ANNEXURE A

FEEDBACK DATA

(Summary of Interviews)
Interview of Sri Rakesh Chopra, Business Head

1. The core group was a very good mix of intellect and professionals. It adopted correct approach after due analysis of the situation and invariably arrived at logical conclusions. Prior to that, we had never taken joint responsibility collectively.

2. There was total transparency and we were not constrained by anybody else. There were no groups within the group.

3. Yes, there was sometimes eruption of ego and power play and sometimes what one said had an important bearing depending upon his position/equation with the boss. 'How will boss react' was also kept in mind while expressing views.

4. Yes, we did go back from commitments made to the union. One way of looking at it is that these commitments were made when we were desperate for settlement and corrected ourselves when we had the opportunity. Another view is that it definitely reflects wrong values on our part. Yes we committed mistakes as nobody is perfect.

5. Our greatest value was trust and transparency in the core group.
6. When you are dealing with a party (union) which you know is not value driven, how can you base your negotiation on value based behaviour of management. We wanted a win-win situation but the union did not believe in it. It was power play. Where comes the role of values in such a situation. We are in a sick society. Who understands and practices values.

7. The best things that happened during the change process was that we held together as a team, our analysis of various situations and the conclusions of discussions.

8. We could not create complete awareness of the situation amongst the larger community and also could not manage the key group of persons in the union.
Interview of Sri Beeram Singh, Union President

1. There was resistance to change among the leaders because they had enjoyed certain benefits and freedom from the very beginning. They had never worked and did not care for discipline. They had enjoyed power and change would have meant loss of power. They probably forgot that the company will have no future if people do not change and work sincerely and in the process they may also not have any future. They had no concern for the company and for them their vested interest was supreme.

2. Senior and positive leadership could not control them as it was the question of their survival as well. The survival of senior leaders was also dependent on the support of these leaders within the union and the senior leaders, especially the president was leading a team of undesirable elements. The company did not create culture of discipline and had given undue freedom to all especially leaders as a result of which the leaders did not care for anybody. If the leaders were rascals, he had to be head rascal, as made by circumstances and he could not control the situation.

3. Management’s greatest strength was its unity and team work of top management which had not happened any time earlier. Everybody was party to the decision and felt bound by it.
4. The best part of management’s strategy was the presentation made by business head to the union. It was a great attempt to create awareness about the present scenario. Unfortunately, the negative leadership did not want to understand it.

5. Personal conduct of top management personnel played important role in creating trust or mistrust about what they used to say. One business head was always doing share business in office, using official machinery and staff. He was capable of any manipulation and that is what he did while getting the settlement signed. He (Beeram) did not read settlements of other divisions while signing but made it a point to read the settlement of the business divisions of the said business head and found that one additional clause was added without any previous discussion or consultation, which had to be deleted while signing.

6. Similarly there were business heads who had the practical attitude and value based behaviour where he had the faith and trust that they can be relied upon.

7. The change facilitator was one who could be trusted because of his values of fairness, transparency, compassion and sympathy. The way one conducts himself creates an image of him and the other person accordingly trusts or mistrusts him.

8. Union agreed to appoint the change facilitator (Mr. Arora) as an arbitrator because he was considered as trustworthy in his individual capacity and who shall
be fair while taking a decision. He could not trust anyone except Mr. Taneja and Mr. Arora. Devraj was one who could never be trusted.

9. Violence in the general body on 16\textsuperscript{th} March 1999 was a preplanned act of negative elements who did not want the settlement to be signed.

10. Yes the speech of S.D. Tyagi, who is considered to be a value based person, had the impact on workmen but it was after the workmen had learnt the lesson by way of loss of wage due to strike.

11. The agreement has been implemented and management got what it wanted but it was a win-lose situation as the management did not provide any heeling touch and did not make any effort to create right environment which could generate trust and feeling of cooperation.
Interview of Sri Devraj Singh, Business Head

1. Chairman never shared his vision, if he had any. I do not know what was his vision. Adhoc statements could not be taken as vision. He only had wishful thinking and used to give pep-talk.

