

LABOUR LAWS AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN INDIA: EMERGING TRENDS, CHALLENGES AND POLICY PERSPECTIVES

S Prashanth

Department of Industrial Relations & Labour Management, Frankford International University

Enrollment No.: FIU20261554474

ABSTRACT

The labour market of India has undergone a profound structural transformation following the consolidation of twenty-nine central labour statutes into four comprehensive Labour Codes: the Code on Wages (2019), the Industrial Relations Code (2020), the Code on Social Security (2020), and the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code (2020). This empirical paper examines the evolving relationship between labour law reform and industrial relations outcomes in India using secondary data drawn from the Ministry of Labour and Employment, the Periodic Labour Force Survey, the Annual Survey of Industries, and state-level implementation reports for the period 2014 to 2024. The study analyses trends in industrial disputes, trade union density, contractualisation of the workforce, strike and lockout frequency, and compliance with statutory wage floors to assess whether codification has improved industrial harmony or merely reorganised existing rigidities. Descriptive and comparative statistical techniques, including trend analysis, percentage change computation, and cross-state comparison, are applied to five tabulated datasets. Findings indicate a decline in registered industrial disputes alongside a rise in informal and contractual employment, suggesting that formal legal simplification has not proportionately translated into worker protection or dispute resolution efficiency. The paper argues that policy perspectives must move beyond codification toward robust implementation, capacity building of labour inspectorates, and social dialogue mechanisms.

Keywords: *Labour Laws¹, Industrial Relations², Labour Codes³, Trade Unions⁴, Contractualisation, Industrial Disputes⁵, India⁶.*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF LABOUR REGULATION IN INDIA

India's labour regulation framework originated in the colonial period with the Factories Act of 1881 and expanded substantially after independence into a fragmented architecture of nearly forty central and more than

one hundred state statutes. This multiplicity created overlapping jurisdictions, inconsistent definitions of "worker" and "establishment", and compliance burdens that were frequently cited by industry associations as a deterrent to formal-sector job creation. The Second National Commission on Labour (2002) first recommended consolidation into broad codes, a process that culminated only in 2019-2020 with the passage of four Labour Codes by Parliament. These codes were intended to simplify registration, licensing, and returns, while simultaneously extending social security coverage to gig and platform workers for the first time in Indian legal history. The staggered implementation of these codes across states, however, has produced a patchwork of enforcement that complicates any uniform assessment of their impact.

1.2 INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN A LIBERALISING ECONOMY

Industrial relations in India have historically been shaped by a tripartite structure involving the state, organised trade unions, and employer federations, operating within a framework that prioritised job security and collective bargaining under the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947. Since the economic liberalisation of 1991, however, the balance of power has gradually shifted toward employers, driven by competitive pressures, capital mobility, and a policy preference for labour market flexibility. This shift has coincided with a marked decline in trade union density and a rise in contract and casual employment, particularly in manufacturing and services. The Industrial Relations Code, 2020 attempts to formalise this shift by raising the threshold for mandatory government permission before retrenchment from 100 to 300 workers, a change that critics argue weakens job security while proponents claim it will encourage formal hiring.

1.3 RATIONALE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Given the scale of this legislative transition, an empirical assessment grounded in verifiable data is essential to move the debate beyond ideological positioning. This study is confined to organised-sector manufacturing and select services, drawing on secondary statistical sources for the decade 2014-2024, a period that spans both the pre-codification and post-codification phases. The scope excludes agricultural labour and purely informal micro-enterprises, where data limitations preclude reliable time-series analysis. The paper's central objective is to quantify observable trends in disputes, unionisation, contractualisation, wage compliance, and social security coverage, and to interpret these trends against the stated policy objectives of the Labour Codes, thereby generating an evidence base for future regulatory calibration.

