ORGANIZATION CHANGE AND EFFECTIVENESS

Salma Syeda
Dr. Malcolm Homavazir

ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

ORGANIZATION CHANGE
AND EFFECTIVENESS

ORGANIZATION CHANGE AND EFFECTIVENESS

Salma Syeda
Dr. Malcolm Homavazir

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

First Published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Organization Change and Effectiveness by *Salma Syeda, Dr. Malcolm Homavazir*

ISBN 978-1-64532-859-9

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

ORGANIZATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Mrs. Salma Syeda, Assistant Professor
Masters In Business Administration, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:syeda.s@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

People use organizations as a tool to organize their activities in order to attain their goals to get what they want or value. Organizations are value-creation systems that receive inputs from the environment and turn them into completed commodities and services using skills and knowledge. Utilizing an organization enables individuals to work together to improve specialization and the division of labor, use advanced technology, govern the organizational environment, reduce transaction costs, exercise authority and control, and more. All of these actions contribute to the organization's ability to produce more value. The study of how organizations work, as well as how they influence and are impacted by their environment, is known as organizational theory. The formal system of task and authority connections that governs how individuals coordinate their activities and utilize resources to accomplish an organization's objectives is known as organizational structure. The collection of common beliefs and conventions that govern how members of an organization interact with one another, as well as with vendors, clients, and other external parties, is known as the organization's culture.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Culture, Cost, Development, Organization.

INTRODUCTION

Organizations are one of the few things in the modern world that are both essential and taken for granted. Although we often appreciate the products and services that businesses provide, we seldom ever stop to consider how these products and services are made. We watch on a local TV channel how our schools or hospitals are attempting to use advancements in new types of computer hardware and software, such as online learning programs, to help students improve their performance. We see online videos of manufacturing production lines churning out automobiles, PCs, or smartphones. However, we seldom ever ask why or how these organizations operate. Most of the time, we only consider organizations when they let us down in some manner, such as when we have to wait two hours in the emergency department to see a doctor, when our new smartphone breaks, or when we are at the back of a lengthy queue at a bank on a Friday afternoon. When something like this happens, we question why the hospital made us wait an hour and a half for service after making us spend 30 minutes filling out paperwork, why the bank did not prepare for the rush of customers and add more tellers, and why wireless phone companies don't demand higher-quality hardware and bug-free software from their smartphone supplier[1], [2].

Due of the intangibility of organizations, people adopt a careless attitude towards them. Nobody has ever seen or touched an organization, despite the fact that the majority of individuals in the world today are born, live, and die in organizations. When we enter a FedEx Kinko's or doctor's office, for example, we see the goods or services that an organization offers, and sometimes we see the people that the organization employs. However, most individuals outside the organization are unaware of why an organization, like

FedEx Kinko's, is driven to provide products and services, as well as the ways it manages and persuades its members to do so. However, the core of organizing and what an organization accomplishes is assembling people and other resources to provide commodities and services.

People use organizations as a tool to organize their activities in order to attain their goals—that is, to get what they want or value. People that place a high importance on security establish institutions like banks, armies, and police forces. Entertainment-loving individuals found businesses like the Walt Disney Company, CBS, or a neighborhood club. People found churches, social service agencies, or charities because they needed spiritual or emotional assistance. A reaction to and a way of meeting some human need is an organization. Social networking sites like Facebook are examples of new organizations that are created when new technologies are made accessible and new needs are identified. Conversely, Blockbuster and other video rental companies are examples of organizations that expire or undergo transformation when the needs they satiated are no longer critical. Amgen, Genentech, and other biotech businesses, for instance, were founded in response to the need to develop better pharmaceuticals. The need to manage growing information loads and new computer technologies resulted in the growth of high-tech corporations like IBM, Apple, Microsoft, Google, and others, as well as the collapse and failure of businesses with outmoded technology like Smith Corona, which made typewriters. In an effort to meet shifting customer demands and preferences, retailers like Walmart, Target, the Gap, and Sears are constantly adapting though not always effectively.

Who develops the businesses that emerge to meet the demands of people? Sometimes a person or group of individuals establish a company to manufacture products and services because they feel they have the requisite abilities and expertise. Companies like Google, sandwich shops, and software design firms were all founded in this fashion. Sometimes a group of individuals comes together to establish an organisation in order to address a perceived need. Wealthy individuals could pool their resources to invest in the construction of a resort. A new religion may be founded by a group of individuals who share the same ideas, and a new political party may be founded by the people of a country. Entrepreneurship, in its broadest sense, refers to the process through which individuals identify chances to fulfil wants, then acquire and use resources to do so. Many new businesses today, especially those growing quickly, provide items and services that are somehow connected to modern information technology. All organisations are seeing a transformation in how they do business as a result of the rising usage of mobile computing devices like laptops, smart phones, and tablet computers connected to the Internet through wireless broadband connections. This book investigates this important topic by concentrating on one business, Amazon.com, which has seen spectacular growth as a result of the creation of IT goods and services like its Kindle book reader. The history of this corporation is presented in nine chapters of this book to illustrate the numerous ways that the IT revolution is changing how businesses operate and generate value in the present. We start off by looking at the background of Amazon.com's founding, which is covered in the Focus on New Information Technology box [3], [4].

How Can a Company Create Value?

The process through which an organisation develops value. Input, conversion, and output are the three processes where value is created. The environment in which the organisation functions has an impact on each level. The factors and circumstances that exist outside of an organization's borders yet have an impact on its capacity to gather and use resources to produce value make up the organisational environment. Resources such as raw materials, equipment, knowledge and know-how, human resources, and money and capital are all examples of inputs. The amount of value an organisation produces at the input stage depends on how it picks and obtains from its environment the inputs it requires to produce products and services. As an example, Jeff Bezos decided to build software to make Amazon.com's website as straightforward and user-friendly as he could, and he only hired individuals who could deliver the kind of excellent, personable service that would appeal to his online consumers the most. His business would not have been successful if he had made bad decisions and consumers had disliked Amazon.com's website or customer service.

The amount of value generated during the conversion stage depends on how the organisation transforms inputs into outputs by using human resources and technology. The level of an organization's talents, particularly its capacity to adapt to and learn from the environment, determines how much value it generates. For instance, Jeff Bezos had to choose how to effectively promote and sell his goods to draw people. His solution was to provide clients with a large selection of books at affordable costs, as well as speedy shipping. The value that buyers saw in his notion was a result of his proficiency in these actions. The outcome of the conversion process is a finished product such as delivered books that the organisation puts into the market. Customers buy and utilise this product to fulfil their requirements. The organisation buys fresh supply of inputs with the proceeds from the sale of its product, and the cycle repeats. A company that continues to meet people's needs will be able to accumulate more resources over time and will be able to add value as it expands its pool of knowledge and abilities. Amazon.com has prospered because happy customers keep coming back to its online store and continue to provide the funds it needs to continuously develop its capabilities and expand its operations.

DISCUSSION

The majority of organisation types may utilise a value-creation model to explain their operations. Component parts, skilled or semi-skilled labour, and technical know-how are taken from the environment by manufacturing companies like GE, GM, and IBM. At the conversion stage, these companies create value by using their manufacturing skills to organise and assemble those inputs into outputs like cars and computers. Customers or clients are the "inputs" to service organisations' operations, and they are interacted with directly by businesses like McDonald's, Amazon.com, the Salvation Army, and your family doctor. In the conversion stage, service organisations create value by applying their skills to yield an output: satisfied hunger, a cared-for family, a cured patient. Hungry people who go to McDonald's for a meal, needy families who go to the Salvation Army for assistance, and sick people who go to a doctor for a cure are all "inputs."The majority of the time, commodities and services are produced in an organisational environment because groups of people can typically generate more value than individuals working alone.

Specialisation and the Division of Labour Need to Be Increased

Individuals who operate in groups may become more effective and productive in their jobs than those who work alone. The usage of an organisation allows for the development of specialisation and a division of labour for various types of productive activity. People may concentrate on a specific area of knowledge because to the collaborative nature of organisations, which enables them to become more talented or specialised at what they do. Engineers that work in the engineering design division of a major automaker like GM or Toyota, for instance, could focus on enhancing the design of fuel injection systems or other engine parts. The whole engine may have been created by an engineer who works for a tiny automaker. The degree of specialisation in the small company is lower because the engineer must perform many more tasks than the engineer in the large company; there is less chance of learning what makes for a great carburetor and thus creating more value for someone who wants high speed [5]–[7].

Utilise Big Data and Technology

Utilising contemporary automated and computerised technologies allows organisations to benefit from economies of scale and scope. When products and services are produced in big quantities on automated production lines, economies of scale—or cost savings—occur. Economies of scope are cost reductions that occur when a company is able to employ underutilised resources more productively by allowing them to be shared across a variety of different products or jobs. When it is feasible to build an automated production line that can make many product kinds at once, for instance, economies of scope may be gained. The first automakers to create manufacturing lines that could create three versions of a vehicle rather than just one were Toyota and Honda. Following suit, GM and Ford have seen substantial increases in efficiency. Automobile manufacturers benefit from cheaper production costs and more flexibility with multimodel assembly lines to easily switch from producing one model to another to satisfy shifting client demands.

To control the Workplace Environment

Organisations are the preferred option for converting inputs into outputs due to pressures from the organisational context in which they function. The environment of an organisation is the source of important input resources and the market into which it releases products. Additionally, it is the origin of the political, social, and economic factors that have an impact on an organization's capacity to acquire these resources. Most people lack the skills necessary to manage complicated surroundings, but an organisation has the means to hire experts who can foresee or try to influence the many environmental forces. The organisation can produce greater value for itself, its members, and its clients thanks to this specialisation. Corporate leaders at big firms like IBM, AT&T, and Ford have whole departments dedicated to monitoring, reacting to, and trying to control the external environment, but small businesses also need to engage in same tasks. Local shops and eateries may not have whole departments dedicated to monitoring the environment, but their owners and managers still need to be aware of new patterns and developments in order to adapt to shifting consumer demands, just as Jeff Bezos did.

In order to Reduce Transaction Costs

There are several issues that come up when individuals work together to generate products and services. People have to select who will do which duties, who will be paid what amounts, and how to determine whether each teammate is completing his or her part of the work as they learn what to accomplish and how to collaborate with others to complete a task efficiently. Transaction costs are the expenses related to negotiating, supervising, and regulating interactions between persons to address various sorts of transactional difficulties. The transaction costs related to these transactions are decreased by organisations' capacity to regulate human interactions. Imagine Intel hired all of its scientists on a daily basis, forcing thousands of experts to spend hours each day debating what to do and who they should collaborate with. Such a work structure would be very expensive and a waste of time and resources. However, because to the organization's structure and coordination, managers are able to recruit scientists on a long-term basis, assign them to specific projects, and put them on work teams, all with the authority for Intel to keep an eye on their progress. The steadiness that results lowers transaction costs and boosts output.

In order to increase production efficiency, organisations can put a lot of pressure on people to comply with task and production requirements.6 In order to complete a task effectively, people must arrive at work predictably, act in the organization's best interests, and recognise the authority of the organisation and its managers. All of these demands reduce manufacturing costs and increase efficiency, but they place a strain on people who must adhere to organisational demands. When people labour for themselves, their primary concern should be their own needs. However, when they are employed by an organisation, they must consider both the organization's and their personal demands. Workers who don't follow rules may be disciplined or fired by their employers, and strong performance may be rewarded with promotions and higher pay. Organisations may utilise employment, promotion, and higher incentives to impose control over people since they are valuable and often in short supply.

These five elements, when considered together, serve to explain why it is often possible to produce more value when individuals collaborate and plan their activities in a structured environment than when they do so alone. The stability an organisation fosters over time creates an environment in which the organisation and its employees may develop their skills and capacities, and the organization's capacity to provide value grows by leaps and bounds. For instance, Google, which was founded by Larry Page and Sergey Brin, developed into the most valuable Internet software firm in the world by 2011 as a result of the flexibility it gave its employees to hone their talents and capacities and produce ground-breaking new products. However, due to their inability to provide the Internet software that consumers need, other software businesses like WordPerfect, Lotus, Novell, and even Microsoft have had significant difficulties during the last ten years. Why does Google's company permit it to generate ever-increasing value, when these other companies have actually reduced the value they may generate? We must carefully examine organisational theory, design, and change before we can provide a satisfactory response to this topic.

Theory, Design, and Change in Organisations

The study of how organisations work and how they influence and are influenced by their environment is known as organisational theory. In order to sustain and improve an organization's performance, we look at the underlying concepts that guide its design, operation, change, and redesign in this book. To successfully govern and transform organisations so that they can generate income and resources, it is necessary to first understand how they function. This book's second goal is to provide you the conceptual skills you need to influence organisational conditions in which you find yourself. In small or big organisations, in environments as disparate as the assembly line of a manufacturing firm or the not-for-profit organisation, the lessons of organisational design and transformation are as essential at the level of first-line supervisor as they are at the level of chief executive officer. Knowledgeable employees and managers are able to evaluate the structure and culture of the organisation for which they work, identify issues, and make adjustments that support the achievement of the organization's objectives.

Organisational Design

When a collection of individuals creates an organisation to achieve shared objectives, the organisational structure changes to improve the organization's ability to control the tasks required to do so. The main goal of organisational structure is control: to control how people coordinate their actions to achieve organisational goals and to control the means used to motivate people to achieve these goals. Organisational structure is the formal system of task and authority relationships that govern how people use resources and coordinate their actions to achieve organisational goals. For instance, Larry Page and Sergey Brin at Google struggled with how to manage the activities of their IT engineers to best use their skills and how to reward them when they created ground-breaking technologies. They decided to reward scientists with Google shares based on both individual and team success by putting them in tiny, self-contained teams. An acceptable structure for any organisation is one that enables efficient responses to coordination and motivational issues, which might develop for a variety of environmental, technical, or human factors. As organisations expand and diversify, the structure correspondingly changes. Organisational design and change processes may be used to control organisational structure [8]–[10].

Corporate Culture

Organizational culture is changing at the same time as organizational structure. The common beliefs and conventions that govern how members of an organization interact with one another, as well as with vendors, clients, and other external parties, make up its organizational culture. The individuals who make up an organization, its values, the employment rights it grants its employees, and its organizational structure all have an impact on its culture. Organizational culture governs and moulds behavior inside the organization, just as organizational structure does. It affects how individuals react to circumstances and how they perceive the world around the organisation. At Google, Page and Brin made an effort to foster principles that rewarded risk-taking and entrepreneurship in order to foster an environment where innovation was valued as an organisational activity. The small-team format was advantageous because it allowed scientists to regularly meet in person to coordinate their tasks and learn from one another, which spurred them to experiment and come up with innovative solutions to issues.

Organisations that provide fundamentally the same products and services might have completely diverse cultures. For instance, Coca-Cola and PepsiCo are the two biggest and most successful businesses in the soft drink sector. Given that they offer comparable goods and operate in comparable contexts, we could anticipate that their cultures would be similar. They are not, however. Coca-Cola takes pride in its dedication to its workforce over the long term, in its devoted managers many of whom work there for the whole of their careers and in its careful and cooperative planning style. In contrast, PepsiCo has a very political and competitive culture where disagreements over decisions often lead to arguments and regular management turnover. Organisational design and change may be used to control organisational culture, which changes much as organisational structure does.

CONCLUSION

Organisations and organisational efficiency are interwoven, with the latter being crucial to success and sustainability in the contemporary corporate environment. The degree to which an organisation accomplishes its objectives while effectively using its resources is referred to as organisational effectiveness. It includes a number of aspects, including as financial performance, staff happiness, innovation, productivity, and customer satisfaction. In conclusion, businesses that prioritise and spend money on improving their organisational efficiency are more likely to succeed in the long run. Organisations may maximise efficiency, encourage innovation, and provide value to stakeholders by matching their strategy, structures, processes, culture, and performance measurement. Organisational performance is ultimately a journey that calls for constant assessment, modification, and a dedication to perfection.

REFERENCES:

[1] Y. W. Lin and Y. Y. Lin, "Health-promoting organization and organizational effectiveness of health promotion in hospitals: A national cross-sectional survey in Taiwan," *Health Promotion International*. 2011. doi: 10.1093/heapro/daq068.

[2] S. H. Jeong, T. Lee, I. S. Kim, M. H. Lee, and M. J. Kim, "The effect of nurses' use of the principles of learning organization on organizational effectiveness," *J. Adv. Nurs.*, 2007, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.04206.x.

[3] E. Singh, P. Leader, and A. P. Limited, "Learning organization and its impact on organizational effectiveness: a literature review," *Int. J. Reseatch Commer. Manag.*, 2016.

[4] D. Thatrak, "The Effect of Strategic Innovation on Company Performance: A Case Study of the Industrial Estate of Thailand," *J. Asian Financ.*, 2021.

[5] A. Bikmoradi, J. Fardmal, and Y. Torabi, "Correlation of learning organization with organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness of educational and therapeutic centers of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences in Iran," *Amaz. Investig.*, 2017.

[6] M. A. Kareem And I. J. Hussein, "The Impact of Human Resource Development on Employee Performance and Organizational Effectiveness," *Manag. Dyn. Knowl. Econ.*, 2013, doi: 10.25019/mdke/7.3.02.

[7] P.-S. Yu and H.-S. Choi, "The Effect of a Librarian's Organizational Commitment and Organization Citizenship Behavior on Organizational Effectiveness," *J. Korean Soc. Inf. Manag.*, 2016, doi: 10.3743/kosim.2016.33.2.007.

[8] C. L. Nwanzu and S. S. Babalola, "Predictive relationship between sustainable organisational practices and organisational effectiveness: The mediating role of organisational identification and organisation-based self-esteem," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su10023440.

[9] Ali Sudqi Al-Za`areer, Rula Ali Al-Damen, "Impact of learning organization on organizational effectiveness – An applied study on Five Star hotels in Jordan. doi: 10.26389/ajsrp.o161220.

[10] S.-H. Hong, S.-H. Seo, and W.-H. Yi, "Analysis of the Moderating Effect of Disaster Management Organization Type on Resilience Capability and Organizational Effectiveness," *J. Korean Soc. Hazard Mitig.*, 2020, doi: 10.9798/kosham.2020.20.3.19.

CHAPTER 2

DESIGNING ORGANIZATIONS AND CHANGE

Dr. Nishant Labhane, Assistant Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:nishantbhimrao@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Organisational design is the process by which managers choose and control elements of culture and structure so that a company may exert control over the actions required to meet its objectives. The competitive advantage of a company, its capacity to handle unforeseen circumstances and manage diversity, its efficiency, its capacity to produce new goods and services, its control over the environment, the coordination and motivation of employees, and the development and implementation of strategy are all significantly impacted by organisational design. In order to evolve from their current state to a desired future state and boost their performance, organisations rethink and transform their cultures and organisational structures. Finding new or better methods to use resources and competencies to boost an organization's capacity to produce value and, therefore, performance, is the aim of organisational transformation. The external resource approach, the internal systems approach, and the technical approach are three methods that managers may use to assess the success of their organisations. Each strategy has a set of objectives for the organisation as well as a set of metrics that can be used to gauge its efficacy.

KEYWORDS:

Capacity, Culture, Environment, Organization, Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Organisational design is the process by which managers choose and control elements of culture and structure so that a company may exert control over the actions required to meet its objectives. The organisation utilises its organisational structure and culture to accomplish its aims; organisational design explains how and why different approaches are used. The principles guiding an organization's operation and design determine how it behaves. It is a duty that calls on managers to achieve a balance between internal demands from, for instance, an organization's choice of technology, and external pressures from the environment. Organisational members may observe and react to the environment differently as a result of the design, whether viewed from the outside. Looking inward, an organization's design influences how people and work groups should act. Finding the right balance contributes to the organization's long-term survival. The ideas, concepts, and methods described in this book are meant to provide you practical tools you may use to analyse organisational challenges and to suggest and carry out appropriate solutions in order to transform an organisation and improve its efficacy [1]–[3].

As they create new technologies and release new goods, high-tech companies like Google, Apple, and Intel must be adaptable and capable of swift answers to the competitive movements of their rivals—Facebook, Samsung, and ARM. The ability of such organisations' members to collaborate to generate value, address issues, and achieve organisational goals requires solid task connections. In contrast, businesses like Nucor and Alcoa, which manufacture sheet steel and aluminium, respectively, operate in conditions that are more stable and where technological advancements are more gradual. As a result, rather of choosing a structure and culture that encourage flexibility, their organisational design decisions are probably motivated by the requirement for a structure and culture that lower production costs. The process by which organisations transition from their current state to a desired future state in order to boost their performance is known as organisational transformation. Increasing an organization's capacity to create value and, consequently, its performance, is the aim of organisational change. Organisational structure and culture are once again a key tool or fulcrum that managers use to change the organisation in order for it to reach its desired state in the future.

Change and organisational design are thus closely intertwined. In fact, the process of organisational redesign and transformation may be thought of as organisational change. As organisations expand, their structure and culture change continuously and become more complicated, as we will cover in following chapters. Because of the differences in structure and culture between big and small organisations, the design and redesign challenges they encounter are distinct. In fact, it has been claimed that early choices are a crucial driver of disparities in long-run performance. Managers need to understand that their initial design decisions will have significant consequences in the future as their organisations evolve. As an example, think about how Steve Jobs' designs for the organisational structure and culture of Apple evolved as he learnt more about them, as seen in Organisational. People who start new organisations may initially lack the kinds of skills or knowledge to manage an organization's structure and culture effectively, but many of them can develop these skills over time, as the example of how Steve Jobs had changed his approach to organising people and resources suggests. This learning process is sped up and awareness for the many nuanced technological and social factors that affect how organisations function is deepened by understanding the concepts underlying organisational design and transformation.

Organisational Design and Change: Their Importance

Organisational design is now one of management's top responsibilities as a result of rising demands from worldwide competition and the growing usage of modern IT. In order to improve the value that their organisations can provide, managers are looking for more creative and effective methods than ever before to coordinate and inspire their teams. Designing an organization's structure and culture, as well as altering them to improve its effec- tiveness, are crucial responsibilities for a number of reasons. A company's capacity to handle unforeseen events, gain a competitive edge, manage diversity successfully, and boost efficiency and innovation are all significantly impacted by organisational design and transformation.

Taking Care of Emergencies

A contingency is an unforeseen circumstance that has to be prepared for. Examples include the pressure of a changing environment, such as increasing gas costs, or the advent of a new rival, such as Amazon.com, who chooses to employ new technology in a creative manner. How well an organisation is able to adapt to varied demands in its environment and so get limited resources depends on the design of the organisation. The degree to which an organization's design gives it influence over these three environmental aspects, for instance, determines its capacity to recruit qualified staff, devoted consumers, or government contracts.

In order to have more control over its environment, a company might build its structure in a variety of ways. An organisation may alter task connections with workers to increase environmental awareness, or it may alter its interactions with other organisations by creating new contracts or joint ventures. For instance, Microsoft hired a significant number of customer service professionals and established a new department to enable them to better serve consumers when it sought to draw in more users for its Windows software both domestically and internationally. Over 90% of all desktop PCs worldwide still run on the Windows platform, demonstrating how successful the plan was. In order to adapt to the increasingly complex and challenging environment that all organizations are faced with, including challenges from customers, rivals, and the government, more effective forms of structure and culture are constantly being created and tested [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

The global environment is one aspect of the organisational environment that is both significant and complicated. In order to save costs, boost productivity, and ensure their survival in the 2000s, American businesses like Apple, IBM, and Walmart are continuously under pressure to broaden their worldwide reach and create and sell more of their goods in foreign markets. An organisation often has to develop a new structure and culture in order to compete globally, therefore organisational design is crucial in this context. The structures and cultures that a corporation might acquire as it participates in various sorts of worldwide operations. Another occurrence to which organisations must adapt is changing technology. Today, managing connections with workers, customers, and suppliers is one of the main ways businesses utilise the Internet and other cutting-edge IT. Organisations have altered their structures to make the best use of IT as a result of the expanding usage of IT, which is fundamentally altering how organisational structures are built. Examining how IT is altering the nature of the organisational border and the specific methods in which organisations coordinate people and activities is a recurring issue throughout the book. Organisational operations have altered significantly as a result of the rise of outsourcing and global network organisations, whose members are predominantly connected via electronic methods. Later chapters go into more detail on the advantages and disadvantages of this shift in organizational structure as organisations seek to improve their efficacy and obtain a competitive edge.

