There could be many inherent drawbacks in the structure of organisations. The organisational distance created by traditional hierarchy is the most destructive one. The second one is the presence of highly assertive and unsurmountable bureaucracy. The presence of bureaucracy would necessarily result in red-tapism and impersonalisation. The bureaucracy also separates the decision makers from those who execute the decisions.

The organisational drawbacks mentioned are most serious hurdles in the creation of cordial and intimate interpersonal relationship within the organisations and the building up of a healthy organisational climate.

The impact of the organisation structure on interpersonal relationship in three sample units, are dealt with in this chapter. Some of the related factors are:

- Freedom to approach the manager on job related matters.
- Freedom to approach the manager on personal problems.
- Freedom to use resources for organisational work.
- Company's financial strength.
- Company's technical strength.
- Effort to reduce work related conflicts.
- Salary and perks.
- Career prospects.
The factors mentioned above, directly or indirectly are the creations of the organisational structure. Those factors also have a direct impact on the interpersonal relationship, particularly the relationship between managers and other employees working under them.

The finding of the study at three different units are discussed below. The frequency distribution of the respondents in all the three sample units are as mentioned in Chapter III. The responses received from the employees and the executives are discussed separately.

I KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION LIMITED

Table No. 13 shows that there is no uniformity in the nature of the response to various items mentioned in the questionnaire. In this organisation, many of the vital issues were avoided by a large number of the respondents. For instance, in certain cases up to fifty seven percent of the respondents, decided to stay non-committed in case of suitability of a flat organisation, about forty three percent did not want to answer any question related to 'effort to reduce work related conflicts'. As for 'Freedom to approach manager on job-related matters', only sixteen percent mentioned it is very good, thirty three percent as good, and twenty three percent as satisfactory. Similarly, 'freedom to approach manager on personal problems', twenty three percent expressed that they do not want to answer,
### TABLE NO. 13

**IMPACT OF ORGANISATION STRUCTURE ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP**

**TOTAL NO. 60**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL NO</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL NO./%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freedom to approach the manager on job related matters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Freedom to approach the manager on personal problems</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freedom to use resources for organisational work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Company’s financial strength</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Company’s technical strength</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Effort to reduce work related conflicts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salary and perks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Freedom to manage oneself</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Suitability of a flat organisation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Desirability of a combined canteen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- NC - No comments
- US - Unsatisfactory/Do not agree
- SAT - Satisfactory/May be OK
- G - Good/Desirable
- VG - Very good/A Must
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while forty percent mentioned that it is satisfactory. To the question on the 'Freedom to use resources for organisational work', only three percent pointed out that it is just satisfactory, thirty percent avoided answering and twenty percent expressed that it is unsatisfactory. In the case of 'effort to reduce work-related conflict', forty three percent remained non-committed and twenty three percent expressed it is satisfactory and another twenty three percent expressed it is very good. In the case of salary and perks, about fifty seven percent mentioned that it is just satisfactory. Common canteen is supported by sixty two percent of the respondents who expressed, may be 'O.K.'. Freedom to manage oneself is not prevalent because sixty percent of the respondents mentioned it is only satisfactory. The employees are not aware of the good and bad effects of a flat organisation. This is evident from the fact that upto to fifty seven percent of the respondents refused to comment on this subject. Similarly the company's HRD initiative is not appreciated by the people. While thirty three percent avoided giving a reply, twenty seven percent mentioned it is satisfactory.

The questionnaire designed for executives was aimed to gather information on the following aspects.

* Dependency syndrome found in Indian organisations.
* Functional efficiency of top-heavy management.
* Advantage of multi-level vertical structure.
* Suitability of different types of structure.
* Communication in a flat organisation.
* Possibility of introducing a flat organisation in Indian companies.
The responses received from the executive respondents, shown at Table No. 14 definitely indicate lack of experience of working in a flat organisation. Perhaps, such organisations are very rare in India. As such, the advantages of a flat system are not known to the respondents. The responses, therefore, are not considered realistic. However, it indicates the general feeling of the executives based on whatever information they possess. Besides, certain items like separate corporate office, colonial hang-over etc., can be easily understood by them and the responses taken as true. About fifty six percent of the respondents stated that superficial undue adoration of superiors is the most noticeable sign of dependency syndrome. Forty four percent of respondents felt that multilevel vertical structure is advantageous because it can minimise errors and lapses. Thirty seven percent stated it is safe also because responsibility cannot be pin-pointed.

