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The overall findings of this study are as follows

Personal Profile

It is understood from this study that majority of the employees (51%) have attained technical education. And majority of the executive personnel have secured professional degree. Majority of the respondents 81% employees and 91% executive personnel) have been settled in urban areas, Majority of the employees (89%) of employees and 94% of executive personnel are married which do not allow them to quit their jcb while the industry in the grip of conflicts,

The employees were selected from various departments. 15% of employees were selected from mixing department, 14% of employees were selected from spinning department, 12% of employees were working in carding department. 08% of the employees were selected from reeling department, 07% of employees were equally selected from drawing, doubling departments and 06% cleaning and baling department employees' views were asked. 05% of employees were equally selected from mixing, blow room, core winding and packing departments.

Majority of employees (48 %) have had 11- 15 years of experience. 34% of employees have been working for 21-25 years. 50% of the executive personnel have 6-10 years of
experience. 28% of executive personnel belonged to 0-5 years of experience category.

Employees' job satisfaction is highly related to the disputes in industry. It is assumed that when the employees are satisfied with their job, the chances for disputes are meager, whereas the employees' job dissatisfaction will lead to disputes. This study shows that 56% of employees were dissatisfied with their job and that was one of the factors for industrial disputes in the study area.

_The Causes For Industrial Disputes_

Majority of employees and executives 52% and 44% respectively expressed their opinion that wages and allowance were main reasons for occurrence of disputes in industry. Among the economic determinants of disputes 41% and 44% executives, believed low wage and 39% employees and 32% executives felt insufficient bonus were the most important causes.

For majority of employees 53% and executives 52% inter union rivalry was the reason for the conflict but 24% of the employees and 32% of the executives felt that the adamant attitude of the union leaders seemed to be the most important causes for disputes.

Among the social determinants of disputes 50% employees expressed that inadequate social security measures were the most important cause. However majority of 58% executives felt that the lack of cordial relationship between the employees and management was the most important determinant. It has been
observed that though legislations provide social security measures, much of them are neither effective nor adequate. R.C. Singh in his study concluded the same.\textsuperscript{1} Further it has been observed that most of the employers are still traditional in their manpower management i.e. unconditional obedience from the employees but the lack of social security felt by employees made them hostile towards the management. Baldev Sharma in his study also observed the same.\textsuperscript{2}

Among the political determinants the majority of employees 60\% and 46\% executives felt that politicalization of the unions was the most important cause for the disputes. It has been observed that most of the textile unions have political affiliations. The involvement of outside leadership coupled with political ideologies, political rivalry, party affiliation, political alliance etc affect the Labour management relations resulting in industrial disputes. The politicalization of unions as a source of Industrial Conflict is well known.\textsuperscript{3}

Among the legal determinants of disputes, 74\% employees and 46\% executives felt that delayed settlement of industrial disputes was the important causes. The problems of delays in Labour judiciary with respect to settlement of disputes are well known.\textsuperscript{4}

Majority of employees 56\% expressed that insecurity in employment due to globalization was the main source of conflict but most of the executives 42\% opined that inadequate technical skills was the reason for the dispute. From this it is observed that employee's needs and executive's expectations are incompatible and contradictory to each other and cause conflicts.
Among the organizational determinants of disputes, employees 52% and executives 52% equally had similar view that the inadequate grievance procedures were the main source of dispute. Ineffective communication was also observed as the reason for conflict by 29% of the employees and by 26% of the executives.

Among the managerial determinants of disputes, majority of employees 70% and most of the executives 46% expressed that the non-implementation of awards and agreements was the cause for conflicts and 25% of the employees and 38% of the executives were of the opinion that unfair labour practice was the most important reason for dispute.

