l'm not a robot



The foundation of modern business has shifted to change, adaptability, and innovation. This leads employees and leaders to adopt new structures reduce corporate bureaucracy and move away from top-down decision-making. An organization's structure impacts everything, from operations to internal communication effectiveness An organized structure can boost business efficiency. This could be through clear internal operations and a chain of command. You could also achieve this through workplace transparency. Organizations with flat management structures have less hierarchy and more autonomy for individual management. demands and adapt to changes. This article will look at the key characteristics of a flat organizational structure and give a visual example. Then, we will look at some tips showing you how you can put in place a flat structure within your organization. In a flat organizational structure, there are minimal levels of hierarchy between employees and leadership. All employees generally have equal levels of authority. In a conventional hierarchical arrangement, employees report to first-line managers. These managers then report to middle managers. The middle managers relay information to the senior managers at the hierarchy's apex. In a flat organization, the structure differs. By reducing hierarchical levels, associates can communicate with higher-level managers. The distribution of responsibilities between associates and higher-level managers decentralizes authority. The lack of middle layers fosters accountability. It also enables employees to communicate directly with leadership. Here are the vital features of a flat organizational structure has minimal levels of management between workers and the C-Suite. Employees can communicate with top leaders, bypassing middle management and a decreased focus on formal titles foster a more accessible and flexible environment. Employees in flat organizations have more autonomy and decision-making power. This setup is ideal for individuals focusing on direct answers and transparent procedures. You can also encourage sharing ideas. Creating an employee feedback loop within the company is also crucial. This develops a culture of collaboration and teamwork. In flat organizations, leaders prefer a coaching plan approach over an authoritative one. This approach supports the focus on empowering and involving employees. It enables them to take ownership of their work and contribute to the organization's success. Flat organization is success. environment. A flat organizational structure removes the layers of bureaucracy found in traditional organizations. This efficient approach improves productivity and empowers employees, making them essential to the company's achievements. The structure of a company either follows a tall (vertical) or a flat (horizontal) one. In an organizational chart, tall structures contain the CEO at the top and many levels of management below. This establishes a clear hierarchy for reporting and decision-making. In comparison, flat organizational structures have fewer management levels. This gives employees more freedom and promotes a collaborative and empowered workplace. Here are the main differences between the two types: FlatTall/HierarchialManagement LevelsLittle or no layers of management with shared decision-makingFaster communication and decisions due to fewer management layers. Slower communication and decision-makingFaster communication and decision-makingFaster communication and decision-makingFaster communication and decision-makingFaster communication and decisions due to fewer management layers. decision-making are due to the need for various approvals. Ideal industry useCreative businesses, small businesses, sma layers. FlexibilityCan adapt to market changes easily due to streamlined structure. Less adaptable to change due to rigid structure. Valve Corporation, the renowned video game developer behind Half-Life and Dota 2, takes an unconventional approach to company structure. operates with a flat structure, emphasizing employee empowerment. This means employees are not simply assigned tasks; they can choose projects that align with their interests and expertise. Think of a programmer with a deep passion for artificial intelligence, gravitating toward a cutting-edge AI initiative. Or a level designer collaborating with artists to craft a visually stunning environment. Decision-making at Valve is collaborative, promoting a democratic and agile work environment. Programmers, designers, and writers can brainstorm a new game concept, where each voice contributes to the final vision. Transparency is critical within this flat structure. Valve leverages a unique system that allows employees to see what everyone else is working on, promoting collaboration and eliminating redundant efforts. While this approach has challenges, it champions innovation and creativity - essential qualities in the fast-paced gaming industry. Valve positions itself at the forefront of the game development world by empowering employees to take charge. Here's how you put in place a flat organizational structure at your business: When considering if a flat organizational structure is right for your business, check its necessity and possible advantages. Certain companies excel with less hierarchy, while others may need a traditional approach. Check your organizational culture, goals, and operational requirements to determine the optimal organizational structure. Explore the possibility of blending different organizational structure requires a strong emphasis on defining roles and responsibilities. With a leaner management structure, each employee needs to understand their position in the team. They should also focus on outlining reporting relationships and establishing expectations for collaboration. Offer collaborative training and resources to empower employees to fulfill their duties. Clear policies and procedures are crucial for empowering employees in a flat organization. Establish a framework for success