ABSTRACT
As in a civilized society relations among human beings determine the quality of society, industrial relations in an industrial organization vitally spell out the success or unsuccess of that organization. In fact, Industrial Relations generally imply the relationship between the management and the organized labor in an industrial organization or within an industry. In this fast developing world industrial progress is a synonym for material well being of a country. For this industrial relations are of utmost importance. It has been pointed out by few management experts like that Bethel, Atwater, Smith & Stackman state that industrial relation is that part of management which is concerned with the manpower of the enterprises(1). “Industrial Relations is an art, the art of living together for the purposes of productions”(2). The relationship can either be cordial or otherwise, depending upon the attitudes and approaches of the people concerned. Attitudes and approaches of the management and those of workers, possibly represented by trade unions, can be complex and diverse. Dunlop attests that the industrial societies necessarily create industrial relations defined as the complex of inter-relations among workers, managers and the government.(3) Thus, Industrial Relation is the composite result of the attitudes and approaches of the employers and employees towards each other with regard to planning, supervision, direction and coordination of the activities of an organization with a minimum of human efforts and frictions with an animating spirit of cooperation and with proper regard for the genuine well being of all members of the organization.(4) Hence, Industrial Relation is the relation in the industry created by the diverse and complex attitudes and approaches of both the management and the workers or employers and employees in the connection with the management of the industry. The attitudes of both workers and management influence each other and determine natural relationship. However, it should be noted that industrial relation is not a simple mutual relationship. It is a set of functional inter dependence which is influenced by various factors, say, economic, social, psychological, technological, political occupational etc.

1. THE DETERMINANT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
It is true that industrial relations can perform a number of functions and their scope and effects can be wide spreads and far reaching. Good industrial relations, not only maintain cordial atmosphere in the industry, but also facilitate production and industrial growth. They also safeguard the rights of the workers and the prestige and interest of the management. The three parties who are primarily concerned with industrial relations and whose interaction will determine the shape of industrial relations are the employers of the management, the workmen and their trade unions and the Government. Good labor- management relations depend on employers and trade unions being able to deal with their mutual problems freely, independently and responsibly. The trade unions and employers and their organizations are desirous of resolving their problems through collective bargaining though in resolving such problems the assistance of appropriate government agencies might be necessary in public interest. Collective bargaining, therefore, is the corner stone of good relations and hence, the legislative framework of industrial relation should aid the maximum use of the process of mutual accommodation. The workers’ and employers’ organizations should be desirous of associating with the government agencies in consideration of general, social and economic measures affecting employers’ and workers’ relation. It cannot be ignored that the governments make certain possible efforts to establish an effective and universal labor management relations in India. An analysis of the roles played by the management, the trade unions and the government may reveal how their interactions influence industrial relations and what are the factors which cause impediments in the maintenance of cordial industrial relations.(5)

2. THE ROLE OF MANAGEMENT
For peaceful industrial relations, it is primarily essential that a management should have progressive outlook and democratic approach. Autocratic approaches, rigid and prestigious attitude on the part of the management and fragmentation have been the fundamental causes of most of the industrial strife. In many cases the role management has led to serious industrial unrest. Many employers are still reluctant to recognize the role of employees as partners in a common endeavour, rather they have developed a superiority complex and consider it below their dignity to sit around the conference table and discuss to settle the disputes with the people whose
hands and clothes are soiled, bearing the mark of their hard labor. Even genuine disputes are not settled in a spirit of accommodation but dilatory tactics are employed to keep settlement in abeyance through the delays in the process of conciliation, adjudication and writs to courts leading to the resentment amongst the workers.

Even when collective bargaining is resorted to for settlement of disputes, the representatives of the management are not vested with adequate authority to decide the demands at the bargaining table, making the whole process a farce and causing a credibility gap in the minds of the workers. Many management have not instituted a regular procedure for redressal of grievances arising out day to day matters with the results that minor irritants continue to pile up the entire work environment. Many management are totally oblivious to the basic human needs to the workers and their aspirations, their need for security, provision of basic amenities, prospects for career growth recognition of good work etc, leading to an estrangement between the workers and the employers. Thus, progressive outlook and democratic approach towards workers are needed for cordial relations and this can play vital role in maintaining industrial peace.

