIVE marks each and students has to attempt any FOUR questions.**
- 2. SECTIONS-B consists of FOUR Subsections : Units-I, II, III & IV. Each Subsection contains TWO questions each carrying EIGHT marks each and student has to attempt any ONE question from each Subsection.**
- 3. SECTION-C is COMPULSORY and consists of ONE Case Study carrying EIGHT marks.**

SECTION-A

- Q1. What is Behavioral Modeling?
- Q2. Discuss System Theory.
- Q3. What do you mean by Comprehensive Interventions?
- Q4. What are T-Groups?
- Q5. Distinguish between Organizational development and Management development.
- Q6. Define Organizational Politics.

SECTION-B

UNIT-I

- Q7. What do you mean by Organizational Development? Discuss assumptions and beliefs in OD.
- Q8. What do you mean by planned organizational change? Discuss the models and theories of planned change.

UNIT-II

Q9. Discuss the various steps involves in Organizational Development process.

Q10. Write a brief note on the following :

- a) Third Waves Consulting
- b) Action Research Model

UNIT-III

Q11. What is Team Development? Discuss the process of Team Development.

Q12. Write a short note on the following :

- a) Gestalt approach to team building
- b) Structural Interventions

UNIT-IV

Q13. Discuss the various issues in consultant-client relationship.

Q14. Write a short note on :

- a) The consultant Team as a Microcosm
- b) Ethical Standards in OD

SECTION-C

15. 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 on the workshop from the team members and the Directors was very positive. They felt that the honest discussions about issues would help them improve.

Questions :

What type of intervention do you understand from the above case, discuss in detail with proper theoretical foundation?