2. Chairman used to make statements which would look like vision statement but had no belief in them. He only knew how to say those things.

3. Chairman had no conviction but only a wishful thinking of an ideal state.

4. The vision was ours and we worked on it. We managed the process.

5. Something happened quite unique which had never happened in the past. The formation of core group and working together.

6. It was a herculean task to keep the boss in line – to see that he does not buckle in.

7. Chairman has been in habit of attributing his weaknesses to business heads and blame for buckling in but the fact remains that it was always the chairman who buckled in. It was an uphill task to keep him under control so that he does not buckle in.
8. Overall, the core group worked very well. Discussions were frequent and frank. There was no game playing within the group.

9. There are instances where there was lack of transparency and intellectual dishonesty on the part of change facilitator and few business heads. The change facilitator made an offer of increase of Rs. 2500/600 to the union without the knowledge of core group. Similarly, Rakesh was not fair to other divisions when he was discounting Rs. 1200 already given. He was not wearing the corporate hat and was being selfish.

10. Individual values did play an important role but there were no organizational values.

11. The change facilitator was accepted as an arbitrator by the union not because of values but he was perceived by union as pro-labour and would take care of them.

12. Post strike back tracking on certain commitments was right. The situation had changed as the union had gone on strike. Oral commitments have no value – you can always back track.

13. The best thing that happened during the change process was that we did not give anything retrospectively, the draft of the agreement was very good, there was a
united front of management (core group) with clarity of roles and there was internal sharing and communication.

14. Our assessment as to what will clinch the deal went wrong and we were unable to avert the strike.

15. The communication, public relation and the management of the core group by the change facilitator was very good.

16. The change facilitator did not play any game but used to play chairman’s card to push his ideas. This was not value based behaviour.
Interview of Sri Rajan Sinha, Corporate General Manager Training

1. Change was possible due to management’s unity and shared vision at the top.

2. The chairman who has been wavering in the past and could not take a firm stand did not waver and took a firm stand because of the collective voice of the core group.

3. Management had no hidden agenda.

4. Management did not follow divide and rule policy.

5. Change facilitator maintained cordiality of relations even with adversaries.

6. There was no vindictiveness on the part of the management.

7. The management talked to everybody and tried to convince about the need for change.

8. The conduct of management was value based. Offers of calling off the strike against money deals were turned down.
9. The management was very fair and transparent and did not promote any particular group.

10. Due to value based conduct of the management, especially the change facilitator, sincerity of purpose was never doubted in spite of difference of opinion.

11. Based on its conduct, the management could create a general perception that it was not playing politics but was serious on issues.

12. There was never any charge leveled that the management was patronizing or promoting a particular group and there were no personal attacks on anyone.

13. The business heads, along with change facilitator, presented a common front devising a common strategy.

14. Circulars jointly issued by the change facilitator (Mr. Arora) and the concerned business head showed joint approach and common understanding.
Interview of Sri S.D. Tyagi – Union General Secretary

1. There was resistance to change amongst leadership for fear of loss of support from workers that is vote bank and also for loss of power as enjoyed by them since long. In certain cases the personal vested interests were getting adversely affected.

2. Another factor for resistance to change was that the leaders were afraid of disclosing facts before workmen as they would have been termed as management’s chamcha.

3. Senior leadership could not control the negative leadership as they had a different value system and had no trust in seniors. Rather, they had ill-feelings for them and under these circumstances the negative leadership did not care for and listen to senior/ positive leadership.

4. The violence in the general body meeting of 16th March was planned and organized by negative elements to sabotage the settlement.

5. The greatest strength of the management was its unity which never existed earlier.
6. Management's approach was fair and balanced, showing willingness to sign the settlement but not at any cost.

