

The Decline of Unions and Its Impact on The Resolution of Industrial Disputes: An Empirical Analysis of The Indian Manufacturing Industry

¹ G H Nandish, ² Dr. Ismail Zabiullah

¹ Research Scholar, School of Management, CMR University City Campus, Bangalore-560043, India

² Assosiate Professor, School of Management CMR University City Campus Bangalore-560043, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2025.1411000011>

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the connection between the decreasing density of trade unions and the mechanisms for resolving industrial disputes within India's manufacturing sector. By utilizing data from Labour Bureau reports (2015-2024), statistics from the Industrial Disputes Act, and recent labour reforms, this study evaluates how the 06resolution. The research uncovers a paradoxical trend: despite a decline in union membership from roughly 30% density in 1985 to 15% in 2024, industrial disputes saw a reduction of 73% between 2010 and 2021. This seemingly positive development conceals deeper issues such as heightened power imbalances, the diminishing of collective voice mechanisms, and an increasing dependence on individual grievance redressal. The study employs a quantitative analysis of official statistics alongside a qualitative review of legislative changes, particularly focusing on the Industrial Relations Code 2020. The findings suggest that the decline of unions has transitioned dispute resolution from collective negotiations to employer-dominated alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms, which raises concerns regarding worker agency and the sustainability of industrial harmony in the long run. This paper contributes to applied science by presenting empirical evidence of institutional changes in labour relations and offers policy recommendations aimed at establishing balanced dispute resolution frameworks in emerging economies.

Keywords: Trade unions, industrial disputes, collective bargaining, labour reforms, India, dispute resolution, union density.

INTRODUCTION

Industrial dispute resolution mechanisms are essential for maintaining workplace stability and enhancing economic productivity within manufacturing economies. In India, trade unions have traditionally acted as the main institutional avenues for collective representation, negotiation, and dispute resolution[1]. Nevertheless, the last forty years have seen an unprecedented drop in union density, decreasing from 30% in 1985 to around 15% in 2023-24, reflecting global patterns while exhibiting unique national traits[2]. The manufacturing sector, which employs over 57 million individuals and accounts for 17% of India's GDP, serves as a vital area for investigating this shift[3]. This sector has undergone concurrent trends of diminishing unionization, a decrease in strike occurrences, and significant legislative changes through the introduction of four Labour Codes in 2020, set to be implemented in 2025[4]. Grasping how these simultaneous developments influence the effectiveness of dispute resolution has important ramifications for both industrial relations theory and practice. This study seeks to fill a significant void in the current literature by empirically examining the causal link between the decline of unions and the outcomes of dispute resolution within the Indian context. While international research has highlighted the decline of unions in developed countries, the path and implications vary greatly in emerging industrial nations where informal employment constitutes over 90% of the workforce[5]. The Indian scenario provides valuable insights into how the institutional gaps resulting from the weakening of unions are addressed—or remain unaddressed—in labor-rich economies characterized by intricate regulatory frameworks.

The timing of this research aligns with India's most extensive labour law reform since independence, rendering it especially pertinent for policymakers, practitioners in industrial relations, and academic researchers. The

Industrial Relations Code 2020 significantly transforms the framework for dispute resolution by implementing mandatory timelines, streamlining tribunal structures, and allowing direct access for workers to adjudication processes[6]. Analyzing these modifications in the context of the decline of unions offers essential insights for determining if formal institutional reforms can offset the erosion of informal collective mechanisms.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Global Trends in Union Decline

International scholarship has thoroughly documented the decline of trade unions in both developed and developing economies. Data from the OECD shows that global union density decreased from 30% to 15% between 1985 and 2024, with a more pronounced decline in manufacturing sectors that are experiencing technological transformation and globalization[2]. Scholars attribute this trend to structural economic changes, regulatory modifications, employer opposition, and evolving worker identities[7]. Freeman and Medoff's groundbreaking research introduced the concept of the "two faces" of unions—monopoly effects versus collective voice advantages—offering a theoretical framework for comprehending the roles of unions in resolving disputes[8]. Further studies by Bryson and colleagues indicated that the decline of unions is linked to a decrease in collective bargaining coverage, which impacts not only the prevention of disputes through negotiated agreements but also the resolution of disputes via established grievance procedures[9]. In emerging economies, the decline of unions presents unique patterns. Investigations into China, Brazil, and South Africa indicate that rapid industrialization, regulatory reforms that promote flexibility, and the growth of informal employment weaken traditional union frameworks[10]. Nevertheless, these countries have also witnessed phases of union resurgence, especially where state support and social movement unionism have offered alternative organizing strategies[11].

Trade Union Decline in India

India's trade union movement, which began in the early 20th century with textile mill workers in Mumbai and jute workers in Kolkata, reached its highest density in the late 1980s[12]. Sundar's thorough analysis outlines the decline of unions following the economic liberalization of 1991, pinpointing three main factors: industrial restructuring that favors services over manufacturing, legal reforms that facilitate contract labor, and fragmentation among various union federations[13].

Recent statistics from the Labour Bureau indicate that merely 2% of India's workforce participates in collective bargaining, with union membership predominantly found in public sector undertakings and large private companies[14]. The manufacturing sector has experienced a particularly steep decline, with union presence restricted to establishments that employ more than 50 workers—however, 71% of manufacturing jobs are situated in smaller units[15]. There is an ongoing scholarly debate about whether Indian unions are truly in decline or merely undergoing transformation. Bhattacharjee contends that despite low density compared to international standards, India experiences more workdays lost to strikes than most nations, implying a weakness of unions rather than their absence[16].

In contrast, research conducted by Sen Gupta and Sett suggests that union density has not consistently decreased, with instances of revival especially in informal sector organizing[17]. This paradox—where formal membership declines while industrial action remains persistent—highlights the complexity involved in evaluating union effectiveness. The expansion of contract labor is a significant aspect of the weakening of unions. By 2024, contract and temporary workers are expected to make up over 50% of formal sector manufacturing employment, a segment of the workforce that is largely excluded from union representation and collective bargaining frameworks[18]. This division results in dual labor markets with unequal access to mechanisms for dispute resolution.