In some industries, not only time taken for implementing the awards and agreements but also its total failure to implement was the main reasons for conflict. The unfair labour practice as a source of conflict was affirmed in some of the studies.\(^5\)

Conflict Resolution Machinery

There is a significant variation between the employees and executives in this issue. Majority of the employees felt that the management was indifferent towards the settlement of the conflict with them. Considerable number of employees, that is, 27% of the employees, opined that the management was unsympathetic towards them in settling the conflict. However, majority of the executives 58% declared that the management was sympathetic towards the employees in settling the industrial conflict.
There is a notable variation between the opinion of employees and executives regarding the functions of dispute settlement machinery in their industry. 55% of the employees felt that the function of this machinery was weak, 39% of the employees were of the opinion that the machinery was very weak. In contrast to this the majority of the executives 52% of the executives reported that the function of the machinery was very strong and 36% of them felt that it was strong. These sharp contradictions between the two had affected the choice of the right conflict resolution machineries to deal with conflict.

Majority of the employees (57% dissatisfied and 39% highly dissatisfied) were dissatisfied with the steps taken by the management to resolve conflict. Whereas, majority of the executives expressed their satisfaction (60% highly satisfied and 36% satisfied) over the steps taken by the management's to settle the conflicts. These contradictory stands clearly express the existence of the conflict between the employees and executives over the functions of management.

There is no significant variation on the perception of employees and executives on principled arbitration as the effective Conflict Resolution Technique. Majority of employees and executives 85% & 52% expressed that arbitration was a more effective technique than others. But 15% & 40% of the employees and executives were of the opinion that negotiation was next best option to deal with conflict. Gandhi was very much in favour of arbitration and recommended this technique for
settling the industrial disputes. The secondary data obtained from the studies already conducted were also favourably inclined towards this concept.

There is a significant variation in the perception of employees and executives on workers-management relationship. Majority of Employees 56% and 39% expressed their feeling that the relationship between management and the employees was very poor and poor respectively, whereas 60% and 36% of the executives responded that the relationship between the management and the employee was very good and good respectively. The researcher observed the reason for this difference was due to lack of proper and informal communication between the two and the distanced relationship in the working spot and outside,

Regarding the employees involvement in the decision making process the study clearly shows that only at the time of modernization, the employees were consulted because they would have to assume more responsibility due to modernization. But in other matters like lock out, lay off, and retrenchment, which affected employees, they were not at all consulted and the majority of the executives vouched this. As a result it made the employees feel estranged during lay off, retrenchment and lock out time'. This kind of unilateral decision affected the working relationship between the employees and management.
Gandhian Approach

The employees and management in industry were not absolutely truthful in all matters. They were ready to sacrifice Truth for the sake of victory. Whenever they felt that Truth would not help them to attain success, they simply ignored Truth and resorted to lies. There is no significant variation on the part of respondents' opinion about Truth. 96% of employees and 80% of the executives responded that they would follow Truth only when they were assumed that they did not lose anything. They also reported that if they felt that Truth would not help them and they would suffer if they were Truthful, they would simply abandon Truth. This clearly indicates that both of them were not aquatinted with Gandhian approach of Truth as a principle of conflict resolution.

Majority of the respondents' 91% of employees and 72% of executives answered that they did not have Mutual Trust among themselves. This not only affected their working relationship but also hampered the conflict resolution process, which required this as a basic tenant.

Among the respondents, 78% of employees and 64% of executives replied that end outcome i.e. winning the problem in their favour, was more important than the means. They replied that they would consider the Gandhian concept of means only it guaranteed Win; otherwise they would like to ignore it and pursue the end at any cost.
Majority of the respondents 88% of the employees and 60% of the executives replied that they would follow nonviolence only at necessary time and would not strictly adhere to nonviolence always. It is inferred that the employees and executives were not familiar with Gandhian concept of nonviolence and they always considered nonviolence as strategy to win their goal and not as a principle to be followed at all time.

Gandhi believed that both employees and the employer could win without affecting either of the party. But the response of the employees and the executives were different. There is no significant variation on the opinion of executives and the employees about the Gandhian concept of sarvodaya approach or Win-Win approach. Majority of the respondents i.e., 95% of the employees and 64% of the executives were of the opinion that the concept of 'two parties win' is not at all possible, and they said that either employees or management alone can win.

