

MHROD / III Sem.

A

Course 632 – TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

Time : 3 hours

Maximum Marks : 70

(Write your Roll No. on the top immediately on receipt of this question paper.)

Attempt all questions.

1. Discuss the various principles underlying the effective training for individual and organization. Also describe the role of knowledge of results on training.

OR

What are the skills required for an excellent trainer? How these skills are helpful in delivering the training.

12

2. Differentiate between the system and systematic approach to training along with its various stages.

OR

How and why the training need assessment is needed for development of an effective training module? Illustrate the various steps adopted for carrying out training need assessment.

12

3. Discuss off-the-job training methods application for an organization facing the global challenges with advantages and disadvantages of each. To build interpersonal relationship at work, illustrate any one off-the-job method which you think is more suitable and why

OR

Discuss the various on-the-job methods of training with their advantages and disadvantages.

12

4. Develop a training capsule for the middle level managers for three days to develop soft skills.

OR

5. Write short notes on any Two of the following:

- a) Flexible learning modules
- b) Developing and planning curriculum
- c) Reactive approach to training
- d) Proactive approach to training

14

CASE STUDY

Read the following case and answer the questions asked at the end

The Hindustan Chemicals Limited (HCL) is a public sector firm engaged in petrochemical business. It employs about 1600 most of who are well-qualified, fairly young (average 32 years) and typically have an urban background. HCL has retained one reputed consulting and training organization each to impart training in supervisory skills for their junior managers, human resource management programmes for senior managers. HCL 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 the growing tendency on the part of some of the employees on night shift to sleep while on duty. Since it was a tightly mannered petro-chemical complex any negligence or dereliction of duty in certain critically 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 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 weaknesses 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, the management would be considerate enough. With a result, the incidence of sleeping on night duty began to grow. Top management became alarmed. The personnel department was asked to advice all line managers particularly shift in-charges 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 management's perception of industrial relations dynamics at the plant is very different from that of juniors 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 Co-ordinator readily agreed to the suggestion because he felt that in doing so he was making it tailor-made to the needs of the organization.

When the module was first offered to the fifth batch of middle managers, the participants wondered why this subject was additionally introduced. They wanted to know 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 or 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 being threatened due to sabotage, violence and vandalism by a handful of unruly elements. Discipline, therefore, is not merely an organizational 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 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 initiating actions on the cases they themselves have booked".

Such restiveness 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 organizational analysis in small groups. Most participants wondered what happened to the suggestion their predecessors made while presenting the findings for their group discussions on organizational 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 co-ordinator, "why are you asking us to vent to our feelings? Do you realize that our top management is merely using you and the other faculty as a buffer?" a third one queried, 'you quoted Kurt Lewin on the first day and observed that behavior 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 concerning to their personality should remain a taboo since projection will not help us"

Questions:

1. Identify the key issues of the case.

2. As a member of the top management team how would you propose to handle a situation of this kind? 5
3. Critically evaluate the comments of the participants? 5
4. How do you see the training strategy of the top management? Evaluate whether it would help in solving this problem? 5