Industrial Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in India

India's framework for resolving industrial disputes has developed through three key statutes: the Trade Unions Act of 1926, the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act of 1946, and the Industrial Disputes Act of

1947[19]. This tripartite system mandated conciliation as the initial step, followed by either voluntary arbitration or compulsory adjudication via labour courts and industrial tribunals[20].

The conciliation process, managed by officers appointed by the government, was designed to promote negotiated settlements prior to disputes escalating to adjudication. Historical records show that conciliation effectively resolved 40-50% of disputes from the 1970s to the 1990s, although success rates fell to around 30% by the 2010s[21]. Critics have pointed to insufficient training for conciliators, procedural delays, and power imbalances that favor employers in environments with weak union representation as reasons for this decline[22].

From the 2000s onward, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms have gained traction, including Lok Adalats for labor disputes, mediation centers in various states, and private arbitration for individual grievances[23]. Research conducted by Sharma indicates that while ADR mechanisms offer quicker resolutions—averaging 6-8 months compared to 2-3 years for tribunal adjudication—they may place workers at a disadvantage if they lack legal representation or collective support[24].

The Industrial Relations Code of 2020 brought significant changes to the dispute resolution framework. Notable provisions include: mandatory 45-day timelines for conciliation, two-member industrial tribunals with both judicial and administrative expertise, direct access for workers to tribunals following failed conciliation, and time-bound adjudication within 12 months[25]. Preliminary implementation data from Karnataka reveals a 60% decrease in pending dispute cases and a 20-30% improvement in average resolution times[26].

Relationship Between Unionization and Dispute Incidence

Theoretical viewpoints differ regarding the impact of unions on workplace conflicts. The "industrial relations pluralism" perspective contends that unions offer structured avenues for voicing grievances, which in turn mitigates spontaneous disputes through systematic processes[27]. In contrast, the "unitarist" viewpoint posits that unions foster adversarial dynamics, leading to conflicts that might not arise otherwise[28].

Empirical data from developed nations predominantly aligns with the pluralist perspective. Studies conducted in the United States, United Kingdom, and Germany indicate that workplaces with unions tend to have fewer individual grievances submitted through formal mechanisms, a trend attributed to proactive collective agreements and informal resolutions at the shop floor level[29]. Nevertheless, when conflicts do occur, unionized environments exhibit higher instances of formal grievance filings, owing to enhanced worker awareness and representation[30].

In India, the evidence presents a more complex picture. Data gathered by Factly shows a significant reduction in industrial disputes (strikes and lockouts) from 1,066 in 2010 to 287 in 2021, which coincides with a drop in union membership[31]. However, this correlation does not imply causation; other factors such as stricter strike regulations, economic shifts away from sectors prone to disputes, and advancements in human resource management practices may also play a role[32]. Critical academic discourse questions the notion that a decrease in disputes signifies improved industrial relations. Bhattacharjee and Das assert that the reduction in recorded disputes may indicate a diminished ability of workers to mobilize for collective action rather than a true state of harmony[33].

Supporting this argument, evidence reveals a rise in individual grievances, litigation in labor courts, and informal work stoppages that are not captured in official statistics[34].

Research Gaps

Current literature indicates notable deficiencies that this study seeks to address: Inadequate empirical investigation of the transformation in Indian dispute resolution: Although the decline of global unions is well-established, there is a lack of systematic empirical research that explores the specific connection between the weakening of unions and the effectiveness of dispute resolution in the Indian manufacturing sector.

Lack of longitudinal data integration: The majority of studies conducted in India depend on cross-sectional data or limited time frames. There is a notable absence of thorough longitudinal analyses that cover the periods before liberalization (1985-1991), during liberalization (1991-2010), and the reform phase (2010-2024).

Insufficient analysis of power dynamics in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR): While the literature extensively covers the efficiency of ADR, it fails to adequately consider the power imbalances present in employer-dominated non-union environments, especially concerning contract and informal workers.

Limited assessment of the impact of the 2020 Labour Codes: The Industrial Relations Code 2020 marks the most significant reform in India's labour laws in the past seventy years; however, empirical evaluations of its influence on dispute resolution are still in the early stages due to its recent implementation (November 2025). **Overlook of sectoral and regional differences:** Existing studies tend to aggregate data at the national level, which obscures critical distinctions between the public and private sectors, large and small businesses, and states with differing levels of labour law enforcement.

Theoretical inadequacy: The scholarship on Indian industrial relations has not adequately developed theoretical models that elucidate how changes in union structures influence dispute resolution within dual labour markets typical of emerging economies.

This research tackles these deficiencies by conducting a thorough quantitative analysis of official dispute statistics from 2010 to 2024, investigating trends in union membership across various manufacturing sub-sectors, and performing a critical evaluation of legislative modifications. The study provides empirical evidence to the ongoing policy discussions regarding the equilibrium between labour market flexibility and worker protection within the context of India's developmental path.

Research Design

This research utilizes a mixed-methods strategy that integrates quantitative analysis of secondary data alongside a qualitative evaluation of legislative and institutional modifications. The research framework adopts a longitudinal comparative design, scrutinizing three separate time-frames: Period I (2010-2015), Period II (2015-2020), and Period III (2020-2024). This approach facilitates the identification of temporal trends and possible causal links between the decline of unions and patterns in dispute resolution.

Data Sources

Primary data sources encompass: Labour Bureau Trade Union Statistics: Official returns from registered trade unions detailing membership, affiliated federations, and sectoral distribution (2010-2022)[35]

Industrial Disputes Act Reports: Annual statistics regarding strikes, lockouts, workers involved, and man-days lost, published by the Ministry of Labour and Employment (2010-2021)[36]

Annual Survey of Industries: Data on manufacturing sector employment, factory distribution, and workforce composition from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (2019-2024)[37]

State Labour Department Reports: Statistics on dispute resolution from Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, and Gujarat for sub-national analysis (2018-2024)[38]

Legislative Documents: Texts of the Industrial Relations Code 2020, implementation notifications, and parliamentary proceedings[39]

Variables and Measurement

Dependent Variables:

Frequency of industrial disputes (number of disputes annually)

Duration of dispute resolution (average number of days from filing to settlement or award)

Mechanisms for resolution employed (conciliation, arbitration, tribunal, court)

Outcomes of settlements (favourable to workers, favourable to employers, compromise)

Independent Variables:

Union density (the percentage of manufacturing employees who are union members)

Collective bargaining coverage (the percentage of workers protected by negotiated agreements)

Contract labor proportion (the percentage of temporary or contract workers) Establishment size (classified as <50, 50-500, >500 employees)

Control Variables:

Growth rate of the manufacturing sector Indicators for the enforcement of labor laws at the state level Sub-sectors of the industry (such as textiles, automotive, pharmaceuticals, etc.) Phase of the economic cycle (recession, growth, stability)

Analytical Techniques

Quantitative analysis utilizes: Descriptive statistics (averages, trends, distributions) Correlation analysis exploring the relationships between union density and dispute metrics Time-series analysis detecting structural breaks that align with policy changes Comparative analysis among manufacturing sub-sectors and states

Qualitative analysis encompasses: Document analysis of legislative provisions and implementation guidelines Framework analysis contrasting pre- and post-reform dispute resolution structures Critical interpretation of policy objectives in relation to implementation outcomes.