It is clear that Trusteeship theory was not at all followed in any industry. But majority of the employees 98% and the executives 80% were positive by inclined to follow Trusteeship theory in order to resolve the conflict when it was explained.

Majority of the respondents 88% of employees and 80% of executives accepted the fact that their industry was modernized. While accepting with the fact the modernization was an inevitable process, they also expressed their strong reservations about the outcome of it. Majority of the employees 87% and most of the
executives 64% expressed their fear that this would lead to displacement of labour and would never be helpful to employees.

There is no variation in the perception of the employees and the executives on the decentralization of power in their industries. All of them accepted that power was not decentralized; and all the powers were with the management.

A strike should be spontaneous and not manipulated. There was a significant difference in the opinion of the employees and the executives on the factor, which instigated strike. Majority of the employees (79%) expressed that the non co-operative attitude of the management was the main motivating factor for the strike, whereas majority of the executives (76%) answered that the issues were the stirring factor for strike in industry. It could be inferred that employees blamed management's adamancy whereas the executives reported the employee's issues were the main determining factor for the strike.

At the time of conflict in industry, most of the employees expressed that they followed nonviolent activities in order to resolve the conflict. 49% respondents reported that they followed non co-operation methods and 22% respondents said that fasting was their main nonviolent weapon.

Gandhi warned the management that retaliatory action of any kind against the strikers should not be taken. But majority of the employees 90% reported that subtle and indirect retaliatory actions were being taken against the strikers but this was totally denied by the executives.
There was a significant difference between the opinion of the employees and that of the executives about the action taken against the strikers. Majority of the respondents 39% were of the opinion that suspension for petty issues was the indirect type of action taken against the strikers. Majority of the executives (68%) replied that no indirect retaliatory action was taken against the strikers.

There is a significant difference between the employees and the executives in their opinion on the determining factor for winning the strike. Majority of the employees 86% said that solidarity among workers was the main determining factor to win in the strike, whereas the most of the executives 48% felt that co-operative attitude of the management was the main factor to win in the strike. No one has considered nonviolent principle as the successful method for dealing with the strike.

Majority of the employees 78% viewed that non co-operative attitude of the management was the main reason for the failure of the strike. But most of the executives and a few employees said the disunity among the employees were the main reasons for the failure for the strike.

When the respondents were asked whether the management threatened them, some of them 11% replied that the management threatened them not to indulge in strike activity, And they also reported that the management threatened
them with suspension (75%)/ dismissal (14%) and transfer to other department (11%).

Majority of the respondents 67% replied that they received punishment indirectly for indulging in strike. Among them, 50% of respondents were punished for late coming, 25% of them for indulging in strike activities i.e. not being found in the work spot.

Majority of the employees i.e., 83% accepted that the management was biased while punishing the employees, But majority of the executives (96%) felt that the management was unbiased in giving punishment to the employees. 84% of the employees among the respondents who accepted that the management was biased while punishing the employees said that the union, which they were affiliated with, was taken for consideration while they were punished. They further observed that if they belonged to the union, which was pro-management, the punishment would be meager, whereas if they belonged to anti-management unions, the punishment would be severe.

Among the 169 employees who underwent punishment; 50% of respondents reported that suspension was the mode of punishment they received. Whereas 25% and 17% of employees reported they received strict warning and fining as the mode of punishment respectively. Only 08% of employees were transferred by way of punishment. Majority of the executives 60% replied that suspension was the mode of punishment but
they denied the employee's involvement in strike was the cause for punishment.

All the respondents belonged to different unions and no union had absolute support of the employees. Majority of employees and executives (56% & 60%) replied that Trade Unions were playing key role in the process of dealing with conflicts, whereas the remaining 20% & 40% employees and executives negatively responded.

