



MBA & MBA (Finance) II Semester Regular Examinations June/July 2018

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

(For students admitted in 2017 only)

Time: 3 hours

Max. Marks: 60

SECTION – A

(Answer the following: (05 X 10 = 50 Marks))

1 What are the functions of HRM? Explain.

OR

2 Distinguish between personnel management and HRM.

3 Explain any four tests used in selection process.

OR

4 What are the methods of job evaluation? Explain.

5 What are the objectives of wages and salaries administration? Explain.

OR

6 Which are the monetary benefits given by organizations? Explain.

7 Explain the states of career development.

OR

8 What is training? Explain the procedure involved in analyzing the training needs.

9 How do you maintain a good work life balance if you are an employee? Explain.

OR

10 Write a detailed notes on quality circles.

SECTION – B

(Compulsory question, 01 X 10 = 10 Marks)

11 **Case Study:**

Politics and Performance Appraisal

Kalyani Electronics Corporation Ltd., recently diversified its activities and started producing computers. It employed personnel at the lower level and middle level. It has received several applications for the post of commercial manager-computer division. It could not decide upon the suitability of the candidates to the position, but did find that Mr. Prakash is more qualified for the position than other candidates. The corporation has created a new post below the cadre of General Manager i.e. Joint General Manager and asked Mr. Prakash to join the Corporation as Joint General Manager. Mr. Prakash agreed to it viewing that he will be considered for General Manager's position based on his performance. Mr. Anand, the Deputy General Manager of the Corporation and one of the candidates of General Manager's position was annoyed with the management's practice. But, he wanted to show his performance record to the management at the next appraisal meeting. The management of the corporation asked Mr. Sastry, General Manager of televisions division to be the General Manager in-charge of computer division for some time, until a new General Manager is appointed. Mr. Sastry wanted to switch over to computer division in view of the prospects, prestige and recognition of the position among the top management of the corporation. He viewed this assignment as a chance to prove his performance.

Contd. in page 2





The Corporation has the system of appraisal of the superior's performance by the subordinates. The performance of the Deputy General Manager, Joint General Manager and General Manager has to be appraised by the same group of the subordinates. Mr. Prakash is a stranger to the system as well as its modus operandi. Mr. Sastry and Mr. Anand were competing with each other inconvincing their subordinates about their performance and used all sorts of techniques for pleasing them like promising them a wage hike, transfers to the job of their interest, promotion, etc. However, these two officers functioned in collaboration with a view to pull down Mr. Prakash. They openly told their subordinates that a stranger should not occupy the 'chair'. They created several groups among employees like pro-Anand's group, pro-Sastry group, Anti-Prakash and Sastry group, Anti-Anand and Prakash group.

Mr. Prakash has been watching the proceedings calmly and keeping the top management in touch with all these developments. However, Mr. Prakash has been quite work-conscious and top management found his performance under such a political atmosphere to be satisfactory. Prakash's pleasing manners and way of maintaining human relations with different levels of employees did, however, prevent the emergence of an anti-Prakash wave in the company. But in view of the political atmosphere within the company, there is no strong pro-Prakash's group either.

Management administered the performance appraisal technique and the subordinates appraised the performance of all these managers. In the end, surprisingly, the workers assigned the following overall scores. Prakash: 560 points: Sastry: 420 points and Anand: 260 points.

Questions:

- (a) How do you evaluate the worker's appraisal in this case?
- (b) Do you suggest any techniques to avert politics creeping into the process of performance appraisal by subordinates or do you suggest the measure of dispensing with such appraisal systems?