Limitations

This research recognizes several limitations: Data availability constraints: Statistics from the Labour Bureau indicate delays and gaps, with the most recent trade union data accessible only up to 2022.

Informal sector exclusion: Official statistics reflect formal manufacturing establishments, omitting 71% of manufacturing employment in units with fewer than 50 workers. Causality challenges: Although a correlation between the decline of unions and the reduction of disputes is evident, establishing definitive causality necessitates controlling for various confounding variables. Recent reform assessment:

The Industrial Relations Code 2020, which was implemented only in November 2025, restricts the availability of post-reform data for evaluating impact. Quality of dispute data: Official statistics may fail to accurately report informal work stoppages, individual grievances, and disputes resolved without formal filing.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Trends in Union Membership and Density

An examination of Labour Bureau data indicates a continuous decrease in trade union density within India's manufacturing sector throughout the duration of the study. Table 1 presents the overall trends in union membership.

Period	Total Unions	Membership (Million)	Avg per Union	Density (%)
2010-2012	92,187	11.24	1,220	22.3
2013-2015	88,543	10.87	1,228	20.1
2016-2018	82,116	9.92	1,208	18.2
2019-2021	76,894	9.18	1,194	16.4
2022-2024	71,235	8.45	1,186	15.1

Table 1: Trade Union Membership Trends in Manufacturing Sector (2010-2024)

The data indicates a steady decline across all metrics. The total number of registered unions has dropped by 22.7%, from 92,187 to 71,235 during the specified period. Overall membership has decreased by 24.8%, falling from 11.24 million to 8.45 million. Union density, a vital measure of the proportion of the workforce that is organized, has declined from 22.3% to 15.1%, signifying a rapid deterioration of collective representation[40].

A breakdown by sector reveals varying rates of decline. The manufacturing sub-sectors that have been most impacted include textiles (-31% density), garments and leather (-28%), and electronics assembly (-26%), which align with the growth of contract labor and export-oriented production models[41]. In contrast, automotive manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, and heavy engineering have maintained relatively higher density levels (18-21%), which can be attributed to larger establishment sizes and the enduring strength of legacy unions[42].

Data comparing permanent and contract workers sheds light on the structural factors contributing to the decline of unions. Among permanent employees in manufacturing, union membership has decreased from 31% in 2020-21 to 17% in 2023-24, while contract workers—who now represent over 50% of the formal manufacturing workforce—exhibit a union density of less than 4%[43]. This shift in composition fundamentally weakens the capacity for collective bargaining.

Industrial Dispute Incidence and Characteristics

Statistics on industrial disputes from the Ministry of Labour indicate contradictory trends. Table 2 displays metrics related to the frequency and intensity of disputes.

Year	Total Disputes	Workers Involved	Man-Days Lost (Million)	Avg Duration (Days)
2010	1,066	1,827,301	28.4	15.5
2013	894	1,542,789	22.1	14.3
2016	672	1,184,226	16.8	14.2
2019	412	887,445	11.3	12.7
2021	287	624,318	7.8	12.5
2023	318	701,254	8.9	12.8

Table 2: Industrial Disputes in Manufacturing Sector (2010-2023)

Industrial disputes saw a significant reduction of 73%, decreasing from 1,066 in 2010 to 287 in 2021, with a slight rise to 318 in 2023 attributed to adjustments in the post-pandemic labor market.[44]

The number of workers involved dropped by 66%, and man-days lost fell by 72.5%, indicating not only a decrease in the number of disputes but also a reduction in their intensity and duration. The average duration of disputes decreased from 15.5 days to 12.5 days, suggesting a quicker resolution or settlement under economic pressures.[45]

The composition of lockouts versus strikes underwent a dramatic shift. In 2010, strikes accounted for 68% of disputes, while lockouts represented 32%. By 2023, this ratio had reversed, with lockouts rising to 61% and strikes declining to 39%.[46] This change indicates a shift in power dynamics, with employers increasingly initiating work stoppages rather than workers, a trend associated with the weakening of unions and advantages in capital mobility.

An analysis of causation reveals that wage-related disputes decreased from 42% of the total in 2010 to 28% in 2023, while disputes concerning retrenchment and closure increased from 18% to 34%.[47] This shift suggests that weakened unions are finding it more challenging to prevent job losses than to negotiate wages, reflecting a decline in bargaining power, particularly in sectors that are either declining or undergoing restructuring.

Dispute Resolution Mechanisms and Outcomes

An examination of resolution pathways reveals notable alterations in dispute settlement trends. Table 3 illustrates the use of resolution mechanisms.

Mechanism	2010-2013 (%)	2014-2017 (%)	2018-2021 (%)	2022-2024 (%)
Conciliation	48.2	42.7	38.4	35.1
Arbitration	12.4	14.6	16.8	18.3
Labour Court/Tribunal	31.8	28.4	24.2	21.6
Direct Settlement	7.6	14.3	20.6	25.0

Table 3: Dispute Resolution Mechanism Utilization (Percentage of Total Disputes)

Conciliation, which has historically served as the main method for resolving disputes, has seen a decline in its effectiveness, dropping from resolving 48.2% of disputes between 2010 and 2013 to just 35.1% from 2022 to 2024, highlighting a reduced efficacy of government-mediated tripartite processes[48]. Similarly, the adjudication by labour courts and tribunals has also decreased from 31.8% to 21.6%, indicating either a reduction in the number of disputes that proceed to formal adjudication or a shift towards alternative resolution methods[49].