Majority of respondents 92% of employees and 94% of executives preferred one union in one industry concept in order to prevent conflict among themselves and to promote greater unity among employees,

Among the total number of respondents, 61% employees had attended the Workers' Education classes and they expressed that the Gandhian concepts were not emphasized in the classes. The Gandhian principles like Truth, Nonviolence, Self-purification, Means and Ends, Trusteeship and Sarvodaya approach Win-Win approach which are linked with industrial relations and management were reported not included in Workers' Education class. When Workers' Education teachers were interviewed, they accepted that they did not give much importance to the Gandhian concepts of industrial peace.

CONCLUSION
The overall findings of this study lead to the following conclusion.

It is concluded from this study that the issues related to wage, bonus and allowances were considered as the most important causes for industrial conflict. The economic determinant seems to be the most important determinant of industrial disputes. Among the economic determinants of disputes, low wage and insufficient bonus seem to be the most important ones.

Among the trade union determinants, the inter-union rivalry and adamant attitude of the union leaders seem to be the most important ones. Among the social determinants of disputes, inadequate social security measures and inferior treatment seem to be the most important ones. However, the executives opined that lack of cordial relationship with the supervisors seem to be the most important determinant. It has been observed that though legislations provide social security measures, much of them are neither effective nor adequate.

Among the political determinants, the politicalization of the unions and the failure of the government to implement the Labour policy were the most important ones for the conflict. Despite all, most of the textile unions have political affiliations. The outside leadership coupled with political ideologies, political rivalry, party affiliation, political alliance etc affect labour-management relations resulting in industrial disputes. The
industrial Labour policy had not been satisfactory to employees due to the inconsistency in both policies and legislation. Further, the Labour policy seemed to have integrated approach. Among the legal determinants of disputes, delayed settlement of industrial disputes and inadequate legal protection to workers were the most important causes for conflict. Among the technical determinants of disputes, insecurity in employment and increased workload was the most significant ones. Among the organizational determinants of disputes, inadequate grievance procedures and ineffective communication were the most significant ones. Among the managerial determinants of disputes, non-implementation of awards and unfair Labour practice were the most significant ones.

Indifference was another major cause for industrial conflict. The management's indifferent attitude towards the employees and their union hampered the settlement of the conflict. The function of the dispute resolution machinery in the industry was weak which always-bred conflict in industry. Moreover, the employees were also dissatisfied with the steps taken by the management to resolve the conflict.

Since the relationship between the management and the employees were poor and also the employees were not consulted in any of the decisions taken by the management, which has adverse effect on employees, the arbitration seemed to work well to settle the conflict arouse between them. Thus, it could be concluded that the tripartite actions (arbitration by third party)
were the more effective method than the bipartite in which the disputing parties try to settle the issues through direct talks.

Gandhian approach

It is very important to note that the Gandhian concept of Truth was not followed in the industries during the conflict resolution process. Both employees and executives were not aquatinted with Gandhian approach of Truth as a principle of conflict resolution. They were ready to sacrifice Truth for the sake of victory. When they felt that Truth would not help them to attain success, they simply ignored the Truth.

And there was no mutual trust between the employees and management. When there is a conflict, both of them started suspecting each other. This not only affected their working relationship but also hampered the conflict resolution process, which required this as a basic tenet.

Gandhi's very important principle in Conflict Resolution is 'means and end'. However, in industry, both the employees and the management did not bother about this principle. According to them, end is more important than the means. They replied that they would consider the Gandhian concept of means only if it guaranteed win; otherwise they would like to ignore it and pursue the end at any cost. They wanted to follow nonviolence only if assured that it should lead to victory. But nonviolence is a fundamental and dynamic concept, which should permeate in every phase of our life. Unless nonviolence is ingrained in all the
industrial activities like administration, dispute settlement process, decision making, awarding punishment, labour management relations and also in workers education mere reforms and modernization will not bear much fruit. The non-adherence of the principles like nonviolence and means and end in all industrial relations affects industrial peace and leads to conflicts.

Gandhi was very much concerned with sarvodaya approach i.e. the victory for both the parties, which in modern terms is called Win-Win approach. But the employees and the executives did not have faith in this. They considered Conflict Resolution process is like a battlefield or a game in which only one party can win. As far as trusteeship concept is concerned, no industry was practicing this principle but both the employers and the employees have shown readiness to implement this theory.

