

(6)

MB-303(H2)

agreed that this amount will be recovered from the compensation payable and since no compensation is payable, the workman should pay back the advance. The management further pointed out that it cannot waive the recovery of the above advance as it is bound by the rules.

The union, however, insisted that management should not proceed on the recovery of advance from the workman. The management also heard rumors that the said union may stage a "show down" over this issue.

Questions :

- (i) What is the problem in the case ?
- (ii) Analyze the causes which led to the problem.
- (iii) How should one deal with such a situation ?

MB-303(H2)

310

H

Roll No.

MB-303(H2)

M. B. A. (THIRD SEMESTER)

MID SEMESTER

EXAMINATION, Jan., 2023

COMPENSATION & BENEFITS

MANAGEMENT

Time : 1½ Hours

Maximum Marks : 50

- Note :** (i) This question paper contains two sections—A and B.
- (ii) Both Sections are compulsory.
- (iii) Answer any *two* sub-questions among (a), (b) and (c) in each main question of Section A. Each question carries 10 marks.
- (iv) Section B consisting of case study is compulsory. Section B is of 20 marks.

P. T. O.

(2)

MB-303(H2)

Section—A

1. (a) State the underlying objectives of compensation management. (CO1)
(b) What is the difference between Job description and job specification ? (CO1)
(c) From the human resource manager's point of view, what are the uses of job analysis ? (CO1)
2. (a) Discuss the procedure involved in the evaluation of jobs. (CO2)
(b) Briefly explain various methods of job evaluation. (CO2)
(c) Distinguish between wage and salary. (CO2)
3. (a) "Job evaluation is the ranking of job not the job holder." Comment. (CO3 and CO4)
(b) Examine the salient features of executive/managerial remuneration in business organizations. (CO3 and CO4)
(c) Are wage differentials justified ? Comment. (CO3 and CO4)

(3)

MB-303(H2)

Section—B

5. Case Study :

Mr. Nand Kishore is a workman employed in the dispatch department of a cement factory. The factory is located in one of the towns of a politically sensitive state. It employs about 1,500 employees besides the managerial staff. The annual turnover of the company is around ₹ 150 crores and its capacity utilization is 75 per cent.

The factory has three unions besides a security staff association and a management association. For eight years, only one union has been recognized, on the basis of its "claim" that it has the largest following of workmen. Continued recognition of a single union led to strained relations between the two unrecognized unions and the management and also among the unions themselves.

Mr. Nand Kishore is an office bearer of one of the unrecognized unions. The industrial relations situation in the factory has been fluctuating from periods of harmony to periods of disturbances.

P. T. O.

(4)

MB-303(H2)

On December 10, 1998, Mr. Nand Kishore fell down from the ladder, while working during the second shift. The accident resulted in serious injury to his right arm. He was admitted in a government hospital for treatment. An accident report was sent to the commissioner under Workmen's Compensation Act, to determine the amount of compensation, if any, to be paid to Mr. Nand Kishore for the loss of any advance to the injured workman for covering medical expenses. It also stated that the above amount may be deducted from the compensation which Mr Nand Kishore may get, according to the commissioner's decision. The management paid ₹ 3,000 as advance, after obtaining a written under-taking from the union that this amount will be deducted from the compensation payable. The union also agreed to this condition. It also arranged for the release of ₹ 2,000 from the Labour Welfare Fund.

(5)

MB-303(H2)

The medical officer treating the workman submitted a report in February, 1989. The medical report did not mention any kind of disablement (Full/partial, temporary/permanent) to the workman. The commissioner, after processing the case and studying the report, ruled that the workman, Mr. Nand Kishore shall be paid only half-monthly wages for these two months against his request for compensation as there was no permanent or partial disablement.

On receipt of this report from the commissioner, the management asked the workman to repay ₹ 3,000 given as an advance and requested the union to do the needful in this regard. The union, however, contended that since the accident occurred during and in the course of employment, the management must treat it as ex-gratia payment and that it should not demand its repayment as the money was used for treatment. The management, however, pointed out that at the time of taking advance, both the union and workman had

P. T. O.