DegreeLive

Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) | Semester 4 | UK4DSCMGT202

Organisational Behaviour and Group Dynamics

Course Code: UK4DSCMGT202 • Module 4 Notes

degreelive.in

Module 4: Organisation Structure and Structural Behaviour

Course: Organisational Behaviour and Group Dynamics (UK4DSCMGT202) • Academic Level: Semester 4 • DegreeLive Academic Press

1. Concept, Foundations, and Strategic Role of Organisational Structure

An **Organisational Structure** defines the formal framework of task allocation, coordination, authority relationships, and communication patterns that directs the collective activities of employees toward enterprise strategic objectives. Structure is the skeleton of the enterprise: it dictates who reports to whom, how specialized functions collaborate, where decision-making power resides, and how information cascades across departments. An appropriately aligned structure reduces operational confusion, eliminates redundant expenditures, accelerates execution velocity, and optimizes employee motivation.

The Formal Versus Informal Organization

Every commercial enterprise encompasses two parallel, coexisting organizational realities:

- **The Formal Organization:** The deliberately planned, officially documented administrative structure depicted on official organizational charts. It establishes legitimate authority, job descriptions, departmental boundaries, standard operating procedures, and formal communication channels.
- **The Informal Organization:** The spontaneous, fluid network of interpersonal relationships, informal friendships, peer cliques, and shared norms that emerges naturally as workers interact daily. The informal organization satisfies human social needs for belonging, bypasses bureaucratic bottlenecks through informal communication ("the grapevine"), and can either powerfully accelerate corporate execution or mobilize collective resistance against management directives.

2. The Six Foundational Building Blocks of Organizational Design

When designing or restructuring an organizational architecture, corporate leadership must make deliberate choices across six structural dimensions:

DegreeLive

Design Dimension	Core Architectural Question	Structural Spectrum / Choices	Behavioral Consequences
Work Specialization	To what degree should operational tasks be sub-divided into separate, specialized individual jobs?	High Specialization (assembly lines) vs. Low Specialization (job enrichment, generalist roles).	High specialization expands early technical efficiency and lowers training costs, but eventually triggers human boredom, fatigue, absenteeism, and alienation.
Departmentalization	On what operational basis should jobs be grouped together into distinct administrative units?	Functional, Product, Geographic, Customer, or Process Departmentalization.	Determines whether employees identify with their specialized technical function (e.g., engineering) or with specific customer outcomes.
Chain of Command	To whom do individuals and groups report across the vertical hierarchy?	Rigid Scalar Chain with Unity of Command vs. Multiple Reporting Lines (Matrix architectures).	Unity of command prevents conflicting instructions, whereas dual reporting in matrix structures accelerates cross-functional agility but risks role ambiguity.
Span of Control	How many subordinates can an individual manager efficiently and effectively direct?	Narrow Span (Tall Hierarchy) vs. Wide Span (Flat Hierarchy).	Narrow spans provide close supervision but inflate overhead costs and slow communication; wide spans empower workers but risk managerial overload.
Centralization vs. Decentralization	At what hierarchical level does the ultimate decision-making authority reside?	Centralized (Headquarters executive board) vs. Decentralized (Frontline operational managers).	Centralization ensures unified strategic direction; decentralization accelerates frontline responsiveness, customer satisfaction, and employee empowerment.

DegreeLive

Design Dimension	Core Architectural Question	Structural Spectrum / Choices	Behavioral Consequences
Formalization	To what extent do explicit written rules, job descriptions, and standard procedures govern employee behavior?	High Formalization (bureaucracy, standardized SOPs) vs. Low Formalization (agile, discretionary autonomy).	High formalization ensures uniform quality and legal compliance; low formalization stimulates employee creativity and adaptability.

3. Contingency Determinants of Organizational Design

In accordance with contingency theory, there is no universally superior organizational structure. The optimal structural configuration depends on the alignment of four primary contextual forces:

A. Corporate Strategy (Alfred Chandler's Maxim: "Structure Follows Strategy")

Chandler demonstrated that an enterprise's structural design must align directly with its overarching competitive strategy:

- **Innovation Strategy:** Requires organic, flexible, loosely coupled structures with low formalization and decentralized decision-making to foster creative experimentation and rapid product prototyping (e.g., Apple, 3M).
- **Cost-Minimization Strategy:** Requires mechanistic, tightly controlled structures with high work specialization, high formalization, and centralized authority to eliminate waste and enforce operational efficiency (e.g., Walmart, low-cost airlines).
- **Imitation Strategy:** Requires hybrid structures blending mechanistic stability for core mature product lines with organic project teams to swiftly copy and commercialize successful innovations.

