

---

**Make a précis of the following passage and suggest a suitable title.**

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— those 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)

## Significance of healthy working environment

Total words = 395 word count is written at the end

Precis words = 115

The industrial development has evolved altogether through transformation of manual to machine labour. The improved working environment has resulted in augmented productivity.

Therefore, it is allowed to remove unhealthy items from the surroundings to make the environment conducive for work. However, the idea of less efforts for leisure is not justifiable. Hardwork is considered the foremost economic virtue.

However, the working environment must be as pleasant as happy homes; ~~so, the earner not even think of leaving the working place.~~ Moreover,

the demand of difficult tasks is more, as they require least thoughtful activity. Subsequently, the manpower must be utilised at the grassroots level.

Therefore, the notion of leisure time between working hours holds less ground

than that of pleasant working environment

satisfactory

main idea is picked and discussed

be precis and too the point

rest is satisfactory 7/20