In contrast, direct settlements between employers and employees saw a significant rise from 7.6% to 25.0%. Although this may appear beneficial for efficiency at first glance, qualitative evidence indicates that these settlements frequently take place under pressure in non-unionized environments where workers do not have collective representation or bargaining power[50]. Arbitration experienced a slight increase from 12.4% to 18.3%, often initiated by employers for individual complaints rather than for collective issues.

Analysis of resolution duration indicates varied results. States that have adopted the provisions of the Industrial Relations Code 2020 prior to national implementation, such as Karnataka and Maharashtra, report a 20-30% decrease in the average time taken to resolve disputes, with Karnataka's fast-track tribunals resolving 60% of the

pending cases submitted before 2023[51]. Conversely, states with less robust administrative capabilities exhibit negligible progress, suggesting that the quality of implementation is significantly important.

Settlement results reveal troubling trends concerning the interests of workers. An examination of tribunal awards and settlements shows that outcomes favorable to workers decreased from 42% (2010-2013) to 31% (2022-2024), whereas outcomes favorable to employers rose from 28% to 38%[52]. Compromise settlements have remained consistent at around 30-32%. This change is associated with a decline in union density, reinforcing the theory that collective representation influences not only the frequency of disputes but also the fairness of their resolutions.

Impact of Legislative Reforms

The Industrial Relations Code 2020, which replaces three previous statutes, has introduced significant structural changes to the dispute resolution framework. The key provisions and initial implementation results are as follows:

Two-member tribunals: The introduction of an administrative member alongside a judicial member is intended to accelerate the hearing process. Data from Karnataka suggests that case disposal is 23% faster under this new structure[54].

Direct tribunal access: Workers are now permitted to approach tribunals directly following a failed conciliation, without the need for a government referral. While this provision enhances access to justice, it also raises concerns regarding capacity, as tribunal caseloads have increased by 34% in the initial months of implementation[55].

Standing orders threshold: Establishments with 300 or more employees (previously 100 or more) are now required to draft standing orders. This modification decreases the coverage from roughly 18% to 6% of manufacturing establishments, which may undermine procedural protections[56].

Strike restrictions: The mandated 60-day notice and the prohibition of strikes during conciliation or adjudication are intended to diminish "illegal" strikes. Labour organizations contend that these measures disproportionately limit the collective actions of workers compared to the capacity for employer lockouts[57].

A preliminary assessment indicates that the reforms enhance procedural efficiency—resulting in quicker resolution timelines and fewer pending cases in well-managed states—yet they may intensify power disparities in environments with weak union representation. The Code's focus on individual access mechanisms, without a corresponding enhancement of collective bargaining frameworks, could hasten the transition from collective to individualized industrial relations.

Correlation Analysis

Statistical analysis investigates the relationship between the decrease in union density and the metrics of dispute resolution. Table 4 displays the correlation coefficients.

Variables	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance
Union Density × Dispute Frequency	+0.78	$p < 0.01$
Union Density × Worker-Favorable Outcomes	+0.71	$p < 0.01$
Union Density × Collective Settlements	+0.84	$p < 0.01$
Union Density × Resolution Duration	+0.23	$p > 0.05$
Contract Labour % × Union Density	-0.82	$p < 0.01$

Establishment Size × Union Density	+0.69	$p < 0.01$
------------------------------------	-------	------------

Table 4: Correlation Between Union Density and Dispute Resolution Variables

A strong positive correlation ($r = 0.78$, $p < 0.01$) is observed between union density and the frequency of disputes, which supports the theoretical viewpoint that unions serve as institutional avenues for voicing grievances instead of stifling conflicts. Nevertheless, this association should not be construed as unions "causing" disputes; rather, they illuminate underlying conflicts through formal processes[58].

Union density exhibits a robust positive correlation ($r = 0.71$, $p < 0.01$) with outcomes of disputes that favor workers, suggesting that collective representation has a significant impact on the quality of settlements, extending beyond the mere occurrence of disputes. The most pronounced correlation ($r = 0.84$, $p < 0.01$) is observed between union density and collective settlement mechanisms, reinforcing the notion that a decline in union presence transitions dispute resolution from collective negotiations to individualized processes[59].

Significantly, union density exhibits a weak positive correlation ($r = 0.23$, $p > 0.05$) with the duration of resolution, which is statistically insignificant. This observation challenges the prevalent belief that unions extend disputes, indicating that other elements (such as administrative capacity, legal complexity, and case backlogs) have a greater influence on the speed of resolution than the mere presence of unions[60].

The proportion of contract labor shows a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.82$, $p < 0.01$) with union density, indicating that the casualization of the workforce significantly weakens unionization efforts. In contrast, establishment size has a positive correlation ($r = 0.69$, $p < 0.01$) with union density, which elucidates the concentration of union presence in larger factories, while 71% of manufacturing jobs in smaller establishments remain predominantly unorganized[61].

DISCUSSIONS

5.1 The Paradox of Decreasing Disputes in the Context of Union Weakening The primary observation—an observed decrease in both union density and the frequency of industrial disputes—presents a paradox that necessitates thorough interpretation. Three explanatory frameworks arise from this analysis.

The "Efficiency Hypothesis" posits that a decline in union activity leads to a reduction in disputes by removing adversarial collective bargaining, thereby fostering more amicable employer-employee relations through direct communication and advanced human resource management. Advocates point to a decrease in man-days lost, quicker resolution of disputes in reformed states, and the emergence of alternative grievance mechanisms [62]

Nevertheless, this perspective faces considerable empirical obstacles. Firstly, the transition from strikes to lockouts signifies that employers are more frequently instigating work stoppages, which hardly supports the idea of harmonious relations. Secondly, the decrease in outcomes favorable to workers contradicts the assertion that direct relations are beneficial for them. Lastly, qualitative evidence of suppressed grievances, fear of retaliation, and informal conflicts indicates that official dispute statistics may significantly underrepresent the actual level of workplace discord [63]

The "Power Asymmetry Hypothesis" provides an alternative explanation: the decline of unions diminishes disputes not by fostering better relations but by impairing workers' ability to organize collective action. In the absence of union infrastructure—such as organizers, legal resources, strike funds, and federation support—workers encounter greater obstacles to formalizing disputes, resulting in the acceptance of unfavorable conditions or individual turnover instead of a collective voice.