Getting an edge over competitors

Organisations are learning more and more how organisational design, transformation, and re-design may be a source of long-term competitive advantage. A firm may surpass another if its management are able to extract more value from the resources at their disposal, which gives them a competitive edge. Core competencies, managers' skills, and talents in value-creating activities like manufacturing, R&D, managing new technologies, or organisational design and transformation are the source of competitive advantage. A corporation might establish a plan to outperform rivals and provide better goods, or offer the same products but at a cheaper cost, based on its core competencies. The specific set of choices and activities that managers make in order to exploit their core competencies to gain a competitive advantage and outperform rivals is known as a strategy. Take Groupon, which is profiled in Organisational Insight 1.2, as an example. The company has been hurrying to build its strategy in order to attract consumers and maintain its competitive edge.

Because it impacts how the organisation executes strategy, how managers develop and modify organisational structure is a key factor in determining how much value the organisation produces. Because they are very simple for rivals to copy, many sources of competitive advantage, such as expertise in research and development that results in unique product features or cutting-edge technology, vanish. Imitating effective organisational design and thoughtfully orchestrated transformation that results in a successful organisational structure and culture is significantly more difficult. Such imitation is challenging since structure and culture are ingrained in how individuals interact with one another and coordinate their efforts to complete a task in an organisation. Furthermore, since they take a long time to build and develop and because good structures and cultures take a long time to construct, such at Dell and Apple, those who have them may have a long-term competitive edge. Organisational design must be a constantly developing management activity for a corporation to remain ahead of the competition as an organization's strategy is always altering in response to changes in the environment. The demands of an organisation can never be met by a single optimum or "perfect" design. The effectiveness of the organisational structure and culture must be continuously assessed by managers, who should also alter them as needed.

Taking Care of Diversity

The values of an organization's culture and its effectiveness are significantly impacted by differences in the race, gender, and country origin of its members. For instance, the variety of opinions taken into account and the kind of analysis used determine the effectiveness of organisational decision making. Similar to this, a significant portion of the workforce in many organisations consists of minority employees, whose requirements and preferences must be taken into account. Also requiring consideration and forethought are changes in the nature of the workforce, such as an influx of new immigrants or the ageing of the present workforce. An organisation must build a structure and control system that will allow it to make the most use of the capabilities of a varied staff and foster a collaborative workplace culture. How well managers can organise and inspire employees depends on the structure and culture of the company. Organisational design is becoming even more crucial to balancing national and organisational cultures as businesses increasingly operate in nations with wildly divergent cultures throughout the world.

Advocing Efficiency, Speed, and Innovation

Businesses exist to provide valuable products and services to their target markets. Organisations generate value by producing more or better products and services the more effectively they operate. Since the beginning of time, improved methods of creating and distributing products and services have greatly boosted an organization's ability to produce value. We previously spoke about how the division of labour is essential for lowering expenses, accelerating work processes, and improving efficiency. Equally crucial are the creation and use of new, more effective organisational structures. For instance, in the current global climate, competition from nations with cheap labour costs is forcing businesses all over the globe to become more efficient in order to lower prices or improve quality [5].

Increasingly, a company's capacity to compete effectively in today's market depends on how well it can innovate and how rapidly it can adopt new technology. Innovation heavily depends on organisational design. For instance, how an organization's structure connects personnel with various specialties, such as marketing and research, affects how quickly it can launch new products. Similar to how individuals' willingness to be inventive may be influenced by an organization's culture. Because entrepreneurial ideals allow employees to learn how to react and adapt to changing circumstances, cultures based on these norms and values are more likely to foster innovation than cultures that are conservative and bureaucratic. A key component of organisational design is the ongoing quest for fresh or more effective methods of coordinating and inspiring people. Employees are and are treated differently as a result of varied institutions and cultures. In Chapters 4, 5, and 6, we look at the structures that promote efficiency and creativity, and in Chapter 7, we look at the cultures that do the same.

The Effects of Inadequate Organisational Design

Many management teams are unaware of the significant impacts organisational design and transformation may have on the efficiency and success of their business. Despite the fact that organisational structure and culture govern behaviour, managers often aren't aware of all the variables that play a part in this connection, giving little thought to how people behave and their place in the company that is, until something goes wrong. In the last ten years, Ford, Sears, and Kodak have all struggled mightily to adapt to the realities of contemporary global competition, which has resulted in sharp declines in sales and profits. They have cut down on the quantity of items they produce, their employees, and even their investment in R&D as a result. Why did these blue-chip firms' performance decline so drastically? Managers' loss of influence over their companies' cultures and organisational structures is a crucial factor. These corporations grew to be so large and bureaucratic that its management and staff were unable to adjust and change with the times [6]–[8].

The organisation will deteriorate as a result of bad organisational design or a lack of attention to organisational design. Talented workers depart for employment with strong, expanding businesses. The process of creating value slows down as resources become more difficult to get. When organisational design is neglected until a crisis is imminent, managers are forced to make changes to the organisational structure and culture that undermine the business's strategy. One significant change in the previous ten years at big businesses has been the hiring of chief operating officers, who are now in charge of managing organisational structure and culture. In addition to organising tiny, gradual changes in strategy, structure, and culture, COOs often oversee teams of senior managers with extensive expertise who are in charge of organisational design. It is crucial to comprehend how managers assess organisational performance since they are in charge of making the best use of organisational resources to maximise an organization's capacity to generate value. Control, innovation, and efficiency have been identified by researchers who have studied what CEOs and managers do as the three most crucial activities managers use to evaluate and measure how well they and their organisations are able to create value. In this sense, control refers to having influence over the outside world and the capacity to draw in resources and clients.

Developing an organization's capacities and talents will enable it to create novel goods and procedures. Efficiency entails developing cutting-edge production facilities using new information technologies that can produce and distribute a company's products in a timely and cost-effective manner. It also means designing and developing new organizational structures and cultures that enhance a company's ability to change, adapt, and improve how it functions. To increase productivity, it also entails implementing strategies like complete quality management, just-in-time inventory systems, and Internet-based information systems. Managers may choose one of three methods to assess how well an organization handles each of these three difficulties. An organization is effective if it can attract valuable and scarce resources and skills from outside the company; creatively match resources with employee talents to develop new products and respond to shifting consumer demands; and effectively translate resources and skills into finished products and services.

The Use of External Resources: Control

Managers may assess how well an organisation manages and controls its external environment using the external resource method. For instance, managers and the survival of the organisation place a high value on an organization's ability to sway stakeholders' perceptions in its favour and receive a favourable assessment from outside stakeholders.

Similarly, an organization's capacity to make use of its surroundings and secure valuable resources is another sign of its environmental control. Managers utilise indicators like stock price, profitability, and return on investment, which compare the success of their organisation to the performance of other organisations, to assess how well they are controlling the environment. Because it affects shareholder expectations, top managers keep a careful eye on the stock price of their firm. Similar to this, managers research the quality of their company's goods in comparison to those of their rivals in an effort to draw consumers and assess the effectiveness of their organisation.

Another sign of an organization's capacity to shape and control its environment is top management's capacity to notice and react to environmental changes or to start changes and be the first to seize new opportunities [9]–[11].

For instance, it is generally known that the Walt Disney Company has the capacity and desire to manage its environment by taking every opportunity to leverage its reputation and brand name to generate new goods that take advantage of market possibilities. An example of this was when it acquired Pixar from Steve Jobs. Similar to this, CEO Larry Page has said that he wants Google to have a competitive edge by leading new developments in mobile computing hardware and software. These businesses convey via their competitiveness that they want to maintain control over their surroundings in order to maintain access to valuable and limited resources like markets and consumers. Managers are aware that stakeholders evaluate how well a company's management is regulating its environment based on the aggressiveness, entrepreneurial spirit, and reputation of the organisation. Companies must learn to define and redefine their businesses to meet those demands in rapidly changing settings where consumers' needs alter and develop and where new customer groups arise as a consequence of new technology producing new sorts of goods and services. In order to effectively fulfil changing consumer demands and preferences, businesses must pay careful attention to their customers.

Innovation Using Internal Systems Approach

Managers may assess how well an organisation performs and functions using the internal systems method. An organisation requires a structure and a culture that promote flexibility and prompt reactions to changing environmental circumstances if it is to be successful. The company must also be adaptable in order to make decisions quickly and provide goods and services. The time it takes to make a decision, the time it takes to bring new goods to market, and the time it takes to coordinate the operations of several departments are all indicators of an organization's potential for innovation. These criteria are often measurable objectively. As an example, Netflix reported in the spring of 2011 that its quick actions to negotiate deals with major film studios to hasten the debut of its new online movie streaming service had resulted to a record rise in the number of its customers and that its stock price had surged. Similar to this, Apple's ability to redesign and enhance its products far more swiftly than its competitors allowed it to declare record sales of the new generations of the iPhone and iPad in 2011.

The effectiveness of an organization's internal processes that affect staff coordination or motivation directly affects that organization's capacity to react to its environment. Companies like Netflix and Apple have been able to outperform rivals like Blockbuster, Comcast, Blackberry, and HP because to the shorter product development cycle. Customers that always desire the product that incorporates the most current technology available, such as the most cutting-edge Intel CPUs, or software programmes like those in Apple's App Store, are attracted to companies with superior product launch capabilities.

Efficiency in Technical Approach

The technical method enables managers to assess how effectively a company can produce finished products and services from a certain quantity of organisational skills and resources. Technical effectiveness is measured in terms of productivity and efficiency.24 For instance, an increase in the number of units produced without the use of additional labour and a decrease in the amount of labour or materials needed to produce each unit of output both indicate a gain in productivity. Productivity indicators are unbiased assessments of how well a company's manufacturing processes are working. As a result, production line managers often use indicators like the quantity of defective goods or wasted materials to gauge productivity at all stages of the manufacturing process. They are rewarded for cost-cutting after they figure out how to boost productivity. Line managers use measures like sales per employee or the ratio of sold-to-returned items to evaluate staff productivity in service organisations, when no physical commodities are generated. No matter how complicated a task is, there is usually a method to assess productivity or performance. Employee attitude, motivation, and a willingness to cooperate are also significant factors influencing productivity and efficiency.

In many settings, rewards offered to both employees and managers are closely linked to improvements in productivity, so it is important to choose the appropriate measures to evaluate effectiveness. In the aviation industry, it is crucial to constantly increase productivity. Due to increased fuel costs, the majority of big airlines reported billions of dollars in losses during the current financial crisis, however one carrier, Southwest Airlines, only reported reduced profits. Even though its prices have historically been at least 25% less than those of its competitors, Southwest has long been the most profitable U.S. airline. The main factor in its excellent performance is its constant effort to improve operational effectiveness. The airline has focused on creating an operational structure that reduces the cost of inputs and the cost of transforming inputs into outputs, which are on-time flights that please passengers, from the inception, under the supervision of its founder, Herb Kelleher.

How does it accomplish this? To ensure the new recruit will fit in and be a team member with the correct attitude, Southwest carefully picks its human resource inputs; just 3% of those who are interviewed each year are employed, and its current workers are the ones who decide the hiring decisions. This is a crucial tactic since staff members are required to maintain a positive, supportive attitude towards both passengers and one another. All of Southwest's staff members are required to support one another as needed to expedite the departure of its flights in order to boost efficiency. Southwest can turn a jet around and have it back in the air in 30 to 45 minutes, which is far faster than its competitors. In the airline industry, efficiency is judged by the amount of time each plane spends in the air, not at the gate. The bottom line is that Southwest requires fewer staff than other airlines in order to efficiently operate its fleet of aircraft, which results in significant cost savings. It also makes efficient use of other inputs.

For instance, since it exclusively flies the Boeing 737, far less pilot training is needed, which lowers maintenance costs. Additionally, it exclusively flies into low-cost airports, not the major city airports where landing fees, traffic congestion, and aircraft turnaround times are often substantially greater. Additionally, it runs a "hub-and-spoke" network, which means that most of its flights land before they get to their final destination. This helps it to fill its planes more readily and use its resources more effectively. Finally, Southwest never provided complimentary lunches or other freebies to customers, a strategy that other airlines have now adopted in an effort to save expenses as fuel prices rise. A further simplification of its processes is that, although testing allocated seats, boarding is done on a first-come, first-served basis.

In order to increase efficiency, Southwest essentially works to simplify and streamline all of its operational processes. However, its lean and simplified operations are only achievable because of the collaboration amongst its staff. And as we just stated, coordination alone won't ensure that an organization's operational structure functions well; workers also need to be inspired to put in extra effort and work together. Southwest has always provided its workers with a substantial profit-sharing scheme that rewards them with company shares based on the firm's performance. Southwest's workers now hold more than 20% of the company's shares, which is a definite evidence that the company's ongoing efforts to design an operational structure that increases efficiency have been successful. In order to increase the number of its domestic routes, Southwest acquired AirTran in 2011. JetBlue, Southwest's current low-cost competitor, adopted Southest's business model. Both of these airlines frequently rank at the top of customer satisfaction surveys.

Organisational objectives for Evaluating Performance

To gauge how well the organisation is doing, managers set targets. Official objectives and operational goals are two different sorts of goals used to gauge organisational success. The organisation legally outlines its guiding principles in its annual report and other public publications as its official aims. These objectives often outline the organization's mission: they describe why the organisation exists and what it ought to be doing. Official objectives include guiding a product's production, displaying a preeminent concern for the safety of the public, and other objectives. Consider how Amazon.com's mission and goals have changed from 1998 to 2008 as its managers changed its business operations to better manage its environment. Official goals are meant to legitimise the organisation and its activities, enabling it to obtain resources and the support of its stakeholders. Due to its growth and development, as these developments imply, Amazon.com now caters to the demands of three distinct client types. As a consequence, as we will describe in subsequent chapters, its organisational structure has also become much more complicated [12].

Operative goals are precise long- and short-term objectives that direct managers and staff members as they carry out the organization's job. Managers may utilise the operational objectives to assess the efficiency of their organisations. Operational objectives may be used by managers to gauge how well they are handling the environment. Market share: is it growing or shrinking? Are input costs increasing or decreasing? The length of time it takes to reach a decision or the level of conflict among organisational members may also be used to gauge how effectively the organisation is doing. Finally, they may assess their efficiency by setting operational objectives that enable them to benchmark themselves against their rivals, or to contrast their own cost and quality accomplishments with those of their rivals. For instance, in an effort to continually improve performance, UPS, FedEx, and First Global Xpress keep tabs on one another's package delivery times and lost cargo rates.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the success of contemporary enterprises depends on the interdependence of organisational design and change management. The establishment of structures, procedures, and systems that enhance performance and promote cooperation is included in organisational design. On the other side, change management entails purposefully modifying the present condition of an organisation to accommodate changing internal and external circumstances. Organisational design and change management necessitate a dynamic and iterative methodology. Organisations need to understand that change is a continual process, not a singular event. In order to successfully navigate the transition process, they must cultivate a culture that values adaptation, promotes employee participation, and supports efficient communication. Successful organisations are aware that managing change and developing organisations are constant processes. They make investments in solid design methodologies that support company goals and beliefs while still staying adaptable and receptive to changes that may be required. They make use of cutting-edge approaches and technologies to facilitate quick and efficient change implementation.

REFERENCES:

[1] C. G. Worley and E. E. Lawler, "Designing organizations that are built to change," *MIT Sloan Manag. Rev.*, 2006.

[2] R. Duran-Novoa, J. D. Weigl, M. Henz, and E. C. Y. Koh, "Designing in young organisations: engineering change propagation in a university design project," *Res. Eng. Des.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s00163-018-0292-9.

[3] E. E. Lawler and C. G. Worley, "Designing Organizations That Are Built to Change," *MIT Sloan Manag. Rev.*, 2006.

[4] E. E. Lawler, "Designing Change Capable Organizations," *Cent. Eff. Organ. Marshall Sch. Bus. Univ. South. Calif.*, 2000.

[5] J. Molineux, "Using action research for change in organizations: processes, reflections and outcomes," *J. Work. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/JWAM-03-2017-0007.

[6] H. L. Colquhoun, J. E. Squires, N. Kolehmainen, C. Fraser, and J. M. Grimshaw, "Methods for designing interventions to change healthcare professionals' behaviour: A systematic review," *Implementation Science*. 2017. doi: 10.1186/s13012-017-0560-5.

[7] C. Adams, A. Dawson, and M. Foureur, "Competing Values Framework: A useful tool to define the predominant culture in a maternity setting in Australia," *Women and Birth*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.wombi.2016.09.005.

[8] D. Ifenthaler, S. Hofhues, M. Egloffstein, and C. Helbig, *Digital transformation of learning organizations*. 2021. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-55878-9.

[9] E. D. Kooijman, S. McQuaid, M. L. Rhodes, M. J. Collier, and F. Pilla, "Innovating with nature: From nature-based solutions to nature-based enterprises," *Sustain.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13031263.

[10] R. Deiser, "Designing the smart organization: How breakthrough corporate learning initiatives drive strategic change and innovation.," *Des. smart Organ. How Breakthr. Corp. Learn. Initiat. drive Strateg. Chang. Innov.*, 2009.

[11] A. Mihailović, J. C. Smolović, I. Radević, N. Rašović, and N. Martinović, "Covid-19 and beyond: Employee perceptions of the efficiency of teleworking and its cybersecurity implications," *Sustain.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13126750.

[12] M. Leufvén, R. Vitrakoti, A. Bergström, K. C. Ashish, and M. Målqvist, "Dimensions of Learning Organizations Questionnaire (DLOQ) in a low-resource health care setting in Nepal," *Heal. Res. Policy Syst.*, 2015, doi: 10.1186/1478-4505-13-6.

CHAPTER 3

DETERMINE THE DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDER GROUPS, INTERESTS, AND THEIR CLAIMS AGAINST AN ORGANIZATION

Ms. Swati Sharma, Assistant Professor
Masters In Business Administration, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:swatisharma@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The success of an organisation depends heavily on its ability to identify and manage stakeholders. Stakeholders are people, organisations, or groups that have a stake in the operations and results of a company. The significance of recognising various stakeholder groups, their diverse interests, and potential complaints they may have about an organisation are discussed in this abstract. Organisations function within intricate ecologies where a variety of stakeholder groups have an effect on and affect the operations and goals of the organisation. It is essential to recognise and comprehend these stakeholders for efficient decision-making, strategic planning, and sustaining good relationships. Employees, clients, suppliers, shareholders, government organisations, regional communities, advocacy organisations, and more are examples of stakeholder groups. Regarding the organization's activities and performance, each group has own interests, expectations, and worries. These pursuits may include everything from monetary gain and employment stability to social responsibility, environmental sustainability, and ethical behaviour. Stakeholders may also make a variety of accusations against an organisation. The demands, expectations, or complaints that stakeholders have about the organization's choices or activities are represented by these claims. Customers, for instance, can insist on high-quality goods and first-rate customer service, while staff members would want reasonable pay, secure working conditions, and chances for advancement. Environmentalists may promote sustainable methods, and local communities may anticipate beneficial contributions to their social and economic well-being from the organisation.

KEYWORDS:

Company, Economic, Management, Organization, Stockholder, Social.

INTRODUCTION

Organisations are a part of a complex social environment that is shaped by the requirements and preferences of its constituents. When creating an organisational structure and culture that fosters effectiveness and restricts managers' and workers' capacity to utilise organisational resources for their own goals or that harms the interests of other stakeholders, it is important to take into account the interests of all stakeholders. All individuals who have control over organisational resources must prioritise developing an ethical culture and ensuring that organisational members adhere to ethical principles while making decisions.

Corporate Stakeholders

Organisations exist because they may provide value and desirable results for a variety of stakeholder groups, or those who have an interest in an organisation, what it does, and how well it performs. Stakeholders are often encouraged to join an organisation if they are given incentives that are worth more than the contributions they are needed to make. Rewards like money, authority, and organisational position are examples of inducements. Contributions include the expertise, knowledge, and abilities that organisations expect from their members to do tasks. Inside stakeholders and outside stakeholders are the two basic categories of organisational stakeholders [1]–[3].

Interned Parties

Shareholders, managers, and employees are examples of inside stakeholders since they are closest to an organisation and have the greatest or most direct claim on its resources. Shareholders because they are the company's owners, shareholders often have a stronger claim on organisational resources than other internal stakeholders. The shareholders' contribution to the company is their financial investment via the purchase of shares or stock. The potential return on their investment in the form of dividends and rises in stock price is what encourages shareholders to invest. However, since there is no certainty of a return, investing in stocks is hazardous. Investors who don't think the enticement is sufficient to justify their contribution sell their shares and stop supporting the company.

The financial crisis that followed the previous recession brought on by the sub-prime mortgage issue culminated in a stock market crash during which the majority of investors lost 40% or more of the value of their stock investments. In order to defend their interests and improve their collective capacity to influence top management, shareholders most often mutual fund investors are leaning more and more on the government and huge institutional investment corporations. Both mutual fund managers and large mutual fund companies like Fidelity and TIAA/CREF are aware of their growing obligations to investors who lost billions in their pension funds as a result of the subprime crisis and the earlier dot.com meltdown. Mutual fund managers are also aware of their growing obligation to monitor the performance of top managers to stop the kinds of unethical and illegal actions that led to the collapse of Lehman Brothers, Enron, Tyco, and other companies. In order to ensure that the senior management of the firms they invest in operate in a way that does not jeopardise shareholders' interests while advancing their own, mutual fund companies must monitor and exert influence over these companies' behavior.

Mutual fund firms have become more outspoken in their attempts to persuade senior management as a consequence of this concern for shareholders. For instance, they have attempted to persuade businesses to remove "poison pills," or antitakeover clauses that make it very difficult and costly for another business to buy them. Poison pills are popular among top managers because they help them keep their positions, lucrative incomes, and other benefits. The massive salaries and bonuses that top managers award themselves, which have risen to record levels in recent years, are another issue that mutual fund firms are becoming more interested in regulating. They have also demanded that businesses explain their accounting practises in response to the accounting issues that caused Enron to fail and the subpar performance of other businesses like Computer Associates. Additionally, they have been effective in pressuring Congress to enact new legislation like the Sarbanes-Oxley and Dodd-Frank Acts and to give government agencies like the Federal Trade Commission more authority to supervise banks and other financial firms. Companies now find it harder to cover up unfair, immoral, or unlawful activities that may benefit management but harm other stakeholders, most notably consumers.

Managers

Managers are the staff members in charge of organising organisational resources and making sure that an organization's objectives are effectively accomplished. To maximise the value of an organization's future production of products and services, top managers must spend shareholder money in resources. In actuality, managers act as the shareholders' representatives or workers; they are chosen by shareholders via the board of directors that shareholders choose to supervise managers' operations. The abilities and expertise that managers bring to the table are used to build the organisational structure and culture as well as to plan and coordinate the organization's reaction to external challenges. For instance, a manager's abilities to expand into new markets, find new product markets, or resolve technology and transaction cost issues may considerably aid in the accomplishment of organisational objectives. Managers are motivated to do their jobs successfully by a variety of incentives, including monetary remuneration and the psychological high they get from running the company, wielding authority, or taking calculated risks with other people's money. Managers are likely to withdraw their support by quitting the organisation if they feel that the inducements do not equal or surpass their contributions. Therefore, top managers switch companies in order to get better compensation for their work [4]–[6].

The Workforce

Nonmanagerial workers make up the majority of a company's workforce. The workforce is made up of individuals who are responsible for completing tasks and obligations to the needed standard. Employers benefit from the skills and knowledge that employees utilise to fulfil necessary tasks and obligations at a high level. However, an employee does have some degree of influence over how effectively they perform. The incentives that the company employs to influence employee performance are, in fact, often a result of the person's drive to do well. Employees who do not feel that these incentives match or surpass their contributions are likely to stop supporting the organisation by lowering their performance standards or quitting altogether.

External Stakeholders

Outside stakeholders are those who have no ownership or employment in the organisation but do have an interest in it. Outside stakeholders include people and organisations like as clients, vendors, the government, labour unions, regional communities, and the general public.

DISCUSSION

Customers are often the biggest group of external stakeholders for a company. Customers are persuaded to choose a certain product over competing ones by how valuable they see the benefits of the product in comparison to the price they must pay. The amount people pay for the goods represents their commitment to the company and the perceived value they get from it. Customers will continue to purchase the product and support the company as long as the price is equal to or lower than the value they perceive they are receiving. If customers decline to pay the price the company is requesting, they renounce their support, and the company loses a crucial stakeholder. Southwest Airlines is an example of a business that works hard to provide consumers with a lot of value, and the outcome is their steadfast support. Southwest Airlines focuses on boosting its efficiency to provide cheaper prices.