B. Enterprise Size

As an enterprise expands its workforce from a 20-person startup to a 50,000-employee corporation, it undergoes predictable structural transformations. Size increases structural differentiation, expands vertical hierarchical levels, multiplies specialized departments, and necessitates formal written policies. However, the relationship is non-linear: adding 500 employees to a 20-person firm radically transforms its structure, whereas adding 500 employees to an enterprise of 30,000 workers exerts minimal structural impact.

C. Production Technology (Joan Woodward and Charles Perrow)

- **Joan Woodward's Production Typologies:** *Unit / Small-Batch Production* (custom machinery) requires organic structures with flexible relationships; *Mass / Large-Batch Production* (automobile assembly) requires mechanistic, bureaucratic structures with narrow spans and high standardization; *Continuous Process Production* (chemical refineries) requires organic, highly automated technical structures with wide executive spans.

Degreelive

- **Charles Perrow's Task Framework:** Evaluated technology across *Task Variability* (number of unexpected exceptions encountered) and *Problem Analyzability* (availability of established procedural methods to solve exceptions). Routine tasks thrive in mechanistic designs; non-routine strategic research requires organic network designs.

D. Environmental Uncertainty and Volatility (Lawrence & Lorsch)

The external commercial environment varies across two critical dimensions: **Dynamism** (rate of technological and market change) and **Complexity** (heterogeneity and concentration of competitors, regulators, and suppliers). In simple, stable environments, mechanistic bureaucratic structures maximize operational cost efficiency. In complex, highly volatile environments characterized by rapid digital disruption and shifting consumer demands, organizations must adopt organic, agile, and decentralized network structures to survive.

4. Classical and Contemporary Organizational Structural Designs

A. Traditional Structural Designs

1. **Simple Structure:** Characterized by a low degree of departmentalization, wide spans of control, authority centralized in a single entrepreneurial owner-manager, and little formalization. Ideal for early-stage startups; collapses as organizational size expands due to information overload at the executive center.
2. **Functional Structure:** Groups employees according to specialized operational functions (Marketing, Finance, Operations, Human Resources, Engineering). Achieves deep functional expertise and economies of scale; suffers from functional "silos" where departments prioritize narrow technical goals over broader corporate success.
3. **Divisional Structure:** Decentralizes the enterprise into autonomous, self-contained business units organized around products, geographic markets, or customer segments. Each division houses its own functional support units (marketing, finance). Enhances responsiveness to market needs and provides clear divisional profit accountability; duplicates administrative overhead across divisions.

DegreeLive

B. Contemporary and Modern Structural Designs

Modern Structure	Architectural Mechanics	Key Strategic Advantages	Structural Vulnerabilities & Challenges
Matrix Structure	Overlays functional departmentalization onto project/product departmentalization, creating a dual command system where employees report to two distinct bosses (functional head and project manager).	Exceptional resource sharing; fluid cross-functional collaboration; optimized deployment of scarce technical specialists across multiple concurrent projects.	Violates the classical principle of Unity of Command; creates role ambiguity, power struggles between functional and project managers, and meeting fatigue.
Network / Modular Structure	The central hub corporation retains only core strategic competencies (brand management, R&D), while outsourcing all other functions (manufacturing, logistics, customer service) to specialized independent partner vendors linked electronically.	Extreme structural agility; minimal fixed capital investments; ability to scale global operations rapidly with a lean corporate staff (e.g., Nike).	Loss of direct operational control over manufacturing quality; vulnerability to supplier supply chain disruptions; risk of intellectual property leakage.
Virtual / Boundaryless Organization (Jack Welch)	Seeks to eliminate internal vertical hierarchical boundaries, remove horizontal departmental barriers, and dissolve external borders separating the company from suppliers and customers.	Unleashes boundless creativity; rapid horizontal knowledge sharing; frictionless customer co-creation; highly empowering for knowledge professionals.	Requires extraordinary clarity of vision, high interpersonal trust, and sophisticated digital collaboration tools; can feel ambiguous for workers needing structure.
Team-Based Agile Structure	The entire enterprise is structured as a network of autonomous, cross-functional "squads" and "tribes" that self-organize to solve customer problems in rapid iterative sprint cycles.	Instant customer responsiveness; high employee engagement; continuous innovation; dismantles bureaucratic inertia.	Demands deep cultural transformation; requires high baseline psychological safety and mature collaborative competencies.

