

Manpower's Efficiency

Today, industrialization has eliminated a large gap from the past years which has been the outcome of multiple forces. The effort has had to lessen the burden; however it also has enhanced the productivity. It was justifiable to ~~let~~ adopt good and healthy work environment. Although, the excessive leisure is not good but people standing the a notion of less working hours. The worker must be provided a pleasant working environment like a home. Commonly at industrial scene, most of the difficult tasks are required a manpower in a huge number. Large labour force is a solution of it. on prima facie grounds, despite of more leisure, working hours must

be agreed. It is not argued that
the less working hours raised
the productivity but those hours
must be pleasant ones

word count = 133

Total words = 404

PRÉCIS EXERCISE 9

2: Write a précis of the following passage in about 100 words and suggest the title: (20+5)

The present-day industrial establishment is a great distance removed from that of the last century or even of twenty-five years ago. This improvement has been the result of a variety of forces— government standards and factory inspection; general technological and architectural advance by substituting machine power for heavy or repetitive manual labour; the need to compete for a labour force; and union intervention to improve working conditions in addition to wages and Hours.

However, except where the improvement contributed to increased productivity, the effort to make more pleasant has had to support a large burden of proof. It was permissible to seek the elimination of hazardous, unsanitary, unhealthful, or otherwise objectionable conditions of work. The speedup might be resisted to a point. But the test was not what was agreeable but what was unhealthful or, at a minimum, excessively fatiguing. The trend toward increased leisure is not reprehensible, but we resist vigorously the notion that a man should work less hard on the job. Here older attitudes are involved. We are gravely suspicious of any tendency to expand less than the maximum effort, for this has long been a prime economic virtue.

In strict logic there is as much to be said for making work pleasant and agreeable as for shortening Hours. On the whole it is probably as important for a wage-earner to have

pleasant, working conditions as a pleasant home. To a degree, he can escape the latter but not the former— though no doubt the line between an agreeable tempo and what is flagrant feather-bedding is difficult to draw.

Moreover it is a commonplace of the industrial scene that the dreariest and most burdensome tasks, requiring as they do a minimum of thought and skill frequently have the largest number of takers. The solution to this problem lies, as we shall see presently, in driving up the supply of crude manpower at the bottom of the ladder. Nonetheless the basic point remains, the case for more leisure is not stronger on purely prima facie grounds than the case for making labour-time itself more agreeable. The test, it is worth repeating, is not the effect on productivity. It is not seriously argued that the shorter work week increases productivity— that men produce more in fewer Hours than they would in more. Rather it is whether fewer Hours are always to be preferred to more but pleasant ones. (CSS 1976)