Southwest sends birthday cards to frequent flyers, personally replies to the thousands of customer letters it receives each week, and routinely solicits feedback from customers on how to improve service, all practises that former CEO Herb Kelleher credits with the success of his airline. Southwest has been one of the fastest growing and most successful U.S. airline companies for more than ten years because to its dedication to its clients, who feel cherished and encouraged to travel when they get such individualised service. Southwest also has the view that staff won't serve consumers fairly if management doesn't treat them fairly. Additionally, as we have pointed out, 20% of Southwest's stock is owned by its workers, which gives them an added incentive to contribute to the organisation and enhance customer service. Thus, one stakeholder group supports another.

Suppliers

Suppliers, another significant group of external stakeholders, support the organisation by supplying dependable raw materials and component components that enable the organisation to lower uncertainty in its technical or manufacturing operations and, as a result, lower production costs. Suppliers have a direct impact on an organization's productivity and a secondary one on how well it can draw in consumers. High-quality inputs enable an organisation to produce high-quality items and attract clients. The company then places increased expectations on its suppliers for larger amounts of high-quality inputs as demand for its goods rises. Japanese automobiles continue to be quite popular with American buyers in part because they still need less maintenance than the typical American-built car. The utilisation of component components that adhere to strict quality control requirements is what gives this dependability. The efficiency of Japanese component suppliers is also continually being improved. The strong partnership between the major Japanese automakers and their suppliers is a stakeholder relationship that benefits both sides over the long run. After realising this, American automakers began to build solid connections with their suppliers in the 2000s to raise quality, which boosted the dependability of their automobiles. As a consequence, Ford in particular has made significant quality improvements and announced record profitability in 2011.

The Government

The government has a number of claims against a company. It urges businesses to play by the laws of free competition and engage in fair competition. Additionally, it wants businesses to abide by established guidelines and regulations pertaining to worker compensation and treatment, workplace safety and health, nondiscriminatory employment practises, and other social and economic concerns for which Congress has passed legislation. By standardising laws so that they apply to all businesses and prevent any from gaining an unfair competitive advantage, the government helps the organisation. The government is in charge of enforcing the laws governing ethical corporate conduct, and it has the authority to sue any corporation that disobeys the law. various commentators have claimed that more regulations are required to oversee various areas of the way organisations work in light of the continuous corporate scandals of the 2000s. By putting a time restriction on how long a partnership between a corporation and the accounting firm that audits its records might last, some politicians hoped to regulate this relationship. Accountancy firms lobbied for the rule to be passed, although it simply restricts the amount of time one of their partners may supervise a specific account. After then, the account is transferred to a different partner in the same business rather than to a new accounting firm, which is obviously a far laxer supervision regime. Financial lobbyists who wanted to limit the Dodd-Frank Act's ability to regulate financial institutions attacked it in 2011. The law created a strong government agency to defend consumers against discriminatory ATM and interest rate charges from banks and credit card firms.

Trade Unions

A trade union's relationship with an organisation may either be one of conflict or collaboration. The productivity and efficacy of the organisation and the union are directly impacted by the type of the partnership. If both sides agree on a fair share of the benefits from an increase in a company's fortunes, cooperation between management and the union may result in favourable long-term consequences. For instance, managers and the union may agree to split the benefits of cost savings attributable to productivity increases brought on by flexible work schedules. The management-union relationship has historically been adversarial, however, as a result of the direct conflict between shareholders' expectations for more corporate profits and, therefore, higher returns on their investments, and unions' demands for larger benefits [7]–[9].

Local Communities

Local communities have a stake in an organization's performance since local enterprises' success or failure directly influences employment, housing, and a community's overall economic well-being. For instance, Austin's and Seattle's economies are strongly related to those of Dell and other computer businesses, as well as those of the Boeing Corporation.

The General Public

When businesses successfully compete against international competition, the general public is pleased. Given the intimate relationship between a country's current and future riches and the effectiveness of its commercial organisations and economic institutions, this is not unexpected. For instance, even when imported goods are clearly better, the French and Italians choose locally manufactured automobiles and other goods. They are somewhat motivated by national pride to support their nation's organisations by purchasing its goods. American customers often don't provide their businesses the same kind of support. In order to preserve the long-term viability of American enterprises, they emphasise competition above loyalty. The general populace of a country expects its firms to behave in a socially responsible manner, which implies abstaining from any acts that could harm or cost other stakeholders.

For instance, a controversy shook United Way of America in the 1990s when it came to light that its president, William Aramony, had used the organization's finances improperly to pay for extravagant personal expenses. Elaine L. Chao, a seasoned investment banker and former head of the Peace Corps, was named the new president of United Way in an effort to persuade prior donors, particularly significant funders like Xerox and General Electric, not to withhold funds. She prevented a significant fall in public donations by implementing tough new financial controls right away. Within a few years, many had forgotten about the controversy, and donations were back to where they had been. After Hurricane Katrina ravaged New Orleans, the Red Cross had similar issues as a result of the ineffective management of its resources. That organisation has also undergone a significant restructure to improve its efficiency. Finding means to keep an eye on not-for-profits in order to make sure that their management are acting ethically has grown to be a serious problem in recent years.

Organisational effectiveness: Meeting the objectives and interests of stakeholders

Various stakeholder groups utilise an organisation in tandem to achieve their objectives. For an organisation to be successful and to fulfil its objective of creating products and services, the participation of all stakeholders are required. Each stakeholder group has its own set of objectives that drive it to contribute to the organisation, and each group assesses the success of the organisation by determining how effectively it achieves those objectives. Customers judge a company by the dependability and value of its goods in relation to their cost, shareholders by the return on their investment, managers and workers by their pay, stock options, working conditions, and career possibilities. These objectives often clash, and stakeholder groups must negotiate the proper ratio between the incentives they ought to get and the contributions they ought to make. An organisation is viable as long as a dominant coalition of stakeholders has control over enough inducements to enable it to obtain the contributions it needs from other stake- holder groups. This is why organisations are frequently viewed as alliances or coalitions of stake- holder groups that directly bargain with each other and use their power and influence to tip the balance of inducements and contributions in their favour. When their unlawful activities were made public, stakeholders in companies like Enron and WorldCom stopped investing in them. Shareholders sold their shares, banks stopped lending money, and borrowers called in their loans.

However, there is no reason to believe that the distribution of inducements and donations would satisfy all stakeholders equally. The coalition perspective of organisations does in fact suggest that certain stakeholder groups are more important than others. However, in order for an organisation to be functional, all of the groups who have a stake in it must have their interests at least partially met. The demands of each group must be addressed; otherwise, a group may withdraw its support and harm the organization's future performance, as happens when banks refuse to lend money to a business or a strike is called by a number of workers. The relative ability of a stakeholder group to regulate the distribution of inducements determines how an organisation will try to serve various stakeholder objectives and what standards stakeholders will use to evaluate its performance when all stakeholder interests are at least marginally satisfied. Choosing which stakeholder objectives to meet, determining how to distribute organisational rewards to various stakeholder groups, and balancing short-term and long-term goals are all issues that an organisation must deal with in order to secure the support of its stakeholders.

Competing Objectives

Organisations exist to meet the objectives of its stakeholders, but who chooses which objectives to pursue and which objectives are most crucial? The objectives chosen by an organisation have political and social repercussions. In a capitalist nation like the United States, it is assumed that shareholders, who are the owners of an organization's accumulated wealth or capital its tools, structures, real estate, and goodwill have first claim on the value it generates. This point of view contends that managers' primary responsibility is to maximise shareholder value, and the best method to achieve this is to increase the organization's return on the resources and money put into the company. Is management's main objective always to maximise shareholder wealth? One argument claims that it isn't. A separation of ownership and control takes place when shareholders give managers the authority to plan and utilise organisational capabilities and resources. Although in theory managers are shareholders' employees, in reality because managers have control over organisational resources, they actually have real control over the company even though shareholders own it. As a consequence, managers could have objectives that serve their own interests rather than those of shareholders.

For instance, an effort to maximise shareholder value would include taking chances in unexplored terrain and investing heavily in R&D, which might not pay off until later when fresh discoveries and innovations lead to new products and a stream of new profits. However, since this is the objective on which they are judged by their colleagues and stock market experts who do not take the long view, managers may opt to maximise short-term profits. Another perspective is that managers choose a calm existence with less risk since they are in charge of their own salary and have no need to be entrepreneurial. Furthermore, managers may opt to follow low-risk strategies even if they may not maximise return on invested capital due to the strong correlation between managers' wages and organisational size. Because managers are in charge of the organisation, even if managers and shareholders may have aims that conflict, managers' objectives are more likely to be followed.

It is not simple to choose goals that will increase an organization's prospects of survival and future development, even if all stakeholders agree on the objectives that the organisation should pursue. Let's say management want to focus on increasing shareholder wealth as their main objective. How should they work to accomplish this objective? Should managers aim to boost productivity and cut expenses in order to boost quality or profitability? Should they spend billions to become a worldwide firm and improve the organization's capacity to influence its external stakeholders? Should they allocate organisational funds to new R&D initiatives that would boost their capacity for innovation, which is essential in high-tech industries? These are all options that management of an organisation have to maximise shareholder value. You can see that there are no simple guidelines to abide by. Additionally, in many cases, being productive entails making more wise decisions than foolish ones. One thing is for sure, though: A company that ignores its stakeholders and makes no effort to at least somewhat advance their interests will lose credibility in their eyes and be condemned to failure. Later in the chapter, the need of employing organisational ethics to prevent this result is discussed [10], [11].

Distributing Rewards

How to distribute the profits an organisation makes as a consequence of being successful among the many stakeholder groups is another significant issue that an organisation must deal with. In other words, managers must choose the incentives or rewards each group deserves. An organisation must, at the very least, meet each group's expectations. But how should the "extra" awards be distributed when they are more than adequate to cover each group's very basic needs? How much compensation should employees or managers earn in relation to stockholders? What factors determine the proper compensation for managers? The majority of respondents agree that the effectiveness of the organisation should decide management remuneration. However, this response poses a new issue: What are the most reliable performance measures for management rewards? a quick profit? Maximising wealth over the long term? Organisational development? Various criteria might provide various responses to the same question. In fact, despite the current financial crisis, a CEO's income was 600 times more in 2010 than it was in the 1980s—about 40 times higher than the typical worker's wage at the time! Can such a significant rise even be justified? Analysts are refusing more often, and some have urged boards of directors and Congress to find methods to limit CEO compensation in light of the many instances of corporate greed. For other organisational members, the same considerations apply.

What are the proper incentives for an employee as a whole when the business is experiencing record profits or for a middle manager who creates a new procedure that brings the organisation millions of dollars annually? Should they get short-term incentives or business equity instead? Should an employer promise lifelong employment as the ultimate reward for superior performance? Similar to this, should a corporation spend all of its profits back into growing its capabilities and resources rather than paying out monthly dividends to shareholders? The question of whether physicians should hold shares in the hospitals they practise in serves as a stark reminder of how these objectives might collide. Over the last several decades, physicians have increasingly invested in the hospitals and clinics where they practise. Sometimes medical groups in a certain region band together to start their own clinics. Large hospital networks may award physicians shares in the facility. A significant conflict of interest between physicians and their patients might result from this tendency. Consider the Columbia/HCA hospital chain, which started by giving physicians a financial stake in the company to entice them to refer their patients to Columbia hospitals for treatment16. Other HMOs soon followed, but as of the 2000s, physicians teamed up more frequently to form physician-owned hospitals, in which they hold the majority of the stock and refer their patients.

However, when they become owners, physicians may feel pressured to provide patients with subpar treatment in order to save expenses and boost the hospital's bottom line, or, more likely, to overcharge for their services in order to raise their personal profits. Additionally, because of the financial relationship between hospitals and physicians, these doctors won't go to independent hospitals, which may have a better track record of reducing post-operative infections or offering better patient care. When physicians are shareholders, their possible conflicting agendas with patients have significant ramifications for managing stakeholder interests. In fact, there has been some support for outlawing physicians' ownership of their own clinics and hospitals. There is no reason to believe that physicians would exploit their patients any more than there is cause to believe that attorneys will find a way to overcharge their customers, despite the fact that doctors assert that they are in the same position as lawyers or accountants.

The distribution of incentives, often known as rewards, is a crucial element of organisational success since the incentives provided to stakeholders today impact their motivation and hence, the kind and extent of their contributions in the future. Future investment choices made by stakeholders are influenced by the expected returns on their assets, whether those returns in the form of dividends, stock options, bonuses, or salaries. Because they are the stakeholder groups with the capacity to decide the amount of compensation or inducements each group including themselves will eventually get, senior executives' and the board of directors' duties become crucial in this situation. Directors and senior management often fail to fulfil their responsibilities, as the Enron workers and stockholders who lost virtually all of the value of their pensions and shares discovered.

CONCLUSION

Establishing open lines of communication, paying attention to stakeholders' concerns, and incorporating their comments into decision-making processes are all necessary for organisations to manage stakeholder relationships successfully. Organisations may develop trust, improve their image, and gain a competitive edge by proactively addressing the interests and claims of stakeholders. For efficient stakeholder management, it is essential to identify the various stakeholder groups, their interests, and any complaints they may have against a company. Organisations may better align their activities with stakeholder expectations, prevent disputes, and create long-lasting partnerships by understanding the viewpoints of their stakeholders. Organisations may handle the complexity of their operational environment and improve overall organisational performance and reputation by acknowledging the different interests and demands of stakeholders.

REFERENCES:

[1] I. Erina, V. Shatrevich, and E. Gaile-Sarkane, "Impact of stakeholder groups on development of a regional entrepreneurial ecosystem," *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/09654313.2017.1282077.

[2] M. Slabá, "Stakeholder Groups of Public and Private Universities in the Czech Republic - Identification, Categorization and Prioritization," *Review of Economic Perspectives*. 2015. doi: 10.1515/revecp-2015-0022.

[3] W. de Nooy, "Communication in natural resource management: Agreement between and disagreement within stakeholder groups," *Ecol. Soc.*, 2013, doi: 10.5751/ES-05648-180244.

[4] K. Davis, "Different stakeholder groups and their perceptions of project success," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.02.006.

[5] C. Tumpach, P. Dwivedi, R. Izlar, and C. Cook, "Understanding perceptions of stakeholder groups about Forestry Best Management Practices in Georgia," *J. Environ. Manage.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.02.045.

[6] H. D. Kim, "Images of stakeholder groups based on their environmental sustainability linked CSR projects: A meta-analytic review of Korean sport literature," *Sustain.*, 2017, doi: 10.3390/su9091586.

[7] T. J. Rowley and M. Moldoveanu, "When will stakeholder groups act? An interest- and identity-based model of stakeholder group mobilization," *Academy of Management Review*. 2003. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2003.9416080.

[8] K. Davis, "An empirical investigation into different stakeholder groups perception of project success," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.02.004.

[9] J. Eshuis, E. Braun, E. H. Klijn, and S. Zenker, "The differential effect of various stakeholder groups in place marketing," *Environ. Plan. C Polit. Sp.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/2399654417726333.

[10] J. Węgrzyn, "The perception of critical success factors for PPP projects in different stakeholder groups," *Entrep. Bus. Econ. Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.15678/EBER.2016.040207.

[11] S. Baggett, B. Jefferson, and P. Jeffrey, "Just how different are stakeholder group opinions on water management issues?," *Desalination*, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.desal.2006.08.025.

CHAPTER 4

TOP EXECUTIVES AND ORGANIZATIONAL POWER

Ms. Neha Saxena, Assistant Professor
Masters In Business Administration, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:nehasinha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Top executives have a substantial impact on organisational results and strategic choices, playing a crucial role in organisations. The link between top executives and organisational power is examined in this abstract, with particular emphasis on the sources of power they wield and the ramifications for organisational dynamics. Top executives hold important leadership roles inside organisations, including CEOs, presidents, and board members. They have a variety of sources of power, which adds to their influence and capacity to steer the organisation. These power sources may be divided into formal power, which comes from lawful authority bestowed by the organisational hierarchy, and informal power, which comes from a person's traits, knowledge, and connections. Organisational dynamics are influenced by senior executives' authority in a variety of ways. They are able to distribute resources, create strategic objectives, and make important choices that have an influence on the present and future of the organisation. Their influence also extends to determining the organisational tone and direction, affecting employee behaviour, and impacting organisational culture. In order to guarantee that the authority of senior executives is used responsibly and in the interests of the organisation and its stakeholders, effective governance systems and checks and balances are crucial. The usage of boards of directors, independent review, and open decision-making procedures all serve to prevent possible abuses of authority and encourage accountability. Additionally, organisations that support shared authority and dispersed leadership gain from a variety of viewpoints, higher employee engagement, and more flexible decision-making procedures. An organisation may become more inclusive and resilient by empowering workers at all levels and fostering involvement.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Company, Management, Organization,Power.

INTRODUCTION

It is beneficial to take a deeper look at these top managers since they are the stakeholder group with the ultimate responsibility for establishing corporate goals and objectives and for allocating organisational resources to accomplish these goals. What are they, what are their responsibilities, and how do managers work together to run a business? The ability to hold individuals responsible for their actions and to directly affect what they do and how they do it is known as authority. Shareholders are the stakeholder group having ultimate control over how a firm uses its resources. Legally speaking, they are the company's owners and govern it via the board of directors, which serves as their proxy. Shareholders provide management the right and duty to utilise the resources of the company to add value and achieve objectives via the board. Corporate managers are held responsible for the way they utilise resources and the amount of value the organisation produces when they accept this power and duty from shareholders and the board of directors.

The board of directors keeps an eye on corporate managers' actions and rewards them for taking initiatives that advance shareholder objectives. The board has the power to appoint, dismiss, and punish corporate management. The chief shareholder representation and ultimate authority in an organisation is the chair of the board of directors. The chair is in charge of overseeing and assessing how corporate managers utilise organisational resources via the executive committee, which is made up of the most significant directors and senior management of the organisation. The chair and the other directors occupy a stewardship role, acting as stewards to safeguard the interests of shareholders and other stakeholders. For business managers, the compensation committee determines their pay and benefits [1]–[3].

Inside directors and outside directors are the two different categories of directors. Inside directors are directors who also have positions in the official hierarchy of a business; they work for the firm full-time. The majority of outside directors are professionals who hold seats on the boards of several businesses or are executives of other firms who serve on the boards of other firms; they are not employees of the company. The purpose of having outside directors is to balance the authority of internal directors, who naturally support an organization's management, and to add impartiality to a company's decision-making process. However, inside directors often control boards because they have the greatest access to corporate information and may use that knowledge to sway decisions in the direction of management.

Furthermore, a lot of outside directors have a tendency to remain passive and act as a veto for management's choices. Many of the issues that have arisen and continue to arise in organisations like Computer Associates, Walt Disney, Bank of America, HP, and others have allegedly been caused by passive or captive directors who were chosen by the CEO but failed to conduct enough oversight. Due to their negligence, directors of various corporations have been sued and fined millions of dollars. The internal stakeholder group known as corporate-level management is in charge of formulating business goals and objectives, assigning organisational resources to meet those goals, and creating the organisational structure. These corporate managers, who are they? What precisely do they do, and in what capacities? The usual chain of command and hierarchy of management titles, or the system of hierarchical reporting connections of a major organisation, are shown in Figure 2.1. An organisational hierarchy is a vertical arrangement of responsibilities according to their level of authority.

In charge of the company

The CEO is ultimately in charge of determining the organization's strategy and policies. Although the CEO reports to the board chair, in reality, the CEO is the most powerful individual in the company since they have the last say in how resources are allocated. The CEO is given authority by the board of directors to determine the organization's strategy and how to best use its resources to provide value. The chief executive officer and head of the board are often the same individual. A person who holds both posts has significant authority and serves as a direct connection between the board and company management. How exactly does a CEO impact how an organisation runs? There are five main ways a CEO may affect how well an organisation makes decisions.

1. The CEO is in charge of establishing the organization's objectives and creating its structure. To ensure that all workers of an organisation are coordinated and motivated to fulfil organisational objectives, the CEO assigns authority and job duties. Different organisational frameworks favour various approaches to organising and inspiring staff members at all levels.
2. The CEO chooses important executives to fill the highest positions in the administrative pyramid. Because the effectiveness of decision-making is directly impacted by the skills of an organization's top managers, choosing which managers to

advance to the top of the organisational hierarchy is an essential component of the CEO's role. For instance, the CEO of General Electric personally chooses and promotes 100 of GE's top managers, and he or she also gives his or her approval for the promotions of 600 additional executives19. By selecting important employees, the CEO shapes the values, conventions, and culture that develop inside the company. The organization's culture influences how its members handle issues and reach conclusions. Are they innovative or traditional?

3. The CEO chooses the incentives and rewards for senior management. Top managers' desire to properly pursue organisational objectives is influenced by the CEO. One of the reasons why Netflix has become so successful and is now the market leader in movie and TV programming rental and streaming with one in eight Americans signed up for its service is because of its method of compensating managers. Even though they knew Enron was going to collapse, in the days before, its top managers decided to award themselves over $80 million in compensation for their "work." Each month, managers choose whether they want to receive a part of their pay in the form of a base salary or stock options that are contingent on the company's future success. The end result has been a group of dedicated management that are committed to maximising the company's potential in the future [4]–[6].
4. The CEO is in charge of deciding how to divide up the organization's functional sectors or business divisions among its limited financial and decision-making resources. Due to this control, the CEO has significant influence on the future value creation activities of the organisation, including the kind of goods it will produce, the markets it will enter, and other decisions. In the late 1990s, Henry Ford III reclaimed his position as CEO of Ford after the company's previous CEO, Jacques Nasser, faced criticism for spending tens of billions on several international initiatives that had done nothing to boost the business' profitability. Ford's management style was that before he would approve investing money to create new automobiles, his staff had to show their ideas would be profitable. No more successful than previous CEOs was CEO Ford. The company's worldwide auto sales was declining, so in 2005 Ford made the decision to hand over leadership of the business to a new CEO, Alan Mulally. By 2011, Mulally had transformed the business by leveraging his expertise to make the best possible use of Ford's resources. Mulally said in the summer of 2011 that he had no intentions to retire despite being 65 years old at the time, and Henry Ford quipped that he hoped Mulally would live until 2025!
5. The organization's perceptions by internal and external stakeholders, as well as the organization's capacity to draw resources from its surroundings, are significantly influenced by the CEO's behaviour and reputation. The personality and charisma of a CEO may affect an organization's capacity to raise capital from shareholders and banks as well as consumers' willingness to purchase a company's goods. A track record of making wise, moral business judgements may also help, as can a reputation for honesty and integrity.

DISCUSSION

The CEO has tremendous potential to directly affect organisational performance because of their capacity to shape management behaviour and organisational decision-making. The CEO's influence on decision-making is also indirect since it comes from the individuals they choose to lead their organisations, as well as the organisational structure and culture they establish. The CEO's top management team will thus have a major impact on the organization's performance, both now and in the future.

The Senior Management Group

The chief operational officer, who is next in line for the CEO position, or president, who may or may not be the CEO's successor, are the two most crucial executives after the chair and CEO. Together with the CEO, the COO or president is directly answerable to for the overall management of the company. The top of most organisations has a division of labour between these two positions. The CEO is often in charge of setting the long-term strategic goals of the organisation as a whole and all of its business divisions. He or she also has major responsibility for managing the organization's interaction with external stakeholders. To ensure that internal operations are in line with the organization's strategic goals, the COO or president has main responsibility. The COO of a major firm is also responsible for managing the performance of the most crucial business divisions and units. The executive vice presidents are in charge of high management at the following level. The most important line and staff duties of a corporation fall under the purview of someone with this designation. Managers who are directly in charge of the production of products and services have a line position. For instance, an executive vice president may be in charge of managing the performance of all 200 chemical divisions or all overseas divisions of a corporation. Managers who are in charge of a particular organisational function, like sales or R&D, hold a staff position. The executive vice president for finance, for instance, is in charge of an organization's entire financial operations, while the executive vice president for R&D is in charge of that organization's research and development efforts. Although staff positions are advisory only and do not directly involve production, they have a significant impact on how decisions are made.

At the top of an organization's chain of command are the CEO, COO, and executive vice presidents. The group of managers who report to the CEO and COO and assist the CEO in setting the company's strategy, long-term goals, and objectives collectively make up the top-management team of a company. All members of the top-management team are corporate managers, whose responsibility it is to set strategy for the corporation as a whole. A crucial component of the CEO's job is managing the senior management team and selecting the individuals who will serve on it. For instance, when the CEO names the COO, he or she is making it abundantly obvious to the top management team what types of challenges and events are most significant to the company. For instance, an organization often chooses a new CEO or names a COO who has the management and functional experience necessary to handle the most important difficulties confronting a firm. Many businesses take great care when choosing the CEO's replacement so that they may continue and build on the long-term strategy that will best use their resources. The first step in this process of developing the future CEO is, of course, appointment to the top-management team. The composition of the top-management team is increasingly one of the top priorities of the CEO and of a company's board of directors, and the stock price of a company is frequently correlated with a CEO's future performance. Investors at Apple were alarmed in 2011 when Apple CEO Steve Jobs had to take another leave of absence due to health issues, while investors in Google were alarmed when Larry Page, the company's founder, succeeded Eric Schmidt as CEO after Schmidt had overseen the business through its explosive climb to renown in the 2000s.