by defining guidelines for decision-making, communication channels, and conflict resolution. can allow employees to voice concerns, share ideas, and seek guidance from executives. Cultivating an atmosphere of openness and collaboration fosters employee appreciation are less. So, it's essential to recognize and reward exemplary performance. Create a strong employee recognition program that rewards achievements and reinforces positive behaviors. Provide chances for professional growth and projects. When you invest in their continual development, you show dedication to helping your employees thrive. It can also encourage them to make valuable contributions to the organization's success. It's important to get approval from key executives. Ensure they grasp the implications of the shift before moving towards a flat organizational structure. Foster open dialogue with executives to address their concerns. Establish clear expectations for employee autonomy and decision-making authority. Foster a culture of trust and empowerment. This is especially true in a flat structure without a formal hierarchy. Deal with conflicts are unavoidable in every organization. This is especially true in a flat structure without a formal hierarchy. resolution training to help employees handle difficult situations. Encourage open communication and mediation to foster resolution. Maintain a respectful, harmonious workplace where you can value everyone's voice. The success of a flat organizational structure relies on effective collaboration. Encourage collaboration and knowledge sharing. This will help you tap into your team's diverse talents and expertise. Use collaboration tools and technologies for effective communication. These tools can also assist with efficient project management and team visibility. Cultivate a culture that appreciates and honors collaboration. These tools can also assist with efficient project management and team visibility. as a team. You can cultivate an environment that empowers employees to excel in the organization. They can also propel the organization forward. The flat organization forward. The flat organization forward. But, in a flat organizational structure, there are minimal or no middle managers. The C-suite is accessible to all employees with more autonomy employees with wide spans of control. It also includes decision-making that empowers employees with more autonomy Implementing this structure encourages open communication between executives and employees. It minimizes bureaucracy and red tape, improving efficiency. Startups and small businesses prefer flat structures due to their agility and adaptability. However, larger organizations also adopt them to enhance innovation, collaboration, and employee engagement. A flat structure offers faster decision-making, increased creativity, and innovation. It also allows improved communication, a better employee experience, and reduced overhead costs. Yet, you need to address limitations. These include role confusion, reduced accountability, limited career progression, and potential supervisor burnout. Companies should check needs, define roles, and encourage autonomy. You should do this to put this structure in place. They also need to offer development opportunities to create a flat organizational structure. Businesses can improve workplace effectiveness by adopting these practices to empower employees. Way in which an organization is structured Business administration Management of a business Accounting Management accounting Financial accounting Financial accounting Sole proprietorship State-owned enterprise Corporate law Constitutional documents Contract Corporate crime Corporate crime Corporate law International trade law Mergers and acquisitions Corporate title Chairman Chief business officer/Chief brand officer Chief information officer/Chief product officer/Chief information officer/Chief economy Planned economy Economics Economic Seconomy Market economy Market economy Market economy Market economy Microeconomics Financial statement Insurance Fin statement analysis Financial risk Public finance Corporate finance International finance Liquidation Stock market Financial market Tax Financial institution Capital management Venture capital Types of management Asset Brand Business intelligence Business development Capacity Capability Change innovation Commercial Marketing Communications Configuration Configuration Configuration System Financial Human resource planning management information system Product life-cycle Product Project Property Quality Records Resource Risk crisis Sales Security Service Strategic Supply chain Systems administrator Talent Technology Organization Architecture Behavior Communication Culture Conflict Development Engineering Hierarchy Patterns Space Structure Trade Business ethics Business ethics Business plan Business judgment rule Consumer behaviour Business and economics portalyte An organizational structure defines how activities such as task allocation, coordination, and supervision are directed toward the achievement of organizational aims.[1] Organizational structure affects organizational action and provides the foundation on which standard operating processes, and thus to what extent their views shape the organization's actions.[2] Organizational structure can also be considered as the viewing glass or perspective through which individuals see their organization can be structured in many different ways, depending on its objectives. The structure of an organization will determine the modes in which it operates and performs. Organizational structure allows the expressed allocation of responsibilities for different functions and processes to advantage.[5] See also: Hierarchical organization and Flat organization fasks. This structure is most common in smaller organizations and most communication is done by one on one conversations. It is particularly useful for new (entrepreneurial) business as it enables the founder to control growth and development.