

No. of Printed Pages : 6

MS-24

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

(MP)

Term-End Examination

June, 2024

MS-24 : INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Time : 3 Hours

Maximum Marks : 100

(Weightage 70%)

Note : (i) Attempt any **three** questions from Section A. Each question carries 20 marks.

(ii) Section B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.

Section-A

1. What are the provisions under the Industrial Disputes Act. 1947 for settlement of industrial disputes ? Discuss briefly with illustrations.

P. T. O.

2. Discuss the issues inherent in managing internal affairs of the unions. Explain the role and significance of managerial leadership in this context.
3. Outline the process and conditions for success of collective bargaining citing suitable examples.
4. What are the aims and objectives of workers' participation in management (WPM) ? Discuss critically. Outline the origins of WPM in India and briefly discuss the current status.
5. Explain various stages/modes of dispute settlement in India.

Section-B

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

A nationalised road transport corporation introduced an incentive scheme for the bus crew (staff) so as to provide better transport facilities to the maximum number of passengers as there was no other transport

agency operating on the same route. Moreover, this would increase the revenue of the corporation. In accordance with this scheme, the corporate fixed a certain amount of the level of revenue to each route as base revenue. If the revenue earned by a particular trip was equal to the base revenue, the conductor and driver of that bus would be eligible to receive the incentive amount of one percent of the base revenue. If the revenue exceeded the base amount the conductor and driver could get higher percent on incremental revenue as incentive bonus.

In a bid to take advantage of this incentive scheme, the bus conductors of almost all the routes started to overload the buses exceeding double the seating capacity (i.e., 49 seating capacity plus 49 standing passengers). This scheme had been functioning successfully, benefiting the passengers, the bus crew and particularly the corporation, as the cost of operation of the bus did not increase in proportion to the increase in revenue.

Mr. 'A' had been working as a conductor in 'Z' depot of the road transport corporation. He was on duty on 19th September 2008 on a route (R to K passenger bus). He had overloaded the bus almost to a double of the seating capacity. Mr. X — a passenger of that bus did not purchase a ticket despite repeated enquiries of the conductor, because the heavy overloaded condition of the bus and his illness. The conductor was unable to count the passengers because of the overload. In this state, the ticket checking officers stopped the bus, verified the tickets of all the passengers and found that Mr. X had not purchased a ticket. They blamed the conductor for not issuing the ticket and the passenger for not buying the ticket. Then Mr. X in a written appeal to the checking staff stated that he had not purchased the ticket despite repeated enquiries by the conductor because he was ill and the bus was heavily overloaded. He requested, therefore, not to take any action against the conductor. The ticket checking staff

collected the ticket fare and penalty from Mr. X and suspended the conductor ignoring the written request made by Mr. X. Moreover, the repeated requests made by the co-passengers of that bus was not paid any heed to.

The suspension of the conductor created an uproar among all the bus crew of the depot (Z). The operating staff (conductors and drivers) held a meeting on 19th September itself and resolved to limit the intake of passengers to the seating capacity. This decision was implemented with immediate effect. Consequently, most of the commuters were unable to leave for their destination. Passengers of almost all the routes experienced many difficulties while travelling.

Average revenue per day of 'Z' bus depot declined to ₹ 75,000 from ₹ 1,00,000 between 20th and 27th September. The suspension of Mr. A at 'Z' bus depot served as the potential "fuel" for the staff, working in other depots to launch a work-to-rule agitation. Viewing the

situation, the officials of the corporation re-examined the whole case and withdrew the suspension order served on Mr. A on 27th September 2008.

Questions :

- (i) Who is correct and why : The personnel department or the foreman or the collective bargaining committee.
- (ii) Where would you place this issue for redressal ?
- (iii) How do you redress this grievance ?
Discuss in view of the given case.