Supporting this perspective, evidence indicates that individual labor court litigation rose by 41% during the study period, even as collective disputes decreased, implying that grievances continue to exist but are expressed through individualized rather than collective channels. Furthermore, the surge in informal sector employment,

where disputes seldom appear in official statistics, suggests that aggregate dispute data increasingly misrepresents the true levels of workplace conflict.

The "**Structural Transformation Hypothesis**" attributes the decline to economic restructuring that shifts focus from dispute-prone manufacturing to service sectors, technological displacement that reduces workforce size, and regulatory changes (such as contract labour and special economic zones) that fragment traditional union organization sites[66]. This explanation highlights that both the decline of unions and the reduction of disputes stem from shared structural causes rather than one being the cause of the other.

The analysis indicates that all three mechanisms function concurrently, with the effects of power asymmetry being most pronounced in sectors experiencing rapid contract labour growth, while structural transformation is more prevalent in industries that are technologically advancing. The efficiency hypothesis receives limited backing in progressive firms that possess strong HR systems—a minority within Indian manufacturing.

Dispute Resolution Quality Versus Quantity

A significant difference arises between the quantity of disputes (frequency) and their quality (fairness, durability, worker voice). Although a decrease in dispute frequency seems beneficial for industrial harmony and productivity, the analysis uncovers troubling aspects related to quality:

Decrease in favorable outcomes for workers: The 11-percentage-point drop in settlements and awards that favor workers suggests that a reduction in disputes does not equate to improved results for workers, possibly indicating diminished bargaining power in environments without unions.

Decrease in favorable outcomes for workers: The 11-percentage-point drop in settlements and awards that favor workers suggests that a reduction in disputes does not equate to improved results for workers, possibly indicating diminished bargaining power in environments without unions.

Durability of settlements: Subsequent data regarding the recurrence of disputes (with limited availability) indicates that direct settlements in non-unionized environments exhibit higher rates of follow-up disputes concerning implementation when compared to agreements negotiated collectively, which suggests a lower quality of settlements[67].

Voice suppression: Qualitative findings from worker interviews (which extend beyond the scope of this study but are recorded in related research) reveal that fear-driven non-filing of valid grievances is particularly prevalent among contract workers who are apprehensive about non-renewal[68].

Access barriers: Although the IR Code 2020 allows for direct access to tribunals, practical obstacles (such as legal expenses, information imbalances, and employer intimidation) disproportionately impact unorganized workers, which may result in the existence of formal rights without actual access[69].

These findings indicate that assessing the success of industrial relations necessitates transcending simplistic metrics such as the frequency of disputes. Instead, a multidimensional evaluation should be employed, which encompasses outcome equity, procedural fairness, the preservation of worker voice, and the durability of settlements.

Legislative Reforms: Compensation or Acceleration

The Industrial Relations Code 2020 aims to modernize dispute resolution by enhancing procedural efficiency, establishing timelines, and providing direct access mechanisms. The key question remains: do these reforms offset the decline of collective institutions or promote the individualization of labor relations.

Evidence indicates a dual interpretation. In states with robust administrative capabilities and judicial resources, such as Karnataka and Maharashtra, the reforms exhibit real efficiency improvements—quicker resolutions, decreased backlogs, and better compliance. These results imply that a well-structured formal institutional design

can, to some extent, make up for the lack of informal collective mechanisms in contexts that are well-resourced[70]

In states where capacity is limited, the reforms tend to worsen pre-existing issues. The increase in tribunal caseloads (34% during the initial implementation phase) without a corresponding increase in resources leads to the creation of new bottlenecks. Although direct access provisions are theoretically democratizing, they primarily benefit workers who possess legal knowledge and resources—usually permanent employees in larger organizations, rather than the more vulnerable contract workers[71]

Of particular concern is the Code's dilution of collective mechanisms—such as reduced coverage of standing orders, more stringent requirements for strikes, and lower recognition thresholds for negotiating unions—which indicates that the reforms favor individual grievance resolution over collective bargaining. This structural decision presupposes that isolated workers can effectively navigate dispute resolution systems that were historically designed for collective representation[72]

The inquiry regarding "compensation versus acceleration" consequently provides a conditional response: reforms may offer compensation in contexts that are well-resourced and possess a robust rule of law; however, they are likely to promote individualization and exacerbate power asymmetry in the predominant segment of Indian manufacturing, which is marked by small enterprises, contract labor, and inadequate enforcement.

Implications for Industrial Harmony

The research findings contest traditional beliefs regarding industrial harmony. The narrative of "industrial peace"—which lauds diminished disputes, fewer strikes, and limited labor unrest—masks the underlying tensions that are building in poorly regulated, non-unionized workplaces. Three trajectories deserve attention:

short-term stability, long-term volatility: The current low levels of disputes may indicate a temporary suppression rather than a lasting harmony. Historical data from various contexts demonstrates that the prolonged accumulation of grievances without avenues for collective expression leads to sporadic yet intense outbursts—wildcat strikes, violent confrontations, and mass protests—that are often more destabilizing than institutionalized disputes [73].

Informalization of conflict: As formal mechanisms for dispute resolution become either inaccessible or ineffective for poorly organized workers, conflict manifests through informal means—such as sabotage, absenteeism, turnover, and withdrawal of productivity. Although these actions are not reflected in official dispute statistics, they carry significant economic repercussions and reveal underlying discord [74].

Geographical and sectoral fragmentation:

The dual labor market—where permanent employees in large organizations maintain a degree of union representation, in contrast to contract workers in smaller entities who are largely unorganized—results in industrial relations that are fragmented both geographically and sectorally. This fragmentation complicates assessments at the national level and may lead to varying stability trajectories across different manufacturing sub-sectors[75]

Theoretical Contributions

This study adds to the theory of industrial relations in multiple ways:

Institutional void theory: Enhances comprehension of the impact that the deterioration of a single institution (unions) has on interconnected institutional frameworks (dispute resolution), especially in scenarios where alternative institutions evolve inconsistently across different geographical and sectoral areas.

Power asymmetry dynamics: Illustrates that dispute resolution systems intended for contexts with balanced power (featuring collective representation) operate differently when power imbalances increase, necessitating theoretical models that consider institutional prerequisites.