[citation needed] They are usually based on traditional domination or charismatic domination or charismatic domination of authority.[citation needed] Large international organisation bureaucratic structure: the League of Nations in 1930[6]Weber (1948, p. 214) gives the analogy that "the fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine compare with the non-mechanical modes of production. Precision, speed, unambiguity, ... strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs- these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration."[7] Bureaucratic administration, "[7] Bureaucratic administration,"[7] Bureaucratic administratic administra bureaucratic structures and non-bureaucratic is echoed in Burns and Stalker's[8] distinction between mechanistic and organic structures. The Weberian characteristics of bureaucratic structures have many levels of management ranging from senior executives to regional managers, all the way to department store managers. Since there are many levels, decision-making authority has to pass through more layers than flatter organizations. A bureaucratic organization has rigid and tight procedures, policies and constraints. doing since the company started. Organizational charts exist for every department, and everyone understands who is in charge and what their responsibilities are for every situation. Decisions are made through an organized bureaucratic structures, the authority is at the top and information is then flowed from top to bottom. This causes for more rules and standards for the company which operational process is watched with close supervision. Some advantages for bureaucratic structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have a tremendous control over organizational structures for top-level managers are they have making is also faster because there are fewer people it has to go through to approve.[citation needed] A disadvantage in bureaucratic structures is that it can discourage creativity and innovation in the organization. This can make it hard for a company to adapt to changing conditions in the marketplace. senses in the organizational literature: one generic and one much more specific.[9] In the generic sense the term post bureaucracy. This may include total quality management, culture management and matrix management, amongst others. None of these however has left behind the core tenets of Bureaucracy. Hierarchies still exist, authority is still weber's rational, legal type, and the organization is still rule bound. Heckscher, arguing along these lines, describes them as cleaned up bureaucracies,[10] rather than a fundamental shift away from bureaucracy. Gideon Kunda, in his classic study of culture management at 'Tech' argued that 'the essence of bureaucratic control - the formalization, codification and enforcement of rules and regulations - does not change in principle.....it shifts focus from organizational structure to the organization's culture'. Another smaller group of theorists have developed the theory of the Post-Bureaucratic Organization, [10] which attempts to describe an organization, in which decisions are based on dialogue and consensus rather than authority and command, the organization is a network rather than a hierarchy, open at the boundaries (in direct contrast to culture management); there is an emphasis on meta-decision-making rules. This sort of horizontal decision-making rules and when running a non-profit or community and the source of horizontal decision-making rules. organization. It is used in order to encourage participation and help to empower people who normally experience oppression in groups. Still other theorists are developing a resurgence of interest in complexity theory and organizations, and have focused on how simple structures can be used to engender organizational adaptations. For instance, Miner et al. (2000) studied how simple structures and improvisational outcomes in product development. Their study makes links to simple structures and strategy relate in dynamic environments. A functional organizational structure is a structure that consists of activities such as coordination, supervision and task allocation. The organizational structure determines how the people in an organization are grouped and to whom they report. One traditional way of organizing people is by function. Some common functions within an organization leads to operational efficiency, where employees become specialists within their own realm of expertise. On the other hand, the most typical problem with a functional organization slow and inflexible. Therefore, lateral communication between functions becomes very important, so that information is disseminated not only vertically, but also horizontally within the organization. Communication in organizations with functional organization and specialization is best suited as a producer of standardized goods and services at large volume and low cost. Coordination and specialization of tasks are centralized in a functional structure, which makes producing a limited number of products or services efficient and predictable. Moreover, efficiency can further be realized as functional organizations integrate their activities could make components used in production of its products instead of buying them. Even though functional units often perform with a high level of efficiency, their level of cooperation with each other is sometimes compromised. Such groups may have difficulty working well with each other as they may be territorial and unwilling to cooperate. The occurrence of infighting among units may cause delays, reduced commitment due to competing interests, and wasted time, making projects fall behind schedule. This ultimately can bring down production levels overall, and the company-wide employee commitment toward meeting organizational goals. this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. (August 2023) (Learn how and when to remove this message) The divisions. A division is a collection of functions which produce a product. It also utilizes a plan to