5. Behavioral Implications of Organizational Structure

An enterprise's structural choices exert direct, measurable psychological impacts on employee attitudes, motivation, and task execution:

Degreelive

- **Specialization and Job Alienation:** While extreme specialization expands early output, it breeds psychological monotony, emotional burnout, and disengagement. Progressive enterprises counteract specialization fatigue through *Job Enlargement* (horizontal expansion of tasks), *Job Enrichment* (vertical expansion granting planning autonomy), and *Job Rotation*.
- **Span of Control and Supervisory Autonomy:** Wide spans of control force managers to delegate, fostering subordinate autonomy, initiative, and self-efficacy. Conversely, narrow spans result in supervisory micromanagement, stifling employee creativity and creating dependency.
- **Centralization and Psychological Ownership:** Decentralized decision-making empowers frontline workers, strengthening their affective commitment, self-determination, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Centralized structures foster feelings of helplessness and passivity among frontline personnel.

6. Jay Galbraith's Star Model of Organizational Design

Jay Galbraith established that organizational design is not simply drawing boxes on an organizational chart; it is an integrated holistic system depicted in the **Star Model**, requiring alignment across five foundational design policies:

1. **Strategy:** The foundational driver determining the company's competitive direction, core objectives, and market positioning. Strategy dictates the criteria for structural choices.
2. **Structure:** The formal distribution of authority, departmental grouping, reporting relationships, and degree of centralization across the enterprise.
3. **Processes & Lateral Coordination:** The flow of information and decision-making across departments. Lateral coordination mechanisms include direct manager contact, liaison roles, cross-functional task forces, and permanent matrix integrator roles.
4. **Reward Systems:** Aligning employee incentives, bonuses, stock options, and recognition with corporate strategic objectives, reinforcing desired behavioral norms.
5. **People Policies (Human Resource Practices):** Recruiting, training, developing, and rotating human talent to build the specific competencies required by the structural configuration.

7. Henry Mintzberg's Five Organizational Structural Configurations

Canadian management scholar Henry Mintzberg demonstrated that organizations consist of five basic component parts: the **Operating Core** (frontline workers), the **Strategic Apex** (top executive leadership), the **Middle Line** (intermediate supervisory managers), the **Technostructure** (analysts, engineers, and planners standardizing work), and the **Support Staff** (clerical, legal, and cafeteria services). Depending on which component exerts the greatest coordination pull, organizations configure into five structural archetypes:

Structural Configuration	Dominant Component Part	Primary Coordination Mechanism	Real-World Example
Simple Structure	Strategic Apex (Entrepreneurial Founder)	Direct Supervision	Small entrepreneurial startups, local retail retail outlets.
Machine Bureaucracy	Technostructure (Industrial Planners)	Standardization of Work Processes	Automobile assembly plants, commercial postal services, mass airlines.
Professional Bureaucracy	Operating Core (Specialized Professionals)	Standardization of Skills	Specialty teaching hospitals, universities, corporate law firms.
Divisionalized Form	Middle Line (Divisional General Managers)	Standardization of Outputs	Multinational multi-product conglomerates (e.g., General Electric, Tata Group).
Adhocracy (Innovative Organization)	Support Staff & Operating Core	Mutual Adjustment	Aerospace engineering firms, high-tech R&D laboratories, advertising agencies.

8. Boundaryless Organizations and Modular Outsourcing

Pioneered by former General Electric CEO Jack Welch, the **Boundaryless Organization** seeks to eradicate four traditional institutional barriers: (1) *Vertical Boundaries* separating hierarchical tiers; (2) *Horizontal Boundaries* separating functional silos; (3) *External Boundaries* separating the firm from suppliers, distributors, and customers; and (4) *Geographic Boundaries* separating regional offices. In boundaryless firms, cross-functional project squads, customer co-creation platforms, and open innovation networks replace bureaucratic red tape.