This certainly is due to the ignorance of the advantages of flat organisation structure and also they may be favourably disposed to the existence of bureaucracy. The impression was further confirmed from the responses to the statement that 'flow of information in flat organisation is fast and individual satisfaction is greater'. Almost sixty nine percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement. However, when asked about the possibility of introducing a flat organisation, fifty six percent of the respondents expressed that it is possible only when all the people are capable and committed. Eighty seven percent felt...
### TABLE NO. 14 (EXECUTIVES)

**IMPACT OF ORGANISATION STRUCTURE ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NO. 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL NO</th>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>%AGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Dependency syndrome found in Indian organisations**
   - a. Superficial undue adoration of superiors 27 56.2
   - b. Excessive efforts to please the boss 12 25
   - c. Effort to influence the significant ones through servitude, unethical practices etc 6 12.5
   - d. None of them 3 6.3 48/100

2. **Do top heavy management adversely affect the functional efficiency of lower executives**
   - a. Yes 24 50
   - b. No 24 50
   - c. Not in all cases - -
   - d. No comments - - 48/100

3. **Advantages of multilevel vertical structure**
   - a. Errors and lapses can be minimised 21 43.7
   - b. Safe, since responsibility cannot be pinpointed 18 37.5
   - c. Workload gets reduced. More people to worry about 3 6.3
   - d. None 6 12.5 48/100

4. **Which of the following organisation structure is most ideal for an organisation**
   - a. Four-tier (MD-GM-Department Head-Supervisor) 24 50
   - b. Three-tier (MD-GM-Supervisor) 24 50
   - c. Two-tier (MD-Department Head) - -
   - d. None - - 48/100
5. The flow of information in a flat organisation is fast and individual satisfaction is greater
   a. Yes 15 31.3
   b. No 33 68.7
   c. Depends on the organisation - -
   d. Depends on the task - - 48/100

6. The possibility of introducing a flat organisation in Indian companies
   a. The colonial attitude of managers will not permit it 12 25
   b. Possible only when all the people are capable and committed 27 56.3
   c. The traditional Indian joint family type of flat organisation can work wonders 9 18.7
   d. Flat organisation need not always be successful - - 48/100

7. What is the distinct hangover of colonialism
   a. Having the corporate office away from the production centre at a posh locality 21 43.8
   b. Far flung reporting relationship, aloofness and superiority feeling of the top brass 9 18.7
   c. Ill-treatment, lack of concern for employees and neglect of their personal growth 6 12.5
   d. All the three 12 25 48/100

8. Your view about having the separate corporate office at a luxurious place, away from work place
   a. Decision making demands a conducive and comfortable environment 6 12.5
   b. Top executives must be available at the workplace. It will be a morale booster to the work force. They will have a better understanding of the operations of the company 42 87.5 48/100
9. Can the concept of 'nishkama karma' integrated with employees functioning?
   a. It has no place in the present day materialistic and virtueless society  
      - 25
   b. The concept is unrealistic  
      - 37.5
   c. In an atmosphere filled with concern for others, selflessness, trust, sense of security etc., it is possible  
      - 37.5
   d. It should be first integrated with functioning of top bosses  
      - 48/100

10. Managers do not spontaneously like to interact with shop floor workers, why?
    a. They differ in status  
       - 37.5
    b. Workers not educated, do not dress well, habits and language differ  
       - 31.3
    c. The castelism in the society is also carried to the work place  
       - 12.5
    d. B and C both  
       - 48/100