Various Managers

Senior corporate-level managers in both line and staff positions, such as vice presidents and senior vice presidents, make up the next level of management. Many hundreds or thousands of corporate level managers work for large corporations like Time Warner, Ford, and Microsoft. General managers, who are in charge of one of a company's several operational firms or divisions, are also at this level. Since they have primary accountability for their division's success and often answer to the corporate CEO or COO, general managers of the divisions frequently hold the title of CEO of their respective divisions. They are divisional managers, not corporate managers, since they only create policy for the division they lead, not for the whole company. For instance, each of Ford's car-making divisions or units is controlled by divisional managers inside the company. Functional managers, who go by titles like "marketing manager" or "production manager," are also employed by an organisation or a section of an organisation. The key competencies that provide the organisation its competitive edge are collectively provided by the functional skills and capabilities that functional managers are responsible for developing. For instance, there are a number of functional managers in each division who answer to the general or divisional manager [7]–[9].

Using Agency Theory as a Lens

The complicated authority relationship between senior management and the board of directors may be better understood using agency theory. When one person transfers control or decision-making power over resources to another, an agency relationship is created. Members of senior management are their agents, chosen by shareholders to make the best use of organizational resources. Starting at the top of a company's chain of power, shareholders are the principals. For instance, the typical shareholder is not an expert in business management or a specific sector. They employ managers, who are professionals in the field, to do this task on their behalf. However, by giving managers more authority, an issue with agency one with assessing management accountability arises. This is due to the fact that if you hire an expert manager, by definition, that person must be more knowledgeable than you; how can you then contest the expert's judgement and the way managers are managing the business? Additionally, it takes a lot of time to evaluate the outcomes of a manager's performance. As a result, it is highly difficult to hold managers responsible for their actions. Most of the time, shareholders don't act until it's too late when the business has incurred losses of billions of dollars. Shareholders lose their power to significantly influence management decision-making when authority is delegated. The issue is that shareholders or founders lack access to information that senior management have. They find it exceedingly challenging to evaluate the success of a top-management team's activities since it is often only possible to do so over the course of many years. Furthermore, as was already said, there may be a conflict between the interests of management and shareholders. Shareholders could favour measures that result in long-term profitability, such as enhanced efficiency and long-term innovation, while managers may choose to pursue strategies that provide short-term profits or market domination.

The Issue of Moral Hazard

A moral hazard issue arises when these two circumstances coexist and the principal finds it extremely challenging to assess how well the agent has performed because the agent has an information advantage and is motivated to pursue goals and objectives that differ from the principal's. Agents are given the chance and incentive to act in their own best interests in this situation. For instance, the entertainment behemoth Time Warner came under fire in the 2000s because its senior executives had made several acquisitions, including AOL, which had decreased innovation, efficiency, and profits. Shareholders asked that Time Warner relinquish AOL and its TV cable business because they believed the company's senior management was pursuing the incorrect tactics to boost the company's profitability. Shareholders sought a change in the company's direction and objectives as well as additional financial information they could use to make up for their knowledge deficit in order to force senior management to face difficult challenges. In order to resolve the agency issue, they essentially want greater influence over the company's strategy. Time Warner was split up as their influence grew and the company's stock price continued to fall. In 2008, the cable sector was first spun off, and then in 2009, AOL. Both of these divisions became independent businesses with their own CEOs.

The media often cites other, more concrete instances of moral hazard, such as the massive insider trading securities scandal that resulted in billionaire hedge fund manager Raj Rajaratham's conviction on all 14 charges of securities fraud in May 2011. Rajaratham bribed top officials at AMD and Intel to provide him with information about impending changes to their business plan, which enabled him to profit over $64 million by selling these firms' shares before the changes were made public. In an effort to stop the practise of using insider knowledge to exploit common shareholders, the government prosecuted 15 further instances of insider trading in 2011. Top executives undoubtedly have many possibilities to advance their own objectives at the cost of other stakeholders. Self-dealing is the term used to describe the actions of corporate managers who act in their own interests rather than those of other stakeholders by exploiting opportunities to misuse corporate resources, including secret information.

Fixing the Agency Issue

The main goal of agency theory is to find ways to rule, or exercise forms of control, that balance the interests of principal and agent, giving both parties the motivation to cooperate in order to achieve organizational performance. The many types of governance systems are numerous. First and foremost, the board of directors' main responsibility is to keep an eye on what senior management are doing, challenge their judgement and methods, and step in when required. Some have urged for a distinct separation between the roles of CEO and chair in order to limit the authority of the CEO, claiming that the enormous growth in CEO compensation is proof that it is necessary to avoid power abuses. The organization's code of ethics has to be strengthened and developed, as we'll examine later. Finding the ideal set of incentives to match the interests of managers and shareholders is the next step in resolving the agency issue. Remember that since the outcomes of management actions may only be evaluated after a number of years have passed, it is exceedingly difficult for shareholders to monitor and analyse their efficacy. As a result, pinning incentives to choices is often ineffective as an alignment tactic. Making manager compensation based on the results of their actions, or organisational success, is the most effective strategy to align the interests of management and shareholders. There are several approaches to achieving this, and each has benefits and drawbacks [10], [11].

Schemes for Stock-Based Compensation

One approach to achieve this is via stock-based compensation plans. The majority of the money managers are paid comes in the form of performance-based stock options or shares of stock. The value of their stock options and monetary remuneration will increase significantly if the firm performs well. Because managers become shareholders, interests are really matched. This tactic has been used in various businesses, like GM and IBM, whose senior executives have historically owned relatively little equity in the company. In order to increase senior managers' interest in the long-term success of the firm, the board of directors mandated that they acquire stock in the companies and granted stock options.

Promotion Tournaments and Career Paths

Other types of incentives are also possible. Creating organizational career pathways that enable managers to go to the top of the organization is one approach to long-term connect incentives to performance? Many senior managers want the authority of the CEO position. A board of directors, for instance, might make it plain to top management what actions will be rewarded in the future by demoting certain senior executives and elevating or recruiting new ones, often from outside the company. Every company has "promotion tournaments" where executives fight for a limited number of promotions by showcasing their superior abilities. The board of directors may give out a clear signal about future management behaviors that would lead to promotion by explicitly tying promotion to performance. This would force managers to concentrate on long-term goals rather than short-term ones. The benefit of being promoted to the top of an organization includes more than simply the long-term financial package that comes with it. It also includes the chance to control resources, prestige, position, and intrinsic gratification that come with climbing the organizational ladder. There is already a great deal of discussion around the complicated subject of developing corporate governance systems to guarantee long-term effectiveness.23 Congress has already passed several new governance measures, and others are being developed. For instance, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act included a new requirement that the chief executive officer, chief operating officer, and chief financial officer sign off on their company's balance sheets so they may be held legally and personally accountable for any unintentional or intentional errors discovered later. Organizations now disclose their financial results more thoroughly as a consequence of this obligation. Similar to what has been mentioned, new regulations have been put in place that require companies to disclose to shareholders all benefits and perks that CEOs and other top executives receive in addition to their salaries, such as stock options, pensions, use of company jets, and so forth. These regulations also govern relationships between businesses and their accountants.

In fact, as firm after corporation acknowledged to breaking corporate rules and regulations in the 2000s, the subject of shareholders' rights has grown in importance. Salomon Smith Barney, for instance, consented to pay a $5 million fine to resolve allegations that one of their top brokers was marketing a company to investors despite internal communications suggesting the stock was a dud. It was discovered that brokers at Merrill Lynch, which is now a division of Bank of America, behaved similarly, joking in private about the bleak futures of the companies whose stocks they continued to promote to their thousands of investors. Numerous significant mutual fund organizations acknowledged that they had let their fund managers and wealthy investors to utilize confidential information to execute stock market transactions that profited them significantly but harmed millions of little investors. The cost of insurance plans for clients was artificially boosted by these huge insurance firms admitting they had paid bribes to brokers in order to win their business. All of these businesses have paid hundreds of millions of dollars in fines to resolve these allegations, and their top executives many of whom had significant influence within their respective industries have all been let go. Visit the Investor Relations area of the business website and look at the Corporate Governance Guidelines to learn more about Amazon's approach to corporate governance.

CONCLUSION

Top executives' use of their positions of authority, meanwhile, may have unintended repercussions. Decision-making biases, constrained viewpoints, and reluctance to change may come from the concentration of power in the hands of a small number of people. It could make it harder for the company to promote employee empowerment, open communication, and cooperation. In conclusion, senior executives have enormous influence inside organisations, which affects organisational culture, employee behaviour, and strategic decision-making. For the leadership authority and organisational dynamics to remain in balance, it is essential to comprehend and manage this power. Organisations may utilise the influence of senior executives while maintaining alignment with organisational values and goals by encouraging accountability, dispersed leadership, and employee empowerment.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Forouharfar, "The anatomy and ontology of organizational power as a fractal metaphor: A philosophical approach," *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2020.1728072.

[2] M. Wu, D. D. Kesa, and C. J. Ko, "Organisational power, cohesiveness and culture of Taiwan's cosmetology industry," *Asian J. Bus. Account.*, 2019, doi: 10.22452/ajba.vol12no2.8.

[3] L. Cacciolatti and S. H. Lee, "Revisiting the relationship between marketing capabilities and firm performance: The moderating role of market orientation, marketing strategy and organisational power," *J. Bus. Res.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.067.

[4] W. Lu, Y. Wei, and R. Wang, "Handling inter-organisational conflict based on bargaining power: Organisational power distance orientation matters," *Int. J. Confl. Manag.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/IJCMA-06-2019-0092.

[5] Y. Altinkurt and K. Yilmaz, "Relationship between school administrators' organizational power sources and teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors," *Educ. Sci. Theory Pract.*, 2012.

[6] A. Creed, A. Zutshi, and R. Johnson, "Organizational power embodied in hand and finger touchlines," *Cross Cult. Strateg. Manag.*, 2021, doi: 10.1108/CCSM-06-2020-0133.

[7] J. Tække, "Digital panopticism and organizational power," *Surveill. Soc.*, 2011, doi: 10.24908/ss.v8i4.4181.

[8] T. Argon and Ü. Dilekçi, "Teacher Views on School Administrators' Organizational Power Sources and Their Change Management Behaviours," *Univers. J. Educ. Res.*, 2016, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2016.040932.

[9] S. Lankshear, M. S. Kerr, H. K. Spence Laschinger, and C. A. Wong, "Professional practice leadership roles: The role of organizational power and personal influence in creating a professional practice environment for nurses," *Health Care Manage. Rev.*, 2013, doi: 10.1097/HMR.0b013e31826fd517.

[10] J. Lee, "Determinants of government bureaucrats' new PMIS adoption: The role of organizational power, IT capability, administrative role, and attitude," *Am. Rev. Public Adm.*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0275074007304386.

[11] K. Jehanzeb and J. Mohanty, "The mediating role of organizational commitment between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Power distance as moderator," *Pers. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/PR-09-2018-0327.

CHAPTER 5

LEADING EXECUTIVES AND ORGANIZATIONAL ETHICS

Dr. Vijayarengam Gajapathy, Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:vgajapathy@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Leading executives are essential in developing a culture of integrity and forming an organization's ethical foundation. The link between top executives and organisational ethics is examined in this abstract, with a focus on the value of ethical leadership and how it affects organisational behaviour and results. Integral values like honesty, fairness, respect, and accountability are all part of the basic ethical principles that serve as the foundation for both individual and organisational behaviour. Through their actions, choices, and communications, senior executives, including CEOs, have a big impact on the ethical standards of an organisation. Organisational behaviour is cascaded when ethical standards are prioritised and upheld by top leaders. Employees are more inclined to follow and imitate ethical standards, which promotes trust, collaboration, and dedication inside the workplace. The reputation of the business, consumer trust, and stakeholder relationships are all improved by ethical leadership, which ultimately results in long-term organisational success. In contrast, a culture of unethical behaviour may develop in the absence of moral leadership, encouraging mistrust, employee disengagement, and significant legal and reputational concerns. Leading executives' unethical actions may damage the organization's reputation and destroy stakeholder trust. Leading executives should develop and explain clear ethical standards, include ethical factors into decision-making processes, and make sure that ethical behaviour is rewarded and recognised in order to promote organisational ethics. They should promote open lines of communication where staff members feel free to bring up ethical issues and provide procedures for handling moral conundrums.

KEYWORDS:

Company, Culture, Ethics, Management, Organization, Social.

INTRODUCTION

Insisting that managers follow ethical principles in their decision-making when presented with an ethical dilemma is a crucial component of corporate governance, one that a board of directors should emphasise more as a result of recent corporate crises. The conundrum individuals have while deciding whether to act in a manner that would aid another person or group and is the "right" thing to do, even when doing so might go against their own self-interest, is known as an ethical dilemma. Another situation where a person may be faced with a dilemma is when he or she must pick between two options while knowing that one of them may hurt one individual or group while perhaps benefiting another. Determining which course of action is the lesser of two evils is the ethical conundrum in this situation. People often recognise an ethical issue when it causes them to pause, reason, and consider the "rightness" or "goodness" of a certain course of action. Moral scruples are ideas and emotions that inform a person on what is good or bad; they are a component of their ethics. The inner-guiding moral principles, values, and beliefs known as ethics are what individuals use to evaluate and analyse situations in order to determine what is the "right" or proper course of action. At the same time, ethics also define what improper conduct is and how one ought to act to prevent hurting another person. There are no unquestionable, absolute standards or principles that can be devised to determine if a behaviour is ethical or immoral, which is the fundamental challenge in dealing with ethical concerns and hence solving moral dilemmas. Simply defined, based on their own individual self-interest and particular attitudes, beliefs, and values, various persons or groups may disagree about whether behaviors are morally right or wrong. Therefore, how can we, businesses, and their management judge what is moral and behave in a morally proper manner towards other individuals and groups?

The Law and Ethics

The first response to this question is that society as a whole has the power to advocate for and enact rules that define what individuals and organisations are allowed to and are not allowed to do. For instance, there are several distinct categories of laws that regulate business, such as antitrust and employment laws. Laws also outline the penalties or fines that will be applied if they are breached. Various social groupings advocate for the passage of certain laws based on their own individual interests and convictions about what is good or wrong. The laws that most accurately reflect the interests and values of the group with the greatest support are able to pass. A choice on whether behaviour is appropriate in relation to a person or circumstance is transferred from the individually decided ethical sphere to the societally determined legal realm once a law is approved. You may face legal action for breaching the law, and if you are proven guilty, you may face punishment [1]–[3].

Understanding that neither laws nor ethics are inflexible, timeless concepts is crucial when analysing the interplay between ethics and the law. As time goes on, ethical convictions shift and evolve, and laws adapt to reflect these shifting ethical convictions of a society. Many sorts of behaviour, including stealing, industrial espionage, the selling of dangerous goods, and insider trading, are presently regarded by the majority of people, if not all, as being entirely immoral, unethical, and should be prohibited. Many other types of activities and behaviours, however, are debatable in terms of their ethical character. Some individuals may think that a certain action—like top managers earning stock options and bonuses worth hundreds of millions of dollars or exporting millions of jobs to countries with cheaper labour costs—is immoral and should be declared illegal. Others may argue that the board of directors of a corporation should determine if a given behaviour should continue to be lawful and whether such behaviour is ethical or not. Laws may and do change and vanish as ethical ideas do, while ethical values inspire the creation of laws and regulations to promote or discourage certain behaviours. Because there are no unchanging or absolute norms that govern how we should conduct and because moral issues arise often, both ethical and legal principles are thus subjective. We must thus make moral decisions.

Understanding the relationship between ethics, law, and business is complicated, as the debate that came before it makes clear. Major corporations have been afflicted by several controversies in the 2000s; management at some of these firms obviously disregarded the law and utilised unethical methods to deceive investors. Top managers have sometimes offered unethical and often illegal gifts to board members of their firm in exchange for their support of the CEO, which encouraged them to act unethically. For instance, CEOs often utilise their power to appoint lifelong friends to their boards of directors; although this is legal, it is evident that these individuals would support the CEO when the board votes. In one typical instance of such immoral behaviour, WorldCom's board gave former CEO Bernie Ebbers large stock options and a personal loan of more than $150 million in exchange for which they received handsome compensation. For instance, Ebbers provided them access to WorldCom's corporate planes at a cheap cost, saving them hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, in addition to other benefits worth millions of dollars.

Some individuals responded to these occurrences by saying, "Well, what these people did was not illegal," with the implication that since it wasn't criminal, it wasn't also immoral. However, just because a behaviour is not against the law does not imply that it is moral; in fact, such behaviour is obviously immoral. To plug the gaps and stop immoral persons like Ebbers from acting in this manner, legislation are often introduced afterwards. In any case, Ebbers was found guilty of fraud and given a 20-year prison term. Many other corporate leaders have also gotten penalties along these lines, and others found guilty of insider trading will also get prison terms along these lines. Managers must make judgement calls about what is proper and inappropriate when they employ organisational resources to produce goods that consumers wish to purchase, just like regular individuals.

Organisational stakeholders and morality

Ethics are moral principles or views about what is right or bad, as was previously said. The principles of ethics assist people choose moral answers to circumstances when the optimal course of action is not evident. These ideas serve as a guide for people in their interactions with other people and groups and serve as a foundation for determining if a given choice or behaviour is right and suitable. Managers use ethics to help them decide what to do in different circumstances. Managers may choose the optimal course of action based on ethics while addressing the needs of diverse organisational stakeholders. As we previously stated, top managers regularly make decisions regarding the proper or suitable approach to deal with various stakeholders while directing a company's operations, its relationships with both external and internal stakeholders. For instance, a business might question whether it should notify workers and middle managers in advance of significant impending layoffs or plant closures, whether it should recall its cars due to a known flaw that could endanger or injure passengers, or whether it should permit its managers to bribe officials in foreign nations where corruption is a common practise in business. Managers must weigh their own interests and the interests of the "organisation" against the interests of various stakeholder groups in each of these scenarios, which puts them in a difficult position. To put it simply, they must determine how to distribute the "helps and harms" brought about by an organization's activities across stakeholder groups. Sometimes choosing is simple because a clear standard, value, or norm of behaviour is in effect. In other situations, managers struggle with making decisions and confront an ethical conundrum when balancing or contrasting the opposing claims or rights of diverse stakeholder groups [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

For centuries, philosophers have argued about the precise standards that should be used to decide whether a choice is morally right or wrong. The utilitarian, moral rights, and justice models are the three models that are used to judge if an action is ethical. The three models should be used in combination to assess the ethicality of a given course of action since, in principle, each one provides a unique and complementary method for deciding whether a choice or behaviour is moral. However, ethical problems are seldom black and white, and the interests of many stakeholders often collide, making it difficult for a decision maker to utilise these models to determine the most ethical course of action. For this reason, a lot of ethics experts recommend using this practical checklist to assess if a choice or behaviour is morally acceptable. An ethical choice, from a management viewpoint, is one that reasonable or normal stakeholders would accept because it benefits those stakeholders, the organisation, or society. A management would rather conceal or hide an immoral action from others because it allows a business or a specific person to profit at the cost of society or other stakeholders. The many ethical challenges involved in animal experimentation make obvious how ethical issues develop and how various firms deal with them. The well-known manufacturer of razors and shaving-related items Gillette, along with other major cosmetics firms, came in for growing criticism for using animals in product testing to assess the security and long-term impacts of novel product compositions. Angry parents and kids who oppose the use of animals in cosmetics testing because they believe it to be cruel and immoral sent hundreds of emails to Gillette's management. Several other corporations' management have attempted to avoid confronting this ethical dilemma, while Gillette's managers tackled the matter head-on. According to Gillette's ethical viewpoint, testing the qualities of new formulations cannot be done using any other reliable approach that would be recognised in a court of law since human health is more important than animal health. Therefore, animal testing is necessary if the firm is to safeguard the interests of its stakeholders and develop innovative, safe goods that consumers wish to purchase.

Other cosmetics companies, like the Body Shop, do not test their products on animals, and their managers are equally willing to explain their ethical stance to the general public: They believe animal testing is unethical. Gillette's managers responded to each letter protesting this policy and frequently telephoned children at home to explain their ethical position they use animals only when necessary. The Body Shop does not actively test any of its products on animals, but many of the substances they use have already undergone safety testing on animals at Gillette and other firms. Animal experimentation ethics, like most other ethical questions, are undoubtedly complex topics. Currently, it seems that the average stakeholder believes that animal experimentation is appropriate as long as it can be defended in terms of benefits to humans. However, the majority of stakeholders agree that such testing should be performed sparingly and only when absolutely required. Over time, ethical principles emerge as a result of stakeholder bargaining, compromise, and negotiation. Ethical norms may also arise through open conflict and rivalry between various stakeholder groups, where the viability of one group's solution to impose on the other group determines which ethical principles will be observed. Employees may put moral pressure on management, for instance, to enhance their working circumstances or notify them of potential layoffs. Shareholders may demand that top management refrain from making investments in nations that support racism or that use children as slaves in factories.29 Over time, many ethical principles and rules are incorporated into a society's legal system, and at that point, unethical behaviour is no longer acceptable. These legal regulations must be followed by both individuals and organisations, and breaking them may result in penalties.

Organizational Ethics Resources

It is helpful to explore the ethical foundations of an organisation in order to comprehend the nature of its ethical ideals. Societal, group or professional, and individual ethical principles are the three main ethical factors that shape organisational ethics.

Societal Ethics

Societal ethics is a significant factor in organisational ethics. A society's legal code, conventions, practises, and unspoken rules and ideals that individuals employ to interact with one another are all examples of how societal ethics are codified. People in a society adhere to many ethical standards and ideals without thinking about them because they have internalised those standards and made them part of their own. In turn, these internalised norms and ideals strengthen social norms and practises in how individuals interact with one another. For instance, ethics about an individual's unalienable rights are the outcome of choices made by members of a society on how they wish to be treated by others. Ethics controlling the use of bribery and corruption, as well as the general norms of doing business in a community, are the outcome of judgements made and enforced by individuals who decide what is acceptable in a society. The ethical ideals that are acceptable in the United States are not accepted elsewhere since these standards vary by culture. For instance, if I purchase a pound of rice in India, I may anticipate that 6-8% of it will be dust; moreover, I am aware that the more I spend, the less dust I can anticipate. In India, it is both custom and practise. Contrarily, the purity of foodstuffs is governed by a complicated set of laws in the United States that businesses must abide with. Although many American businesses provide voluntary layoff benefits, many don't. Employees are more likely to be treated poorly in general the poorer the nation. Using child labour ethically is one topic that is of special ethical concern on a worldwide scale [7]–[9].

This has recently been attempted via the Fair Factories Clearinghouse, a cooperative effort started in 2006 by businesses such L.L. Bean, Reebok, and Timberland to combine the knowledge they get on the manufacturing practises of the factories with whom they have contracts. The goal is to establish a unified set of labour code requirements that factories everywhere must adhere to in order to get certification as ethical suppliers; otherwise, they will be closed down by all respectable businesses. All unlawful behaviour may be seen as unethical behaviour when social ethics are codified into legislation and then assessed by a society's ethical standards. Legally, an organisation and its management must abide by all societal regulations and conduct themselves towards stakeholders and other people in accordance with the law. As senior managers may be held liable in certain circumstances for the performance of their subordinates, it is one of their primary duties to guarantee that managers and workers below them in the organisation are abiding with the law. However, not all businesses operate in a legal manner. These organisations often engage in crimes that are not only against the law but also potentially immoral inasmuch as they negatively impact other stakeholder groups.

Professional ethics are the moral standards and principles that a group of individuals use to guide how they carry out a job or make use of resources. For instance, medical ethics govern how physicians and nurses are supposed to carry out their duties and assist patients. Doctors are supposed to apply due diligence, refrain from doing unneeded operations, and operate in the patient's best interest, not their own. To guarantee the validity of their conclusions, scientific and technical researchers are obliged to conduct themselves ethically while preparing and presenting their findings. The majority of professional organisations may uphold their profession's ethics, just as society does. For instance, if a doctor or lawyer breaks the law or prioritises their own interests, they may be disbarred. Professional ethics control the conduct of many different employee groups in an organisation, including accountants, attorneys, and researchers. These influence how they behave inside the organisation, leading them to follow certain values. People internalise the norms and values of their profession, just as they do those of society, and they act in accordance with these guidelines without thinking about it. Contrarily, clients often anticipate that some "professionals" would take advantage of them, such as those who fix vehicles and roofs or provide services like taxi transportation.