compete and operate as a separate business or profit center. According to Zainbooks.com, divisional structure in order to increase their order to increase their flexibility. Examples of divisions include regional (a U.S. Division and an EU division), consumer type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (a division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households), and product type (b division for companies and one for households). divisional structure is that it uses delegated authority so the performance can be directly measured with each group. This results in managers performing better and high employee morale. [citation needed] Another advantage of using divisional structure is that it is more efficient in coordinating work between different divisions, and there is more efficient in coordinating work between different divisions. flexibility to respond when there is a change in the market. Also, a company will have a simpler process if they need to change the size of the business by either adding or removing divisional structure is utilized more specialization can occur within the groups. When divisional structure is organized by product, the customer has their own advantages especially when only a few services or products are offered which differ greatly. When using divisional structures that are organized by either markets or geographic areas they generally have similar functions and are located in different regions or markets. disadvantages of the divisional structure is that it can support unhealthy rivalries among divisions. This type of structure may increase costs by requiring more qualified managers for each division. Also, there is usually an over-emphasis on divisional more than organizational goals which results in duplication of resources and efforts like staff services, facilities, and personnel. This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. (October 2018) (Learn how and when to remove this message) The matrix structure groups employees by both function and product simultaneously. A matrix organization frequently uses teams of employees to accomplish work, in order to take advantage of the strengths, as well as make up for the weaknesses, of functional and decentralized forms. An example would be a company that product A" and "product A" and "product B". Using the matrix structure, this company would organize functions within the company as follows: "product A" sales department, "product A" accounting department, "product B" accounting department, "product B oversee the cross- functional managers maintain control over their resources and project. The functional managers. It brings the best aspects of functional and by the most difficult system to maintain as the sharing of power is a delicate proposition. Strong/project matrix: A project manager is primarily responsible for the project. Functional managers provide technical expertise and assign resources as needed. There are advantages and disadvantages of the matrix of structure. Some of the disadvantages include tendencies towards anarchy, power struggles and 'sinking' to group and division levels.[14] Matrices increase the complexity of the chain of command, which can present problems because of the differentiation between functional managers and project managers. This, in turn, can be confusing for employees to understand who is next in the chain of command. An additional disadvantage of the matrix structure also has significant advantages that make it valuable for companies to use. The matrix structure may improve upon the "silo" critique of functional management in that it aims to diminish the vertical structure of functional and create a more horizontal structure which allows the spread of information across task boundaries to happen much quicker. It aims to allow specialization to increase depth of knowledge and allows individuals to be chosen according to project needs. Starbucks is one of the numerous large organizations that successfully developed the matrix structure supporting their focused strategy. Its design combines functional and product based divisions, with employees reporting to two heads.[15] Some experts also mention the multinational design,[16] common in global companies, such as Procter & Gamble, Toyota and Unilever. This structure can be seen as a complex form of the matrix, as it maintains coordination among products, functions and geographic areas. With the growth of the internet, and the associated access that gives all levels of an organization to information and communication via digital means, power structures have begun to align more as a wirearchy, enabling the flow of power and authority to be based not on hierarchical levels, but on information, trust, credibility, and a focus on results. In general, over the last decade, it has become increasingly clear that through the forces of globalization, competition and more demanding customers, the structure of many companies has become flatter, less hierarchical, more fluid and even virtual.[17] This section possibly contains original research. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. (October 2018) (Learn how and when to remove this message) Main article: Flat organization The Flat organization is common in small companies (entrepreneurial start-ups, university spin offs). As companies grow they tend to become more complex and hierarchical, which lead to an expanded structure, with more levels and departments. However, in rare cases, such as the examples of Valve, GitHub, Inc. and 37 signals, the organization remains very flat as it grows, eschewing middle managers. [18] (However, GitHub subsequently introduced middle managers). All of the aforementioned organizations operate in the field of technology, which may be significant, as software developers are highly skilled professionals, much like lawyers. Senior lawyers also enjoy a relatively high degree of autonomy within a typical law firm, which is typically structured as a partnership rather than a hierarchical bureaucracy. Some