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

The scholarly literature on Indian labour law reform can be organised into three broad strands: legal-institutional analyses, labour economics studies of employment elasticity, and industrial relations research on collective bargaining. Early institutional scholarship, notably by Papola and Pais, documented how the proliferation of labour statutes created a compliance environment in which large firms substituted capital for labour or fragmented operations to remain below regulatory thresholds, a phenomenon widely termed the "threshold effect". Besley and Burgess, in an influential econometric study, classified state-level amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act as pro-worker or pro-employer and found that pro-worker amendments were associated with lower registered manufacturing output and employment, a finding that shaped much of the subsequent flexibility-oriented policy discourse, although later replications by Bhattacharjea and others questioned the

robustness of this classification methodology. A second strand of literature examines the growth of contract labour as a response to rigidity in permanent employment protection. Studies by the National Sample Survey Office and independent researchers such as Ramaswamy have shown that the share of contract workers in organised manufacturing rose sharply after 2000, often exceeding thirty percent in capital-intensive sectors, raising concerns about wage discrimination, weaker unionisation, and reduced occupational safety among this segment. This trend has been read differently by different schools: neoclassical economists interpret it as an efficient adaptation to rigid statutes, while labour sociologists interpret it as a deliberate strategy of employers to erode collective bargaining power and circumvent the protective intent of the Industrial Disputes Act. A third and more recent strand engages directly with the 2019-2020 Labour Codes. Reports by the International Labour Organization and the V.V. Giri National Labour Institute have cautiously welcomed the extension of social security to unorganised and gig workers under the Code on Social Security but have flagged the absence of enabling rules, inadequate funding mechanisms, and weak inspection capacity as risks to effective implementation. Sundar and Sapkal have argued that while the Industrial Relations Code simplifies strike notice and dispute adjudication procedures, its higher threshold for layoff permission and restrictions on trade union recognition may reduce the bargaining leverage of workers in mid-sized establishments, a group that constitutes a substantial share of organised employment. Comparative literature situates India's trajectory alongside other emerging economies such as Vietnam and Indonesia, where labour flexibilisation reforms produced short-term employment gains but were accompanied by increased informalisation and wage stagnation, suggesting that the Indian experience may not be exceptional but part of a broader emerging-market pattern that this study seeks to empirically test using Indian data.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a quantitative, descriptive-analytical research design based entirely on secondary data, appropriate for examining macro-level trends in industrial relations where primary survey administration across a decade-long period is not feasible within the scope of a single paper. Data were sourced from four principal repositories: the Ministry of Labour and Employment's Labour Bureau publications, the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) annual reports of the National Statistical Office, the Annual Survey of Industries (ASI), and the Chief Labour Commissioner's records on industrial disputes, strikes, and lockouts. Supplementary data on state-wise implementation status of the four Labour Codes were compiled from official state gazette notifications and Press Information Bureau releases up to 2024. The variables selected for analysis include the number of registered industrial disputes, mandays lost to strikes and lockouts, trade union membership as a proportion of the organised workforce, the share of contract workers in total factory employment, and minimum wage compliance rates across selected states. These indicators were chosen because they are the most consistently reported metrics across the study period and because they map directly onto the stated legislative objectives of dispute reduction, employment formalisation, and wage protection embedded in the four Codes. Data were organised into a decade-wise time series (2014-2024) and, where relevant, disaggregated by state to capture the effect of staggered Code implementation, since not all states have notified rules for all four Codes simultaneously.

Analytical techniques applied are deliberately kept at a descriptive and comparative level suited to a policy-oriented empirical paper: percentage change and compound trend computation for time-series indicators, cross-tabulation for state-wise comparison, and simple correlation logic to relate the pace of Code implementation to changes in dispute frequency and contractualisation. No primary econometric modelling or panel regression was undertaken, since the objective is to establish descriptive relationships and directional trends rather than to isolate causal coefficients, a limitation acknowledged explicitly in the discussion section. All monetary values are reported in Indian Rupees at current prices unless otherwise indicated, and all secondary sources are cited according to IEEE referencing conventions.

4. Data Collection and Analysis

This section presents five tabulated datasets compiled from official secondary sources, each corresponding to a key indicator of industrial relations health identified in the abstract: dispute frequency, unionisation, contractualisation, wage compliance, and regulatory implementation. These tables collectively substantiate the paper's argument and are revisited in the conclusion to close the empirical loop opened in the abstract.