The distinct characteristics of emerging economies pose challenges to the direct application of industrial relations theories from developed economies, particularly in contexts marked by extensive informal sectors, dual labor markets, and variations in state capacity. This situation calls for the development of theories that are sensitive to the specific contexts involved. The paradoxes of reform demonstrate that procedural changes aimed at enhancing efficiency, timelines, and access can lead to contradictory results. While certain metrics may improve, broader systemic goals may be compromised, depending on the context of implementation. This phenomenon necessitates the use of multi-level analytical frameworks.

CONCLUSIONS

This thorough examination of the decrease in union activity and the resolution of industrial disputes within India's manufacturing industry leads to several clear conclusions:

Primary Findings

The decline of unions is significant and accelerating: The density of trade unions in the manufacturing sector decreased from 22.3% to 15.1% between 2010 and 2024, with a particularly steep drop among contract workers, who now represent over 50% of the formal workforce. This diminishing of collective representation fundamentally transforms the institutional framework of industrial relations.

The reduction in the frequency of disputes conceals concerns regarding quality: Although industrial disputes have fallen by 73% and the speed of resolution has improved in certain situations, evidence suggests that this trend is indicative of a diminished capacity among workers to organize collective action, rather than a true state of workplace harmony. The percentage of outcomes favorable to workers has decreased by 11 points, indicating that a reduction in disputes does not equate to fairer outcomes.

Power imbalances have notably increased: The transition from strikes initiated by workers (68% in 2010) to lockouts initiated by employers (61% in 2023), along with a decrease in settlements favorable to workers, illustrates a significant transfer of power from labor to capital in the context of disputes.

Legislative reforms exhibit conditional effectiveness: The Industrial Relations Code 2020 provides gains in procedural efficiency in states with effective administration (20-30% quicker resolution) but may worsen power disparities by prioritizing individual mechanisms over collective bargaining frameworks. The results of these reforms are heavily reliant on the administrative capacity and enforcement capabilities of the state.

The transformation of structures contributes to the decline of unions: In addition to internal factors, external changes such as the growth of contract labor, restructuring within the manufacturing sector, and advancements in technology generate self-perpetuating cycles that diminish both the capacity of unions and the effectiveness of dispute resolution.

Theoretical Implications

The study indicates that dispute resolution mechanisms tailored for institutionally balanced environments (characterized by strong collective representation) operate in a qualitatively distinct manner when the foundational institutional conditions deteriorate. This conclusion calls into question the assumptions that have informed recent labor reforms, which suggest that procedural efficiency can offset the weakening of substantive institutions.

The contradiction of decreasing disputes in the context of union decline highlights the inadequacies of aggregate statistical measures in evaluating the quality of industrial relations. A comprehensive framework that includes

outcome equity, procedural fairness, the preservation of voice, and the durability of settlements is essential for a meaningful assessment.

Policy Recommendations

Drawing from empirical evidence, this study presents a number of policy recommendations grounded in research.

Enhance the framework for collective bargaining: Instead of perceiving the decline of unions as unavoidable, policies ought to proactively endorse mechanisms for collective representation, such as sectoral bargaining, works councils in environments without unions, and safeguards for organizing efforts, especially for contract workers.

Achieve a balance between procedural and substantive reforms: Although enhancements in procedural efficiency (such as timelines and digital systems) provide benefits, they should be paired with substantive protections that guarantee equitable negotiations. Access to direct tribunal services necessitates additional legal assistance, worker education, and protections against retaliation.

Contextualized implementation: Acknowledge that the effectiveness of reforms differs based on state capacity, the size of establishments, and the composition of the workforce. Strategies for implementation must be tailored to the specific realities of each context instead of relying on standardized templates.

Equity in outcomes should be monitored in conjunction with efficiency: Develop thorough monitoring systems that not only assess the frequency of disputes and the speed of resolutions but also evaluate settlement results, rates of recurrence, and access trends among various worker categories (permanent, contract, informal).

Address the obstacles to organizing contract labor: Considering that contract workers make up over 50% of formal employment in manufacturing yet are predominantly unorganized, it is imperative to focus on specific legal measures that facilitate collective representation for temporary workers.

Enhance dispute resolution capabilities: Provisions for direct access lead to an increase in tribunal workloads. In the absence of adequate investment in judicial infrastructure, staffing, and training, procedural reforms may inadvertently create new bottlenecks that undermine efficiency goals.

Maintain tripartite mechanisms: Although simplifying bureaucratic processes provides benefits, completely abolishing tripartite conciliation and government reference roles could eliminate crucial sources of countervailing power in asymmetric situations. It is worth considering the selective preservation of institutional buffers.

Directions for Future Research

The scope and limitations of this study indicate various fruitful avenues for future research:

Longitudinal outcome tracking: Monitoring particular groups of disputes throughout the resolution processes, from settlement implementation to recurrence, would shed light on quality aspects that are hidden in cross-sectional data.

Comparative state analysis: A systematic comparison among states with differing levels of labour law enforcement, union density, and reform implementation may reveal institutional design characteristics and implementation practices linked to balanced outcomes.

Informal sector extension: Creating methodologies to analyze dispute patterns in the informal manufacturing sector (which accounts for 71% of employment) would yield a more comprehensive understanding of workplace conflict within Indian manufacturing.

Comparative state analysis: A systematic examination of states with differing levels of labour law enforcement, union density, and reform implementation may reveal institutional design characteristics and practices that lead to balanced outcomes.

Informal sector extension: Creating methodologies to analyze dispute trends in the informal manufacturing sector (which accounts for 71% of employment) would enhance the understanding of workplace conflicts within Indian manufacturing.

Worker voice qualitative research: Qualitative studies based on interviews that explore how workers perceive and navigate dispute resolution systems in both unionized and non-unionized environments would provide valuable insights to complement quantitative institutional analyses.

Sectoral deep dives: In-depth studies focused on specific industries (such as automotive, textiles, and pharmaceuticals) that consider unique production systems, technological advancements, and market dynamics could improve the understanding of the varied impacts of union decline.

Long-term Code impact assessment: As the implementation of the Industrial Relations Code 2020 progresses, a thorough quasi-experimental evaluation comparing states that adopt different provisions could yield strong causal evidence for the refinement of policies.

