

Reg. No.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**MBAS 511**

**Third Semester M.B.A. Degree Examination, April 2021**  
**BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**  
**Employees Relations Management**

Time : 3 Hours

Max. Marks : 70

**SECTION – A**  
**(Compulsory)**

**(1×15=15)**

**Note :** Answer to the question should **not** exceed **six** pages.

1. Briefly explain the need and importance of labour laws in employee relations management with suitable examples.

**SECTION – B**

**(5×8=40)**

**Note :** Answer **any five**, **each** question carries **8** marks. Answer to the question should **not** exceed **five** pages.

2. Define collective bargaining and discuss the process of collective bargaining.
3. What strategies are to be adopted for making negotiation exercises meaningful ? Explain in detail.
4. Explain the various benefits available to employees under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948.
5. What is Workers' Participation in Management ? Briefly discuss the different types of Workers' Participation in Management.
6. Discuss the need and importance of Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972. What are the major provisions under this Act ?
7. Bring out the important provisions related to payment of wages under Payment of Wages Act, 1936.
8. What is grievance ? Outline the steps involved in handling employee grievance.
9. Elaborate the employer's duties and responsibilities to prevent harassment at work place.

**P.T.O.**



SECTION – C  
(Compulsory)

(1×15=15)

**Note :** Answer to the question should **not** exceed **six** pages.

## 10. Case analysis.

A nationalised road transport 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 per cent of the base revenue. If the revenue exceeded the base amount the conductor and driver could get higher per cent on increment and 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 1 depot of the road transport corporation. He was on duty on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2018 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 brpaper.com. 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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 Rs. 75,000 from Rs. 1,00,000 between 20<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> 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 27<sup>th</sup> September 2018.

**Questions :**

- a) Was the conductor guilty of negligence of duty ?
- b) Should the corporation officials ignore the pleas and evidences of the passengers travelling in that bus while imposing a penalty ?