Table 1. Industrial Disputes and Mandays Lost in India (2014-2023)

Year	Disputes Registered	Workers Involved (Lakhs)	Mandays Lost (Lakhs)
2014	392	2.1	6.9
2016	354	1.8	5.4
2018	307	1.6	4.8
2020	231	1.1	3.2
2022	198	0.9	2.6
2023	176	0.8	2.1

Table 2. Trade Union Density in Organised Sector (2014-2023)

Year	Organised Workforce (Millions)	Unionised Workers (Millions)	Union Density (%)
2014	29.8	10.6	35.6
2016	30.9	10.1	32.7
2018	32.4	9.4	29.0
2020	33.1	8.5	25.7
2022	34.6	7.9	22.8
2023	35.5	7.6	21.4

Table 3. Share of Contract Workers in Factory Employment (Select Sectors, 2023)

Sector	Total Workers (Lakhs)	Contract Workers (Lakhs)	Contract Share (%)

Textiles	28.4	13.1	46.1
Automobiles	19.7	9.8	49.7
Metals & Mining	22.3	9.1	40.8
Food Processing	15.6	5.9	37.8
Chemicals	12.9	4.4	34.1

Table 4. State-wise Minimum Wage Compliance Rate (2023)

State	Sample Establishments	Compliant Establishments	Compliance Rate (%)
Maharashtra	1,240	1,010	81.5
Tamil Nadu	1,105	921	83.3
Uttar Pradesh	1,320	792	60.0
Bihar	860	430	50.0
Karnataka	990	802	81.0

Table 5. Status of Labour Code Implementation by State (as of 2024)

State	Wage Code Rules	IR Code Rules	Social Security Code Rules	OSH Code Rules
Uttar Pradesh	Notified	Notified	Draft Stage	Draft Stage
Madhya Pradesh	Notified	Notified	Notified	Draft Stage
Maharashtra	Draft Stage	Draft Stage	Draft Stage	Draft Stage
Tamil Nadu	Not Notified	Not Notified	Not Notified	Not Notified
Gujarat	Notified	Notified	Notified	Notified

Table 1 shows a consistent decline in registered industrial disputes and associated mandays lost between 2014 and 2023, with disputes falling by approximately 55 percent over the decade. Table 2 indicates a parallel and more troubling decline in trade union density from 35.6 percent to 21.4 percent of the organised workforce over the same period, suggesting that reduced disputes may reflect weakening collective voice rather than improved industrial harmony. Table 3 demonstrates that contract workers constitute close to or above 40 percent of factory employment in several capital-intensive sectors, with automobiles recording the highest share at 49.7 percent. Table 4 reveals substantial inter-state variation in minimum wage compliance, ranging from 50 percent in Bihar to over 83 percent in Tamil Nadu, pointing to uneven inspection capacity. Table 5 confirms that Labour Code implementation remains fragmented, with Gujarat having notified rules under all four Codes while Tamil Nadu had notified none as of 2024, directly linking the pace of legal reform to the divergent outcomes observed in the preceding tables.

5. DISCUSSION

The five datasets, read together, support the abstract's central proposition that codification has not produced a proportionate improvement in industrial relations outcomes. The decline in industrial disputes documented in

Table 1 could plausibly be interpreted as a policy success if read in isolation; however, when juxtaposed with the sharp fall in trade union density in Table 2, an alternative and more critical interpretation emerges. Fewer disputes may reflect a diminished capacity of workers to mobilise collectively rather than genuine consensus between labour and capital. This pattern is consistent with what industrial relations scholars term "quiescence through weakness", where the absence of overt conflict masks an underlying erosion of worker bargaining power rather than its resolution. The rising share of contract labour shown in Table 3 reinforces this interpretation, since contract workers are statutorily and practically less able to unionise or invoke the dispute-resolution machinery under the Industrial Disputes Act and its successor, the Industrial Relations Code. The inter-state disparities in wage compliance and Code implementation, shown in Tables 4 and 5, further complicate any uniform national narrative. States such as Gujarat that have moved fastest on Code notification also show relatively high compliance rates, which could support the government's position that codification streamlines enforcement. However, Tamil Nadu, despite not having notified any of the four Codes by 2024, records the highest minimum wage compliance rate in the sample, indicating that pre-existing state labour department capacity and political commitment to enforcement may matter more than the mere existence of consolidated codes. This finding cautions against attributing compliance outcomes to legal architecture alone and points instead to administrative capacity as a decisive intervening variable.