Concluding Reflection

The connection between the decline of unions and the resolution of industrial disputes in India illustrates broader conflicts in modern labour regulation: the need to balance flexibility with protection, efficiency with equity, and individual access with collective representation.

This study reveals that merely implementing procedural reforms cannot offset the weakening of institutions when fundamental power imbalances increase.

As India aims for economic growth driven by manufacturing, the quality of industrial relations—not just the lack of visible disputes—will significantly influence whether development is inclusive and sustainable. The results indicate that celebrating lower dispute statistics without scrutinizing the underlying power dynamics and equity of outcomes risks confusing suppression with harmony, which could be a costly misunderstanding for long-term industrial stability and social cohesion.

The evolving industrial relations framework, marked by diminished union power, increased reliance on contract labor, and revised dispute resolution processes, signifies not just a technical modification but a profound change in the recognition, expression, and resolution of workplace conflicts. The impact of this transformation on industrial harmony—whether it improves or detracts from it—hinges significantly on the policy decisions made in the upcoming years concerning collective voice mechanisms, enforcement capabilities, and institutional equilibrium—decisions for which this research offers an empirical basis.

REFERENCES:

1. Bhattacharjee, D. (2002). Union Dynamics in India: The Context. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 45(4), 711-728.
2. OECD. (2025). Membership of Unions and Employers' Organisations and Bargaining Coverage. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/membership-of-unions-and-employers-organisations>
3. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2024). Annual Survey of Industries 2023-24 Results. Government of India. Retrieved from <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2161192>
4. Press Information Bureau. (2025, November 19). India's Labour Reforms: Simplification, Security, and Standardisation. Government of India. Retrieved from <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspxPRID=2192524>

5. Vattakuzhy, J. (2025, January 26). Indian Trade Unions at Crossroads. Indian Currents. Retrieved from <https://www.indiancurrents.org/article-indian-trade-unions-at-crossroads>
6. Press Information Bureau. (2025, November 19). Industrial Relations Code, 2020: Promoting Harmony and Efficiency. Government of India. Retrieved from <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2193100>
7. Bryson, A., Gomez, R., Kretschmer, T., & Willman, P. (2013). The Comparative Advantage of Non-Union Voice in Britain, 1980-2004. *Industrial Relations*, 52(S1), 194-220.
8. Freeman, R. B., & Medoff, J. L. (1984). *What Do Unions Do* Basic Books.
9. Bryson, A., & Forth, J. (2010). Trade Union Membership and Influence 1999-2009. Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper, No. 1003.
10. Lee, C. H., & Eyraud, F. (2008). Globalization, Flexibilization and Working Conditions in Asia and the Pacific. International Labour Organization.
11. Webster, E., Lambert, R., & Bezuidenhout, A. (2008). *Grounding Globalization: Labour in the Age of Insecurity*. Blackwell Publishing.
12. Shyam Sundar, K. R. (2008). Emerging Trends in Employment Relations in India. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(1), 1-21.
13. Shyam Sundar, K. R. (2011). Labour Flexibility Debate in India: A Comprehensive Review. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(21), 115-122.
14. Sharan, P. R. (2024). Growing Union Strength, Declining Political Power: Understanding the Paradox of General Strikes in India. *Labour Review*. Retrieved from <https://labourreview.org/growing-union-strength-declining-political-power>
15. Srivastava, R., & Jain, S. (2024). Between Strikes and Precarity: Workers Agency and Productivity in Industrial India. SPRF Research Report. Retrieved from <https://sprf.in/between-strikes-and-precarity-workers-agency-and-productivity-in-industrial-india-2/>
16. Bhattacharjee, D. (2002). The Evolution of Indian Industrial Relations: A Comparative Perspective. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 33(5), 396-420.
17. Sen Gupta, A., & Sett, P. K. (2000). Industrial Relations Law, Employment Security and Collective Bargaining in India. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 31(2), 144-153.
18. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2024). Report on Statistics of Industrial Disputes 2021. Government of India. Retrieved from https://labourbureau.gov.in/uploads/pdf/Industrial-Disputes-Act,-1947-Report_2021.pdf
19. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (1947). Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Government of India.
20. Ramaswamy, E. A. (2013). Indian Journal of Industrial Relations: Fifty Years of Industrial Relations Research in India. Shri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources.
21. Sharma, A. N., & Gupta, N. (2018). Alternative Dispute Resolution in Labour Conflicts: The Indian Experience. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 61(3), 487-502.
22. Kumar, P., & Srivastava, S. (2023, April 24). Role of Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in Labour Law Enforcement India. TaxGuru. Retrieved from <https://taxguru.in/corporate-law/role-alternative-dispute-resolution-mechanisms-labour-law-enforcement-india.html>
23. Drishti IAS. (2025, October 7). Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in India. Retrieved from <https://www.drishtias.com/daily-updates/daily-news-analysis/alternative-dispute-resolution-adr-in-india>
24. Sharma, R., & Das, S. (2022). Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Labour Disputes in India. SSRN Electronic Journal. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4159133
25. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2020). Industrial Relations Code, 2020. Government of India.
26. Sinha, A. (2025, April 29). Industrial Relations Code 2020: Smoother Labour Dispute Resolution? TaxGuru. Retrieved from <https://taxguru.in/corporate-law/industrial-relations-code-2020-smoother-labour-dispute-resolution.html>
27. Fox, A. (1974). *Beyond Contract: Work, Power and Trust Relations*. Faber and Faber.
28. Kaufman, B. E. (2004). *The Global Evolution of Industrial Relations: Events, Ideas and the IIRA*. International Labour Organization.
29. Addison, J. T., & Belfield, C. R. (2004). Union Voice. *Journal of Labor Research*, 25(4), 563-596.
30. Budd, J. W., & Colvin, A. J. (2008). Improved Metrics for Workplace Dispute Resolution Procedures: Efficiency, Equity, and Voice. *Industrial Relations*, 47(3), 460-479.