3. THE ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS

It has been noted that despite some of its similarities with other organizations, a trade union is different in its own way, in terms of internal organizational dynamics. The uniqueness of trade unions seems to rest on the fact that although they are formed by workers, they themselves pose a threat to their very survival. No other organization seems to suffer from this paradox. The fact that democracy is a key input for union organization and that it finds a ready place in relatively small unions because of active membership participation, need not, however, encourage one to advocate that small unions be operated in industry. Having too many small unions has its obvious limitations. Fragmented trade union movement in the country is an important factor which gives rise to many industrial strifes in the country. The multiplicity of trade unions with different political ideologies and inter and intra union rivalries have vitiates the work environment with each union vying with the other for the predominant place in the industrial establishment. The problems of multiplicity of unions at both the plant and the industry levels have posed a serious threat to the maintenance of industrial peace and harmony in India.

In India, the prevalence of outside leadership, the apathetic and non-committed rank and file, the existing loopholes in labor legislation and the national trade unions altogether different political ideology and orientation, are acting together as major forces to boost up the numerical growth of Indian trade unions. The mushroom growth and multiplicity of trade unions are attributable to the provision of the Trade Union Act, 1926, whereby any seven persons in an organization can form a trade union and raise industrial disputes. The above factor is further compounded by the affiliation of the various trade unions of different political parties with each politician trying to carve out an important place for occupying a position of influence for him. Quite often the management becomes the worst victim of these fending trade unions and their vested interest. In recent years a new development has appeared on the horizon of trade unions and that is the growth of many parochial unions along linguistic, regional and individualistic lines, vitiating the entire socio-economic and industrial atmosphere. Lack of education and leadership among the workmen leads to vesting leadership of trade unions in the hands of persons who are aliens to the industry and the role of such leadership has generally been detrimental to harmonious industrial relations despite the fact that the Government is spending immense amount of money on workers education. It can undoubtedly be realized that trade unionism has a constructive role to play in the industrial relations scene of the world. We cannot ignore the role of trade unions in industrial harmony.

4. THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

The pattern of labor-management relations in India has increasingly been structured by the government. “In India the Government has been playing, particularly after Independence, a comprehensive and dominant role in shaping the pattern of industrial relations”

The difficulties in developing a committed industrial labor force, the rivalries and weaknesses of the Indian trade union movement, the failure of many Indian and foreign employers to deal fairly with workers or constructively with trade unions, and the resultant labor discontent and strife have encouraged government intervention in order to contain, channel and redirect incipient and actual labor protest. Increasingly, planning objectives for rapid economic development have been given priority and the pattern of labor management relations has been expected to conform these objectives. Government was not always so active in guiding labor management relations in India. Before Independence, or at last before the war, the role of the government was passive, as it will be seen in a brief examination of labor legislation prior to 1947. But, faced with the problems
of a new nation and post-war labor unrest, government became an active intervener with passage of number of new laws, beginning with the Industrial Dispute Act of 1947.

In the mixed economy we have in this country, the state has now emerged as a big employer. One significant aspect of its role is to evolve norms or standards through tripartite forums to act as guidelines for shaping industrial relations. The Government also accepts the responsibility of ensuring conformity to these norms through the administrative and judicial machinery. This is a direct form of intervention, for the state enacts legislation and also assumes the responsibility of implementing substantive and procedural laws.

The Government’s industrial relations policy is part of its broader labor policy, which has been stated by the National Commission on Labor in terms of its main postulates. The main tenets of the policy are:

1. Primacy to the maintenance of industrial peace;
2. Encouragement of mutual settlement, collective bargaining and voluntary arbitration;
3. Recognition of the worker’s right to peaceful direct action, i.e. strike; and
4. Tripartite consultation.

The State intervention primarily aims at preserving industrial peace and has, therefore, focused attention on (1) the avoidance of industrial disputes and (2) an expeditious settlement of industrial disputes when they do arise. The State has done little in India about the positive aspects of labor relations, such as encouraging the growth of strong and effective trade union movement by providing for trade union recognition, by promoting a stable relationship between the parties by fostering the growth of collective bargaining. Though its policy pronouncements, considerable importance is assigned by the Government to building up of a stable bipartite relationship between the management and the labor, the machinery for settling industrial disputes by the Government intervention is often pressed into action in preference to the method of bipartisan negotiations and collective bargaining. Only about 25 percent to 28 percent of the disputes are resolved through mutual settlement.