11. Why subordinates disobey their bosses?
    a. Poor relationship due to mutual distrust, disrespect etc.  
       - 50
    b. Lack of concern for subordinates  
       - 43.7
    c. No workers participation in decision making; workers consider managers as exploiters  
       - 6.3
    d. Managers are irrational, unjust and dishonest in most of their dealings with their subordinates  
       - 48/100

12. What is the best way open to managers to get more involvement of employees?
    a. Through leadership styles acceptable to employees  
       - 68.7
    b. Be very strict, help the needy at the right time  
       - 25
    c. See that they are disorganised and helpless  
       - -
    d. Give full freedom to the workers in their activities  
       - 6.3 48/100
that the top executives must be available at the work place and not at the corporate office which is situated away from the place of production. Citing the reason for disobeying the bosses by the subordinates, fifty percent of respondents mentioned that it is because of the poor relationship, mutual distrust and disrespect. Almost sixty nine percent felt that employee's involvement can be generated through the leadership styles acceptable to the employees.

From the analysis of the data given in Table No.13, and Table No. 14, it can be concluded that the existing organisation structure of KPC, as shown in the profile of the company in Chapter III, has a distinct adverse impact on interpersonal relationship. KPC functions as a government department, predominated by the typical bureaucracy, red-tapism and slow decision making.

The analysis did not show any significant variation in response based on the personal factors like language, religion, length of service and age. However, female employee respondents were not in favour of the managers visiting their homes. Similarly some of the less educated employees did not answer certain questions, relating to leadership styles, organisation structure and reporting relationship. Their knowledge in these areas was vague. On further questioning, the female respondents clarified that they are not in favour of the managers visiting their houses because the managers belong to a higher status. If they go to their homes, the respondents expressed, they do not feel comfortable.
A glance at the responses received, shown in Table No. 15, gives an impression that the organisational structure of the company is helpful to create a healthy organisational climate. Majority of the responses are on the higher side of the scale. 'Freedom to approach the manager on job related matters, was rated as good by fifty percent of the respondents and very good by thirty percent. 'Freedom to approach the manager on personal problem' was rated as good by thirty percent and very good by fifty percent of the respondents. Similarly 'Freedom to manage oneself' was rated good by forty percent and very good by fifty percent of the respondents. The company is having a combined canteen since the last seven years and almost all the workers are fairly happy about the running of the canteen. Seventy percent of the respondents, when asked about the desirability of a combined canteen mentioned that it is a must. On certain matters such as 'salary and perks', twenty to thirty percent remained non-committed. As regards the suitability of a flat organisation, the response indicated certain amount of confusion. Same was also true about the effort to reduce work-related conflicts.

The reaction of the executives to the questions was not much different from the responses of the executives belonging to the KPC (see Table No. 16). Fifty six percent of the respondents stated that 'Superficial undue ordination of superiors', is the common dependency syndrome found in Indian organisations. Forty three percent mentioned that having a separate corporate office away from the work place is a distinct hang-over of colonialism. Almost eighty eight percent of the respondents felt that the top executives must be available at the work place and not at the corporate office situated far away from
### TABLE NO. 15 (EMPLOYEES)

**IMPACT OF ORGANISATION STRUCTURE ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP**

**TOTAL NO. 60**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL No</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL NO.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Freedom to approach the manager on job related matters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Freedom to approach the manager on personal problems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Freedom to use resources for organisational work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Company's financial strength</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Company's technical strength</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Effort to reduce work related conflicts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Salary and perks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Freedom to manage oneself</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Suitability of a flat organisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Desirability of a combined canteen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- NC - No comments
- US - Unsatisfactory/Do not agree
- SAT - Satisfactory/May be OK
- VG - Very good/A Must
- G - Good/Desirable
### TABLE NO. 16 (EXECUTIVES)