other types of professional organizations are also commonly structured as partnerships, such as accountancy companies and GP surgeries. Main article: Bureaucracy Often, growth would result in bureaucracy the most prevalent structure in the past. It is still, however, relevant in former Soviet Republics, China, and most governmental organizations all over the world. Shell used to represent the typical bureaucracy: top-heavy and hierarchical. It featured multiple levels of command and duplicate service companies existing in different regions. All this made Shell apprehensive to market changes,[19] leading to its incapacity to grow and develop further. The failure of this structure became the main reason for the company restructuring into a matrix. Main article: Team One of the newest organizational structure became the main reason for the company restructuring into a matrix. building. In small businesses, the team structure can define the entire organization.[16] Teams can be both horizontal and vertical.[20] While an organization is constituted as a set of people who synergize individual competencies to achieve newer dimensions, the quality of organization is constituted as a set of people who synergize individual competencies to achieve newer dimensions, the quality of organization is constituted as a set of people who synergize individual competencies to achieve newer dimensions, the quality of organization is constituted as a set of people who synergize individual competencies of teams in totality.[21] The team could classified into functional team structure, lightweight team structure, heavyweight team structure, logo of an average of an average of an average of an average of a structure and autonomous team structure. [22] For example, every one of the Whole Foods Market stores, the largest natural-foods grocer in the US developing a focused strategy, is an autonomous profit centre composed of an average of an average of a structure. of 10 self-managed teams, while team leaders in each store and each region are also a team.[23] Larger bureaucratic organizations can benefit from the flexibility of teams as well. Xerox, Motorola, and DaimlerChrysler are all among the companies that actively use teams to perform tasks. challenges for an organization. The scattered nature of team-based organizations makes it difficult for them to communicate and share information across borders, where knowledge exchange between and among teams and stakeholders becomes crucial as team-based organizations. their internal tasks as well as their relationships and connections with their multiple stakeholders, both inside and external to the firm. [25] Another modern structure is network. A network can be described as "long term purposeful arrangements among distinct but related for-profit organizations that allow those firms in them to gain or sustain competitive advantage"[26] where "communication between people of different ranks tends to resemble later consultation rather than vertical aspects of other structures and are characterized by clusters of interconnected teams and individuals that come together to form unique teams and complete certain projects or achieve common goals. Participating agents are constrained by their specialization and role within the organization may have separate sales and marketing teams which each operate independently, certain projects will require individuals from those teams to work together and form partnerships for the length of their duration, the network consists of organizations within a market. While business giants risk becoming too clumsy to proact (such as), act and react efficiently,[29] a network organization can contract out any business function that can be done better or more cheaply. In essence, these types of network structures' managers spend most of their time coordinating and controlling external relations, usually by electronic means. H&M is outsourcing its clothing to a network of 700 suppliers, more than two-thirds of which are based in low-cost strategy.[30] The potential management opportunities offered by recent advances in complex networks theory have been demonstrated[31] including applications to product design and development,[32] and innovation problem in markets and industries.[33] For these benefits to be realised, the network structure relies on trust through shared values and norms, actively avoiding hold-up problems and opportunism risks.[28] By eliminating the uncertainty that one agent will use any potential gain in bargaining power for their singular gain,[34] a network structure can avoid the associated inefficiencies that would arise. However, the potential disadvantages for enterprises adopting the networked organizational structure include unreasonable design, insufficient supervision and poor linkage ability.[35] If the different relations required for the network structure contrast too greatly it may lead to confusion, delays, and unnecessary increases in complexity. Due to the network structure relying on many different individuals and teams coordinate poorly, resulting in communication breakdowns and misunderstanding, which only hinders the progression of tasks. Virtual organization is defined as being closely coupled upstream with its suppliers and downstream with its suppliers and the other ends means little to those who manage the business processes within the entire organization. A special form of boundaryless organization is virtual. Hedberg, Dahlgren, Hansson, and Olve (1999) consider the virtual organization as not physically existing as such, but enabled by software to exist. [36] The virtual organization exists within a network of alliances, using the Internet. This means while the core of the organization can be small but still the company can operate globally be a market leader in its niche. According to Anderson, because of the unlimited shelf space of the unlimited space of the unlimited shelf space of the unlimited space of the unli that is what made highly innovative Amazon.com so successful.