

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

Term-End Examination

June, 2013

00560

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 carries 40 marks.*
-

SECTION-A

1. Elucidate the concept and significance of learning 20
in the contemporary society and organisations.
What are the attributes of learning ? Explain.
2. Discuss the six components analysis approach 20
and its relevance in TNA, with suitable examples.
3. What are the different types of designs used for 20
training evaluation ? Discuss the relative merits
and demerits of each.
4. Explain the objectives of Transactional Analysis 20
and its relevance in structural analysis, life
positions and transactions, with examples.

5. Write short notes on **any three** of the following : 20
- (a) Systems approach to Executive Development Programmes.
 - (b) Advantages and disadvantages of case study, as a method of training.
 - (c) Lesson Plan and Learning activities.
 - (d) Learning curves.
 - (e) Human capital management.

SECTION-B

6. Analyse the case given below and answer the questions : 40

- The CEO of one of the leading pharma companies in America, was impatient. He had seen a huge growth in training costs at the company and wanted to know : 'what were they getting for their money' ?
- A reasonable question and coming from the CEO - Soon, he was presented with a hastily drawn up report - based on anecdotes.
- That was not acceptable. The CEO, an MD by training with a PhD in bio-medical statistics, and a former research scientist himself, wanted hard data - so those involved went back and came up with a more thorough plan for evaluating the dollar value and long term strategic worth of training. They called outside experts - Charlie Morrow from the consulting firm Linkage, and Melvin of Tulane University a Professor in Management.
- The result was a rarity in the organisational world : a rigorous, four year project using the quantitative methods of science to assess whether the company's training actually justified its cost.

- According to the CEO, “despite the billions of dollars spent on corporate trainings globally, the effectiveness of these programmes is rarely evaluated by the companies that pay for them - nor by any one else. Estimates of the extent to which skills taught in company training programmes carry over into day - to - day practice on the job are as low - and gloomy - as a mere 10 percent. But no one knows for sure what the true rate of improved job performance is, because the data are rarely collected and analysed scientifically”.
- The training programmes were evaluated thread-bare with its cost-benefits. The programmes were very different in focus, in audience and in results. The competencies they aimed to bolster ranged from teaching top executives to motivate their employees, to helping managers to communicate effectively, resolve conflicts, manage change, to improving ability to give feedback and foster positive relations with workers, team building and also in improving technical skills in relevant areas.
- Overall, results were mixed ; while a few programmes proved themselves worth the effort, several did not. Not only was there any improvement after the training, but

those executives who attended were rated by their bosses as, average, less effective in these competencies than before the training. "Comparing pre and post training ratings of their managerial behaviour, there was a slight negative shift".

- The effectiveness of the training programmes were studied based on return on investment and pay back period analysis. It was found that the few programmes which were rated 'Good and worth' were able to maintain a spectacularly short pay back period and ROI during the first year was above 500 percentage, the break even of which was quite early and encouraging.
- As regard the other programmes, it was found that, to pay back their cost, it would take more than seven to eight years and ROI was almost 'nil' during the first year.
- In short, it was noticed that many of the in - house training programmes designed and developed in - house out performed much better, due to cost effectiveness, need based programme designs, etc.
- Since then the company has completely revamped its training programmes and the study itself stands as a bench mark, setting the standard for empirically valuing their own training programmes and its effectiveness.

Questions :

- (a) Was the four year project to evaluate the training programmes in this pharma company worth the time and money ? Discuss in detail the pros and cons.
 - (b) As an HR specialist, what other methods you would have used to evaluate the training programmes ? Explain method wise merits and demerits.
 - (c) Do you agree that affective outcomes do not actually measure training effectiveness ? If so, which other outcomes do you recommend for effective evaluation of soft skills ? Explain the reasons there of.
 - (d) What is the relevance of setting bench mark for empirically evaluating the training programmes ? Explain in the context of this case.
-