

MMS-III (H.R)

01-11-2009

# OD 03

Organizational Development

Roll No.:

Total No. of Questions : 6

Total No. of Printed Pages: 3

Duration (hrs.): 3 hours

Maximum Marks: 60

**Note:**

Question no.1, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

Attempt any two questions out of question nos. 2, 3 and 4.

Q.1: (15 Marks)

What is Organisation Development (OD)? How is OD distinct from Change Management. Is OD a broader concept than Change Management? Who is an OD Practitioner? What are his competencies and roles.

Q.2: (10 Marks)

Explain Lewins Change Model, Action Research Model and Positive Change Model as three major theories of planned change? Give comparison of these three models.

Q.3: (10 Marks)

Describe the four major Techniques of Collecting Data for Diagnosis by OD practitioners. Explain the Qualitative Tools as a technique of data analysis.

Q.4: (10 Marks)

What are the forces for change? Mention the five activities contributing to effective change management and explain any two of them in detail.

Q.5: (15 Marks)

Short Notes (Answer any 3) :

- (i) Third Party Interventions
- (ii) Career / life planning
- (iii) Organisational mirror
- (iv) Process Consultation
- (v) Survey / Feedback
- (vi) Environmental scanning

Q.6:

(10 Marks)

Read the following case and answer the questions.

The Ortiv Glass Corporation produces and markets plate glass for use primarily in the construction and automotive industries. The multiplant company has been involved in OD for several years and actively supports participative management practices and employee involvement programmes. Ortiv's organization design is relatively organic, and the manufacturing plants are given freedom and encouragement to develop their own organization designs and approaches to participative management. It recently put together a problem-solving group made up of the top-management team at its newest plant.

The team consisted of the plant manager and the managers of the five functional departments reporting to him: engineering (maintenance), administration, human resources, production, and quality control. In recruiting managers for the new plant, the company selected people with good technical skills and experience in their respective functions. It also chose people with some managerial experience and a desire to solve problems collaboratively, a hallmark of participative management. The team was relatively new, and members had been working together for only about five months.

The team met formally for two hours each week to share pertinent information and to deal with plantwide issues affecting all of the departments, such as safety procedures, interdepartmental relations, and personnel practices. Members described these meetings as informative but often chaotic in terms of decision making. The meetings typically started late as members straggled in at different times. The late comers generally offered excuses about more pressing problems occurring elsewhere in the plant. Once started, the meetings were often interrupted by "urgent" phone messages for various members, including the plant manager, and in most cases the recipients would leave the meeting hurriedly to respond to the call.

The group had problems arriving at clear decisions on particular issues. Discussion often rambled from topic to topic, and members tended to postpone the resolution of problems to future meetings. This led to a backlog of unresolved issues, and meetings often lasted far beyond the two hour limit. When group decisions were made, members often reported problems in their implementation. Members typically failed to follow through on agreements, and there was often confusion about what had actually been agreed upon. Every one expressed dissatisfaction with the team meetings and their results.

Relationships among team members were cordial yet somewhat strained, especially when the team was dealing with complex issues in which members had varying opinions and interests. Although the plant manager publicly stated that he wanted to hear all sides of the issues, he often interrupted the discussion or attempted to change the topic when members openly disagreed in their views of the problem. This interruption was typically

followed by an awkward silence in the group. In many instances when a solution to a pressing problem did not appear forthcoming, members either moved on to another issue or they informally voted on proposed options, letting majority rule decide the outcome. Members rarely discussed the need to move on or vote; rather, these behaviours emerged informally over time and became acceptable ways of dealing with difficult issues.

- Q.i. How clear are the group's goals?
- Q.ii. What is the group's task structure?
- Q. iii. What is the composition of the group?
- Q.iv. What are the groups performance norms?
- Q.v. What is the nature of team functioning in the group?

\*\*\*\*\*