The adjudication and the other regulative aspects of the role of Government continue to form the core of industrial relations in India. Although compulsory adjudication and extensive public regulation of labor management relations constitute the corner-stone of the Indian industrial relations system, it is clear that the government authorities place great deal of importance on the development of stable bipartite relationships between the labor and the management. Inevitably the progress is slow, and this justifies the additional steps to train and to improve the quality of unions and managements.

Thus, The Government can enact legislation to curb the menace of industrial disputes in India or elsewhere.

5. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN PUBLIC SECTOR

After Independence, India adopted mixed economy, which consists of Private and Public Sector. The industrial policy has laid emphasis on optimum utilization of installed capacity and expansion of industries as part of a wider strategy for the revival of the industrial economy. The development of Public Sector has been one of the main objectives of priority in our industrial policy.

In India, even today an era of privatization, Public Sector has been playing a very significant role in the development of basic industries. Before 1991 in India, the Railways, Post and Telegraph, Air Transport, Banking, Insurance and many basic industries were in Public Sector and in its monopoly. Thus, before 1991, the Public Sector was the largest employer in India and Private Sector employed only a little percent of labor force in India.

6. CENTRAL PUBLIC SECTOR ENTERPRISES IN INDIA

There were 242 Central Public Sector Enterprises (CPSEs) under the administrative control of various Ministries/ Departments as on 31.3.2008. The cumulative investment (paid-up capital plus long term loans) in all the CPSEs stood at Rs. 4,55,409 crore as on 31.3.2008. The largest share in this investment belonged to the service sector (40.40 per cent) followed by electricity (27.95 per cent), manufacturing (22.23 per cent), mining sector (8.83 per cent) and agriculture (0.04 per cent). The remaining 0.55 per cent belonged to CPSEs under construction. While “investment” in all the CPSEs grew by 8.31per cent in 2007-08 over 2006-07, capital employed” in all the CPSEs went up by 15.63 per cent during the same period (Table 8.19). A great deal of investment in CPSEs is being made through internal resources rather than through investment from outside.
To provide level playing field with the private corporate sector, the Government has delegated enhanced financial and operational powers to the Navratna, Miniratna and other profit making CPSEs. National Aluminium Company Limited (NALCO), National Mineral Development Corporation Limited (NMDC), Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL), Rural Electrification Corporation (REC), Coal India Limited (CIL) and the Shipping Corporation of India Limited (SCI) have been granted Navratna status in 2007-08 raising the total number of Navratna companies to 18. Eight more CPSEs, namely, the Airports Authority of India, Broadcast Engineering Consultants of India Limited, Cochin Shipyard Limited, Hindustan Copper Limited, Indian Railway Catering and Tourism Corporation Limited, Mishra Dhatu Nigam Limited, National Hydroelectric Power Corporation Limited and Satluj Jal Vidyut Nigam Limited have been granted Miniratna status, raising the total number of Miniratna CPSEs to 56. (9) The Public Sector had employed 54.65 percent of the total labor force in India in the year 1961 which had marked growth to about 70 percent in 1985. It is however a well known fact that private sector employed only a little percent of labor force in India before 1991. The major share of the public sector employment is in the “services”, 81.49 in 1985 following transport and communication, 29.07 and the third comes, manufacturing 17.60. While Service forms the major share of employment in the Public Sector, manufacturing is the most potential area of employment in the private sector in India. This is, perhaps, the major deviation of employment in the public sector compared to the private sector. Materially the industrial relations pattern may reveal a little deviation in the public sector.

7. DISPUTES IN INDIA BEFORE 1990

The Table 1 indicates the number of disputes, man days lost and value of production lost in public sector and private sector. The table analyses the number of disputes to be found more in private sector than that in public sector. But there was increasing trend of disputes in public sector after 1976 than the private sector. The value of production lost and man days lost also indicate the same trend i.e. increasing trend. Thus, comparatively the public sector has greater cordial industrial relations than that of private sector.