**IMPACT OF ORGANISATION STRUCTURE ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP**

**TOTAL NO. 48**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL NO</th>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>%AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dependency syndrome found in Indian organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Excessive efforts to please the boss</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Superficial undue adoration of superiors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Effort to influence the significant ones through servitude, unethical practices etc</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. None of them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do top heavy management adversely affect the functional efficiency of lower executives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Not in all cases</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. No comments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advantages of multilevel vertical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Errors and lapses can be minimised</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Safe, since responsibility cannot be pinpointed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Workload gets reduced. More people to worry about</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Which of the following organisation structure is most ideal for an organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Four-tier</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MD-GM-Department Head-Supervisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Three-tier</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MD-GM-Supervisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Two-tier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MD-Department Head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The flow of information in a flat organisation is fast and individual satisfaction is greater
   a. Yes 15 31.3
   b. No 33 68.7
   c. Depends on the organisation - -
   d. Depends on the task - - 48/100

6. The possibility of introducing a flat organisation in Indian companies
   a. The colonial attitude of managers will not permit it 12 25
   b. Possible only when all the people are capable and committed 27 56.3
   c. The traditional Indian joint family type of flat organisation can work wonders 9 18.7
   d. Flat organisation need not always be successful - - 48/100

7. What is the distinct hangover of colonialism
   a. Having the corporate office away from the production centre at a posh locality 21 43.8
   b. Far flung reporting relationship, aloofness and superiority feeling of the top brass 9 18.7
   c. Ill-treatment, lack of concern for employees and neglect of their personal growth 6 12.5
   d. All the three 12 25 48/100

8. Your view about having the separate corporate office at a luxurious place, away from work place
   a. Decision making demands a conducive and comfortable environment 6 12.5
   b. Top executives must be available at the work place. It will be a morale booster to the work force. They will have a better understanding of the operations of the company 42 87.5 48/100
9. Can the concept of 'niskama karma' integrated with employees functioning
   a. It has no place in the present day materialistic and virtueless society 12 25
   b. The concept is unrealistic 18 37.5
   c. In an atmosphere filled with concern for others, selflessness, trust, sense of security etc., it is possible 18 37.5
   d. It should be first integrated with functioning of top bosses - - 48/100

10. Managers do not spontaneously like to interact with shop floor workers, why?
   a. They differ in status 18 37.5
   b. Workers not educated, do not dress well, habits and language differ 15 31.3
   c. The casteism in the society is also carried to the work place 6 12.5
   d. B and C both 9 18.7 48/100

11. Why subordinates disobey their bosses
   a. Poor relationship due to mutual distrust, disrespect etc. 24 50
   b. Lack of concern for subordinates 21 43.7
   c. No workers participation in decision making; workers consider managers as exploiters 3 6.3
   d. Managers are irrational, unjust and dishonest in most of their dealings with their subordinates - - 48/100

12. What is the best way open to managers to get more involvement of employees
   a. Through leadership styles acceptable to employees 33 68.7
   b. Be very strict, help the needy at the right time 12 25
   c. See that they are disorganised and helpless - - 48/100
   d. Give full freedom to the workers in their activities 3 6.3 48/100
the factory. (The response in this case is almost unanimous because the company does not have a separate corporate office). The main cause for disobeying the bosses by their subordinates is shown as poor relationship due to mutual distrust and disrespect, by fifty percent of the respondents. While almost forty four percent stated that it is due to lack of concern for the subordinates. About sixty nine percent felt employees involvement can be obtained through leadership style acceptable to the employees. As regards the nature of organisation structure the response indicates confusion. They are not aware of the advantages and disadvantages of a flat organisation or top heavy structure. However, fifty six percent of the respondents agreed that a flat organisation can be introduced in Indian companies only when all the people are capable and committed.

Though it is a multinational company and organisational structure rigid, the informal style of functioning of the executives has practically neutralised the rigidity. As a result, the interpersonal relationship as mentioned in chapter III, is favourable for building a healthy organisational climate.