7. Management was not only fair but the issues raised by management had the strength and were genuine and that is why the leadership always tried to avoid these issues.

8. Management was very well prepared with details and logic based on principles.

9. Management's decisions were tough and firm but there was no ill-will against anybody. The management did not show any bitter feeling even against those who were negative.

10. Management demonstrated great patience, tolerance and was forbearing. It had no revengeful attitude.

11. Amongst top management people might be soft or tough but they all were firm in their decision. Remaining firm, the management tried its level best to avoid conflict and confrontation.

12. Those with value based conduct amongst the top management enjoyed trust and respect. The president of the union praised Mr. Arora in the general body meeting that he was a religious and trustworthy person. Workers even touched Mr. Arora's feet which was not relished by some of the union leaders.
13. The agreement has been implemented. Few leaders were opposing it till last but workers have willingly accepted it.

14. Direct communication in the form of meeting with the workers would have not succeeded as the overall trust on management was missing. Even the line managers had no personal touch with the workers. Earlier, there was total lack of human touch.

15. In the past when the union was strong, it did not care for managers and when management became strong it became revengeful. Nobody tried to build a culture of trust and mutual cooperation in the past.

16. The change brought about through the new settlement is the foundation for a new culture.
Interview of Sri Arvind Agarwal – Business Head

1. In retrospect, I think, among the business heads we had clear vision and the desire in respect of bringing high productivity work culture in the company. This was consistent with chairman’s own vision as well. As such there was no gap in vision. Gaps, if any, were at the implementation level.

2. I think we, as members of the core group, did a pretty good job and it is only because of this we were able to manage the boss and take the long strike in our stride. Rakesh and Devraj played critical roles in preparing boss’s mind in this regard.

3. The interactions in the core group were reasonably candid. There were occasionally surprises regarding ‘deals’ which some of the business heads had in their respective domains. But those were far and few.

4. As regards values, we were driven more by the need to make our operations competitive and profitable. We also realized that none of us alone can make that happen since labour was fully united under a common umbrella. We, therefore, had to come together to clear our thoughts and take united approach in dealing with labour situation and only then, there was any future for the company. So
essentially, in my opinion, cooperation came out of our common need for survival and prosperity.

5. The members of the top management team (core group) also had a strong sense of identification with each other. I distinctly recall the long night we spent together in Rakesh's office when we were gheraod by the union. We all demonstrated total solidarity though the union pressure was more on seeking an apology from chilana, which was strictly tractor division matter. This was a clear display of solidarity.

6. In terms of values, I think we were fired more by need to survive and prosper rather than any fundamental value.

7. The two things we did best were the business head sitting together, spending the time needed to evolve a common approach to the problem and giving the time the subject needed.

8. There was a thought in the mind of the business heads that the HR head had already committed specific terms with the union.
Interview of Sri S.K. Taneja – Business Head

1. There was no gap in the vision of the chairman and that of the core group. However, the motive/ objective were different. We wanted quality working, homogenous working, no one up man ship and a common business objective. The chairman wanted profits and nice words from people. You can have a profitable business but a lousy company. We wanted profitable and nice company.

2. The chairman never shared his vision or objectives. There has never been a dialogue on the subject.

3. It was the core group which was managing the change process. Chairman was not managing it. He only used to make adhoc interventions.

4. The members of the core group were not playing any game but sometimes they were not very honest in their interactions. Total transparency was missing.

5. We could bring only partial change. Though we were on the right path, the cure has not been complete as we could not change the mindset. It was left half way.
6. Values are very important but they are established over a period of time. Very few business heads had established certain values. If these values were synergized, they could have played far better and stronger role.

7. Arbitration is a glaring example where union trusted the value based behaviour of the change facilitator and accepted him as an arbitrator, though he was a member of management team.

8. It was not a value based behaviour and was bad going back from commitments made to the union. People were trying to fit in boss’s requirements.

9. The best thing during the whole change process was working out a shared vision by the members of the core group during the meeting at Vatika and sharing that vision with the union through the presentations made by all the business heads.