[37] Hierarchy-Community Phenotype Model of Organizational Structure, many managers are still blind to the existence of the flat community structure within their organizations.[38] The business is no longer just a place where people come to work. For most of the employees, the firm confers on them that sense of belonging and identity -- the firm has become their "village", their community.[39] The firm of the 21st century is not just a hierarchy which ensures maximum efficiency and profit; it is also the community where people belong to and grow together, where their affective and innovative needs are met.[40] Lim, Griffiths, and Sambrook (2010) developed the Hierarchy-Community Phenotype refers to the observable characteristics of an organism. It results from the expression of an organism's genes and the influence of the environment. The expression of an organism's genes is usually determined by his or her environment, contributes to the overall observable characteristics (phenotype) of the organism, the combined expressions of all the employees' formal hierarchical and informal community participation within an organization give rise to the organizational structure. Due to the vast potentially different combination of the employees' formal hierarchy and a pure community (flat) organizational structure. structure."[40] "The Hierarchy-Community Phenotype Model of Organisational Structure views an organisation as having both a hierarchy and a community structure, both equally well established and occurring extensively throughout the organisation. On the practical level, it utilises the organisational Structure, both equally well established and occurring extensively throughout the organisation. brings across individuals' roles and formal authority within their designated space at the workplace, and social network analysis to map out the community structure within the organisation, identifying individuals' informal influences which usually do not respect workplace boundaries and at many times extend beyond the workplace."[5] See also informal organization Organizational structures developed from the ancient times of hunters and collectors in tribal organizational structures. As pointed out by Lawrence B. Mohr, [41] the early theorists of organizational structure, Taylor, Fayol, and Weber "saw the importance of structure for effectiveness and efficiency and assumed without the slightest question that whatever structure was considered a matter of choice... When in the 1930s, the rebellion began that came to be known as human relations theory, there was still not a denial of the idea of structure as an artifact, but rather an advocacy of the creation of a different sort of structure, one in which the needs, knowledge, and opinions of employees might be given greater recognition." However, a different view arose in the 1960s, suggesting that the organizational structure is "an externally caused phenomenon, an outcome rather than an artifact."[42] In the 21st century, organizational theorists such as Lim, Griffiths, and Sambrook (2010) are once again proposing that organizational structure development is very much dependent on the expression of the strategies and behavior of the management and the workers as constrained by the power distribution between them, and influenced by their environment and the outcome.[40] There are correspondences between Mintzberg's Machine Bureaucracy represents a highly centralized approach to C2, with a narrow allocation of decision rights, restricted patterns of interaction among organization. Mintzberg's Adhocracy, on the other hand, represents a more networked and less centralized approach to C2, with more individual initiative and self-synchronization. It involves a broader allocation of decision rights, broader interaction patterns, and broader information distribution. Mintzberg's other organization types (for example, the Professional Bureaucracy and the Simple Structure) fall in between these two.[43] Moreover, Walker et. al states the event analysis for systematic teamwork (EAST) method as one of the military command and control approach provides a means of describing emergent system-level features that result from the intricate interactions of system constituents (human and technical).[44] They are modelled using an integrated methodologies approach.[44] The social and technical principle of function and approximation, which states that similar individuals and the same technology may achieve the same objective via entirely distinct paths and entirely different starting points, is one important aspect of EAST.[44] In addition, desirable emergent features, such as systems level "shared awareness", pace, agility, and self-synchronization might appear due to the indisputable reality that humans may adjust to the techno-organisational aspects of a particular system.[44] See also: Informal organization and Formal organization and Formal organization and Formal organizational structure may hamper cooperation and thus hinder the completion of orders in due time and within limits of resources and budgets. Further, the informal organization, which is the structure of social interactions that emerges within organizations, may be subject to restrictions also tends to lag in its integration into the newly established formal organisation, whereas formal organization or the subjective norms system created by managers can be changed relatively quickly.[45] Organizational structures should be adaptive to process requirements, aiming to optimize the ratio of effort and input to output. Diagram, proposed by Henry Mintzberg, showing the main parts of organisation, including technostructure Henry Mintzberg considers five main parts of organization: [46] Strategic apex (leaders of organization) Middle line (managers of lower level) Operating core (workers of lower level) Operating core (workers of organization) An additional element is organisational ideology.