At the same time as indicated by the executives of the company, there are certain undesirable features which are ought to be removed. As mentioned in Chapter III, the interpersonal relationship in the company is on the healthier side and it is not adversely affected by the organisational structure.
A mention about the manager employee relation has already been made in Chapter III, where it was shown that the atmosphere in the company is charged with tension which indicates that there is something basically wrong with the organisation structure and management practices of the company (see Table No. 17). Many of the employees, up to thirty six percent refused to comment on the question on effort to reduce work-related conflicts. Twenty percent stated that it is unsatisfactory and only thirty six percent stated that it is satisfactory. With regard to the desirability of having combined canteen, about forty seven percent expressed that they do not agree. Similarly, about sixty four percent mentioned that the salary and perks are unsatisfactory. Freedom to use resources for organisational work was rated as good only by twenty one percent and satisfactory by twenty nine percent, while twenty two percent stated that they have no comments. The rating on freedom to approach the manager on personal problems were thirty six percent as satisfactory, twenty one percent as good and another twenty one percent as unsatisfactory. The reaction related to freedom to approach the manager on job-related matters were, seventeen percent 'very good', twenty eight percent 'good', about eighteen percent 'satisfactory'. Another eighteen percent stated 'unsatisfactory', while about eighteen percent expressed that they have no comments. These responses support the impression stated at the outset of the analysis.

Even the responses from the executives does not give a clear-cut tendency towards the impact of organisational structure (see Table No. 18). However, in certain issues the responses are comparable with that obtained from the other two sample units. 'Superficial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL NO</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL NO./%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freedom to approach the manager on job related matters</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Freedom to approach the manager on personal problems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freedom to use resources for organisational work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Company's financial strength</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Company's technical strength</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Effort to reduce work related conflicts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salary and perks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Freedom to manage oneself</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Suitability of a flat organisation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Desirability of a combined canteen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>56/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- NC - No comments
- US - Unsatisfactory/Do not agree
- SAT - Satisfactory/May be OK
- G - Good/Desirable
- VG - Very good/A Must
### TABLE NO. 18 (EXECUTIVES)

**IMPACT OF ORGANISATION STRUCTURE ON INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP**

**TOTAL NO. 40**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL NO</th>
<th>ASPECTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>%AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dependency syndrome found in Indian organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Superficial undue adoration of superiors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Excessive efforts to please the boss</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Effort to influence the significant ones through servitude, unethical practices etc</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. None of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do top heavy management adversely affect the functional efficiency of lower executives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Not in all cases</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. No comments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advantages of multilevel vertical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Errors and lapses can be minimised</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Safe, since responsibility cannot be pinpointed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Workload gets reduced. More people to worry about</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which of the following organisation structure is most ideal for an organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a. Four-tier  
(MD-GM-Department Head-Supervisor) | 30 | 75 | 40/100 |
| b. Three-tier  
(MD-GM-Supervisor) | - | - | |
| c. Two-tier  
(MD-Department Head) | - | - | |
| d. None | 10 | 25 | 40/100 |
5. The flow of information in a flat organisation is fast and individual satisfaction is greater
   a. Yes 20 50
   b. No - -
   c. Depends on the organisation 10 25
   d. Depends on the task 10 25 40/100

6. The possibility of introducing a flat organisation in Indian companies
   a. The colonial attitude of managers will not permit it - -
   b. Possible only when all the people are capable and committed 20 50
   c. The traditional Indian joint family type of flat organisation can work wonders 10 25
   d. Flat organisation need not always be successful 10 25 40/100

7. What is the distinct hangover of colonialism
   a. Having the corporate office away from the production centre at a posh locality 20 50
   b. Far flung reporting relationship, aloofness and superiority feeling of the top brass 10 25
   c. Ill-treatment, lack of concern for employees and neglect of their personal growth - -
   d. All the three 10 50 40/100

8. Your view about having a separate corporate office at a luxurious place, away from work place
   a. Decision making demands a conducive and comfortable environment 10 25
   b. Top executives must be available at the work place. It will be a morale booster to the work force. They will have a better understanding of the operations of the company 30 75 40/100
9. Can the concept of 'nishkama karma' integrated with employees functioning
   a. It has no place in the present day materialistic and virtueless society 10 25
   b. The concept is unrealistic 20 50
   c. In an atmosphere filled with concern for others, selflessness, trust, sense of security etc., it is possible 10 25
   d. It should be first integrated with functioning of top bosses - - 40/100