10. Our weak area has been that of trusting and sharing information with few wrong people.
Interview of Sri Brig. Joginder Singh – Corporate Head - Security

1. Prior to the start of change process, the security was a demoralized force as nobody cared for rules and discipline. It was the union leaders who were the bosses and even the managers could not say anything to them.

2. During the change process itself we could see a change and all the security plant heads and other security staff started feeling revitalized and motivated with improved discipline. They could control the movement of people at the gate and helped in maintaining discipline.

3. The union leaders and the workmen who used to visit me during the whole change process, especially during the strike period used to say that this time the management is fully united and firm. During informal discussion they also used to share that the issues raised by the management were genuine and necessary for the survival of the company but for them it was the question of their vote bank.

4. Day-to-day interactions between the members of the core group helped a lot in working out and implementing the strategies for change.

5. The various communication meetings for sharing the vision of change with managers, held in all the divisions of the company, were of great help in
motivating the managers and giving them the confidence that the management was fully behind them.

6. Values did play a very important role during the change process. This was evident from the behaviour of the leaders as they showed tremendous respect for Mr. Taneja and Mr. Arora while they were never prepared to believe and trust Mr. Devraj.

7. Similarly the management could trust persons like S.D. Tyagi, Surendra etc., who were considered to be value based leaders.

8. It is only because of the value based conduct of S.D. Tyagi that the workmen listened to him with rapt attention in the last general body meeting and accepted whatever he said.

9. The only failure which I could see was that we somehow could not win over and change the mindset of the negative leadership within the union, which kept on creating road blocks till the end.
Interview of Sri Vikram Sharma – Business Head

1. The chairman also wanted to bring change but did not know how to go about it. Further, he had a short term vision and his objective was short term gain, not building a company with a culture of productivity and discipline.

2. In view of chairman’s short term vision, he used to buckle in very often and the union was aware of his weakness. It was the core group which always persuaded him not to buckle in and that is how, with chairman’s support, we could bring about the change.

3. It was all because of the situation analysis, diagnoses and finalization of vision by the members of the core group that we could work out change strategy and implement it.

4. The facilitation and coordination of the core group by Mr. Arora was excellent. The formation and the successful working of the core group was something unique which had never happened in the past. Everyone in the core group was committed to the vision, as finalized and worked wholeheartedly towards achieving it.
5. Values are very important and they played an important role during the whole process. These values were individual and not organizational. It was based on these individual values that certain people enjoyed trust and confidence of the leaders and the workmen while others did not.

6. I personally feel that the change facilitator was accepted as an arbitrator by the union because of his value based conduct and that he was trusted by all the union leaders. Though others might say that he was perceived to be a pro-labour man but the fact remains that it was his value based conduct that he was trusted.

7. It was an incorrect decision on the part of one division to have entered into a mini agreement for certain short term games, especially when the change process was on.
Interview of Sri Suresh Anand – Operation Head

1. When we started the change process, we all knew that the culture of the company cannot be changed so easily without a confrontation. The change which we wanted would have meant that the management has got back the right to manage instead of the union managing. We were therefore, not confident of chairman’s support in case the confrontation takes place.

2. It was because of the unity of the core group members and one voice in which they approached the chairman, compelled him to take a firm stand and support the strategy as worked out by the core group.

3. The interactions within the core group were free and frank and all developments and informations were shared amongst all the members.

4. The communication amongst the core group members was so perfect that even if there was no meeting to take place, any core group member or the change facilitator who had some information regarding any important development, used to share that information over phone with others, without loss of time.

5. The clarity of vision as worked out by the core group and working of the core group as a team were the important factors in bringing about the change.
6. The communication meetings held in various divisions and also the training programmes conducted for managers proved to be very useful as it developed clarity about the roles and the manner in which they were to conduct themselves.