9. Principles of Authority Delegation and Administrative Decentralization

Delegation is the administrative process through which a manager assigns a portion of their work, transfers commensurate decision-making authority, and creates accountability for performance outcomes. Effective organizational design enforces four cardinal principles of delegation:

- **Principle of Parity of Authority and Responsibility:** Authority and responsibility must be co-extensive and equal. Granting a manager responsibility to achieve a production quota without granting authority to requisition raw materials or discipline errant workers creates organizational paralysis. Conversely, granting broad authority without corresponding responsibility invites executive tyranny.
- **Principle of Absoluteness of Responsibility:** While a superior can delegate authority to a subordinate, the superior's ultimate accountability to higher management cannot be delegated or

abdicated. A departmental head remains ultimately responsible for performance shortfalls committed by their team.

- **The Scalar Principle:** Clear, unbroken lines of authority must extend from the highest executive down to every operational level, ensuring every worker knows where they fit within the chain of command.
- **The Exception Principle (Management by Exception):** Routine, standardized decisions should be handled by subordinates using established operating procedures; only exceptional, unusual, or strategically critical decisions should be escalated upward to senior executives.

10. Mechanistic Versus Organic Systems (Burns and Stalker Landmark Study)

Tom Burns and G.M. Stalker (1961) conducted a landmark empirical investigation across industrial manufacturing enterprises in the United Kingdom, demonstrating that organizational structures divide into two coherent structural archetypes matched to environmental stability:

Structural Feature	Mechanistic System	Organic System
Nature of Knowledge	Concentrated exclusively at the strategic apex; executive leadership claims superior knowledge of all organizational challenges.	Distributed throughout the enterprise; specialized expertise located wherever knowledge workers operate.
Task Definition	Rigidly specialized, atomistic, and delineated in detailed contractual job descriptions.	Fluid, holistic, and continually redefined through interaction and mutual adjustment among team members.
Interaction Governance	Vertical, superior-to-subordinate command interactions governed by formal instructions.	Lateral, cross-functional consultations; advisory and collaborative rather than authoritarian.
Commitment Focus	Loyalty to the narrow formal department, bureaucratic rulebook, and immediate supervisory superior.	Commitment to the overarching technological project, customer solution, and broader professional community.
Environmental Match	Stable, predictable market environments with well-established production technologies.	Dynamic, rapidly changing, technologically disruptive market environments.

11. V.A. Graicunas' Mathematical Theory of Span of Control

French management consultant V.A. Graicunas (1933) established that as the number of direct subordinates assigned to a manager increases arithmetically (1, 2, 3, 4...), the number of complex interpersonal relationships that the manager must supervise increases exponentially.

Graicunas classified supervisory relationships into three distinct categories:

- **Direct Single Relationships:** One-on-one relationships between the superior and each individual subordinate (*Number = n*).
- **Direct Group Relationships:** Interactions between the superior and any possible combination of subordinates (*Number = $n \times [2^{n-1} - 1]$*).
- **Cross Relationships:** Mutual interactions among the subordinates themselves that the superior must monitor and coordinate (*Number = $n \times [n - 1]$*).

The Graicunas Mathematical Formula for Total Relationships

Total Relationships (R) = $n \times [2^{n-1} + n - 1]$
Where: n = Number of direct subordinates reporting to the manager; R = Total number of direct, group, and cross relationships created.
Numerical Demonstration of Exponential Complexity:

- For n = 4 subordinates: $R = 4 \times [2^3 + 4 - 1] = 4 \times [8 + 3] = 4 \times 11 =$ ***44 Relationships***.
- For n = 5 subordinates: $R = 5 \times [2^4 + 5 - 1] = 5 \times [16 + 4] = 5 \times 20 =$ ***100 Relationships***.
- For n = 6 subordinates: $R = 6 \times [2^5 + 6 - 1] = 6 \times [32 + 5] = 6 \times 37 =$ ***222 Relationships***.

Adding just one additional subordinate when expanding from 5 to 6 more than doubles the coordination complexity (from 100 to 222 relationships), demonstrating why executive spans of control should typically be restricted to 4 to 7 direct reports for complex, non-routine tasks.