10. Managers do not spontaneously like to interact with shop floor workers, why?
    a. They differ in status 20 50
    b. Workers not educated, do not dress well, habits and language differ - -
    c. The casteism in the society is also carried to the work place 10 25
    d. B and C both 10 25 40/100

11. Why subordinates disobey their bosses
    a. Poor relationship due to mutual distrust, disrespect etc. 20 50
    b. Lack of concern for subordinates - -
    c. No workers participation in decision making; workers consider managers as exploiters 10 25
    d. Managers are irrational, unjust and dishonest in most of their dealings with their subordinates 10 25 40/100

12. What is the best way open to managers to get more involvement of employees
    a. Through leadership styles acceptable to employees 30 75
    b. Be very strict, help the needy at the right time - -
    c. See that they are disorganised and helpless - -
    d. Give full freedom to the workers in their activities 10 25 40/100
undue adoration of superiors' was confirmed as the dependency syndrome. Similarly, having a separate corporate office away from the factory was shown as the distinct hangover of colonialism by fifty percent of the respondents. Seventy five percent of the respondents felt that top executives must be present at the place of work and not at the corporate office situated far away. The cause for the manager's not favouring working together with the shop-floor workers was shown as 'difference in status' by fifty percent of the respondents, a serious sign of adverse interpersonal relationship. Like in the other sample units, fifty percent stated poor relationship is the cause of disobedience. Workers involvement can be encouraged through leadership styles acceptable to the employees, according to seventy five percent of the respondents. Response with regard to the pros and cons of flat organisation and top heavy mangement are not understood by the executives. The response on the subject, therefore, was erratic. Nevertheless, fifty percent of the respondents mentioned flat organisation can be introduced in any company only when all the people are capable and committed.

It can clearly be seen that the organisational structure in the company adversely affect the interpersonal relationship and the organisation climate.

Influence of personal factors

Personal factors mentioned in the questionnaire, seem to have no influence on the responses received from different language, religious or other groups. A "unity in diversity" kind of situation exists in the company. Every employee and executive was strongly concerned about his/her job, career prospects and earning. The concern was common to all. There was an air of uncertainty.
Only when the organisational loyalty and integrity is high, the people would be motivated to think about the intricacies of the policies, structure, and other future oriented and progressive measures of the company. All of them think just about the present.

CONCLUSION

The organisation structure could be totally detrimental to the creation of a healthy organisational climate, if the human factor is not integrated with it. Often the organisation builders think about the floors and walls, and of course, the operations and products while dividing the activities. The human behaviour and human responses are of least concern to them. In other words, they create the compartments or pigeon holes and fill them up with people. The problems start thereafter. Some of the sensitive issues which usually trigger off are interpersonal or interdepartmental or intradepartmental conflicts. These were considered while studying the organisational structure.

I KARNATAKA POWER CORPORATION

The most conspicuous drawback in the structure of KPC, is the organisational distance. While large number of employees avoided answering related questions, responses of many were very low in the scale. People have no freedom to take their personal problems to the executives. They have practically no freedom to use the resources even for the organisational work. On the job-related matters also the freedom to approach the managers is limited. Executives' effort to provide tension free work environment is not adequate. Salary and perks and HRD effort are below their expectations. They do not have common canteen though the employees feel it may be 'OK'. 
The executives supported the multilevel vertical hierarchy. As for the flat organisation, their responses were underlined with ignorance and guess work. They at the same time, felt Indian organisations can have the flat system of structure only when all the people are capable and committed. In other words, now, all the people are not so. They are highly against having a corporate office away from the production centre.

The organisation set up of KPC is, therefore, not in agreement with the requirement for the creation of a healthy organisational climate. The bureaucratic system with all its side effects dominates KPC.

II WIDIA (INDIA) LIMITED

The conclusion with regard to the impact of organisational structure on the interpersonal relationship has already been mentioned earlier. It is a multinational company. The organisation structure is rigid. But the employees do not feel it so, because most of the executives, including the Managing Director, come to the workers everyday. They interact formally and informally at the work spot. The only unpleasant feeling against the executives was their lack of interest in stopping groupism, which was later clarified as insignificant personal feelings.