Individual Ethics

Individual ethics are the moral and personal principles that people use to guide how they interact with others. A person may or may not carry out certain behaviours or reach certain choices depending on these ethics. Many actions that one person may deem immoral may be considered acceptable by another. People may agree to disagree on their ethical ideas or they may attempt to impose those beliefs on other people and make their ethical beliefs the law if such behaviors are not against the law. A person may face legal repercussions if their personal ethics conflict with the law. Many personal ethics have their roots in law and are derived from societal ethics. Personal ethics may come from family, friends, religious observance, or any other significant social institution and are a product of a person's upbringing. How a person behaves in an organisation is influenced by personal ethics. For instance, a manager's behaviour towards subordinates and other managers is influenced by their own values and views.

Organizational ethics, which may be defined as the principles or norms upheld by an organisation and its members in their interactions with other stakeholder groups, is the result of the combined influence of these three ethical sources. Each organisation has its own set of ethics; some of these are exclusive to that organisation and play a significant role in its culture. However, many moral standards are universal and apply to all businesses. Due to the benefits that ethical behaviour produces for a society and its people when its organisations and institutions act ethically, companies are required to uphold ethical and legal standards. To restrain or moderate the pursuit of self-interest is one of the most significant reasons why ethical principles controlling behaviour emerge. Discussing the "tragedy of the commons" issue is one of the finest methods to comprehend the self-interest dilemma. When there is common land, which is land that belongs to everyone, it makes sense for each individual to make the most of it as it is a free resource. Therefore, everyone grazes their cattle on the land in order to further their own personal interests. But what will happen to the land, the shared resource, if everyone does this? Because of overgrazing, which makes it less resistant to the impacts of wind and rain, it is devastated by erosion. Therefore, the logical pursuit of individual self-interest leads to a catastrophe for everyone. The same is true in many structured situations: If left to their own devices, individuals would prioritise their personal interests above group interests.

Ethical laws and regulations are created to regulate selfish behaviour by people and organisations that endangers the interests of the whole community. For instance, rules that define what constitutes ethical or proper corporate conduct are developed because they are advantageous to all parties. Only when there are laws and regulations that set limits on what individuals may do in a given circumstance is there room for free and fair competition amongst organisations. It is ethical for me to compete with a competitor and maybe put that person out of business if I do so through legal methods, such as by creating a product that is less expensive, superior, or more dependable. But for me to achieve it by killing him or blowing up his plant is not right. Competition based on quality or price adds value for the consumer, but competition based on force leads to monopolies and harms both the consumer and the general welfare. Not that no one is harmed—the competitor I drive out of business suffers but the damage I do him must be evaluated against the benefits to customers and to myself.

The distribution of benefits and costs among many stakeholders is a problem with ethical implications, which are by their very nature complicated. The key is to strive to behave in a charitable manner and to adhere to the moral standards that appear to bring about the most positive results. In order to improve the value that people may make when they engage with one another, ethical standards and moral codes are developed. They safeguard individuals. Without these guidelines, fair competition turns into conflict and war, which is bad for everyone. Another way to state this is that ethical standards lower the expenses individuals must pay when determining what is proper or right. By abiding by an ethical guideline, one may save time and effort by not having to think about what is morally appropriate. In other words, ethical principles lower the costs associated with negotiating, monitoring, and enforcing agreements with other people. When strangers get together to do commerce, there may be significant transaction expenses. For instance, how can I be sure that someone else will act morally if I don't know them? Once again, here is where the influence of ethics in determining the standards to be upheld is crucial. Because I won't have to spend time watching someone to make sure they perform as they promised to if I can trust them to follow the guidelines. My time and effort are generally wasted and ineffective when I monitor. Therefore, it lowers transaction costs when individuals share the same moral principles.

A person or organization's reputation is enhanced when they conduct in accordance with established ethical standards, which also lowers transaction costs. How would people see a group if they get to be renowned for carrying out unlawful activities over time? Probably with animosity and distrust. Imagine, nevertheless, that an organisation goes above and above the required legal standards and is renowned for its ethical business practises. People will want to work with it because of its reputation, which is valuable. There are restrictions on organisations beyond those set down by legislation since unethical organisations eventually suffer as a result of people's refusal to do business with them. Reputation effects also contribute to the explanation of why managers and staff who are employed by organisations adhere to moral standards. What would happen if a company acted unethically? What would the workers of such company do? Because they are thought to have performed in accordance with the unethical organization's code of ethics, workers start to be associated with the same reputation as the unethical organisation. All workers would be impacted and harmed by the organization's unethical behaviour, even if it was the result of a few selfish people. For instance, after the stock meltdown in Japan in the 1990s, numerous brokerage firms filed for bankruptcy, and angry consumers sued these companies for hiding the true hazards of investing in the overvalued stock market. Because they carried the "shame" of having worked for these businesses, former employees of these firms had an extremely difficult time finding employment with other enterprises. Employees are therefore encouraged by their company to act morally since their fortunes are entwined with the organization's a company's poor image will harm their reputation as well [10]–[12].

Feeling good about one's actions and enjoying a clear conscience as a result of playing by the rules are intangible benefits of acting ethically. Because it is not a fair measure of talent or character, success by stealth and deception does not provide the same intangible gratification as success by abiding by the rules. The result of acting morally is one's reputation, and individuals have always sought the approval or respect of their peers as a reward. In communities where individuals uphold ethical standards and where illegal and unethical behaviour is suppressed by law, tradition, and practise, more value is generated. Nevertheless, unethical and unlawful behaviour is sometimes committed by people and organisations. Although there are numerous justifications for unethical behaviour, there are also many justifications for people and organisations to act unethically.

Personal Ethics

In theory, when people develop as individuals in a community, they acquire ethical concepts and moral norms. Family, friends, places of religion, education, professional development, and organisations of all types are some areas where one might learn about ethics. People learn to distinguish between good and wrong in a community or in a social group via these. But let's say you come from a really affluent landed family or a gangster family, and your upbringing and education happen in that environment. You can start to feel that it is morally OK to do any action, including murder, if it would benefit your family. Your ethics are as follows. Similar to how managers in an organisation may grow to feel any activities that promote or defend the organisation are more essential than any damage the organisation causes to others, these behaviours are plainly not the ethics of the broader community and as such are susceptible to punishment.

Self-Interest

Normally, while evaluating our own interests against how our actions will affect others, we will run into ethical dilemmas. Imagine you know that if you can get a $100 million contract for your firm, you will be promoted to vice president. However, you also know that you must pay a $1 million bribe to the person awarding the contract in order to do so. How would you respond? What damage could it possibly do if you performed this act, which seemed to secure your job and future? Bribery is a prevalent practise in general, so if you don't hand up the million, someone else definitely will. What do you then? According to research, those who feel they have the most to lose financially or professionally are the ones who are most inclined to behave unethically. Similarly, it has been shown that businesses that are suffering financially are more inclined to engage in unethical and unlawful behaviours like collusion, price-fixing, or bribery.

Outside Pressure

Numerous studies have shown that when there is external pressure for someone to act unethically or illegally, the risk that they will do so is much higher. For instance, in certain organisations, senior managers' efforts to boost performance prompt them to design incentive programmes that, whether on purpose or accidentally, encourage unethical behaviour and overcharging of customers. If corporate performance is declining, top managers could face comparable pressure from shareholders, leading them to start taking shortcuts and acting unethically in order to maintain their positions. We can readily comprehend how immoral organisational cultures emerge if managers adopt the maxim that "the end justifies the means" if all of these forces act in the same way. The temptation for organisations to act unethically and illegally in an anti-competitive manner is quite strong. Because of the increased profits, rivals in the industry can easily see the advantages of banding together to raise prices. The damage they create is considerably harder to perceive since even while their clients may number in the millions, each one is only marginally impacted, making them seem to the companies to be doing them no harm at all. Since many customers do not bother to check the "price per ounce" that supermarkets are required to report, many companies have decided to adopt the strategy of reducing the weight of the containers of their products rather than raising their prices over the last few years. Measurement of the societal consequences of immoral behaviour is exceedingly challenging. However, they are easily detectable over time in the shape of poorly run, top-heavy, bureaucratized organisations that spend less on R&D and more on marketing or executive salaries while becoming less inventive. All stakeholders lose when the climate changes and new, fierce rivals appear because the poorly managed firm begins to crumble.

Building an Ethical Company

What ethical behaviours might be encouraged so that, at the very least, organisational members may resist any desire to commit crimes that serve their own or their organization's interests above those of society? In the end, a company will be ethical if its employees are ethical. How can individuals determine whether they are behaving ethically and making moral decisions? The earlier guideline on a person's willingness to have his or her action or choice shared with others may be used in the first method. Beyond individual motivations, a company may influence behaviour by creating incentives for ethical conduct and disincentives to penalise those who act unethically. The board and senior management determine the organization's ethical culture since they have the last say in policymaking. They may affect organisational ethics in a variety of ways. A management or board member serving as a figurehead and personification of an organization's ethical perspective, for instance, might outline the company's position on corporate ethics. A manager has the power to lead by upholding the moral principles that produce the particular ethical standards and norms that guide people's behaviour. As a liaison or spokesman for the company outside, a manager might explain the ethical standards of the company to potential clients and other stakeholders and then model those standards by behaviour towards stakeholders, such as being truthful and admitting mistakes. A manager may create policies and standards that outline the ethical stance of the company as well as provide incentives for workers to act ethically.

Making an Ethical Control and Structure System

Managers may create an organizational structure that lessens the incentives for individuals to act unethically. Ethics affect the choice of the structure and culture that organise resources and motivate personnel. Members are encouraged to engage in a socially responsible manner, for instance, via the establishment of authority relationships and norms that encourage ethical behaviour and penalise unethical behaviour. The federal government makes ongoing efforts to raise the code of behaviour for those who work for the executive branch. The ethical problems covered by standards include gift-giving and receiving, objectivity in government work and the awarding of contracts, competing financial interests, and extracurricular activities. Five million government employees are impacted by these rules. A ten-person company utilises its mission statement to direct workers in moral decision-making. Whistle-blowing happens when an employee alerts a third party about an organization's unethical or unlawful behaviour, such as a government agency, a newspaper, or a television reporter. When an employee feels helpless to stop a firm from acting unethically or when they fear retaliation from the company if they raise their concerns, they are more likely to become whistle-blowers. However, a company might take efforts to encourage whistleblowing as a rewarding action. It is possible to build up procedures that provide employees access to senior management to raise issues with unethical organisational behavior. To look into allegations of unethical behavior, an ethics officer role may be created, and official ethical decisions can be made by ethics committees. Ten percent of Fortune 500 corporations employ ethics officers who are in charge of informing staff members about organizational ethics, providing staff with training, and looking into ethical transgressions. The organizational structure is intended to support or undermine the ethical ideals that emanate from the top of the organization.

Developing a Culture of Ethics

Culture includes the principles, guidelines, and conventions that establish an organization's ethical viewpoint. Organisational culture is significantly influenced by the actions of senior management. If top management is ethical, an ethical culture is more likely to develop; conversely, if the top-management team is immoral, an unethical culture may convert to an ethical one. This change took place at General Dynamics and other military contracting companies, where fraud and overcharging the government had become typical management pastimes and corruption was rampant at all levels. However, if an organization's senior executives are unethical, neither culture nor structure can make it ethical. Participation from the top down at all organisational levels is necessary for the development of an ethical business culture.

Promoting stakeholder groups' interests

An organization's owners are its shareholders. They may appoint and dismiss senior management via the board of directors, and in principle they can punish managers who act unethically. Higher profits are desired by shareholders, but do they want them at the expense of morality? In general, the answer is no since a corporation becomes a riskier investment when it engages in immoral behaviour. Shares of a company whose reputation is damaged will be worth less than shares issued by companies with a good reputation. Additionally, a lot of stockholders do not want to own shares of businesses that take part in problematic social practises. Visit the Investor Relations section of the corporate website to examine the Corporate Governance Guidelines and find out more about Amazon's approach to CSR. The promotion of ethical organisational behaviour is increasingly dependent on pressure from external stakeholders. The establishment of the ethical standards that organisations should abide by in their operations is a collaborative effort between the government and its agencies, industry councils and regulatory authorities, and consumer advocacy organisations. As was already said, outside regulation plays a significant role in developing and maintaining ethical standards in society by establishing the ground rules for the competitive game.

Large organisations have a great deal of ability to help or hurt society. However, if corporations conduct actions that hurt society and their own stakeholders, society will attempt to regulate and control business in order to reduce its capacity to do harm. The degree to which societies are prepared to put rules on organisations, however, varies. The least restrictive laws are often found in developing nations. People in numerous nations pay significant bribes to government representatives in order to get approval to form a business; once operating, they are unrestricted by laws governing child labour, minimum wages, or employee health and safety. However, since child labour, slave pay, and dangerous working conditions are prohibited by law as well as by tradition and practise, Americans take these forms of ethical behaviour for granted.

CONCLUSION

Organisational ethics is a dynamic process that needs constant attention and dedication, not just a static notion. Through ongoing learning, introspection, and ethical decision-making frameworks, leading executives must show a dedication to ethical behaviour. In order to assess and enhance the ethical environment of the organisation, they should also promote a culture that supports ethical conversation, ethical training initiatives, and regular ethical audits. In sum, top executives have a significant influence on how an organisation develops its ethical standards and cultivates a culture of integrity. They may encourage workers, cultivate trust with stakeholders, and contribute to the long-term success of the company via ethical leadership. Leading executives cultivate a culture of ethical decision-making by prioritising ethical behaviour, establishing clear expectations, and doing so in a way that benefits all parties involved.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. S. Nunziato and R. P. Hill, "Perfectionism and the Place of the Interior Life in Business: Toward an Ethics of Personal Growth," *Bus. Ethics Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/beq.2018.26.

[2] B. A. Mojeed-Sanni and H. A. Ajonbadi, "Dynamics of HR practices in disruptive and innovative business models in an emerging economy," *Acad. J. Interdiscip. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.36941/ajis-2019-0005.

[3] M. D. Reno, "Integrative executive leadership: Towards a general theory of positive business leadership.," *THESIS*, 2011.

[4] L. Valenzuela and F. Villegas, "Orientación Al Valor Del Cliente Y El Desempeño Organizacion Al: Propuesta De Un Modelo Explicativo/Customer Value Orientation

and Organizational Performance: an Explanatory Model Proposal," *Rev. Int. Adm. Finanz.*, 2013.

[5] A. Gini, "Moral Leadership: An Overview," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 1997.

[6] J. Peterson, "Bullying or just a bit of workplace fun?: Employers need to know where the line is drawn," *Human Resource Management International Digest*. 2017. doi: 10.1108/HRMID-05-2017-0099.

[7] T. W. Brown, "The intersection of ownership and leadership in 'texas ranch house': Lessons in leadership for the family business.," *Diss. Abstr. Int. Sect. A Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2015.

[8] R. A. Giacalone, C. L. Jurkiewicz, and C. Dunn, *Positive psychology in business ethics and corporate responsibility*. 2005.

[9] R. E. Freeman, S. R. Velamuri, and B. Moriarty, "Company Stakeholder Responsibility: A New Approach to CRS," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2006.

[10] M. Hanan, "Make way for the new organization man.," *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 1971.

[11] Y. Salisu, "Dealing with the consequences of a rapidly changing global landscape: The core issues faced by organizational leaders around the world," *Strategic Direction*. 2013. doi: 10.1108/SD-05-2013-0024.

[12] "Credibility and trust on the agenda: Authentic leaders bring a touch of humanity," *Strategic Direction*. 2012. doi: 10.1108/02580541211278608.

CHAPTER 6

ORGANIZING IN A CHANGING GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Venkatesh Ashokababu, Assistant Professor
Masters In Business Administration, Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:ashokababu@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

For organizations looking to adapt and succeed in a more connected and dynamic world, organising in a changing global context brings particular difficulties and possibilities. The main factors and tactics for organising in the face of global change including globalisation, technological development, demographic changes, and shifting market dynamics are examined in this abstract. Rapid change is a hallmark of the global environment, which is influenced by developing markets, shifting consumer tastes, and technological breakthroughs. By adopting flexibility, agility, and adaptation in their organisational structures, processes, and strategies, organisations must traverse these changes. The effects of globalisation have changed the nature of business, forcing organisations to grow internationally, deal with different cultural settings, and control supply networks. In this situation, effective organising entails cultivating a global perspective, building cross-cultural proficiency, and encouraging teamwork among geographically dispersed teams. The way organisations work, communicate, and compete has been completely transformed by technological breakthroughs. Organisations must embrace digital transformation, automation, and data analytics to remain competitive. New technologies must be incorporated into organisational structures and procedures quickly, allowing for seamless communication and quick decision-making.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Consumer, Development, Environment, Organization.

INTRODUCTION

The environment is the collection of pressures and factors that may have an impact on an organization's operations and capacity to obtain limited resources. The raw materials and qualified workers that a company needs to produce goods and services, the knowledge that it needs to advance its technology or choose its competitive strategy, and the support of external stakeholders, such as customers who purchase its goods and services and banks and financial institutions that provide the capital that keeps it afloat, are all examples of scarce resources. Competition from competitors for consumers, quick technological advancements that could undercut a company's competitive edge, and a rise in the cost of key inputs that boosts operational expenses are all environmental forces that have an impact on an organization's capacity to acquire these rare resources. Since the days of the American colonies, when they traded tobacco and sugar for manufactured goods in Europe, U.S. businesses have been significantly engaged in international commerce.

In order to manufacture products and services that consumers abroad valued, GM, Heinz, IBM, Campbell's, Procter & Gamble, and hundreds of other U.S. businesses built foreign subsidiaries to which they transferred their home competencies. In fact, American businesses have been present abroad for such a long time that locals often refer to them as homegrown firms. People in Britain, for instance, often overlook the U.S. roots of Heinz, Hoover, and Ford and consider them to be British corporations. In a similar vein, few Americans are aware that Britain is the largest foreign investor in the United States and that British firms now possess or formerly owned "American" institutions like Burger King, Howard Johnson's, and Ben & Jerry's ice cream [1]–[3].

In order to gather the resources needed to generate products and services for consumers and clients, an organisation makes an effort to control the forces in its surroundings. An organisation establishes its domain by deciding how to manage the forces in its environment to maximise its capacity to secure key resources. The term "organisational domain" refers to the specific range of goods and services that the organisation produces, as well as the customers and other stakeholders it serves. An organisation, for instance, must choose which suppliers to work with from a pool of potential suppliers and how to manage its relationships with those suppliers in order to get inputs. An organisation must choose which bank to work with and how to manage its relationship with the bank so that the bank will be disposed to approve a loan before it can get money. A business must choose the clients it will serve in order to attract them, then figure out how to meet their demands.

In order to protect and expand its domain and improve its capacity to generate value for customers, shareholders, workers, and other stakeholders, an organisation tries to arrange its interactions with the environment. For instance, McDonald's produces a variety of burgers, fries, coffees, fruit drinks, and other types of fast-food items to meet the demands of its consumers. To get the resources it needs to defend and expand its domain, McDonald's arranges interactions with its surroundings that is, with suppliers, lenders, consumers, and other stakeholders. International expansion is one of the key ways a company may grow and preserve its territory. An organization's ability to expand globally enables it to look for new opportunities and use its core competencies to provide value for stakeholders. We must thoroughly comprehend which environmental influences have an impact on organisations before we can explore the specific methods in which they manage their environment to safeguard and expand their domain. The ideas of a specific environment and a generic environment provide an advantageous analytical foundation.

The Particular Setting

Customers, distributors, unions, petitioners, suppliers, and the government are all significant outside stakeholders that have the power to persuade and pressure organisations to act in certain ways. These forces from outside stakeholder groups directly affect an organization's capacity to secure resources. Competition from restaurants like Burger King, Subway, and Taco Bell has a significant impact on McDonald's capacity to draw resources, namely customer revenue. Resources become valued and scarce as a result of competition since they become harder to get the fiercer the rivalry. Both local and foreign competitors are acceptable. The ramifications for a company's capacity to gather resources vary depending on the kind. When compared to the American auto industry, where they have hampered American car firms' capacity to recruit talent, foreign rivals have not been as significant an influence in the fast-food sector.

Sony, Toyota, Samsung, BMW, and several more foreign businesses compete with American businesses for American consumers in the United States. Companies from both within and outside the nations where they operate compete with American businesses abroad. For instance, the European divisions of GM and Ford compete not just with Japanese firms like Toyota and Honda but also with European automakers like Fiat, Peugeot, and BMW. In fact, the prosperity of Volkswagen, Ford, and Fiat has been in jeopardy since the establishment of factories with the ability to create 750,000 new vehicles annually by Japanese automakers operating in Europe in the 2000s. Another factor that has an impact on an organisation is changes in the quantity, diversity, and preferences of the consumers. To manage its relationship with consumers and win their support, a company requires a plan. This strategy must evolve over time to take into account changing client requirements. In a global setting, where clients vary from nation to country, meeting customer wants offers additional obstacles. For instance, unlike Americans, European consumers often like their cereal unsweetened, thus Kellogg and General Mills adapt their goods to suit European preferences. If an organisation wants to win their business, it must be willing and able to alter or customize its goods to meet the tastes and preferences of various customers [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Organisations must choose how to manage relationships with suppliers and distributors in order to get access to the resources they provide, in addition to attending to the demands of consumers. The process of organising and managing supply/distribution activities such as acquiring and storing raw materials and semifinished goods, managing work-in-process inventory, and swiftly transporting finished goods from the point of production to the point of sale is known as global supply chain management. In order to most efficiently guarantee a consistent supply of inputs or dispose of its outputs in a timely way, an organisation must make several decisions on how to manage these activities. Should McDonald's purchase or manufacture its inputs, for instance? Should it grow chickens, livestock, fruits, and vegetables? Should it manufacture its own takeout containers? Or ought it to purchase all of these components from international vendors? Fast food safety is a major concern; can input suppliers be relied upon to guarantee product quality and safety? How can McDonald's assure the quality of its goods by distributing them to franchisees in the best possible way? Should

McDonald's use local trucking firms to transport goods to its restaurants, or should it operate its own fleet of trucks to serve its franchisees? In the current global climate, input supplies may be received from sources both home and outside. Apple, for instance, could only compete with Sony and Panasonic for the lucrative MP3 player market when it started to buy and assemble the inputs for its iPod player abroad. If U.S. companies had not used outsourcing as a means to lower the cost of their inputs by purchasing from overseas suppliers, they would have lost their competitive advantage to overseas competitors who did pursue outsourcing. Due to access to low-cost global input suppliers and the production of Apple iPod components in nations like Taiwan, China, and Hong Kong, Apple has been able to consistently reduce the cost of the iPod and so take the lead in the MP3 music player industry. By lowering the cost of producing each new model of its iPhone and iPad thanks to its experience in locating low-cost materials, it can continue Apple draw in more users and rule the worldwide market.

In a globalised world, distribution and marketing difficulties become more difficult. Because consumer preferences differ from nation to nation, many advertising and marketing efforts are country-specific, and many goods are tailored to the interests of international consumers. Additionally, local manufacturers closely control distribution channels in many other nations, like Japan and India, which makes it very difficult for American businesses to join the market and sell their goods. When a company's goods are complicated and clients require a lot of knowledge to correctly operate or utilise them, global distribution likewise becomes challenging. In order to draw in clients, an organisation must carefully evaluate how to manage the worldwide distribution of its goods. Should the company conduct its own international sales and distribution? Should it use a wholesaler to sell its goods in foreign markets? Should it form a partnership with a firm in a certain nation and enable that business to sell and distribute its products? The government, unions, and consumer interest organisations are among other external players. McDonald's policies on equal employment opportunities, food preparation and content, and health and safety standards are of interest to many government bodies, and these organisations put pressure on the company to uphold the law. McDonald's is under pressure from unions to raise pay and benefits. Consumer advocacy organisations put pressure on McDonald's to reduce the fat content of its menu items to combat the rising obesity rates among American consumers.