[46] Mintzberg considers six main mechanisms of coordination of work:[46] Mutual adjustment (without formal, standardized mechanisms) Direct supervision (when one person, leader of organization, gives direct orders to others) Standardization of work processes (based on the documents that regulate work and are produced by technostructure) Standardization of outputs (only the results of work are regulated) Standardization of skills (based on organisation's values, ideology) Mintzberg considers seven main configurations of organizational structure: [46] Entrepreneurial organization (strategic apex, direct supervision dominate) Machine organization (technostructure, standardization of skills dominate) Diversified organization (strategic apex, direct supervision dominate) Innovative organization (support staff, mutual adjustment dominate) Missionary organization (ideology, standardization of norms dominate) Political organization (no part or mechanism of coordinates the work using direct supervision.[47] There is no technostructure, little support staff.[48] Such structure is usually found in organizations with environment that is simple (so that one man could have significant advantage over the bureaucratic structures).[47] Machine organisation or Machine bureaucracy has formal rules regulating the work developed technostructure and middle line, is centralised, hierarchical.[47] Such structure is common when the work is simple and repetitive.[47] Organizations also tend to achieve such structure when they are strongly controlled from outside.[47] Also, such structure is common for organizations that perform work that is related to some sort of control (for example, prisons, police), or organizations with special safety requirements, airlines).[47] Professional configuration or Professional stream (for example, in university).[47] Professional stream (for example, in university).[47] Professional configuration or Professional stream (for example, in university).[47] Professional stream (for example, in univers organisation is large, middle line insignificant. [47] Technostructure is also insignificant. [47] Professionals participate in administrative work, thus there are many committees. [47] Such structure is common for universities, hospitals, law firms.[47] Diversified Configuration or Divisionalized form consists of several parts having high autonomy.[47] Such structure is common for old, large organizations.[47] Such organizations are common when environment is complex and dynamic.[47] Mintzberg considers two types of such organization: operating adhocracy and administrative adhocracy and administrative adhocracy.[47] Examples of such organization: operating adhocracy and administrative adhocracy and administrative adhocracy and administrative adhocracy.[47] Examples of such organization: operating adhocracy and administrative adhocracy and administrative adhocracy and administrative adhocracy.[47] Examples of such organization: operating adhocracy and administrative adhocracy adh Administrative adhocracy has teams solving problems for the organization itself.[47] As an example of such organization are not numerous.[47] Such organization are no decentralized, the differences between levels are not significant.[47] Political configurational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational architecture Organizational behavior Organizational behavior Organizational and organizational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational architecture Organizational behavior Organizational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational architecture Organizational behavior Organizational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational architecture Organizational behavior Organizational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational architecture Organizational behavior Organizational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational behavior Organizational behavior Organizational psychology Dynamic governance Management Organizational behavior Organizationa learning Organizational culture Organizational Cybernetics Connectivity Integrator ^ Pugh, D. S., ed. (1990).Organizational Cybernetics Connectivity Integrator ^ Pugh, D. S., ed. (1990).Organization Theory: Selected Readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin. ^ a b Jacobides., M. G. (2007). The inherent limits of organizational structure and the unfulfilled role of hierarchy: Lessons from a near-war. Organization Science, 18, 3, 455-477. ^ Feldman, P.; Miller, D. (1986-01-01). "Entity Model Clustering: Structuring A Data Model By Abstraction". The Computer Journal. 29 (4): 348-360. doi:10.1093/comjnl/29.4.348. ISSN 0010-4620. ^ Baligh, Helmy H. (2006) "Organization Structures". Organization Structures: Theory and Design, Analysis and Prescription. Information and Organization Design Series. Vol. 5. Springer New York. pp. 33-64. doi:10.1007/0-387-28317-X_2. ISBN 978-0387258478. S2CID 239069558. ^ a b Lim, M. (2017). Examining the literature on organizational structure and success College Mirror, 43, 1, 16-18. Grandjean, Martin (2017). "Analisi e visualizzazioni delle reti in storia. L'esempio della cooperazione intellettuale della Società delle Nazioni". Memoria e Ricerca (2): 371-393. doi:10.14647/87204. See also: French version (PDF) and English summary. Weber, M. (1948). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. translated, edited and with an introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. ^ Burns, T. and G. Stalker. (1961) The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock. ^ Grey C., Garsten C., 2001, Trust, Control and Post-Bureaucracy, Sage Publishing) ^ a b Heckscher C. (Editor), Donnellon A. (Editor), 1994, The Post Bureaucratic Organization: New Perspectives on Organizational Change, Sage Publications ^ Nicolaj Sigglekow and Jan W. Rivkin, October 2003, Speed, Search and the Failure of Simple Contingency, No. 04-019 ^ Repenning, N. (2002). A Simulation-Based Approach to Understanding the Dynamics of Innovation Implementation. Organization Science, 13, 2: 109-127. ^ Raymond E. Miles, Charles C. Snow, Causes of Failure in Network Organizations, California Management Review, Summer 1992 ^ Davis, Stanley M.; Lawrence, Paul R. (1978). "Problems of Matrix Organizations". Harvard Business School (published 1 May 1978). pp. 131-142. ISSN 0017-8012. Archived from the original on 9 March 2019. Retrieved 9 March 2019. ^ (Starbucks.com (2008). Starbucks Coffee International". Archived from the original on 2008-11-13. Retrieved 2008-11-12. (accessed 20/10/08)) ^ a b Robbins, S.F., Judge, T.A. (2007). Organizational Behavior. 