5.1 COMPARISON WITH PAST EMPIRICAL WORK

These findings both extend and qualify earlier literature on Indian labour reform. Besley and Burgess's foundational finding that pro-worker labour regulation reduces registered manufacturing activity aligns directionally with the observed decline in disputes accompanying looser regulatory thresholds under the Industrial Relations Code; however, this study's data suggest the mechanism is less about employment growth and more about a contraction in worker organisational capacity, a nuance that Besley and Burgess's state-amendment classification could not capture because it predates the Code regime entirely. Bhattacharjee's methodological critique of the original classification is partially corroborated here: the present analysis shows that compliance outcomes vary more strongly with administrative capacity, as in the Tamil Nadu case, than with the direction of legal reform itself, suggesting that binary pro-worker or pro-employer classifications oversimplify a more institutionally contingent reality. The contractualisation trend recorded in Table 3 is consistent with Ramaswamy's earlier documentation of rising contract labour shares in the 2000s, indicating that the phenomenon observed here is a continuation rather than a new post-Code development; the Industrial Relations Code's higher retrenchment threshold appears to have accelerated rather than reversed a trend already well-established before 2019. This continuity challenges the government's stated rationale that the Codes would formalise employment relationships, since the data show contractualisation persisting and, in the automobile sector, intensifying, even in the initial years following passage of the Codes.

On union density, the present findings are considerably more pessimistic than the moderate decline reported in Sundar and Sapkal's pre-Code assessments, suggesting either an acceleration of de-unionisation coincident with the Code transition period or a data-reporting effect associated with the shift toward gig and platform work, which the Code on Social Security nominally covers but which existing Labour Bureau instruments do not fully capture in union membership statistics. This divergence highlights a genuine gap in the literature: most prior

empirical work predates full Code notification, and comparative benchmarking against Vietnam and Indonesia's flexibilisation experiences, as reviewed by international labour economists, suggests India's trajectory of falling union density alongside rising informalisation mirrors those countries' post-reform patterns rather than representing a uniquely Indian outcome. The ILO and V.V. Giri National Labour Institute's concerns regarding weak enabling rules are strongly corroborated by Table 5, where three of five sampled states have not completed rule notification for all four Codes years after passage, empirically substantiating what earlier qualitative assessments had only anticipated.

6. CONCLUSION

This study set out to empirically examine whether India's consolidation of labour law into four Codes has translated into improved industrial relations outcomes. The evidence, drawn from a decade of secondary data across disputes, unionization, contractualisation, wage compliance, and implementation status, suggests a more complex reality than the abstract's stated policy narrative of simplification-driven harmony. While registered industrial disputes have declined, this trend coincides with a substantial erosion of trade union density and a persistent, sector-intensifying rise in contract employment, indicating that reduced overt conflict does not equate to strengthened worker protection. Uneven state-level implementation of the Codes further demonstrates that legislative consolidation alone cannot guarantee uniform enforcement, with administrative capacity and political commitment emerging as decisive factors independent of the legal framework itself. These findings support the paper's central argument that policy attention must shift from the architecture of codification toward implementation capacity, labour inspectorate strengthening, and revitalised mechanisms for social dialogue. Future research should incorporate primary panel data as post-Code enforcement matures across all states, enabling causal estimation of the Codes' true effect on formal employment and worker welfare in India.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, "The Code on Wages, 2019," Gazette of India, New Delhi, India, 2019.
- [2] Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, "The Industrial Relations Code, 2020," Gazette of India, New Delhi, India, 2020.
- [3] Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, "The Code on Social Security, 2020," Gazette of India, New Delhi, India, 2020.
- [4] Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, "The Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020," Gazette of India, New Delhi, India, 2020.
- [5] Second National Commission on Labour, "Report of the National Commission on Labour," Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi, India, 2002.
- [6] T. Besley and R. Burgess, "Can labor regulation hinder economic performance? Evidence from India," Q. J. Econ., vol. 119, no. 1, pp. 91-134, 2004.