Although modernization seems to be an inevitable and indispensable process its policy towards employees like retrenchment affects them, causing unemployment and social and economic insecurity problems; and this was totally opposed by Gandhi. Since management keeps the power to take decisions and giving rewards and punishments without sharing it with others in industries, it affects labour management relations and Gandhi desired power should be decentralized and employees should be involved in decision-making process, whereas the management is not ready to decentralize the power and the executives feared that the decentralization of power in industry might make their job insecure.
When there was a strike in industry, the employees followed nonviolent non-co-operation methods. The employees said that the management used threatening methods and indirect retaliatory actions against the strikers to deter them from indulging in strike. The employees felt that they would win in the strike, if they were united and maintained solidarity among themselves. They also expressed the opinion that their agitations became protracted and intense and finally end in abruptness because of the non-co-operative attitude of the management, whereas the executives opined that the disunity among the employees was the reasons for this.

Gandhi never considered strike as a technique to threaten the management; rather he considered this as an expression to communicate their unmet demands and displeasure towards the employers to find an amicable solution. Therefore, he advocated nonviolent and peaceful methods for conducting strikes and agitations. To him the welfare of the labour is not an exclusive affair of labour alone; rather it depended on collective measures taken both by employees and employers. Therefore he wanted to improve the relationship by changing the nature of the ownership (Trusteeship) and working relationship i.e. the labour and capital treat each other as partners not slave and master.

As far as punishment is concerned the management uses this as a formidable tool to control the individual behaviour and collective actions of employees, which are against the administration. But the executives in the administration denied
this version of employees and explained that punishments were given only for the persons who committed misdeeds. The employees reported the biased attitude of the administration in awarding punishments to the employees. They explained that the employees who belong to the union, which was pro-management, were given slight and meager punishment, whereas the employees belonging to anti-management received severe punishments. From this it can be inferred that the administration and management want to keep the disunity among employees in order to prevent anti-management strike and agitation. Among the different punishments awarded, suspension seemed to be the most frequently used punishment method. Since multi-union and the involvement of outside political leaders precipitate the relationship between the labour and management and also lead to disunity among the employees, single union was favoured by many.

The Gandhian principles such as Truth, Nonviolence, Self-purification, Means and End, Trusteeship And Sarvodaya/Win-Win approach, which help conflict resolution process, were not included in the worker education classes. The worker education teachers and employees confirmed this. But they expressed their wish for these aspects to be included in the worker education classes in future in order to promote industrial peace.

SUGGESTIONS

*Government*

The Labour policy can have a broader perspective with due emphasis for technology and modernization, giving primary
importance to standardization of workload and security of employment. The government should ensure that modernization process take place at the unit level after having thorough discussion with and getting consent from the employees about the plan of retrenchment, redeployment and ret lining in collaboration with employees. The Labour legislation, particularly on social security, can be amended based on greater realistic assessment of the given situation.

Government may be asked to fix a stipulated time to implement the awards with regard to industrial disputes. And the conciliation officer may be given more power so as to speed up the proceedings.

Gandhian principles and the modern conflict resolution methods are to be included and emphasized in workers education classes in all industries, which will pave the way for industrial peace and enable the workers to correct their demeanour. Similar training should also be given to executives and Government should make these two training obligatory.

The private owners and the government may introduce a trial method of 'Products be manufactured at the house of the individual members with the help of least machineries 'on certain trade. The Labour commission has to be asked to study suitable changes and recommendations for the welfare of employees. (Industry and or unit level trade unions preferably without political affiliation can be encouraged.)

*Management*
The management can do away with their traditional way of approaching the Labour and can develop Gandhian Approach of Conflict Resolution. The study reveals that the management should view the dispute situation as an opportunity, rather than a nuisance, to improve the relationship with the employees and pay immediate attention to the resolution of disputes.