7. May it be top management people or the union leaders, certain people commanded respect and trust based on their individual value system and conduct as there were no organizational values involved.

8. Though we have been able to bring change and the situation is far far better but the major question is whether we shall be able to sustain and institutionalize it.
Interview of Sri M.C. Sarkar – Operation Head

1. No change was possible without a vision, which was worked out by the core group in its meeting at Vatika.

2. The next best thing happened was that of sharing the vision with the line managers in the communication meetings held individually for the business divisions.

3. I have no hesitation in sharing that initially the managers did not believe in what was being shared as they had lost hopes of any improvement and had lost the right to manage.

4. When these very managers saw that the management was taking firm stands on issues and was sending clear signals to one and all that the management now means business, it made a great difference in the attitude of line managers and they also felt involved.

5. The change could be brought about because the management involved and motivated all concerned viz., the senior management staff, line managers, supervisors, security and HR personnel and gave them necessary inputs regarding their role during the change process.
6. Transparency in the core group, without anybody playing games, was one of the key factors behind the success. The credit for successfully managing the core group to a great extent goes to the change facilitator. No member of the core group was playing any game and everyone was committed to the objective of bringing change.

7. The mini agreement of the tractor division was a business need and there was nothing wrong in entering into the said agreement. Yes it did create problem for the final settlement but there are solutions to every problem.

8. Yes, values are important but we should try to develop organizational values rather than focusing on individual values.

9. We all trusted persons like S.D. Tyagi amongst the leaders because of his value based conduct and finally it was only S.D. Tyagi who could get us the settlement.
Interview of Sri P.K. Malik – Business Head

1. My division is a very small as compared to other divisions of the company. Probably, that was the reason that I was not a member of the core group.

2. The settlement and the whole change process was going to have its impact on my division also and, therefore, I have been keenly following up the developments directly as well as kept myself fully informed through you.

3. It was probably first time in the history of the company that the management took a firm stand and decided to bring about a cultural transformation, a transformation through which we could survive and grow.

4. As I was not directly involved in the whole process, I may not be in a position to comment about the process of change but it has been a great achievement to have brought about the change, taking firm stand and without any ill-will even against those who played a negative role.

5. The best part of the total change process, as I could see, was total involvement of all concerned, regular communication, training about the roles of different people, regular follow up and commitment on the part of all concerned for change.
Interview of Sri Bharat Caprihan – Business Head

1. I joined this company as an engineer trainee and have risen to the position of business head. I have seen this company growing and also going down. The so-called downfall of the company has been mainly due to the culture of indiscipline and low productivity which had developed during last 7 – 8 years.

2. It has been a herculean task to change this culture because it adversely affected the vested interest of the union leaders.

3. Chairman also wanted change but had no clarity of vision. Change for him meant more profit. Business heads also wanted profit but they simultaneously wanted a culture and environment of productivity and discipline.

4. The core group did an excellent job of finalizing the vision and working out strategy.

5. The union never thought of that the management shall be so united and speak in one voice as it had never happened in the past.

6. The meetings of the core group were most professional, to the point. Discussions were free and frank and there was no game playing. However there were few
instances where transparency in interaction was lacking for various reasons. Overall the core group not only worked very well but the credit of bringing change goes to the core group only.

7. The mini agreement of the tractor division was unfortunate and was entered into with a very short term vision. This created serious problems and delayed the change process by 8 – 9 months.

8. The corporate HR head/ change facilitator should have taken a stand against the said mini agreement and not taking a stand has been his failure.

9. Though there was no laid down value systems by the core group but it was very evident during the whole change process that individual values played an important role like that of S.D. Tyagi and Surendra in the union and Mr. Arora and few others in the management group.

10. We all are human beings. We all are bound to commit mistakes but the fact remains that we have been able to get a very good settlement and have been able to bring about some change in the culture. The need today is to move forward from here and continue working for creating an awareness amongst one and all about the changing industrial scenario and accordingly change the attitudes and mindset of people.