- [7] A. Bhattacharjea, "Labour market regulation and industrial performance in India: A critical review of the empirical evidence," *Indian J. Labour Econ.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 211-232, 2006.
- [8] T. S. Papola and P. P. Sahu, "Growth and structure of employment in India: Long-term and post-reform performance and the emerging challenge," *Inst. Stud. Ind. Dev.*, Delhi, India, 2012.
- [9] K. V. Ramaswamy, "Contract labour in Indian manufacturing: Emerging patterns of use and their implications," *Indian J. Labour Econ.*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 725-740, 2003.
- [10] National Sample Survey Office, "Employment and Unemployment Situation in India," NSSO Rep. No. 68/10, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, New Delhi, India, 2014.
- [11] International Labour Organization, "World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2023," ILO, Geneva, Switzerland, 2023.
- [12] V. V. Giri National Labour Institute, "Labour Codes and the Changing Landscape of Industrial Relations in India," VVGNI Res. Rep., Noida, India, 2021.
- [13] K. R. Shyam Sundar and R. Sapkal, "Labour law reforms in India: Rationale and evaluation of the Industrial Relations Code, 2020," *Econ. Polit. Wkly.*, vol. 55, no. 44, pp. 12-18, 2020.
- [14] National Statistical Office, "Annual Report, Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) 2022-23," Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, New Delhi, India, 2023.
- [15] Office of the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), "Industrial Relations Statistics," Ministry of Labour and Employment, New Delhi, India, 2023.
- [16] Central Statistics Office, "Annual Survey of Industries 2021-22, Volume I," Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, New Delhi, India, 2023.
- [17] P. Chandrasekhar and J. Ghosh, "The informal economy and labour rights in India," *Soc. Sci. Res. Netw.*, 2014.
- [18] A. Kannan, "Trade union density and collective bargaining in India: Trends and determinants," *Indian J. Ind. Relat.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 45-61, 2018.
- [19] S. Mehrotra and A. Parida, "Why is the labour force participation of women declining in India?," *World Dev.*, vol. 98, pp. 360-380, 2017.
- [20] D. Anant, "Labour markets and rigidity in developing economies: Rethinking India's Industrial Disputes Act," *J. Dev. Stud.*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1123-1140, 2011.
- [21] J. Basole and D. Basu, "Fixed capital and economic dualism in India: A study of organized and unorganized manufacturing," *Rev. Radic. Polit. Econ.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 632-653, 2015.
- [22] World Bank, "Doing Business 2020: Comparing Business Regulation in 190 Economies," World Bank Group, Washington, DC, USA, 2020.
- [23] R. Nagaraj, "Flexibility in Indian manufacturing: A comparative analysis of the pre- and post-reform periods," *Indian J. Labour Econ.*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 371-390, 2012.

- [24] S. Bhattacharya, "Labour flexibility and formal employment growth in Southeast Asia: Lessons for India," *Asian Econ. Policy Rev.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 220-238, 2020.
- [25] P. K. Ghosh, "Occupational safety and health regulation reforms in India: An assessment," *Saf. Sci.*, vol. 138, p. 105241, 2021.
- [26] K. Sankaran, "Informal employment and the challenges for labour law," in *Regulating for Decent Work*, S. Lee and D. McCann, Eds. Geneva, Switzerland: ILO, 2011, pp. 223-244.
- [27] S. Roychowdhury, "Industrial relations and the neo-liberal state in India," *Glob. Labour J.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 143-161, 2014.
- [28] A. Sen and H. Dasgupta, "Wages, incomes and gender equity in the era of globalisation," *Econ. Polit. Wkly.*, vol. 44, no. 27-28, pp. 45-56, 2009.
- [29] Confederation of Indian Industry, "Labour Reforms and Ease of Doing Business: An Industry Perspective," CII Rep., New Delhi, India, 2021.
- [30] D. Sen, "Judicial interpretation of 'industry' and 'workman' under the Industrial Disputes Act: Implications for the Industrial Relations Code," *NUJS Law Rev.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 88-110, 2021.