When establishing worldwide operations, an organisation must build strong working relationships with all new hires and any labour unions that may represent them. If a Japanese company establishes a new facility in the United States, the Japanese management team must be aware of what the American workforce expects in terms of compensation, seniority, and other workplace circumstances. As Nokia does, a global organisation must modify its management approach to meet the demands of the local workforce while continuing to pursue its objectives. Finally, each nation has a unique political structure, as well as rules and regulations that regulate how business is carried out. When a U.S. corporation expands abroad, it must adhere to the institutional and legal framework of the host nation. The standards regulating commercial activity may sometimes be standardised throughout numerous nations, as in the European Union. Although this may make it simpler for American businesses to do business internationally, it also makes it simpler for other nations to defend their own domestic, home-based businesses.

For instance, Boeing says that Airbus Industries has been able to create new aircraft like its new super "jumbo" at artificially cheap rates because to subsidies from European tax payers. In a similar vein, American farmers claim that European tariffs shield ineffective European farmers and prevent consumers from buying goods from more productive American producers. Domestic rivals often persuade their own governments to stop "unfair" international competition. Japan is widely renowned for its many efforts to prevent foreign rivals from entering the country or to mitigate their negative effects on Japanese businesses. If an organisation is to gain the resources it needs to exist, defend, and improve its domain, it must engage in transactions with each of the forces in its particular environment. The extent and size of its domain will develop over time as those transactions happen. For instance, a company that wishes to broaden its market to meet the requirements of new client groups by creating new product categories would face new pressures and might need to participate in new interactions with the environment to get resources [6]–[8].

The Environment in General

The overall environment is made up of factors that influence each individual environment and have an impact on how easily resources may be acquired by all organisations within a given environment. The amount of product demand and the cost of inputs are influenced by economic factors including interest rates, the health of the economy, and the unemployment rate. The ways in which national variations in interest rates, currency exchange rates, wage levels, gross domestic product, and per capita income affect how organisations operate worldwide are significant. Organisations often strive to produce their goods or get their inputs from the nation with the lowest cost of labour or raw resources. Because doing so has allowed them to match the low prices of international rivals that outsource production to China and Malaysia, companies like Sony, GE, and GM have shuttered many of their U.S. manufacturing units and shifted their operations to Mexico. Clearly, foreign rivals operating from low-wage nations have a competitive edge that might be essential in the struggle for the business of the budget-conscious American customer. In order to compete, a large number of American businesses have been compelled to outsource manufacturing or shift their operations overseas. For instance, to save costs, Levi Strauss shifted manufacture of its jeans to Mexico and the Dominican Republic in the 2000s after closing the last of its U.S. plants. Numerous elements of how organisations operate are influenced by technological influences, such as the creation of new manufacturing methods and information-processing tools. Productivity may be improved by using computerised manufacturing technologies. Similar to this, financial support for cutting-edge R&D initiatives affects how businesses collaborate and how they organise themselves.

The competitive advantage of an organisation is significantly impacted by the worldwide transfer of technology. Organisations must be able to learn about and have access to foreign technical advancements that might provide a competitive edge at a minimal cost. Historically, the United States has exported its technology, and foreign businesses have been eager to adopt it. However, in certain fields, American businesses have been hesitant to benefit from foreign technical advancements. Critics claim that, to the disadvantage of American competitiveness, global learning has often been conducted in a one-way fashion, from the United States to the rest of the world. According to estimates, Japanese corporations paid American businesses $100 million after World War II for the right to licence certain technology, and in exchange they received over $100 billion in sales income from American consumers. In order to bridge the technology gap, American businesses are now eager and ready to learn from their competitors abroad. As Amazon.com has done, such technology learning enables an organisation to strengthen its core competencies and use them globally to generate value.

Government policy towards organisations and their stakeholders is influenced by political, ethical, and environmental factors. For instance, regulations that support certain commercial interests, like a tax on imported vehicles, have an impact on an organization's clients and rivals. Organisational production costs are impacted by environmentalist pressure to minimise things like air pollution and the amount of solid waste produced in the country. Environmentally responsible product design and packaging may change how an organisation interacts with its rivals, clients, and suppliers. Toyota was a pioneer in the creation of hybrid cars that save on gas, such as the Prius, and in 2005 it licenced this technology to GM and Ford. It's a race to see which firm will be the most prosperous when Honda unveiled a new hybrid car in 2009 to compete with the Prius and Toyota unveiled its new Prius model. Around the world, businesses that want to establish low-cost operations take advantage of slack rules in nations that don't do much to protect the environment. As in many Eastern European and Asian nations, the outcome may be greater pollution and escalating environmental issues.

Customers, managers, and workers of organisations are shaped by demographic, cultural, and social factors such the age, education, way of life, norms, values, and traditions of a nation's people. For instance, the age distributions and national birthrates are related to the demand for infant items. Because they have an immediate impact on the preferences and requirements of a country's consumers, demographic, cultural, and social dynamics are significant sources of uncertainty in a global context. The views of a nation towards both local and foreign goods and businesses are influenced by its cultural and social values. Customers in France and Italy, for instance, tend to choose locally manufactured automobiles despite the fact that goods from other countries are more valuable and of higher quality. A U.S. corporation expanding operations abroad must be aware of the host nation's commercial norms and procedures. Different nations have different business practises and commercial organisations. Additionally, they have different perspectives on union-management interactions, ethical standards, and accounting and financial practises. Bribery and corruption are legal commercial practises in several nations. As was already said, domestic businesses seeking to prevent the introduction of more capable foreign rivals are protected under Japanese law. The regulations are evolving, however, and businesses like Walmart now operate there.

Environmental Sources of Uncertainty in the Workplace

In order to easily administer its domain and please stakeholders, an organisation prefers to maintain a stable and ample flow of resources. However, all of the aforementioned causes lead to uncertainty for organisations and make it more challenging for managers to manage the flow of resources required to safeguard and grow their organisational domains. The collection of factors that contribute to these issues may also be seen in terms of how they increase uncertainty since they have an impact on the environment's complexity, dynamism, and richness. The degree of uncertainty rises as a result of these processes, which make the environment increasingly complicated, unstable, and impoverished.

Ecological Complexity

The strength, quantity, and connectivity of the particular and general factors that an organisation must control determine how complex the environment is. The environment becomes more complicated and unpredictable as well as harder to forecast and manage the bigger the number and the greater the variances between them. For instance, Ford formerly employed more than 3,000 separate vendors to provide components. Ford started a program to cut down on suppliers in order to lessen the unpredictability that came with managing so many of them and, as a consequence, the complexity of its environment. Ford now works with fewer than 500 suppliers, making gathering the data required to manage its relationships with them considerably simpler than doing so for 10 times as many. Additionally, complexity rises if a business produces a greater range of goods over time for various consumer segments.

For instance, a corporation like McDonald's would need a significant influx of information if it suddenly chose to join the insurance and banking industries in order to eliminate the ambiguity around the new activities. When particular and general factors in the environment are related, or when they start to interact in a way that makes their effects on the organisation unexpected, complexity may develop significantly. An organisation confronts greater uncertainty the more intertwined the factors in its specialised and overall surroundings are. Imagine if a significant advance in automotive technology renders obsolete the current plants. This overarching factor will lead stock prices in automakers to swing drastically and will disrupt the financial markets. Car manufacturers won't know how the innovation will impact their industry, rivalry will intensify, and management and unions won't know how it will impact employment and the organization's future. In the event that consumers decide to hold off on purchasing vehicles until new models produced with the new technology are released, this might lead to job losses and additional drops in the value of stocks for automakers [9], [10].

This occurred in the 2000s when GM, Chrysler, and Ford all started to experience massive financial losses as a result of their inability to cut costs or create automobiles that could compete with those of their Japanese rivals. To cut expenses and stay afloat, these automakers and the United Auto Workers agreed considerable reductions in health care and benefit prices. Even nevertheless, GM and Chrysler's excessive expenditures drove them into bankruptcy in 2009, allowing them to sever costly contracts with unions and auto dealers. To build new types of high-quality automobiles that American consumers demand, like gas-saving hybrids, in flexible facilities since they emerged from bankruptcy, they have worked hard, like Ford, and by 2011 they were back in the black. The environment of an organisation is unknown to a larger extent the more complicated it is. It becomes very difficult to predict and manage the flow of resources, and there are growing issues with managing transactions with the environment. Because Honda and Toyota both released new cutting-edge hybrid and electric vehicles in 2011, GM and Ford will face significant challenges in the future. However, they have retaliated with their own models, like as the Chevrolet Volt, and the struggle to draw in the tens of thousands of buyers looking for fuel-efficient vehicles in 2011 is fierce.

Ecological Dynamism

Environmental dynamism refers to how rapidly and how much factors in the general and specific surroundings change over time, increasing the unpredictability that an organisation must deal with. If pressures have predictable effects on the supply of resources, the environment is stable. If an organisation is unable to foresee how the forces will alter over time, the environment is unstable and dynamic. The environment is particularly dynamic if technology, like in the case of the computer sector, evolves quickly. An organisation will look for strategies to make a dynamic, unpredictable environment more predictable and less uncertain. We cover long-term contracts and vertical integration as management techniques for potentially volatile elements of the environment later in the chapter. Modern opportunities for an organisation to expand its scope and add value for stakeholders include the existence of sizable new global markets for companies to enter, such as those in China, India, and Eastern Europe, as well as the possibility of gaining access to new global resources and core competencies. However, as businesses compete both domestically and internationally, the environment becomes more complicated and dynamic. As a result, it is more challenging to foresee and manage the environment as a result of globalisation.

Ecological Richness

The quantity of resources available to support a certain organization's domain determines how rich the environment is. Rich settings have low levels of uncertainty since there are many resources available and little need for organisations to compete for them. Because there are so many colleges in the vicinity, biotechnology firms have access to a vast pool of top-notch scientists in Boston, for instance. Due to the scarcity of resources and the resulting competition among organisations, uncertainty is considerable in impoverished contexts. For instance, there is a shortage of excellent scientists in Alaska, and it is costly to fill the need. Environments may be unfavourable for two reasons: either an organisation is situated in a poor nation or area of a rich one, or there is fierce rivalry for few resources among organisations. The more difficult it is for organisations to manage resource transactions in unfavourable circumstances. Organisations must compete to draw in consumers, get the greatest inputs, or access cutting-edge technologies. An organisation experiences uncertainty as a consequence of these battles.

Resources are extremely hard to come by and organisations suffer the greatest uncertainty in a poor, insecure, and complicated environment. In contrast, resources are accessible and uncertainty is minimal in a wealthy, secure, and simple setting. Over the last ten years, U.S. airlines like American, United/Continental, and Delta have operated in a very unstable environment. Southwest and other low-cost carriers have grown nationwide during the last ten years, increasing industry rivalry and degrading the environment as they compete for passengers and must decrease their costs to attract them. Because of the close ties between rival airlines, the airline business environment is complicated: If one airline lowers fares, other airlines must follow like in order to safeguard their territories, yet this just serves to raise uncertainty. The high cost of fuel, increased competition from foreign airlines, and the shifting nature of the economy are all interconnected in the environment of the airlines and change over time, making it challenging to predict or prepare for contingencies. As a result, the majority of airlines suffered significant losses during the recent recession.

The pharmaceutical industry's climate, in comparison, is rather stable. Large pharmaceutical corporations like Merck, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Pfizer, and others are granted patents for their new products and are the exclusive suppliers for 17 years. Because there is no competition during this time and consumers are forced to purchase the medicine from the patent-holding firm, it is possible for that corporation to charge a high price for its product. Pharmaceutical companies operate in a stable, prosperous environment with little competition and little change until patents expire or new medications are developed. However, health care organisations like HMOs and the US government have used their negotiating leverage to pressure these corporations to lower prescription costs as a result of a sharp rise in drug prices throughout the 2000s. As a result, the climate is now more unpredictable for pharmaceutical firms, which are now having trouble coming up with new, blockbuster treatments. Pharmaceutical firms give tens of millions to political parties and members of the House of Representatives and Senate in order to protect their interests and manage complexity and impede the pace of change. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a detailed analysis of the methods used by organisations to control their surroundings. However, it is first helpful to look at the circumstances that Jeff Bezos faced once he started Amazon.com11.

CONCLUSION

Organisations need to have a learning culture that promotes continuous development and welcomes change if they want to operate successfully in a changing global environment. This entails supporting an agile mentality, information exchange, and the creation of chances for skill improvement. Organisations may get access to new markets, resources, and knowledge via cooperation and partnerships with external stakeholders such as suppliers, customers, and research institutes. The development of strategic alliances and the use of networks may improve an organization's competitiveness in a global setting. In conclusion, organisations must be proactive, flexible, and sensitive to new trends and problems if they are to successfully organise in a rapidly changing global world. Organisations may negotiate the complexity of the global world and embrace possibilities for development and success by embracing flexibility, harnessing technology, supporting diversity and inclusion, and developing collaborative connections. An agile attitude, creativity, and a dedication to ongoing learning and development are necessary for effective organising in a changing global economy.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. G. Marroquín-Cardona, N. M. Johnson, T. D. Phillips, and A. W. Hayes, "Mycotoxins in a changing global environment - A review," *Food and Chemical Toxicology*. 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.fct.2014.04.025.

[2] J. J. Kim and J. H. Ryu, "Decision-making of LID-BMPs for adaptive water management at the boise river watershed in a changing global environment," *Water (Switzerland)*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/w12092436.

[3] S. Pan *et al.*, "Modeling and monitoring terrestrial primary production in a changing global environment: Toward a multiscale synthesis of observation and simulation," *Advances in Meteorology*. 2014. doi: 10.1155/2014/965936.

[4] G. A. Lobos and J. F. Hancock, "Breeding blueberries for a changing global environment: A review," *Frontiers in Plant Science*. 2015. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2015.00782.

[5] N. S. Mohd Saad, A. A. Severn-Ellis, A. Pradhan, D. Edwards, and J. Batley,

"Genomics Armed With Diversity Leads the Way in Brassica Improvement in a Changing Global Environment," *Frontiers in Genetics*. 2021. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2021.600789.

[6] G. Taba-Morales *et al.*, "Improving African bean productivity in a changing global environment," *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11027-019-09910-4.

[7] J. Unerman and B. O'Dwyer, "NGO accountability and sustainability issues in the changing global environment," *Public Manag. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/14719037.2010.496258.

[8] F. Su *et al.*, "Reassessing CBRN Threats in a Changing Global Environment," *Stock. Int. Peace Res. Inst.*, 2019.

[9] S. Khan, "Changing global environments," in *World Social Science Report 2013*, 2019. doi: 10.1787/g2a2041b0-en.

[10] S. D. Babler, *Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Project Management in a Changing Global Environment*. 2010. doi: 10.1002/9780470636930.

CHAPTER 7

STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING RESOURCE DEPENDENCIES AMONG ORGANIZATIONS

Dr. Bipasha Maity, Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:bipasha@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

To achieve strategic objectives and preserve competitive advantage in today's linked business environment, managing resource interdependence across organisations has become more important. The strategies and methods for managing resource dependence successfully, such as cooperation, diversity, strategic alliances, and technology integration, are explored in this abstract. Dependence on external sources for vital resources like raw materials, technology, knowledge, or distribution channels causes organisations to become resource dependent. Ineffective management of these dependencies may lead to a broken supply chain, more costs, less flexibility, and subpar performance. Organisations must thus create techniques that reduce risks and maximise resource utilisation. A crucial tactic for controlling resource dependence is collaboration. Businesses may pool resources, exchange information, and improve their collective skills by entering into strategic alliances, joint ventures, or partnerships with other organisations. Collaboration networks provide businesses access to resources that would be difficult or expensive to acquire on their own, promoting innovation and lowering susceptibility to resource interruptions. Another tactic for controlling resource dependence is diversification. Organisations may decrease their dependency on a single resource provider by broadening their selection of suppliers, sources, or technologies. Increased resilience, reduced risks from supply interruptions, and flexibility in responding to changing market circumstances are all benefits of diversification. Diversification must, however, be weighed against the need to preserve efficacy, affordability, and quality.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Company, Network, Organizations, Strategic.

INTRODUCTION

In order to exist and expand, organisations rely on the resources provided by their surroundings. However, the environment's complexity, dynamism, and richness all affect the availability of resources. When a market environment becomes worse due to the loss of significant customers or the entry of new rivals, resources become more limited and expensive, and uncertainty rises. To secure access to the resources, they rely on, organisations make an effort to control their interactions with the environment. Because it makes controlling their domains easier and increases their chances of survival, they want their access to resources to be as predictable as possible. According to the resource dependency hypothesis, an organisation should seek to influence other organisations as little as possible in order to acquire the resources that it needs while minimising its reliance on others for the provision of limited resources in its environment. In order to gain resources, an organisation must exercise influence on other organisations, and it must also react to the wants and demands of the other organisations in its environment. As a result, an organisation must simultaneously manage two parts of its resource reliance [1]–[3].

Two criteria determine how strongly one organisation is dependent on another for a certain resource. The first is how crucial the resource is to the ongoing existence of the company. Resources that are rare and precious are crucial to an organization's existence.15 The degree to which other organisations control the resource is the other consideration. Crown Cork & Seal and other can producers, for instance, need aluminium to make cans, but for many years Alcoa controlled the supply of aluminium. As a result, it could command high prices for its aluminium due to its virtual monopoly. The PC business serves as an example of how both elements work. Manufacturers of computers like HP, Acer, Lenovo, and Dell rely on companies like Samsung, Nvidia, and Intel to provide its memory chips and microprocessors. They also rely on school systems and business clients that purchase huge numbers of their PCs, as well as on electronics retail chains like Best purchase and internet merchants like Amazon.com that carry their goods. Companies become extremely reliant on the few providers of a resource, like memory chips, or the few organisations who distribute and sell a product. For instance, Intel produces many of the most cutting-edge microchips and has significant influence over PC manufacturers that depend on its most recent processors to compete successfully. The more reliant one organisation is on another, the more vulnerable it is, and the more powerful corporation has the ability to threaten or exploit the dependent organisation if it so chooses, for example, by increasing prices.

Organisations employ a variety of ways to manage their dependency on resources and restrict their access to limited resources. Organisations look for methods to expand their influence over the global environment in the same way that states create international policies to attempt to improve their power to influence world events. Accessing resources is unpredictable and difficult since, for instance, clients are famously fickle and migrate to rivals' offerings. An organisation must develop interorganizational strategies to manage the resource interdependencies in its particular and general environment if it is to decrease uncertainty. Organisations may defend and expand their territory by managing these dependencies. Organisations must manage their interactions with factors like suppliers, unions, and consumer interest groups in the given environment. They may cause uncertainty if they limit access to resources. Two basic types of interdependencies competitive and symbiotic cause uncertainty in the particular environment. Symbiotic interdependencies occur when the outputs of one organisation are the inputs for another; as a result, symbiotic interdependencies typically exist between an organisation and its suppliers and distributors. Intel and PC manufacturers like HP and Dell are mutually dependent. Organisations that fight for limited inputs and outputs are interdependent on one another. HP and Dell are in competition for consumers for their laptops, tablets, and for inputs like Intel's most recent microchips.

To govern symbiotic and competitive interdependencies, organisations may utilise a variety of linking mechanisms. However, the implementation of these mechanisms requires coordination between the connected organisations' choices and actions. Each organization's ability to act autonomously and often in its own best interests is restricted by the necessity for cooperation. Imagine HP enters into a deal with Intel committing to utilise exclusively Intel chips in order to secure its supply of processors in the future. Then again, a brand-new chip maker appears with a more affordable chip. Even if paying Intel's increased rates is not in HP's best interests, the contract with Intel obligates HP to do so. Every time an organisation engages in an interorganizational linkage, it must weigh the loss of autonomy or freedom of choice that will result from the linkage against the need to reduce resource dependence. In general, an organisation looks for the interorganizational strategy that provides the most uncertainty reduction for the least loss of control. The interorganizational techniques that organisations might use to manage symbiotic interdependencies and competitive interdependencies are discussed in the following sections. When two or more organisations decide to directly coordinate their interdependencies to lessen uncertainty, the connection is considered formal. The higher the direct coordination and the possibility that it is founded on an explicit written agreement or includes some shared ownership between organisations, the more formal the tie. The more loose or indirect the manner of coordination, and the more probable it is that the coordination will be founded on an implicit or unspoken agreement, the more informal the relationship [4]–[6].

Management Techniques for Symbiotic Resource Interdependencies

Organisations have a variety of options for managing symbiotic interdependencies. The relative formality of four techniques. The recommended field of collaboration between organisations expands as a plan becomes more formalised.

Building a Credible Name

The least formal and most indirect method of managing symbiotic interdependencies with suppliers and clients is to build a reputation, which is the degree to which an organisation is respected and trusted by outsiders as a result of its ethical and moral business conduct. For instance, having a solid reputation and gaining the confidence of suppliers and clients come from paying bills on time and offering high-quality products and services. Consumers will return to a vehicle repair shop if it has a reputation for providing quality repairs and reasonable costs for parts and labour, which means the business is effectively managing its relationships with consumers. The DeBeers diamond cartel manages its relationships with suppliers and clients by relying on reputation and trust. The largest diamond retailers in the world make up a limited group of DeBeers' clients. When these businesses purchase diamonds from DeBeers, they want a certain amount, let's say $10 million worth. DeBeers then chooses a collection of diamonds with a $10 million worth. Customers cannot haggle with DeBeers over the cost or calibre of the diamonds. They have the option to purchase or not, but they always do so because they trust DeBeers not to defraud them. The reputation and sustainability of the business depend on keeping consumers happy. The most frequent connection mechanisms for managing symbiotic interdependencies are probably reputation and trust. As a result, organisations as a whole tend to grow more honest over time. Behaving honestly, however, does not exclude aggressive bargaining and haggling over the price and quality of inputs and outputs. Companies that conduct dishonestly are likely to fail in the long term. Every organisation tries to negotiate conditions in its favour because it wants to make the contract that best benefits it.

Cooptation

An organisation that seeks to win over opponents accomplishes this by giving them a stake in or claim on what it does and strives to meet their interests. Cooptation is a method that handles symbiotic interdependencies by neutralising problematic factors in the particular environment. Pharmaceutical firms coerce doctors through sponsoring medical conferences, providing free samples of their medications, and heavily publicising in medical publications. The pharmaceutical industry's objectives win over doctors' sympathies, bringing them into the "team" and convincing them that they and the industry share similar goals. A crucial instrument in politics is cooptation. Bringing troublesome forces into the organisation and effectively making them inside stakeholders is a popular strategy for controlling problematic forces like consumers, suppliers, or other significant external stakeholders. When a stakeholder group disagrees with how something is being done, an organisation coopts the group by including them in altering the situation. Organisations of all types use this tactic. For instance, local schools may invite parents to join school boards or form teacher-parent committees in an effort to coerce them. The organisation cedes some influence in such a deal, but it often gets more than it loses.

Bribery is a practise that is commonplace in many nations but is forbidden in the United States and may be used to get outsiders into an organisation. An interlocking directorate a connection created when a director from one firm sits on the board of another company can also be used to bring them in. An organisation may invite the financial institution from which it borrows the majority of its funds to send a representative to sit on the organization's board of directors. An organisation may invite members of powerful and significant stakeholder groups in its particular environment to sit on its board of directors. Outside directors communicate with the top management of an organisation, assuring the availability of limited resources, sharing information, and fostering relationships across organisations.

Strategic Partnerships

The management of symbiotic interdependencies between firms inside one nation or across countries is increasingly being done via strategic partnerships. An arrangement requiring two or more businesses to pool their resources in order to create new commercial prospects is known as a strategic alliance. For instance, BMW and Nvidia announced their cooperation in 2011 with the goal of integrating Nvidia graphics processors into all of BMW's automobiles. These chips would control all facets of how BMW's media and GPS systems function and interact with the driver. Similar to this, Microsoft and Nokia said in 2011 that their smartphones will eventually run on the Microsoft mobile phone platform and that they would collaborate and leverage their strategic relationship to build "a new global mobile ecosystem."

DISCUSSION

Different kinds of alliances are crucial. The relative formality of long-term agreements, networks, minority ownership, and joint ventures. The firmer and more prescriptive the relationship and the more tightly the joint activities are controlled, the more formal the arrangement. Organisations often decide on a more formal partnership to safeguard their access to resources when uncertainty rises [7], [8].