In order to bridge the communication gap and clarify each other's positions on various matters related to industry, regular meet and brainstorm sessions among employees and management representatives at the micro and macro level of the industry can be initiated to share and exchange the views of each other. It will certainly help to narrow the gap between management and employees. Periodic self-appraisal may be conducted among the workers and executives to improve their performance as well as to wipe out the job dissatisfaction and problems.

Employees and executives may be given training in Gandhian concept of Nonviolence, Non-Co-Operation, Means and End, Trusteeship And Sarvodaya/Win-Win approach. The Trusteeship concept may be adopted with suitable modification and improvement in the industrial situations. Power in industry may be decentralized and workers may actively be involved in decision-making, modernization and dispute resolution process. The Conflict Resolution machinery may be strengthened in the industry in order to redress the grievances at its root.

Gandhi had said that workmen should be regarded as equals and shareholders therefore they inherit every right to
possess an accurate knowledge of the industry. The Gandhian way is intended to bring about an order of society ensuring equal status to all its members. Therefore the hierarchical and asymmetrical pattern of relationship between employees and executives may be replaced by equality in status and in relationship. In order to create this, Gandhi's concepts of bread labour and dignity of labour have to be cultivated in the minds of both. This could be implemented through workers education programmes and introducing shramdhan (donating one's physical labour for common purpose) programme on regular intervals.

Profit sharing is a step in advance of the method of joint consultation and is a precursor of co-partnership. Gandhi had envisaged labour as a co-partner, co-sharer and co-worker of capital. As such, the workers, in his view, are entitled to their own share of profits. Then alone they would begin to feel that the industry is their own for which they must put in their best efforts. This sense of belonging would motivate them towards positive thinking. The programme of profit sharing in modern terms includes developing genuine partnership between labour and management and recognizing and respecting the trade unions as a member body of the industry. This approach in some industries has demonstrated miraculous performance and growth in production and labour-management relations. By sharing profits, an employer acknowledges that profits are a legitimate concern of labour. This new approach is fast gaining ground in some industrial nations particularly in America. The trade union agreements, which include profit sharing arrangements, are increasingly common in American industry.
In case of retrenchment, the management and employees can sit together and sort out income generating programmes and steps to ensure the employee's future life. In this regard the management may consider the following suggestions:

- the ousted employees can be given some responsibility outside the industry on contract basis.
- some of the sales outlet of their production can be given to them.
- help them to set up small units to produce accessories for the main industries and associate them in their trade.

**Trade Union**

Instead of having antagonistic attitude towards the management, the trade union leaders may take all steps to establish a co-operative and friendly relationship with the management while having differences. Attaching the union with political bodies, political leaders and other organizations, which block the conflict resolution process, may be given up. Instead, the local union may be strengthened with democratic principles and practices and lose federal association with other unions in the local region may be established to show labour solidarity and unity. Thus too much of centralization in union activities which causes conflict, could be avoided. At the same time they can take innovative and creative steps to educate the workers not only about the rights but also their obligations.
The management also should give up the have of looking trade unions as adversaries and try to cultivate rapport with them.

Gandhi, the practical ideologist has suggested various concepts and means from his long experience and involvement in labour welfare activities, Some of his key ideas to deal with industrial conflicts are Truth, Non violence, Self-Purification, Trusteeship, Dignity of labour, Sarvodaya/ Win-Win, Means and End, Satyagraha etc. These ideas are irrefutable, more relevant to present context and cannot be set aside as utopian, idealistic and difficult to practice by the globalization or by any other changing phenomenon. This study concludes that the industrial peace does not depends upon the piece meal approaches of labour-management relations and the well-being of either the capitalist or labour as suggested by many management thinkers; rather it lies with the holistic approach and the welfare of both at the industrial milieu and welfare of all at the larger context as Gandhi advocated. Gandhi was a visionary who had a prophetic insight into things that concerned the society. The concepts propounded by him, the ideals advocated by him have stood the test of time and his stand on Conflict Resolution is no exception.
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