31. Factly. (2024, October 31). Data: Number of Industrial Disputes Decrease Significantly Coinciding with Reducing Share of Workers in Unions. Retrieved from <https://factly.in/data-number-of-industrial-disputes-decrease-significantly>
32. Pathak, G. (2024). 2024 Will Be The Year Of Reckoning For Indian Trade Unions. IPA News. Retrieved from <https://ipanewspack.com/2024-will-be-the-year-of-reckoning-for-indian-trade-unions/>
33. Bhattacharjee, D., & Das, R. K. (2021). Industrial Relations in the Manufacturing Sector: A Study of Changing Patterns. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 56(12), 45-52.
34. Anant, T. C., & Kala, N. (2016). The Decline of Trade Unions in India. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 59(2), 201-221.
35. Labour Bureau. (2022). Report on Trade Unions in India 2022. Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India. Retrieved from <https://labourbureau.gov.in/uploads/pdf/Report-of-Trade-Union--2022.pdf>
36. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2021). Statistics on Industrial Disputes, Closures, Retrenchments and Lay-offs in India 2021. Government of India.
37. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2024). Annual Survey of Industries: Results for 2023-24. Government of India.
38. Government of Karnataka. (2024). Labour Department Annual Report 2023-24. Bangalore: Department of Labour, Karnataka.
39. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2020). Parliamentary Proceedings on Industrial Relations Code Bill 2020. Lok Sabha Debates.
40. Labour Bureau. (2024). Trade Union Statistics Summary 2010-2024. Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India.
41. Saini, D. S., & Budhwar, P. S. (2023). Trade Union Decline in Indian Manufacturing: Sectoral Analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 61(2), 234-256.
42. Ministry of Statistics. (2024). TRADE UNIONS Chapter 41. Retrieved from https://mospi.gov.in/sites/default/files/Statistical_year_book_india_chapters/Trade_Unions_0.pdf
43. Factly. (2024). Among permanent employees, the proportion belonging to associations or unions has dropped from 31% in 2020-21 to just 17% in 2023-24. Retrieved from <https://factly.in/data-number-of-industrial-disputes-decrease-significantly>
44. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2023). *Industrial Disputes Statistics 2010-2023*. Government of India.
45. Venkata Ratnam, C. S. (2024). Industrial Conflicts in India: Trends and Patterns 2010-2023. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 59(3), 412-431.
46. Lawjournals.org. (2024). Industrial Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in India. Retrieved from <https://www.lawjournals.org/assets/archives/2024/vol10issue1/10178.pdf>
47. Bhargava, S., & Singh, M. (2024). Indian Economy in Transition and Role of Industrial Disputes. *American International Journal of Economics and Research*, 15(2), 89-104. Retrieved from https://www.indianjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/aijer/article/download/84920/pdf_25/208462
48. Kumar, R. (2023). Effectiveness of Conciliation in Industrial Disputes: A Declining Trajectory. *Journal of Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 8(1), 45-62.
49. Tripathi, P. C. (2024). Adjudication Mechanisms in Indian Industrial Relations: Changing Patterns. *Managerial Law*, 66(2), 178-195.
50. Singh, P., & Sharma, R. (2024). Power Dynamics in Non-Union Dispute Settlements. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 59(8), 34-41.
51. Government of Karnataka. (2024). *Fast-Track Labour Tribunals Performance Report 2023-24*. Labour Department, Karnataka.
52. Agarwal, M. K., & Patel, J. (2024). Dispute Resolution Outcomes in Indian Manufacturing: A Longitudinal Analysis. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(6), 1234-1258.
53. Government of Maharashtra. (2024). Conciliation Services Annual Report 2023-24. Labour Department, Maharashtra.
54. Karnataka Labour Department. (2024). Two-Member Tribunal Implementation Review. Government of Karnataka.
55. Press Information Bureau. (2025). Direct Access to Tribunals: Early Implementation Outcomes. Government of India.

56. Nishith Desai Associates. (2024). Handbook on Labour Codes. Retrieved from https://nishithdesai.com/fileadmin/user_upload/pdfs/Research_Papers/Handbook-on-New-Labour-Codes.pdf
57. International Trade Union Confederation. (2024). INDIA: Workers' Rights and Labour Reforms. Retrieved from https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/india_en_final.pdf
58. Kelly, J. (1998). Rethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilization, Collectivism and Long Waves. Routledge.
59. Colvin, A. J. (2012). American Workplace Dispute Resolution in the Individual Rights Era. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(3), 459-475.
60. Rao, S. P., & Kumar, V. (2023). Duration Analysis of Industrial Disputes in India. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 66(4), 789-806.
61. Papola, T. S., & Pais, J. (2007). Debate on Labour Market Reforms in India: A Case of Misplaced Focus. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 50(2), 183-200.
62. Sharma, B. R. (2024). New Industrial Relations: Harmony Through Direct Engagement. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, 49(1), 23-38.
63. Bhattacharjee, M. (2023). Suppressed Grievances in Indian Manufacturing: A Qualitative Study. *Work, Employment and Society*, 37(2), 456-473.
64. Hirschman, A. O. (1970). Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Harvard University Press.
65. National Commission for Enterprises in the Unorganised Sector. (2022). Labour Court Litigation Trends 2010-2022. Government of India.
66. Standing, G. (2011). The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class. Bloomsbury Academic.
67. Purcell, J., & Hall, M. (2014). Voice and Participation in the Modern Workplace. *Acas Research Papers*, 01/14.
68. Breman, J. (2013). At Work in the Informal Economy of India: A Perspective from the Bottom Up. Oxford University Press.
69. De Stefano, V. (2016). The Rise of the "Just-in-Time Workforce": On-Demand Work, Crowdwork, and Labor Protection in the "Gig Economy." *Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal*, 37(3), 471-504.
70. Srivastava, R. S. (2024). State Capacity and Labour Law Implementation in India. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 19(1), 67-89.
71. Soundararajan, V. (2019). Heterogeneity of Informal Workers and Organizing Strategies. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 62(1), 89-111.
72. Sridharan, S. (2024). Decline of Collective Bargaining and Subsequent Developments in India. *Christ University Law Journal*, 9(1), 76-92. Retrieved from <https://journals.christuniversity.in/index.php/culj/article/download/1886/1952/5930>
73. Silver, B. J. (2003). Forces of Labor: Workers' Movements and Globalization Since 1870. Cambridge University Press.
74. Ackroyd, S., & Thompson, P. (1999). Organizational Misbehaviour. Sage Publications.
75. Thelen, K. (2014). Varieties of Liberalization and the New Politics of Social Solidarity. Cambridge University Press.