On the basis of above table we can conclude that private sector has more industrial disputes than public sector before 1990. Even though Man days Lost in public sector were not very conspicuous as compared with the same in private sector, productivity has been lesser in many of the public sector units as compared to private sector. In fact, many of the public sector enterprises have been running in loss. Besides Man Days lost there are certain other variables that affect the production potentialities in the public sector. In fine, industrial disputes take a peculiar shape in the public sector. Rather than resorting to direct strike, trade unions in public sector adopt certain other strategies like, “go slow”, “tool down”, “pen down”, “work to rule” and so on. Which do not affect the formal attendance but actual productivity suffers. In the private sector trade unions resort to direct action like strike than go slow, tool down etc.

Thus, Industrial Relations in Public Sector Units are peaceful. National Commission on Labour observed, “It is equally necessary to caution that the public sector cannot reach the position required of it by the effort of management alone. There has to be responsible cooperation from labor as well. If a model employer is the obvious side of a coin, the “model worker” is its reverse. One cannot exist without the other”.(10) Thus, the
labor force are equally responsible for mutual cordial industrial relations and, they should continue to cooperate with the management for the betterment of industrial health and the affluence of our national economy. It will be finally accepted that a harmonious relationship between the management and the workers will go a long way in bringing about a better climate for the functioning of industries in India. This will also save a lot of waste in this field caused through disharmony between the management and the labor.

Table 1. The Number of Disputes, Man days Lost And Value of Production Lost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Disputes</th>
<th>Man Days Lost</th>
<th>Wage Lost (Rs. in Crores)</th>
<th>Value of Production (Rs. in Crores)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>11874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>4471</td>
<td>20849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>4348</td>
<td>23992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7655</td>
<td>36198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>4134</td>
<td>17791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>10006</td>
<td>26517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>10360</td>
<td>64254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>4453</td>
<td>42406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>7871</td>
<td>48154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>26037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>2572</td>
<td>30176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>30121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>6633</td>
<td>27314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>2937</td>
<td>12244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8. DISPUTES IN INDIA AFTER 2000

The number of industrial disputes in country has shown slow but steady fall over the past ten years. In 1998, the total number of disputes was 1097 which fell by more than half to 440 in 2006. It is being estimated that this trend will continue in 2007 as well. To support this, only 45 cases of disputes have been recorded during the first four months of 2007. This significant decline is attributed to the serious attempts made by industries to improve industrial relations with their workers. However, a deeper look at the data reveals that the number of man-days (i.e., the industrial unit of production equal to the work one person can produce in a day) lost due to disputes has not come down as significantly. The country, on an average, lost 25.4 million man-days of work annually between 1998 and 2006, which might have affected its industrial output. More than 2.14 lakh man-days were lost due to work stoppages in 23 industrial disputes during January to March 2007. Though there has been a decline in the number of strikes, the country still witnessed some major strikes between 2004 and 2006, like those in Honda, Escorts, Apollo, and Skumars factories and in SBI bank.

Source: industrialrelations.naukrihub.com
On analyzing the data sector wise, it is clear that the private sector has witnessed greater number of disputes as compared to the public sector. In 2005, only 57 disputes were recorded in public sector which resulted in a wage loss of 79 Crores. In contrast to this, 399 disputes were recorded in the private sector. In the recent past, maximum number of disputes has been recorded in the manufacturing, agriculture and mining and quarrying industries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of disputes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers involved (‘000)</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandays lost (‘000)</td>
<td>6866</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>2322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages lost (Rs. in crores)</td>
<td>39.35</td>
<td>82.52</td>
<td>73.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Production loss (Rs. in crores)</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>36.97</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of disputes</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers involved (‘000)</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandays lost (‘000)</td>
<td>23400</td>
<td>22061</td>
<td>27343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages lost (Rs. in crores)</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>37.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-144</td>
<td>-119</td>
<td>-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Production loss (Rs. in crores)</td>
<td>391.02</td>
<td>318.62</td>
<td>295.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-127</td>
<td>-109</td>
<td>-102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: industrialrelations.naukrihub.com

9. CONCLUSION

What is more important, however, is not the absolute number of disputes as such but magnitude thereof as measured by the number of mandays lost. There have been serious causes of industrial disputes in the past in the public sector, involving a large number of workers and a loss of lakhs of mandays. Railways, Air India, Post and Telegraph, Steel units and many others have experienced long strikes in the recent past. The major industries which account for considerable loss of man-days in the public sector are generally transport and communication, electricity, gas, water, and sanitary services; mining and quarrying; and manufacturing, whereas in the private sector, manufacturing industry alone accounts for about three-fourths of the total mandays lost during a particular year.

