

No. of Printed Pages : 15

MS-2

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME (MP)

Term-End Examination

December, 2021

MS-2 : MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Time : 3 Hours

Maximum Marks : 100

(Weightage : 70%)

Note : Attempt any **three** questions from Section A.

Each question carries 20 marks. Section B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.

Section-A

1. Briefly describe and discuss the concept, objectives and functions of Human Resource Management.

2. What is outsourcing ? Explain the need for it in an organization. Discuss how outsourcing can be successful.
3. Describe the objectives and benefits of performance appraisal. Briefly discuss the errors that occur in having an objective evaluation and give suggestions as to how they can be minimized.
4. Discuss and describe how training can be made as a strategic function.
5. Write short notes on any *three* of the following :
 - (a) Process of coaching
 - (b) Executive compensation
 - (c) Workers' participation
 - (d) Talent management
 - (e) Role efficacy

P. T. O.

Section-B

6. Read the case given below and answer the questions given at the end :

The National Transport Corporation (hereinafter referred to as NTC), a leading transport organization with a fleet strength of 200 vehicles, is engaged in Parcel Services in South India. The NTC has its headquarters at Madras, and has branches in important locations in Tamil Nadu and other southern states.

Madhavan, a loadman of NTC at Salem, was transferred from Salem to Madura, for long absence from work in the beginning of 1985, though the corporation could have discharged him from service for long absence without

P. T. O.

permission, for a period of two months. The Branch Manager of Salem, NTC requested the Head of the Human Resources Division to transfer the employee to another location, to enable the employee to correct himself in future. Madhavan was in NTC from the beginning of 1982.

Madhavan reported for duty at Madura, and again after six months of service, started absenting from work as before. The Branch Manager of Madura counselled him several times, but Madhavan did not show any real change in his attitude. A written warning was given to him in October 1985. He again absented himself from duty on 17th December, 1985 for ten days, and after joining duty on

15th January, he was again absent for 10 days. Disciplinary action followed.

At the departmental enquiry held in February 1986, Mr. Madhavan pleaded that he was suffering from jaundice and that he rushed to his village near Salem for taking Ayurvedic treatment and rest. No medical certificate was produced. He admitted his mistake in not applying for leave, to the enquiry officer and requested for mercy.

Based on the admission of the misconduct, the enquiry officer gave the findings that he was guilty. The Branch Manager, Madura was

informed about the findings. He recommended dismissal (for provisions refer to Annexure-A).

The Chief Executive of NTC, the punishing authority, took the decision that the delinquent was not willing to work regularly. He however, again directed a transfer to Madras, rather than passing an order of dismissal. This was done, once again, to enable the employee to correct himself.

Before issue of orders, Mr. Madhavan approached the Chief Executive of NTC and requested for mercy. He was not in favour of changing the order of transfer. He, however

referred the matter to the Manager of the Human Resources Division for proper disposal.

Before the Manager (HRD)

The Manager HRD, asked Madhavan, the reasons for absence. He asked Mr. Madhavan how a company would tolerate such absenteeism. He was asked why he failed to produce medical certificates, if he was really sick ? Was he not given an opportunity twice to correct himself, once by the Branch Manager, Salem and later by the Branch Manager, Madura ? Madhavan had no answer to these questions. He however, requested the Manager

P. T. O.

to give him one last chance. He had no complaints against the Branch Managers. The management assured support to him if his version was convincing. Madhavan then narrated his family background.

Madhavan's Family Background

He was born to Gundappan and Palaniammal. He had two elder sisters, four elder brothers and another brother younger to him. His sisters and two brothers were living separately after marriage. He got the job as a loadman in NTC in 1982 at Salem, through his brother-in-law, another senior loadman at NTC. Another unmarried brother of his, aged 33 was

employed in a hotel and was living separately. He was living with his parents, a disabled brother aged 35 and his younger brother at Kamandapatti (Please refer Annexure-B) till the end of 1984 in the family house. He was the bread winner of the family.

Madhavan was now living at Omalur, with his wife Madhavi aged 22. Madhavi's tale was a tragic one. A native of Taramangalam, 10 kms from Omalur, her father was in the military, and was now no more.

She was married in 1983 to her father's sister's son Gopal. However, she was ill-treated by both her in-laws and her husband and deprived of

her ornaments. Disillusioned, she applied for a divorce and got an alimony of Rs. 20,000. This helped her to establish a small grocery shop at Omalur and settling down with her sister's family.

Here Madhavan developed intimacy with Madhavi much to the dislike of her sister, and another Gunapalan, a person known to Madhavan. Gunapalan wanted to marry Madhavi. But Madhavi had no interest in him. Gunapalan in this background posed serious problems to Madhavi especially after Madhavan's transfer to Madura. Gunapalan was determined to win her hand. He told her

twice that she will have to forget Madhavan, or else she will have to blame herself for the consequences. Threats followed.

Madhavan got a letter from Madhavi. She wanted real protection. She had antagonised Gunapalan and could not completely rely on her married sister. They should marry—she wrote to him. Madhavan reached Omalur to see that Madhavi's shop was burgled by unknown persons. There was a rumour in the air that Gunapalan was behind everything.

Madhavan decided to marry Madhavi. He married her from the Madura Temple and later

went on a pilgrimage for a fortnight. He however, did not inform the NTC officials and employees about his marriage. He never applied for leave as well during the marriage on 6th January, 1986. What followed was the disciplinary action against Madhavan and his entreaty against transfer.

The HRD Manager's Decision

Madhavan gave a definite undertaking to the Manager that he would be diligent in the work in future and that the management could terminate his services, upon any complaint in future.

The Manager (HRD) contacted the Branch Managers of Madura and Salem and took them into confidence. The family background was fully explained to both the Branch Managers. It transpired that Madhavan had never explained his problem to either of them. Both Managers agreed to abide by the decision of the Manager (HRD) to help the employee concerned. Both promised to counsel Madhavan as well, if he was posted either at Madura or Salem.

The Manager (HRD) taking into account his family background passed an order transferring the employee to Salem.

Questions :

- (i) Identify the issues in the case.
- (ii) If you were HRD manager, how would you have handled the situation ?

P. T. O.

Annexure—A

Provisions in Standing Orders

Habitual absence without leave or absence without leave for more than 10 days.

Habitual late attendance

Punishment—An employee who is found guilty of a misconduct may be punished as provided herein, depending upon the gravity of the misconduct committed by the employee.

- (a) Fine, up to 2% of monthly salary
- (b) Warning
- (c) Demotion
- (d) Stoppage of increment
- (e) Suspension for 30 days
- (f) Discharge or dismissal

The management has the right to transfer employees from head office to branches and vice versa for exigencies of service.

Annexure—B

Location Chart