12. Matrix Organizational Architecture: Navigating the "Two-Boss Manager"

The matrix structure intentionally creates a dual-command reporting architecture that violates Fayol's classical Unity of Command principle. In a global pharmaceutical firm, for example, a clinical research scientist reports vertically to the Vice President of Clinical Pharmacology (functional head) and horizontally to the Global Oncology Project Director (project head).

Matrix Management Role	Primary Authority Domain	Key Operational Responsibilities
The Top Executive (Matrix Leader)	Balances the dual lines of authority.	Maintains creative tension between functional and project dimensions; prevents either line from dominating; resolves escalated disputes.
The Matrix Boss (Functional / Project Head)	Specialized authority over technical standards or project deliverables.	Functional Boss: "How" the work is executed and professional career development. Project Boss: "What" work is executed and project delivery schedules.

Matrix Management Role	Primary Authority Domain	Key Operational Responsibilities
The Two-Boss Manager (Matrix Focal Point)	At the intersection of dual reporting lines.	Must reconcile conflicting demands, prioritize competing project deadlines, and build lateral collaborative networks without formal executive power.

13. Line Versus Staff Conflict in Corporate Hierarchies

In traditional tall and functional organizations, structural friction frequently erupts between **Line Managers** (executives in production and sales who possess formal command authority and are directly responsible for core revenue generation) and **Staff Specialists** (advisory experts in finance, legal, human resources, and IT who provide specialized counsel):

- **Line Complaints Against Staff:** Line managers complain that staff specialists lack practical shop-floor experience, propose academic theories disconnected from operating realities, usurp legitimate line authority, and take credit when projects succeed while blaming line managers when projects fail.
- **Staff Complaints Against Line:** Staff specialists complain that line managers are conservative, resistant to technological innovation, fail to seek specialized advice early in planning cycles, and lack the intellectual foresight to implement modern systems.

Structural Remediation: Effective organizational designs mitigate line-staff conflict by: (1) Clearly defining advisory boundaries (staff advises, line decides); (2) Rotating line managers into staff advisory roles and vice versa to build mutual empathy; and (3) Structuring integrated project reward metrics where both line and staff share equal performance evaluations.

14. The Spotify Agile Model: Squads, Tribes, Chapters, and Guilds

In response to digital disruption, technology leaders have pioneered the **Spotify Agile Organizational Model**, replacing bureaucratic hierarchies with a flexible network of cross-functional units:

1. **Squad:** A small, autonomous, cross-functional team (6 to 12 members) operating like a mini-startup, possessing end-to-end responsibility for a specific customer feature (e.g., search functionality).
2. **Tribe:** A collection of multiple squads working within the same commercial domain (e.g., payment systems).
3. **Chapter:** A horizontal grouping of specialists sharing the same technical competence (e.g., all QA testers across diverse squads) led by a functional manager who oversees professional development.
4. **Guild:** An open, voluntary community of interest cutting across the entire enterprise (e.g., cloud security guild) fostering lateral knowledge transfer.

15. Delegation Versus Decentralization: Comprehensive Comparative Analysis

While delegation and decentralization both involve the downward transfer of decision-making authority, they differ fundamentally in operational scope and organizational philosophy:

Comparison Parameter	Delegation of Authority	Administrative Decentralization
Core Nature	An individual administrative act between a superior and an immediate subordinate; an operational necessity.	A systemic organizational philosophy decided by the corporate board; an optional strategic choice.
Operational Scope	Narrow and bilateral; confined to the specific manager and the subordinate receiving the assigned task.	Broad and enterprise-wide; systematic dispersal of authority across all hierarchical tiers and regional divisions.
Freedom of Action	Limited; the subordinate operates under constant supervision and strict guidelines established by the delegator.	Extensive; operational division heads and branch managers enjoy substantial discretionary autonomy to innovate.
Revocability	Authority can be withdrawn or modified immediately at the personal discretion of the delegating manager.	Authority is permanently codified in formal corporate governance charters and structural policies.
Strategic Purpose	To relieve an overburdened individual manager of routine administrative workload.	To build semi-autonomous operational units, accelerate frontline responsiveness, and prepare future leaders.

DegreeLive