Long-Term Contracts

Long-term contracts between two or more organisations that define alliances fall on the informal end of the continuum. These agreements often aim to save costs via resource sharing or risk sharing for projects like marketing, building, and research and development. Contracts are the least formal sort of alliance since they just include the agreement that binds the parties together. For instance, two major international construction companies, Bechtel Corp. and Willbros Group Inc., decided to pool their resources to build a $850 million oil pipeline in the Caspian Sea in order to lower financial risk. J. B. Hunt Transport, a trucking company, also formed an alliance with Santa Fe Pacific Corporation, a railroad company. Santa Fe agreed to use railroad waggons to transport Hunt's trailers throughout the nation. Hunt's trucks met the trains at the conclusion of the journey and delivered the trailers to their destination. Hunt's expenses were reduced, while Santa Fe's earnings rose as a result of the agreement. Contracts may be informal, shared, written, or implied. Over lunch, two CEOs or senior executives may decide to routinely get together to discuss business-related topics like standardizing computer systems or evolving client demands. Contrarily, some organizations create formal contracts that outline the procedures for sharing resources or information and for using the advantages that come with such agreements. The producer of breakfast cereals, Kellogg, signs formal agreements with the farmers who provide the maize and rice it requires. Regardless of the market rate in effect at the time the product is gathered, Kellogg has agreed to pay a certain amount for their produce. Both parties benefit from the removal of a significant source of uncertainty from their settings.

Networks

A network, also known as a network structure, is a collection of distinct organisations whose operations are coordinated by contracts and agreements as opposed to a formal chain of command. A network's members collaborate closely to support and enhance one another's efforts. Because there are more ties connecting member organisations and there is more formal coordination of activities, the alliance resulting from a network is more formal than the alliance resulting from a contract. Nike and other organisations establish networks to forge enduring relationships with vendors, distributors, and clients in order to avoid the "core" organisation growing too big or bureaucratic. The network's creator organisation wants to raise the efficiency of its partners and lower costs or improve the quality of its products by sharing its production, marketing, and R&D expertise with them. For instance, AT&T established a network organisation and connected its suppliers to enable low-cost production of digital answering machines. AT&T electronically transmits assembly instructions for new products and designs for new component parts to its network partners, who then coordinate their efforts to make the components in the required numbers and transport them to the final assembly location.

Minority Ownership

When organisations purchase a minority ownership share in one another, a more formal partnership results. Contracts and network connections do not have the same formality as ownership. Organisations with minorities are far more dependant, and this dependency creates solid cooperative ties. The keiretsu system in Japan provides an example of how minority ownership networks function. A keiretsu is a collection of organisations that cooperate to serve the interests of the group and each of which has shares in the others. Japanese businesses use two fundamental types of keiretsu. Linkages between input and output are managed by capital keiretsu. Financial keiretsu often include a sizable bank at its core and are used to handle connections across several different enterprises. The Japanese auto industry is a particularly clear illustration of how a capital keiretsu network may benefit all the firms in it, but notably the dominant ones. Toyota is the most profitable automaker in the world. Its cars are frequently rated as being among the most dependable, and its clients are very loyal. Because Toyota has a strong reputation, dependencies with its consumers are not a concern. The way Toyota manages its input interdependencies is one of the factors contributing to its positive reputation.

Today's performance in the global auto industry hinges on controlling this key relationship since a car's dependability depends on the calibre of its inputs. Toyota typically has as much as a 40% minority share in several of its biggest suppliers in order to maintain control over its supplies. Toyota has authority over the costs suppliers charge for their parts because of these official ownership links. The fact that this formal partnership enables Toyota and its suppliers to collaborate to improve product quality and dependability and share the benefits is an even more significant outcome. Toyota's ownership involvement means that it is not reluctant to provide confidential information to its suppliers. As a consequence, suppliers of parts actively engage in the development of new cars, which often results in the discovery of innovative techniques for raising component quality and lowering their price. Toyota and its suppliers benefit equally from this tight collaboration. These partnerships have provided Toyota a sustained competitive edge on the world market, which translates into management of significant environmental interdependencies. Also keep in mind that Toyota has no right to exploit its suppliers by requiring ever-lower pricing from them since Toyota is a stakeholder in their companies. The pooling of activity is advantageous to all parties. When Toyota debuts the most recent model of each of its cars, such as the Camry sedan, these intimate connections consistently pay dividends. Toyota was able to engineer $1,700 in cost reductions in the most recent model and release it at a price lower that of the previous model by making use of the expertise in its network. Due to the same factors, the price difference between the hybrid and non-hybrid Prius in its new model will only be $1,500 as opposed to $3,000 in the previous one [9]–[11].

A financial keiretsu controlled by a sizable bank operates like a massive interlocking directorate. The dominating members of the financial keiretsu, who are often chosen from a variety of businesses, sit on the bank's board of directors as well as frequently on the boards of one another's businesses. Significant long-term stock holdings that are maintained by the bank at the core of the keiretsu tie the enterprises together. Companies that are members may exchange confidential information and expertise for their mutual benefit. In fact, one of the advantages of a financial keiretsu is the ability of enterprises to switch their management and build their network. The Fuyo keiretsu, which is focused on Fuji Bank. Nissan, NKK, Hitachi, and Canon are among of its participants. All of the biggest and most important keiretsu members are connected via the directors of Fuji Bank. Each sizable member firm has a unique group of subsidiary businesses. For instance, Nissan owns a small portion of several of the vendors that supply the raw materials for its vehicle operations.

Joint enterprise

A joint venture is a strategic alliance between two or more organizations that decide to launch and share ownership of a new company. Joint ventures are the most official of the strategic alliances because the participants are obligated by a formal legal agreement that outlines their respective rights and obligations. As an example, Company A and Company B decide to establish Company C, and then work together to choose its top management team and create its organizational structure. Both Company A and Company B send executives to lead Company C and provide the tools it needs to develop and thrive. Joint venture participants often combine their own competencies. The value that the new enterprise may offer is increased by, for instance, one contributing specialist knowledge on efficient manufacturing procedures and the other its competences in R&D. If the foundation of the strategic alliance was only a long-term contract, maintaining complicated interorganizational interactions may become problematic. However, this difficulty is mitigated by the shared ownership of a joint venture. Additionally, since the newly formed organization is free to construct the structure that best meets its objectives, managing interdependencies with the parent firms presents less management challenges. In conclusion, organisations manage symbiotic resource interdependencies via informal and formal strategic partnerships. In order to provide organisations greater control over ongoing contingencies, the level of formality rises as environmental uncertainty rises.

Takeovers and mergers

Because resource transfers increasingly take place inside one organisation rather than across organisations, merging with or taking over a supplier or distributor is the most formal technique for managing symbiotic resource interdependencies. A dominant client or supplier can no longer hold a company hostage. As an example, Shell, a large chemical manufacturer, owns a number of oil fields and so has influence over the price of its oil and petroleum products, which are essential inputs in the production of chemicals. Similar to how

McDonald's raises inexpensive cattle for its hamburgers on large ranches it owns in Brazil. Alcoa has controlled the global aluminium industry for decades and now controls or manages a large portion of the world's supply of aluminium ore. An organisation that acquires another firm often has to spend a lot of money and deal with management issues. So an organisation is only likely to gain control of a distributor or supplier when there is a very strong requirement for it to manage or control a significant interdependency or source. For instance, Coca-Cola and PepsiCo both acquired several U.S. and international firms that can and distribute their soft drinks in the 2000s to be able to react more swiftly to consumers' shifting preferences and expectations.

CONCLUSION

Organisations can adapt quickly to changes and maximise resource utilisation thanks to technology, which makes it possible to share information in real-time and allocate resources efficiently and effectively. Risk analysis and emergency planning are also necessary for the efficient management of resource dependence. To identify crucial resource dependencies, analyse possible hazards, and create contingency plans to minimise interruptions, organisations should carry out detailed evaluations. Effective management of resource dependence depends on proactive monitoring, early risk recognition, and quick reaction mechanisms. Finally, attaining resilience, efficiency, and sustainable performance requires managing resource interdependence across organisations. Organisations may maximise resource utilisation, reduce risks, and promote innovation by using strategies including cooperation, diversity, strategic alliances, and technology integration. Organisations can traverse complexity, adjust to changing conditions, and retain a competitive advantage in today's dynamic business climate by proactively managing resource dependencies.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Waller, "Conservation risk assessment: A strategy for managing resources for preventive conservation," *Stud. Conserv.*, 1994, doi: 10.1179/sic.1994.39.Supplement-2.12.

[2] T. Terer, G. G. Ndiritu, and N. N. Gichuki, "Socio-economic values and traditional strategies of managing wetland resources in Lower Tana River, Kenya," *Hydrobiologia*. 2004. doi: 10.1023/B:HYDR.0000043332.96368.c5.

[3] P. Dass and B. Parker, "Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From resistance to learning," *Acad. Manag. Exec.*, 1999, doi: 10.5465/ame.1999.1899550.

[4] J. M. Ivancevich, D. M. Schweiger, and F. R. Power, "Strategies for Managing Human Resources During Mergers and Acquisitions.," *Human Resource Planning*. 1987.

[5] N. L. Jimmieson, A. J. Bergin, P. Bordia, and M. K. Tucker, "Supervisor strategies and resources needed for managing employee stress: A qualitative analysis," *Saf. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2020.105149.

[6] A. T. Erdem, "The Moderator Role of Generations X and Y in the Effect of Resource Dependency Management Strategy on Corporation Entrepreneurship: Ankara OSTIM Industry Case.," *Aksaray Üniversitesi Iktis. ve Idari Bilim. Fakültesi Derg.*, 2021.

[7] E. Lindkvist, Ö. Ekeberg, and J. Norberg, "Strategies for sustainable management of renewable resources during environmental change," *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1098/rspb.2016.2762.

[8] M. M. Veiga and D. M. Silva, "Waste strategies for managing excessive sludge in

water resources," *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. Plan.*, 2018, doi: 10.2495/SDP-V13-N6-872-884.

[9] P. Dass and B. Parker, "Strategies for managing human resource diversity," *Acad. Manag. Exec.*, 1999.

[10] H. Taherdoost and M. Madanchian, "Determination of Business Strategies Using SWOT Analysis; Planning and Managing the Organizational Resources to Enhance Growth and Profitability," *Macro Manag. Public Policies*, 2021, doi: 10.30564/mmpp.v3i1.2748.

[11] F. A. Mat Nawi, Abdul Malek A.Tambi, Muhammad Faizal Samat, and Wan Masnieza Wan Mustapha, "A Review On The Internal Consistency Of A Scale: The Empirical Example Of The Influence Of Human Capital Investment On Malcom Baldridge Quality Principles In Tvet Institutions," *Asian People J.*, 2020, doi: 10.37231/apj.2020.3.1.121.

CHAPTER 8

TECHNIQUES FOR MANAGING THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF COMPETITIVE RESOURCES

Dr.Vankadari Gupta, Associate Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:chithambargupta@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

For businesses looking to gain a sustained competitive edge, managing the interdependence of competitive resources is essential. This abstract examines numerous methods and approaches used to efficiently manage the interdependencies between important organisational resources. An organization's capacity to outperform rivals is influenced by competitive resources including human capital, technology, intellectual property, supply chains, and strategic relationships. However, these resources often display intricate interdependencies, where the usefulness and success of one resource depend on the accessibility and successful use of others. Organisations use a variety of strategies to manage interdependencies. In order to support the overall strategy of the organisation, resource alignment first entails aligning the goals, capabilities, and deployment of resources. This requires a thorough understanding of the interdependencies and linkages between resources and how they affect performance. Additionally, organisations may manage resource interdependencies by using technology and data-driven strategies. Organisations may simulate and assess the effect of resource interdependencies under various scenarios using advanced analytics, predictive modelling, and scenario planning, which helps with decision-making and resource optimisation.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Company, Cost, Organization, Resources.

INTRODUCTION

Businesses dislike competition. Competition jeopardises the availability of finite resources and raises the level of uncertainty in the particular environment. As product prices decline to entice customers and the environment becomes worse and worse, intense competition might endanger an organization's basic existence. In order to compete with its cellular smartphone competitors, landline telephone carriers, for instance, were obliged to reduce the cost of long-distance calls from 20 cents per minute to 10 cents, and then to 5 cents. Today, they provide unlimited monthly service for one cheap fee. To compete with consumers who are increasingly cancelling their landline phone service and signing up for smartphone cellular contracts that also include Internet access, wireless providers like AT&T and Sprint have continued to lower their costs. In the end, only a small number of the strongest enterprises that are now in direct rivalry for resources dominate the organisational environment. This is because increasing levels of competition increase the likelihood that certain companies in a sector will be acquired or go bankrupt. To lessen the uncertainty of their competing interdependent operations, organisations use a number of direct environmental manipulation techniques. The effort to coordinate the activity of competitors is more overt the more formal the technique chosen. Even if some of these tactics are prohibited, unethical businesses nevertheless violate antitrust laws to seek a competitive advantage. For instance, several large Swiss pharmaceutical companies paid over $1 billion in fines in 2003 to resolve allegations that they had artificially inflated vitamin prices for consumers, and Samsung, Infineon, and other manufacturers of flash memory chips admitted to the same thing in 2007 and were fined over $700 million. LCD manufacturers LG, Sharp, and Chunghwa admitted guilt in 2009 and were fined more than $585 million for colluding to boost the cost of LCD screens purchased by Apple, Dell, and Motorola. It is necessary to acknowledge that businesses are willing to act unlawfully in order to further their own interests, and safeguards—laws and regulations—must be put in place to stop this from occurring [1]–[3].

Accords and cartels

A collusion is a covert agreement between rival businesses to exchange information for fraudulent or unlawful ends, such as maintaining exorbitant pricing, as is the case with the flash memory chip market. Organisations get together to lessen the uncertainties they face in the marketplace. As Samsung and other chip manufacturers did, a cartel is an association of businesses that expressly agree to coordinate their activities. Cartels and collusion improve the stability and richness of an organization's environment and lessen the intricacy of relationships between rivals. They are both prohibited in the United States. Industry standards act as norms of behavior that advice rivals, for instance, what prices they should charge, what their product specifications should be, or what a product's profit markup should be. In certain cases, competitors in an industry may work together by adopting industry standards. Price leadership may lead to industry norms. The strongest company like Samsung in the memory chip industry will probably have the lowest prices. It establishes the pricing for its goods, after which the less powerful businesses impose prices that are comparable to the leader's. In this manner, artificially high industrial prices are fixed. Organisations may always increase their profits by coordinating their efforts rather than by engaging in competition. Customers suffer as a result of having to pay the inflated pricing.

Without a formal written agreement, businesses may still conspire and establish cartels by publicly announcing their future plans to one another and letting the other know what their goals are. They may, for instance, declare price hikes they are considering and then watch to see whether their competitors would follow suit. In the airline sector, it's typical practise for one airline to announce a price increase, a new fee for a second checked bag, or a fuel cost before waiting to see how the other airlines react. When Southwest refuses to cooperate, for example, other airlines often follow suit, which causes ticket costs to drop back to their previous level. Companies that violate unofficial competitive industry standards may be penalised by organisations inside the sector. Large corporations have a reputation for mercilessly going after rivals who violate the unwritten price guidelines in their sector. For instance, Walmart is always prepared to match any price reductions announced by Costco or Target, so these businesses have realised they would not benefit by cutting prices. They may, however, contend in various ways. Target and Costco have worked hard to create shops that are more appealing to customers, provide more high-end merchandise than Walmart's, for example, as well as being more customer-friendly.

Mechanisms for Third-Party Linkages

A third-party linkage mechanism, or regulatory body that permits organisations to share information and regulate how they compete, is one more formal but still indirect way for competing organisations to coordinate their activities. One example is a trade association, an organisation that represents businesses in the same industry and enables competitors to meet, share information, and informally allow them to monitor one another's activities. A trade organisation also has the power to effectively advocate for laws that safeguard the interests of its sector. We have already seen how the pharmaceutical industry fights initiatives to lower medicine prices by using its strong influence. Almost every business, including cable TV, agriculture, and the military, uses lobbying to further its own interests and get access to limited resources. The Chicago Board of Trade, stock exchanges, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and any other organization created to control competitive interdependencies are other instances of third-party linking systems. Third-party linking systems provide guidelines and benchmarks that control and maintain industrial competitiveness, therefore lowering environmental complexity and boosting environmental richness. Linkage mechanisms also make it easier for organizations to respond to change or the environment's dynamic by enhancing the flow of information. To put it simply, third-party linking methods provide rivals a means to control re-source interdependencies and lessen uncertainty. Utilizing a third-party linking mechanism allows organizations to cooperate with one another and benefit from the coordination that the method provides. As global competitiveness intensifies, a growing number of U.S. research and development cooperatives are being established by petitioners to support shared research objectives. Japan serves as the benchmark for such third-party connection systems. Japanese corporations have a long history of achieving worldwide leadership in various sectors thanks to the efforts of their Ministry of International Trade and Industry, which has long encouraged cooperation amongst domestic competitors in the industrial sector [4]–[6].

Strategic Partnerships

In addition to managing symbiotic interdependencies, strategic alliances can also be used to manage competitive interdependencies. Competitors can collaborate and form joint ventures to develop shared technology that will save them all a lot of money, even though they may be competing for customers when their final products hit the market. For instance, in order to produce and market its automobiles in Russia, Ford and OAO Sollers, the country's second-largest automaker, established a long-term joint venture in 2011. Additionally, Live Nation Entertainment and Groupon launched a collaborative venture in 2011 to create Group on Live, a new online ticketing offers channel. Organizations sometimes utilize joint ventures to discourage new entrants or hurt current rivals, even if the kind of joint ventures previously described are not anticompetitive. To compete with Japanese goliaths Sony and Panasonic, two major consumer electronics companies, Philips and Bang & Olufsen, signed a contract to pool their production and design expertise, respectively. Organizations can also form joint ventures to develop new technologies that they can then defend against competitors by obtaining and maintaining patents. The creativity of competing businesses is the sole restriction on how to employ strategic partnerships to manage interdependencies in the marketplace.

Takeovers and mergers

The most effective tool in an organization's arsenal for managing problematic competitive interdependencies is to merge with or take over a rival organization. Mergers and takeovers can strengthen and expand a company's domain and increase its capacity to produce a wider range of products to better serve more customers, both of which can boost its competitive position. For instance, NationsBank rapidly acquired lesser banks before merging with Bank of America to become the largest bank in the United States in 1998. Up until the current financial crisis, everything was going well. Bank of America purchased Merrill Lynch and Countrywide Mortgage, both of which turned out to be terrible investments and may have forced the company into bankruptcy if it hadn't been for government intervention. Many businesses can want to utilise mergers to take control of the market and establish monopolies. Monopolies are outlawed in the US and most other developed nations, which is good news for consumers and organisations. Therefore, antitrust law prevents companies from acquiring rival firms in order to become even more powerful, a charge levelled at both Microsoft and

Google.43 However, cartels, collusion, and other anticompetitive practises can ultimately be harmful to organisations themselves. In the long term, new players will be able to join a sector due to advancements in technology, the availability of cheap labour, adjustments in governmental regulations, and other factors. As a consequence, established businesses that have reduced rivalry among themselves will find themselves without effective rivals. These monopoly-like organizations have grown into big, top-heavy bureaucracies that are unable to face the demands of a fast changing world because they have been protected from competition in an environment with minimal uncertainty. Long-standing market leaders GM, IBM, and Kodak suffered considerably when their competitive conditions shifted, allowing nimbler rivals to join their markets and outperform these well-established businesses.

Theory of Transaction Costs

The expenses associated with negotiating, overseeing, and regulating trades between persons were referred to as transaction costs. When individuals collaborate, there are expenses transaction costs—related to managing their interactions. Transaction costs also appear when businesses trade assets or data. Organisations must manage their symbiotic and competitive interdependencies with other organisations in order to get the resources they need. Organisations strive to obtain control over resources and reduce their reliance on other organisations, according to the resource dependency hypothesis. According to transaction cost theory, the organization's objective is to reduce the costs associated with exchanging resources with the outside world and the costs associated with managing exchanges within the organization. Every dollar or hour that a manager spends negotiating or overseeing exchanges with other organisations or with managers within one organisation is a dollar or hour that is not being used to create value. Because they drain away productive potential, organisations work to reduce transaction costs and bureaucratic expenses. Organisations look for ways to increase the effectiveness of interorganizational transactions. Health care is a vivid illustration of exactly how significant transaction costs can be and why lowering them is crucial. Over 40% of the U.S. health care expenditure is thought to go into managing communications between hospitals, physicians, the government, insurance providers, and other parties. It is obvious that any innovations that lower transaction costs will result in significant resource savings. Health maintenance organisations and other networks of healthcare providers were established with the goal of reducing transaction costs. HMO providers agree to lower expenses in exchange for, among other things, a steadier flow of patients. They feel less ambiguity as a result of this trade-off. Transaction Cost Sources: A mix of human and environmental variables leads to transaction costs [7]–[9].

DISCUSSION

Bounded Rationality and Environmental Ambiguity: The environment is complicated and filled with a lot of ambiguity. People, however, only have a limited capacity for information processing and understanding their immediate surroundings. Because of this finite capacity, or bounded rationality, managing transactions between organisations becomes more challenging the more unpredictable the environment. The two businesses might sign a contract if, for example, Organisation A wishes to licence a technology created by Organisation B. However, there would be a lot of mystery about this deal. For instance, Organisation B may seek out novel ways of using the technology to produce new goods for itself. Given constrained rationality, it would be challenging and prohibitively costly to attempt to create a contract that not only safeguarded Organisation B, which invented the technology, but also specified how the two organisations may jointly partake in the technology's future benefits. Even while it knows it might provide more value by participating in the exchange, the emerging firm may opt to go forward on its own and not swap resources with Organisation A. Therefore, potential value that might have been generated is wasted as a result of constrained rationality and the high transaction costs associated with creating a contract. The cost of negotiating, overseeing, and controlling agreements may be so high due to environmental uncertainty that organisations turn to more formal linking structures, including strategic alliances, minority ownership, or even mergers, to reduce transaction costs.

Opportunism and Small Numbers

The majority of people and organisations act honourably and responsibly most of the time, but some people and organisations always act opportunistically, which means they deceive others or try to take advantage of other forces or stakeholders in the environment. As an illustration, imagine that an organization contracts for parts that must meet a certain standard of quality. The supplier willfully swaps lower-quality materials in an effort to cut expenses and save money, but bills for the costlier, higher-quality components. People also behave opportunistically: Managers embellish their expenditure reports or take advantage of consumers by producing subpar goods. The potential for opportunism is high when a company relies on a single supplier or a limited group of business partners. Due to the supplier's knowledge that the organization must do business with them, they may decide to provide subpar inputs in order to lower costs and boost profits. Due to the limited number of suppliers an organisation may turn to for resources, when the potential for opportunism is high, the organisation must spend resources to negotiate, oversee, and enforce agreements with its suppliers in order to defend itself. For instance, the U.S. government spends billions of dollars annually to safeguard itself from being taken advantage of by defence contractors like Boeing and General Dynamics, who have a history of abusing their position as the only competitors for defense-related work.

Risk and Specific Assets:

Specific assets are investments in knowledge, expertise, equipment, and data that provide value to one specific exchange connection but have no value in any other trade relationship. By investing $100 million on a machine that creates microchips for IBM computers, a business has only made a very specific investment in a very specific asset. A significant amount of risk is involved when an organisation decides to spend money to create specific assets for a specific connection with another organisation in its environment. The organisation is committed to the investment once it has been made. The organisation is in a very difficult position if the other party attempts to take advantage of the situation by declaring, for instance, "We will not buy your product unless you sell it to us for $10 less per unit than you're charging now." This strategy resembles blackmail. An organisation will consider investing in certain assets to be excessively hazardous if it believes there is a chance of being trapped or blackmailed. Value that may have been produced is lost as a result of the investment's excessive transaction expenses.

Costs of Transactions and Linking Mechanisms

The degree of transaction costs associated with an exchange connection influences how an organisation chooses its interorganizational connectivity methods. When certain conditions are met, transaction costs are minimal. Companies are trading general products and services. Low uncertainty exists. There are several potential trading partners. Organisations can easily negotiate and monitor interorganizational behaviour under these environmental circumstances. Organisations may therefore employ somewhat informal connection mechanisms, such as reputation and unwritten, word-of-mouth contracts, in an environment with low transaction costs. When the following circumstances present, transaction costs rise:

Businesses start exchanging increasingly specialised products and services. There is more uncertainty. There are fewer potential trade partners. An organisation will start to believe that it cannot afford to trust other organisations in this kind of environment, and it will seek to watch and employ more formal connections, such long-term contracts, to regulate its exchanges. However, contracts may not always apply to every situation that can occur. What will the other party to the trade do if something unexpected occurs? Even when its activities are detrimental to the other organisation, it has a complete right to behave in a manner that best serves its own interests.

