

596972

No. of Printed Pages : 8

MS-2

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME (MP)

Term-End Examination

June, 2019

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. Discuss the process of selection and elaborate with examples.
2. Discuss the process of career planning with illustration.
3. Describe the principles in designing HRD system with examples.
4. Briefly explain the major components of industrial wage structure of India and highlight the recent developments.

(A-14) P. T. O.

5. Explain the steps in grievance handling procedure with a suitable illustration.

Section—B

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

The National Transport Corporation (hereafter referred to as NTC), a leading transport organization with a fleet strength of 200 vehicles is engaged in Parcel Service in South India. The NTC has its head-quarters 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 1995, though the Corporation could have discharged him from service for long absence without 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 has been in NTC from the beginning of 1992.

Madhavan reported for duty at Madura, and again after six months 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, 1955. He again absented himself from duty for ten days from 17 December, 1955 and after joining duty, he was again absent for 20 days which led to initiation of disciplinary action.

At the departmental enquiry held in February, 1956 the delinquent employee 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 mistake in not applying for leave, 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 of Madhavan.

The Chief Executive of NTC, the final authority however again directed a transfer to Madura, rather than passing an order of dismissal. This was done to enable the employee to correct himself.

After issue of orders, the delinquent approached the Chief Executive of NTC and requested for mercy. The Chief Executive 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.

The Manager HRD, called Madhavan and asked for the reasons for absence. He asked the delinquent how the company would tolerate such absenteeism. Madhavan 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 Branch Manager, Salem and later by Branch Manager, Madura ? Madhavan had no answer to these questions. He, however requested the Manager to give him one last chance. He had no complaints against the Branch Managers. The HRD Manager 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 younger to him. His sisters and two brothers were living separately after

marriage. He got the job as a loadman in NTC in 1992 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 A) till the end of 1994 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 no more. She was married in 1993 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 ₹ 2,000. This helped her to establish a small grocery shop at Omalur 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.

Madhvan got a letter from Madhavi asking for 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 at the Madhura Temple and later went on a pilgrimage for a fortnight. He however did not inform the NTC officials about his marriage. He never applied for leave as well during the marriage on 6 January, 1996. What followed was the disciplinary action against Madhavan and his plea 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 may

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 problems to either of them. Both Managers agreed to abide by the decision of the Manager (HRD) to help Madhavan. Both promised to counsel Madhavan as well if he were posted either at Madura or Salem.

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

Annexure A : Location Chart



Annexure B : Provisions in the standing orders

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

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 one branch to another, from head office to branches and vice versa for exigencies of service.

Questions :

- (i) Explain the main issues of the case from HR perspective.
- (ii) What kind of intervention do you suggest ?