

## MBA - II/III Semester-4/6 (D/E) Examination

OD &amp; L

Time : 2-00 Hours]

May-2024

[Max. Marks : 70

Q.1 Define the following concepts IN A SINGLE SENTENCE: (5)

- (1) Doctor-patient approach to OD
- (2) Humanistic management
- (3) Role
- (4) Change agent
- (5) Survey-feedback

Q.2 Write short notes (any one): (5)

- (1) Process consultation
- (2) Role Negotiation

Q.3 Answer the following questions: (15)

Identify one person whom you consider to be an effective corporate leader, whom you have closely worked with – either as a junior, or colleague, of that person. You may change that person's name and other details for privacy, but briefly describe who that person is.

- (1) Describe that person's behaviors that distinguish him/her as an effective leader, clearly validating why you think that person is an effective leader. (5)
- (2) In terms of leadership style, identify how you understand that person's approach and also narrate why that style is more suitable than any other styles.(10)

OR

- (1) Present the leadership behaviors and style profile of that person so that it is clear why he/she can be considered an effective leader. (15)

Q.4 Read the text and answer the questions appearing below it: (10)

"When I accepted the job of the production in-charge at my present company, I knew it was facing quality problems. The market was tough, demanding zero defects whereas the approach to quality adopted at my company was traditional. Once defects had occurred, they were to be spotted by the supervisors and then corrected. The problem was that even after the supervisor pointed out the error and showed how to correct it, the workers were making the same mistakes.

I decided to abandon that approach. I cleared the area in the centre of the production floor and got a huge square painted red. A sign board was put there, crying in large letters, "Rejected". Rejection is a word that many people do not like. We would simply dump the day's rejected units in the square and leave. No explanation, no instructions. Eventually, in a couple of days, workers could not contain their curiosity. They went to the square to see what things were lying there.

They took the parts in their hands and started talking about them. Naturally, they got to discuss what was wrong with the parts. Once the experienced workers had explained what was wrong, the discussion turned towards how to fix it. After two weeks of such 'unsupervised' discussions, the number of rejected parts reduced substantially. The workers had learned to take interest in their output and error-free production was more meaningful.

to them. (Based on the experience of one senior executive at a famous aircraft parts manufacturer.)

- (1) It appears that the senior executive's approach to problem solving has brought positive change. In terms of OD, what elements have made it possible?

Q.5 Read the following description and answer the questions appearing in the end: (15)

In 2018, K L Gupta, the President of a large, growing vehicle manufacturing company, announced reorganization of the existing structure. The previous structure was now divided into three divisions for three major products of the company. These divisions were Small Passenger Vehicles, Military Vehicles and Utility Vehicles. In his note to all the employees, Gupta explained that the need for growth and diversification were driving change. Through the divisional structure, Gupta said, it would be possible to clearly identify profit responsibility and evaluate the performance of divisions as well as the managers. It was necessary to find out and improve the performance of unprofitable operations.

Thus, under each division, functions such as Engineering, Manufacturing and Accounting were provided. The company also had one laboratory facility that was used by all three divisions for the purpose of determining properties selected by the design engineers. Divisions did not have separate laboratories due to high investment required. Administratively, the Laboratory manager reported to the Vice President of Military Vehicles Division.

All was fine until a time when the Laboratory Manager retired in 2020 and P K Sharma joined to fill the vacancy. Sharma was known to be fiercely ambitious. Soon he made it clear to the Managers of Engineering functions of the other divisions that according to him, material testing was a very limited responsibility. Sharma wanted higher involvement in the related processes of material selection, designing the experiment and evaluation of data. However, the Engineering head of Utility Vehicles, R S Chaudhari told Sharma clearly that the final responsibility for material selection was his, though he did not mind taking Sharma's opinion.

Soon the disagreement started mounting between Sharma and Chaudhari. Chaudhari, a design engineer by profession accused that Sharma did not understand the designing nuances. Sharma countered by saying that designing people did not understand the finer aspects of metallurgy as he himself did. Then Chaudhari noticed that his jobs sent to Lab were not completed in time. When he checked with Sharma, Sharma replied that he had other important jobs from his own, Military Division in hand. When Chaudhari said that Sharma should understand the importance of jobs from Utility Vehicles division. Sharma replied that he should have been involved in the process of material selection and experiment designing. Finally, Chaudhari wrote a long, angry complaint to the Vice President, Utility Vehicles division and requested his intervention, and made it clear that without it, Chaudhari's functioning satisfactorily was impossible.

#### Questions:

- (1) What is the problem with the organization here? Which element(s) of the organization would you hold responsible for the problem(s)? (5)
- (2) If you are the VP of the utility vehicles division, what specific interventions would you make in order to solve the problem? Identify the intervention, its level, and a broad approach you would take. (10)