The executives are for a more progressive structure. They are against empty hero worship, and having a separate corporate office away from the factory. While they are not sure of a flat organisation they are not adverse to it. They respect their subordinates, though, their knowledge about the employees is much below the mark. The organisation structure, thus, has practically no adverse effect on the interpersonal relationship within the company.
Most of the aspects of the organisation structure have been unfavourably commented by the employees either by such answers or by avoiding to answer them. The executives do not favour working together with the shop floor workers, because of the difference in status. They also admitted that the employees disobey because of the poor relationship. They are in support of hierarchy with multi-layers. They also felt that top-heavy management would not affect the efficiency of the lower level executives. They have fixed ideas about the structure and would not like to think of changing them. The study clearly showed that the obsolete organisation structure of International Instruments is one of the major causes of the existing strained interpersonal relationship and the unhealthy organisational climate.

It is to be admitted, no doubt, that when the economic condition is tight, every aspect of the Organisational Climate takes a reverse turn. However, in the case of International Instruments, unhealthy Organisational Climate was, perhaps, the main cause for the unfavourable economic situation.

Uniform Belief

Comparision of the responses of the executives of the three sample units reveals a general agreement on the following aspect of the organisational structure:

* Employees involvement can only be created by the leadership styles acceptable to the later.
* The main cause for disobedience of the superiors by the subordinates is due to the poor relationship.

* Superficial undue adoration of the superiors is the distinct hangover of the colonialism, found in the organisations.

* Top executives must be present at the place of work and not at the corporate office situated far away.

* A flat organisation structure can only be introduced in Indian organisations, when the people are capable and committed.

* Executives may visit the employees houses only in case of emergencies or important social functions.

The common agreement, perhaps, is a positive indication highlighting the fact that the executives welcome change. May be they are unable to introduce changes of their own, because, they are caught in the web of the carried forward redundant management practices and organisation set up. The point cannot be missed that the agreement, particularly, concerning the introduction of flat organisation, indicates the general assumption of executives about the employees. They perhaps, think that the employee at present are not capable and committed. To a question as to how they could be made capable and committed, the answer given by some of the senior executives were not satisfactory. They felt the behaviour and beliefs of the people coming from the heterogeneous segments of the society cannot be moulded by the employers.

One astonishing revelation of the executives was that most of the time they are preoccupied with the production tasks, performance, quality and company policies. The human factor is incidental. The situation was a little better in Widia (India) Limited mainly because of one
person Mr. R. Srinivasan, the Managing Director. It was also revealed that no serious thought has been
given about the behaviour modification in other two units.

In KPC, the executive think that all of them are practically government employees. Their job is
secured. They have to somehow coexist. The employees also think in the same way. As a result, there
is a "forget and forgive" attitude on both sides. The environment is sans dynamism. They accept the
present behaviour. They are used to it.

In the case of Widia (India) Limited there is a continuous effort to keep the employees motivated. They
look to the world, their competitors in the other parts of the world. Their horizon is much wider. A
steady and stable forward thrust in human resource management is noticeable. The behaviour pattern,
particularly, relating to acquiring technical skills, quality improvement, team spirit, preparedness to
take challenges, creativity etc., are undergoing gradual but noticeable change for the better.

The situation is utterly dismal in International Instruments. The executives believe that the employee
, that is, the shop-floor workers are incorrigible. None can correct their behaviour. As mentioned the
workers are not much educated. A large portion of them are ladies. Majority of them were with the
company for a long period. The owner, Managing Director, was a weak person who survived by
pleasing the workers, even at the cost of the existence of the company. The executives assumption as
a result, could, be justified to some degree. From the company's part, no effort has been, made so far,
to improve the situation. Even in the case of executives, there is an air of uncertainty and frustration.
They are not sure of their future and career prospectus. Their behaviour is filled with lack of trust and
ad hocism.