

**POST GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN TEACHING
AND RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT**

00903

Term-End Examination

June, 2014

PGDTRM-06 : TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

Time : 3 hours

Maximum Marks : 100

-
- Note :*
- (i) There are two Sections A and B.*
 - (ii) Attempt any three questions from Section - A.
Each question carries 20 marks.*
 - (iii) Section - B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.*
-
-

SECTION - A

1. Explain the concept of Human Capital. Discuss the impact of human capital on organisational performance.
2. What are the basic principles of training design ? Briefly explain the components of training design process.
3. Discuss the objectives of evaluation training programmes.
4. Explain the basic elements of sensitivity training. Briefly describe the process of sensitivity training with suitable examples

5. Write short notes on **any three** of the following.
- (a) Transactional analysis
 - (b) Role play method of training
 - (c) Roles and functions of trainers
 - (d) Learning and training
 - (e) Executive development

SECTION - B

6. Read the following case and answer the questions given at the end of the case.

The Hindustan Petro Chemicals Ltd. (HPCL) is a public sector firm engaged in petrochemical business. It employs about 1,600 people most of whom are well-qualified, fairly young (average age 32) and typically have an urban background. HPCL has retained one reputed consulting and training organisation each to impart training in supervisory skills for their junior managers, human resources management programme with emphasis on organisation analysis and behaviour modification skills for middle managers and advanced management programmes for senior managers. HPCL wanted to train all managerial employees over a period of 12 to 15 months in batches of 20 per month at junior and middle levels, and 20 senior managers once in every two months.

IAM, a renowned management institute was assigned the responsibility to cover middle managers.

A couple of months after the start of the training intervention, the top management learnt of a growing tendency on the part of some of the employees on night shift to sleep while on duty. Since it was a tightly manned petro-chemical complex any negligence or dereliction of duty in certain critical areas could be potentially hazardous and extremely risky. Therefore, the Director (Personnel) and a couple of members of the top management team went around the plant one night, without any prior information to the plant people about their visit. They caught red-handed, four persons sleeping on duty, recorded evidence and proceeded with taking steps to initiate disciplinary action the following day. When the charge sheets were being prepared, trade union leaders descended on the scene persuaded the top management to be lenient, as an exception in this case, to the concerned persons. The union leaders also assured that they would advise their members not to sleep while on duty. In the interest of maintaining good industrial relations, the top management did not pursue the cases.

This gesture on the part of the top management was perceived as a sign of their weakness by the officers association and its members. They protested to top management whether they (the latter) would be equally considerate in cases involving them (the managers). The workers felt that so long as there is no problem in the plant, management would be considerate enough. With the result, the incidence of sleeping on night duty began to grow. Top management became alarmed. The Personnel

Department was asked to advise all line managers, particularly shift in-charge in night duty to keep a vigil on those who have a tendency to sleep and report cases of persons who are found guilty of sleeping on duty. The circular did not register any impact on the middle and junior managers. Instead, they derisively laughed and ignored the circulars. They also felt that "the top managements perception of industrial relations dynamics at the plant is very different from that of junior and middle level managers."

Seeing no improvement in the situation, the top management asked IAM to include a module on Handling Indiscipline with role-play sessions on "How to conduct Domestic Enquiry". The programme Coordinator readily agreed to the suggestion because he felt that in doing so he was making it tailor-made to the needs of the organisation.

When the module was first offered to the fifth batch of middle managers, the participants wondered why it did not form an integral part of the programme from the beginning itself and whether the need for including the topic was felt by their colleagues who attended the programme in the previous batches by the top management. When they learnt that it was at the latter's instance, they stoutly protested in chorus and said "We know the importance of Discipline. In fact with growing violence, our physical security is often threatened due to sabotage violence and vandalism by a handful of unruly elements. Discipline, therefore, is not merely an organisational need, but also a personal need for

us whereas for the top management it is a bargainable aspect of shop floor industrial relations. What we need is not training but proof that top management means what it says. We demand that the top management supports and sustains the actions we initiate in maintaining discipline. We will be able to have confidence in top management if it shows us the way by first initiating actions on the cases they themselves have booked”.

Such restriveness affected the receptivity in what was on the agenda in the training schedule for that afternoon. But the trainees became involved the following day when they were doing the organisation analysis in small groups. Most participants wondered what happened to the suggestion their predecessors made while presenting the findings of their group discussions on organisation analysis before some members of the top management team on the last day of every programme held thus far. One participant asked “Our colleagues gave their feedback to the top management. We understand the latter agreed on most points. But we see no evidence of follow-up of any kind”.

A second one argued with the programme coordinator. “Why are you asking us to give vent to our feelings ? Do you realise that our top management is merely using you and the other faculty as beggar” ? A third one queried, “You quoted Kurt Lewin on the first day and observed that behaviour is a function of personality and situation. Now tell us whether top management merely wants to change our personality but does

not want to change the situation. We do not know whether discussion on aspects covering their personality should remain a taboo since projection will not help us”.

Questions :

1. Identify and discuss the key issues in the case.
 2. How do you see the training strategy of the top management ?
 3. As a member of the top management team how would you propose to handle a situation of this kind ?
-