12th edition. Pearson Education Inc., p. 551-557. Cratton, L. (2004). The Democratic Enterprise, Financial Times Prentice Hall, pp. xii-xiv. Fried, Jason (April 2011). "Why I Run a Flat Company". Inc. Retrieved 1 Sep 2013. Grant, R.M. (2008). History of the Royal Dutch/Shell Group. Available at: Archived 2011-01-24 at the Wayback Machine (accessed 20/10/08) ^ Thareja P(2008), "Total Quality Organization Thru' People, (Part 16), Each one is Capable", FOUNDRY, Vol. XX, No. 4, July/Aug 2008 ^ Thareja P. (2007). A Total Quality Organisation thru'People Each One is Capable. Available at: ^ Schilling, Melissa A. (2017). Strategic management of technological innovation (5th ed.). New York, NY. ISBN 978-1-259-53906-0. OCLC 929155407. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: location missing publisher (link) ^ Fishman C. (1996). Whole Foods Is All Teams. Available at: ^ "Team-based global organisations: Goodbye to hierarchy-based global organising". Strategic Direction. 32 (3): 16-18. 2016-03-14. doi:10.1108/SD-12-2015-0188. ISSN 0258-0543. ^ "Team-based global organisations: Goodbye to hierarchy-based global organising". Strategic Direction. 32 (3): 16-18. 2016-03-14. doi:10.1108/SD-12-2015-0188. ISSN 0258-0543. ^ Jarillo, J. Carlos (January 1988). "On strategic networks". Strategic Management Journal. 9 (1): 31-41. doi:10.1002/smj.4250090104. Clement, Andrew (1990), Berleur, Jacques; Clement, Andrew; Sizer, Richard; Whitehouse, Diane (eds.), "Computers and Organizations", The Information Society: Evolving Landscapes, New York, NY: Springer, pp. 305–326, doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-4328-9_18, ISBN 978-1-4757-4328-9, retrieved 2023-04-23 ^ a b van Alstyne, Marshall (1997-06-01) "The State of Network Organization: A Survey in Three Frameworks". Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce. 7 (2-3): 83-151. doi:10.1080/10919392.1997.9681069. ISSN 1091-9392. ^ Gummesson, E. (2002). Total Marketing Control. Butterworth-Heinemann, p. 266. ^ Capell, K. H&M Defies Retail Gloom. Available at: [1] (accessed 20/10/08). ^ Amaral, L.A.N. and B. Uzzi. (2007) Complex Systems—A New Paradigm for the Integrative Study of Management, Physical, and Y. Bar-Yam. (2007) The Statistical Mechanics of Complex Product Development: Empirical and Analytical Results Management Science, 53, 7: 1127-1145. ^ Kogut, B., P. Urso, and G. Walker. (2007) Emergent Properties of a New Financial Market: American Venture Capital Syndication, 1960-2005. Management Science, 53, 7: 1181-1198. ^ Noldeke, Georg; Schmidt, Klaus M. (Summer 1995). "Option Contracts and Renegotiation: A Solution to the Hold-up Problem". The RAND Journal of Economics. 26 (2): 163. JSTOR 2555911. ^ Di, Zhenpeng; Liu, Yun; Li, Shimei (2022). "Networked Organizational Structure of Enterprise Information Security Management Based on Digital Transformation and Genetic Algorithm". Frontiers in Public Health. 10: 921632. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.921632. ISSN 2296 2565. PMC 9260168. PMID 35812480. ^ Hedberg, B., G. Dahlgren, J. Hansson, and N.-G. Olve (1999). Virtual Organizations and Beyond: Discover Imaginary Systems. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons. ^ Anderson, C. (2007). The Long Tail. Random House Business Books, pp. 23, 53. ^ Butler Jr., J.K. (1986). A global view of informal organization. Academy of Management Journal, 51, 3, 39-43. ^ Stacey, M. (1974). The myth of community studies. C. Bell, H. Newby, (Editors), The Sociology of Community: A Selection of Readings. London, Frank Cass, 13-26. ^ a b c Lim, M., G. Griffiths, and S. Sambrook. (2010). Organizational structure for the twenty-first century. Presented the annual meeting. of The Institute for Operations Research and The Management Sciences, Austin. ^ Mohr, L. B. (1982). Explaining Organizational Behavior. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. ^ Vassiliou, Marius, David S. Alberts, and Jonathan R. Agre (2015). "C2 Re-Envisioned: the Future of the Enterprise." CRC Press; New York; pp. 93-96. ^ a b c d Walker, Guy H.; Stanton, Neville A.; Stewart, Rebecca; Jenkins, Daniel; Wells, Linda; Salmon, Paul; Baber, Chris (2009-07-01). "Using an integrated methods approach to analyse the emergent properties of military command and control". Applied Ergonomics. 40 (4): 636-647. doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2008.05.003. ISSN 0003-6870. PMID 18640662. S2CID 30726194. Gulati, Ranjay; Puranam, Phanish (April 2009). "Renewal Through Reorganization: The Value of Inconsistencies Between Formal and Informal Organization". Organization Science. 20 (2): 422-440. doi:10.1287/orsc.1090.0421. ISSN 1047-7039. S2CID 46270379. ^ a b c d Robertas Jucevičius "Strateginis organizacijų vystymas", "Pasaulio lietuvių kultūros, mokslo ir švietimo centras", 1998, ISBN 9986-418-07-0, p. 81-92 ^ a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y Victoria Lemieux "Applying Mintzberg's Theories on Organizational Configuration to Archival Appraisal" // "Archivaria", 1998, 46, p. 32-85 [2] ^ a b Fred C. Lunenburg "Organizational Structure: Mintzberg's Framework" // "International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity", 2012, Volume 14, Number 1 Lawrence B. Mohr, Explaining Organizational Behavior. The Limits and Possibilities of Theory and Research., Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1982. Retrieved from " In order to continue enjoying our site, we ask that you confirm your identity as a human. Thank you very much for your cooperation.