An analysis of the industrial disputes reveals that the number of formal disputes in public sector is fewer than private sector. It goes to support that wages and personnel reasons have been the most important causes. Other reasons are also equally important such as intra-union rivalries. Thus, Industrial Relations in Public Sector Units are peaceful. For this the management and the workers are equally to be credited. As Prof. J.S.Mathur has rightly pointed out that “Society cannot allow workers and management to follow the law of jungle”.(11)

It goes without saying that harmony and cohesion determine the success of an organization. It is true for all times that no organization can function effectively if there are constant strife and turmoil between the management and the labor. It is impossible to introduce any innovation or effect any productivity improvement exclusively through the various industrial engineering techniques. Looking at Industrial Relations, therefore, from a broader national and economic view point, it is an important pre-requisite for national and economic growth of a country. One of the major problems of a developing country is to increase the per capita income of the population through the rapid industrialization as well as through the improvement in agricultural field. Industrialization will solve unemployment problems in developing countries and will help in achieving a better standard of living.

This survey is aimed at studying the industrial relations in the public sector in India. Several difficulties were noticed in the course of the study regarding the behavior of employers, workers, union leaders and government officials. It never remained lower than 30 per cent, it has shown an increase to 37 per cent in the last decade. 'Personnel' and 'retrenchment' is another cause of industrial disputes, through it has declined from 29 per cent to 25 per cent. The 'bonus' is another cause, under which the disputes, the inter-union rivalry is important though the proportion has come down from 30 to 20. However, it may be noted that the most important cause has been the economic condition.

However, Industrial relations in public sector are cordial comparatively private sector but not very cordial. The reason being:

(i) Much importance is not assigned to implementation of the various tripartite and other agreements promptly by the management, as it is not a party to these.
(ii) Though most of the public sector enterprise’s bosses are often good administrators but as they have failed as successful business managers with requisite ability and skill in general and personnel manager techniques.

(iii) Bureaucracy, red-tapism, corruption and evasion of responsibility are also responsible for good labour-management relations.

(iv) By virtue of political affiliations trade union problems are usually discussed with the respective management. In such a process, the managements of the units become ineffective and demoralized which affect the personnel and industrial practices of the enterprises.

(v) The Government interference in these enterprises also fuel to the fire, and the workers become indisciplined.

Suggestions have, therefore, been made here to improve the industrial relations between the management and the labor and to avoid strikes in the public sector. The following remedies may be useful:

1. The Government should not take the recognition back at the time of strike and should come forward for the discussion of the demand.

2. An effective two way channel of communication should be developed in the undertakings to ensure that workers grievances are communicated to the authorities and that the workers understand properly the causes and purpose of the orders issued by the officers. Though, there is proper down-ward communication in the Public Sector, there is greater need to improve upward communication. This may be effectively done by the introduction of a new suggestion scheme to develop the innovation ideas of the employees in this globalization era.

3. By delegating authorities to workers and by workers’ participation in the management, the problem of low standard of workers and maintenance of discipline can be solved. This will increase efficiency of workers and will create common interest in the work.

4. Proper social security schemes should be implemented.

5. To solve the problem of multiplicity of trade unions which exist in many public sector, the management should recognize a majority union as a bargaining agent in the public sector. It must be decided by a proper procedure and with the assistance of labour commissioner.

6. Mostly disputes arise in the public sector due to wages. This economic cause of dispute can be removed, to a large extent, by enforcing minimum wages and thus ensuring a reasonably decent standard of living for the workers by enacting rules and regulations and enforcing social security measures.

Lastly, it may be suggested that an organization must be innovative and should follow the policy of self renewal and personnel audit. It is earnestly hoped that the management would look into the possibility of introducing the suggested reforms for the betterment of the corporate image of public sector. A single remedy cannot solve the entire problem so, all remedies should be taken into consideration as required by the situation. Further, it should not be forgotten that a labor-management relations would be successful only if it succeeds to ensure the devotion of both the components: the employers and the employees. A harmonious equation between the management and the workers is the backbone of success of an industrial organization. If the employers are imaginative and humane, the employees are bound to respond favorably.
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