How does a company behave in a scenario with high transaction costs? The transaction cost hypothesis states that when transaction costs rise, an organisation should choose a more formal connection mechanism to control exchanges. Organisations have greater influence over one another's behaviour the more formal the technique utilised. Strategic alliances, mergers, and takeovers are examples of formal processes that internalise the transaction and its cost. A joint venture is when two companies create a third company to conduct their joint business. Establishing a new company that both organisations control equally eliminates the incentives for one organisation to defraud the other and gives them incentives to act in ways that will benefit both of them. The same reasoning apply to mergers since one company now controls the other. From the standpoint of transaction costs, an organization's desire to lower the transaction costs of its exchanges with other organisations drives the transition from less formal to more formal connection systems. Formal procedures reduce the transaction costs linked to lowering risk, uncertainty, and opportunity [10]–[12].

Administrative Fees

Why don't organisations utilise formal linking mechanisms more often if they are such an effective approach to reduce the transaction costs of exchanges with the environment? Why do they ever employ a contract or another informal connection method when a joint venture or merger would provide them more control over their environment? The explanation is that moving transactions inside of an organisation reduces, but does not completely remove, the costs associated with handling transactions. Managers must still negotiate, oversee, and regulate interactions between employees. Internal transaction costs are referred to as bureaucratic costs to differentiate them from the transaction costs of ex- changes between organisations in the environment. Therefore, managing an organization's structure is a complex and expensive problem that becomes much more expensive and complex as the organisation grows, as GM, Kodak, and IBM discovered. Now that we see that integration and communication are not only challenging to achieve but also cost money because managers have to spend their time in meetings instead of creating value.

Choosing an Interorganizational Strategy Using Transaction Cost Theory

By enabling managers to compare the transaction cost reductions realised from employing a certain linking method against the bureaucratic costs of running the linkage mechanism, transaction cost theory may assist managers in selecting an interorganizational approach. Transaction cost theory is better equipped to forecast when and why a corporation will adopt a certain interorganizational approach than resource dependency theory since it emphasises the costs connected with various link-age mechanisms to minimise uncertainty. Managers must take the following actions after choosing a strategy:

1. Determine the sources of transaction expenses that might have an impact on an exchange relationship and how much they are likely to cost.
2. Calculate the transaction cost reductions resulting from the use of various linking techniques.

3. Calculate the administrative expenses associated with running the connection mechanism.
4. Select the linking method that offers the greatest reduction in transaction costs at the least amount of administrative expense.

An intriguing example of how a supplier might utilise a linking mechanism to lower transaction costs for customers in order to secure their support comes from the experience of the Ekco Group of Nashua, New Hampshire. Ekco manufactures a broad variety of non-electric consumer and office items that don't need assembly and are replaced rather than fixed as they wear out, including bakeware, kitchen utensils and equipment, home plastic products, and pest-control devices. Ekco's extensive product selection reflects the requirements of retail clients like Walmart and Kmart, who are always looking for ways to lower the transaction costs related to acquiring items. The transaction costs related to establishing several supplier connections are decreased when a large variety of items are purchased from a single provider. Ekco assists the retailers by reducing the number of companies they must contact in order to get the goods they wish to carry by providing a wide choice of goods that Kmart, Walmart, and other retailers are interested in carrying. By doing this, Ekco implausibly invites clients to deepen their relationships with the company. Ekco developed a cutting-edge $4 million data-processing system that enables it to deliver a just-in-time inventory solution to merchants that give the firm with data in order to build long-term commitment and trust with its clients. This method makes it easier for businesses to manage their inventories and place orders. The solution further lowers the transaction costs for the merchants with Ekco and enhances their view of it as a reliable business by handling customers' transactions at no cost to them. Sales to Ekco's largest customers are increasing every year, proving that the company's efforts to forge informal linkages with its clients have been successful. Since Ekco and its clients have strong personal ties, there is no need for formal, expensive mechanisms to coordinate their interorganizational exchanges.

A formal connection mechanism should only be utilised when transaction costs are high enough to justify it, according to the implication of a transaction cost perspective. A company should only take over and merge with its suppliers or distributors, for instance, if the savings in transaction costs outweigh the costs of managing the new acquisition. If not, the company should, like Ekco and its clients, rely on less formal mechanisms to handle exchange relationships, such as strategic alliances and long-term contracts. The somewhat informal linking methods save an organisation from having to pay for administrative overhead. Keiretsu, franchising, and outsourcing are three connection mechanisms that assist organisations in avoiding administrative expenditures while still minimising transaction costs. The Japanese system of keiretsu can be thought of as a way to get the advantages of a formal linkage mechanism without paying its costs. Toyota's policy of owning a small stake in its suppliers' businesses gives it significant control over the exchange relationship and enables it to avoid issues with opportunism and uncertainty with its suppliers. Additionally, Toyota does not really own or manage its suppliers, saving money on administrative expenses. Keiretsu was created to provide the advantages of complete ownership without the expenses, in fact.

In contrast, up until 2005, GM owned more suppliers than any other automaker, which caused it to pay more for its inputs than the other automakers did. Because GM was a captive customer, its providing divisions had little motivation to be efficient and acted opportunistically, which led to these high costs.60 GM's internal suppliers were in a protected situation as a result. What should GM do as a result to lower input costs? One option would be to sell its inefficient suppliers and then form long-term contracts or strategic partnerships with them to incentivize them to reduce their costs and improve their efficiency. GM would create new agreements with new suppliers if they were unable to lower their costs or enhance their quality. In order to acquire the advantages that Toyota has attained through its policy of minority ownership, GM did just that when it spun out its Delco electronics components business into an independent operating company. It also split off other divisions, such as its gear and axle division. In contrast, GM should switch to a more formal linking mechanism and acquire and merge with its suppliers if it were to have issues reaping the benefits of a strategic partnership with an independent components supplier.

Franchising

A franchise is a corporation that has been given permission to sell a company's goods in a specific location. In exchange for a set price or a percentage of sales, the franchisee grants an individual or organisation access to its resources. Typically, the franchiser supplies the inputs needed by the franchisee, who interacts with customers directly. Franchiser and franchisee have a mutually beneficial partnership. The transaction cost method provides an intriguing window into the emergence of interorganizational initiatives like franchising. Think about how Burger King and McDonald's operate differently. While the majority of Burger King Locations are held by the firm, a significant part of McDonald's restaurants are owned by franchisees. How come McDonald's doesn't own its restaurants? Why is McDonald's more interested in maximising shareholder value than making its franchisees millionaires? The solution, from the perspective of transaction costs, is found in the administrative expenses that McDonald's would spend if it tried to run every location independently. The maintenance of a restaurant's cuisine and customer service standards is its single toughest task. Let's say McDonald's hired supervisors to oversee all of its corporately owned eateries. Would such managers be motivated to maintain the same level of customer service as franchisees who own and directly profit from a successful restaurant? McDonald's believes that the administrative costs incurred to maintain the quality and consistency of the restaurants would outweigh any additional value the company and its shareholders would receive from full ownership if it owned and operated all of its restaurants, i.e., if it used a formal linkage mechanism. As a result, McDonald's typically owns only such eateries that are situated close to major thoroughfares or in urban areas. It may save administrative expenses in large cities by dividing the cost of hiring a management staff over a number of restaurants. McDonald's asserts that franchisees on interstate roads understand they are unlikely to see the same travellers again and have little motivation to maintain standards.

The identical problem occurs on the output side when a company decides how to distribute its goods. Should a company own its retail locations? Should it engage in direct client sales? Should it restrict sales to authorised dealers only? Once again, the solution is based on the transaction cost issues the organisation might anticipate while addressing the demands of its clients. In general, organisations are more likely to have formal hierarchical control over their distributors and franchisees or own their own distribution outlets the more complicated the items are and the more knowledge consumers require about how they operate or how to fix them. Due to the need that clients have access to dependable auto repair, franchised dealers are often used in the sale of automobiles. Additionally, it is beneficial for manufacturers to have some influence over their distributors since vehicles are difficult items and customers require a lot of knowledge before they purchase one. As a result, automakers have tremendous control over their dealerships and keep an eye on and enforce the level of customer service that dealerships provide. Toyota, for instance, keeps a careful eye on the volume of client complaints against a dealership. If there are too many complaints, the dealership is penalized by having less access to new vehicles. Dealers are thus strongly motivated to provide excellent customer service. In contrast, handling basic goods like clothing or food has minimal transaction costs. Thus, few manufacturers of apparel or food choose to regulate product distribution via official connections. The preferred distribution method becomes less formal ones like agreements with huge retail store chains or distributors [13], [14].

Outsourcing

Moving a value-creation activity that was conducted inside of an organisation to the outside, where it is done by another firm, is another technique for managing interdependencies. A corporation contracting a different business to run its computer network or deliver its goods as opposed to doing it itself is an example of outsourcing. Organisations are increasingly relying on specialised businesses to handle their information processing requirements. For instance, Dell, HP, and IBM have established divisions that provide this specialised service to businesses in respective settings. The computation that decides whether an organisation creates or purchases inputs is what leads an organisation to outsource a function. Does the added value the organisation gets from handling its own marketing or information processing outweigh the increased administrative expenses of doing so? If the response is affirmative, the organisation creates its own function. If the answer is no, the company outsources the task. This choice will probably alter in the future. Perhaps having an internal department for information processing in 2001 was optimal. If specialised organisations can handle information more affordably by 2011, however, outsourcing this role will result in significant cost savings. Another way that outsourcing lowers the administrative expenses of managing exchanges within an organisation is via the use of networks like the one that Nike developed. The specific approach a business chooses to handle the outsourcing process will be the one that lessens the unpredictability of the exchange the most, whether it's to guarantee a steady supply of cheap components, to boost quality, or to safeguard priceless proprietary technology.

For instance, in terms of the various types of strategic alliances businesses may decide to forge long-term agreements with a large number of inexpensive foreign suppliers when uncertainty is at a minimum. A business may create a network to handle the interdependencies between these suppliers and international manufacturers and distributors as uncertainty grows, or it may buy a minority stake in these multinational corporations to obtain legal control over the transaction. Last but not least, a business may choose to create a joint venture to manage every part of the value-creation activity when uncertainty is significant. Understanding why and how organisations choose various connection methods to manage their interdependencies is possible via the use of a transaction cost approach. It enhances our capacity to comprehend how organisations manage their settings to increase their possibilities of development and survival. Uncertain resource exchanges and organisational interdependencies may be managed using a variety of strategies, from less formal mechanisms like contracts to more formal mechanisms like ownership. A system that reduces transaction and administrative expenses is ideal for an organisation.

CONCLUSION

In addition, businesses may use strategies like resource diversification and redundancy planning. By increasing the variety of available resources, one may lessen reliance on a single source while reducing the risk of resource interruption or shortage. Creating backup systems or alternate resources is a component of redundancy planning, which ensures continuation in the event of resource failures or interruptions. For organisations looking to maintain a competitive edge, managing the interdependence of competitive resources is essential.

Organisations may maximise the use of resources and improve overall performance by using strategies including resource alignment, integration, allocation, diversification, redundancy planning, and utilising technology. Organisations may react to changing market circumstances, reduce risks, and lay the groundwork for long-term success by managing resource interdependencies effectively.

REFERENCES:

[1] L. D'Oria, T. R. Crook, D. J. Ketchen, D. G. Sirmon, and M. Wright, "The Evolution of Resource-Based Inquiry: A Review and Meta-Analytic Integration of the Strategic Resources–Actions–Performance Pathway," *Journal of Management*. 2021. doi: 10.1177/0149206321994182.

[2] S. Ogbeibu, V. Pereira, J. Emelifeonwu, and J. Gaskin, "Bolstering creativity willingness through digital task interdependence, disruptive and smart HRM technologies," *J. Bus. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.060.

[3] S. T. Fiske and X. Bai, "Vertical and horizontal inequality are status and power differences: applications to stereotyping by competence and warmth," *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.09.014.

[4] J. P. McGill and M. D. Santoro, "Managing Value And Vulnerability In Complex Collaborations: Allying With Competitors," *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams*. 2004. doi: 10.1016/S1572-0977(04)10010-1.

[5] J. Pfeffer, "Merger as a Response to Organizational Interdependence," *Adm. Sci. Q.*, 1972, doi: 10.2307/2392151.

[6] A. Talaja, "Testing VRIN framework: Resource value and rareness as sources of competitive advantage and above average performance," *Manag.*, 2012.

[7] J. Xia, X. Ma, J. W. Lu, and D. W. Yiu, "Outward foreign direct investment by emerging market firms: A resource dependence logic," *Strateg. Manag. J.*, 2014, doi: 10.1002/smj.2157.

[8] F. Pallotti and A. Lomi, "Network influence and organizational performance: The effects of tie strength and structural equivalence," *Eur. Manag. J.*, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2011.02.005.

[9] B. Arslan, "The interplay of competitive and cooperative behavior and differential benefits in alliances," *Strateg. Manag. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1002/smj.2731.

[10] H. Bulińska-Stangrecka and A. Bagieńska, "HR practices for supporting interpersonal trust and its consequences for team collaboration and innovation," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11164423.

[11] C. J. Roseth, Y. K. Lee, and W. A. Saltarelli, "Reconsidering Jigsaw social psychology: Longitudinal effects on social interdependence, sociocognitive conflict regulation, motivation, and achievement," *J. Educ. Psychol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1037/edu0000257.

[12] J. B. Sheu, "Green supply chain collaboration for fashionable consumer electronics products under third-party power intervention - A resource dependence perspective," *Sustain.*, 2014, doi: 10.3390/su6052832.

[13] M. B. Evans, M. A. Eys, and M. W. Bruner, “Seeing the ‘we’ in ‘me’ sports: The need to consider individual sport team environments,” *Can. Psychol.*, 2012, doi: 10.1037/a0030202.

[14] D. W. Johnson, R. T. Johnson, and M. B. Stanne, “Impact of goal and resource interdependence on problem-solving success,” *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1989, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1989.9713780.

CHAPTER 9

BASIC CHALLENGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN

Dr. Jayakrishna Herur, Associate Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:jayakrishna.udupa@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

In order for an organisation to successfully accomplish its strategic goals, its structure, procedures, and systems must be carefully shaped via organisational design. Organisational design, meanwhile, is not without its difficulties. This abstract examines the fundamental difficulties in organisational design, such as managing complexity, balancing centralization and decentralisation, matching structure to strategy, and encouraging adaptation and creativity. A key difficulty in organisational design is striking a balance between centralization and decentralisation. Decentralisation spreads decision-making power across many levels, while centralization concentrates decision-making power at the top. Finding the proper balance is essential because too much centralization may impede employee empowerment and agility while too much decentralisation can cause problems with coordination and lack of strategy alignment. Another difficulty organisations encounter when developing their structures is managing complexity. Due to elements including different products, geographically scattered activities, varied consumer groups, and intricate interdependencies, complexity rises as organisations develop and expand. It is difficult and needs great thought to design systems that can efficiently handle and coordinate complex operations while retaining clarity and efficiency. Additionally, organisations have to include important decision-makers, managers, and workers in the design process. Organisations may promote buy-in and enhance the efficacy of the design by requesting their involvement and feedback.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Operation, Organization, Power, Value.

INTRODUCTION

Managers must make decisions on how to direct and coordinate the activities necessary for the organisation to produce value as it grows. How to manage differentiation to accomplish organisational objectives is the main design problem. In other words, differentiation is the process of establishing and managing the division of labour, or degree of specialisation, in the organisation. It is the process by which an organisation allocates people and resources to organisational tasks and establishes the task and authority relationships that allow the organisation to achieve its goals. Examining an organisation and mapping the issues it encounters in attempting to accomplish its objectives is a simple method to analyse why differentiation emerges and why it presents a design challenge. Because there is little division of labour in a basic organisation, differentiation is minimal. There are often minimal issues with coordinating who does what, for whom, and when since all organisational responsibilities are typically completed by one person or a small group of individuals. But complexity also comes with progress. Both the division of labour and differentiation are significant in complex organisations. The B.A.R. and Grille's proprietors had to come up with new strategies to manage the activities required to achieve their objective of giving guests a good eating experience when the restaurant underwent development. Managing the growing complexity of the business's operations was the owners of the B.A.R. and Grille's primary design problem. At first, there was little division of labour since Bob and Amanda handled all the key organisational duties individually. The proprietors had to select who would perform which duties as the firm expanded and divide the work more evenly. In other words, they had to divide up the organisation into distinct parts and assign people and resources to different organisational duties [1]–[3].

Roles in Organisations

Organisational positions serve as the primary building blocks of distinction. A person's position inside an organisation defines their organisational function as a collection of task-related behaviors.2 For instance, a waiter at B.A.R. and Grille has the responsibility of providing clients with prompt, polite service to improve their dining experience. A chef's responsibility is to provide delicious, freshly prepared meals to consumers. When someone is assigned a job with clear-cut tasks and obligations, they may be held responsible for the resources used to carry out their responsibilities. Bob and Amanda held the waiter accountable for meeting the eating requirements of patrons, a key stakeholder group for the business. The chef was responsible for regularly and quickly serving customers meals of the highest quality. Managers recruit individuals to specialise in some jobs and specialise in others when the division of labour grows within an organisation. Individual skills and knowledge may be developed via specialisation, which is ultimately where an organization's core competencies come from. For instance, the proprietors of the B.A.R. and Grille identified a number of jobs that needed to be completed, such as buying, accounting, and cooking, and they employed individuals who had the skills and expertise necessary to do them. The basis of organisational structure is a system of interconnected roles, and task-related behaviours establish the relationships between one job and the others. Shift supervisors at the B.A.R. and Grille supervise the waiters and bussers, for example, as part of their duties. A person has control over another person when they are able to make them answer for their actions. A clear authority and responsibility requirement for each role in the system results from the differentiation of an organisation into individual organisational roles. Authority is the power to hold people accountable for their actions and to make decisions about how to invest and use organisational resources. Control—the capacity to organise and inspire individuals to work in the organization's best interests—occurs when a person fully knows the obligations of his or her function and what a superior may ask of a person in that role.

Functions and divisions are subunits

People with related and comparable jobs are often divided into subunits in organizations. Functions and divisions are the two basic organizational elements that emerge. A function is a subunit made up of a team of individuals who cooperate and share information, skills, tools, or methods in order to carry out their duties. Chefs are organized together in the B.A.R. and Grille as the kitchen function, while waiters are grouped together as the dining room function. A division is a component made up of a number of departments or activities that are jointly responsible for generating a certain item or service. The dining room and kitchen are the only two operations that make up each restaurant division and are in charge of running the business. There are several distinct divisions inside large corporations like GE and Procter & Gamble, each of which is in charge of creating a certain product. Additionally, these businesses must figure out how to coordinate the actions of various divisions on a worldwide scale in order to contribute the maximum value. A measurement of an organization's complexity—its level of differentiation—is the number of various roles and divisions it has. Differentiating an organization into functions and divisions improves control over its operations and enables the organization to carry out its duties more successfully.

Support functions help an organisation maintain control over its interactions with its environment and stakeholders. As organisations become bigger, they separate into five distinct types of functions. A few examples of support activities include buying, which deals with the acquisition of inputs, sales and marketing, which deals with the selling of outputs, and public relations and legal affairs, which deals with the demands of external stakeholders. Both a manager and an accountant were employed by Bob and Amanda Richards to handle the buying for the three restaurants. Production functions oversee and enhance an organization's conversion processes in order to increase value creation. Production operations, production control, and quality control are all examples of production functions. The Ford production operations department oversees the manufacturing process, while production control chooses the most cost-effective method to make automobiles, and quality control keeps an eye on the standard of the finished goods [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

An organization may maintain the operations of its departments by doing maintenance tasks. A restaurant like the B.A.R. and Grille places a high value on a safe, healthy work environment, therefore maintenance duties also encompass people, engineering, and cleaning services. people is responsible for hiring, training, and developing staff members as well as improving skills. An organization may respond to environmental changes with the help of adaptive functions. Research and development, market analysis, and long-range planning are examples of adaptive activities that enable an organization to learn from and try to control its environment, therefore enhancing its core competencies. Creating new menu options to accommodate consumers' evolving preferences is a crucial adaptive activity at the B.A.R. and Grille. Controlling and coordinating activity both inside and across divisions is made easier by managerial tasks. In order to increase the organization's capacity to generate value, managers at various organizational levels guide the procurement, allocation, and management of resources. For instance, top management is in charge of creating the organization's environmental controls and defining strategy. Middle managers are in charge of managing the resources of the company to achieve its objectives. Lower-level managers supervise and coordinate the labour force's actions.

At first, there wasn't much distinction in the B.A.R. and Grille. All of the work was completed by the owners and one other worker. Unexpected success, however, necessitated the separation of tasks into distinct organisational roles and responsibilities, with Bob in charge of the kitchen and Amanda in charge of the dining area. Bob and Amanda were forced to acquire knowledge and talents in the five functional areas as the restaurant's clientele grew. They employed a manager of restaurant services for the support position, who was in charge of handling supply purchases and neighbourhood marketing. They increased the division of labour in the kitchen and dining room to manage the production job. For maintenance work, they employed cashiers, cleaners, and a contract accountant. They took on the adaptive responsibility of making sure the company met the demands of the customers themselves. In order to successfully complete the overall job of supplying outstanding meals to consumers, Bob and Amanda finally assumed the management duty of creating the pattern of task and functional linkages. The B.A.R. and Grille was made up of the five functions that made up its overall structure and allowed it to produce value.

The proprietors faced the issue of dividing into divisions to manage the operation of three restaurants at once as soon as they made the decision to create new types of restaurants and increase the size of their business. The company expanded to three divisions, each of which used support services based at the organization's top. Each division in big organisations is likely to have its own set of the five fundamental functions, making it a self-sufficient division. The collection of specific talents and skills that provide an organization a competitive edge—its core competencies—are derived from functional skills and abilities. An organization's competitive advantage may be found in one or more of its functions. A core competency of the B.A.R. and Grille was the way Bob and Amanda took charge of the differentiation of their restaurant and increased its capacity to draw customers who valued the good food and good service they received. An organization could have superior low-cost production, exceptional managerial talent, or a leading R&D department. In other words, they established a core competency that provided their restaurant a competitive edge over other eateries. Their access to resources as a result of this competitive advantage enabled them to grow by establishing more eateries.

Horizontal and Vertical Differentiation

The organizational structure that developed when differentiation was place in the B.A.R. and Grille. An illustration that depicts the outcome of organisational distinction is called an organisational chart. A job or function within the organisation is represented by each box on the chart. Both a vertical and a horizontal dimension exists for each job. According to the level of power associated with each function, the organisational chart vertically separates the roles within the organisation. A hierarchy is a classification of individuals based on their relative power and status. Each lower function is under the control or supervision of a higher one; roles higher in the hierarchy of an organisation have greater authority and responsibility than roles lower in the hierarchy. The amount of vertical differentiation or how many levels should there be from top to bottom—must be decided by managers when designing an organisation. For instance, Bob and Amanda came to the conclusion that they needed to designate the position of restaurant manager in order to keep control over the numerous operations in the establishment [7]–[9]. This new position raised the hierarchy one step since the restaurant manager would answer to them and would be in charge of supervising lower-level workers. When an organisation designs its hierarchy of authority and establishes reporting relationships to connect organisational roles and subunits, this is referred to as vertical differentiation. Vertical differentiation establishes the distribution of authority between levels to give the organisation more control over its operations and enhance its capacity to create value. According to their primary work duties, positions are horizontally differentiated in the organisational hierarchy. For instance, Bob and Amanda established additional organisational positions—such as restaurant manager, cashier, bartender, and busser—and divided these roles into functions when they saw that a more complicated division of responsibilities would boost restaurant performance. Horizontal differentiation describes how an organisation divides organisational tasks into roles and divides those roles into subunits. This division of labour creates value creation opportunities for employees by allowing them to become more specialised and productive.

Challenges in Organizational Design

As we've seen, the main design problem for an organisation is deciding which degrees of vertical and horizontal division will provide it the ability to regulate its operations and accomplish its objectives. The next sections of this chapter examine three more design difficulties that managers must overcome when attempting to build a structure that would maximise their organization's efficiency. How to connect and coordinate organisational operations is the first of the three. Decide who will make choices is the second. The third step is to decide what kinds of controls are most effective for regulating certain employee activities and functions. The decisions managers make as they address these four issues have an impact on how well their organisation operates.

Integrating and Differentiating in Balance

People are intended to be able to specialise via horizontal differentiation in order to increase productivity. However, businesses have often discovered that specialisation hinders communication and inhibits subunits from learning from one another. A subunit orientation is a tendency to view one's role in the organisation exclusively from the perspective of the time frame, goals, and interpersonal orientations of one's sub- unit as a result of horizontal differentiation. For instance, the production department is most concerned with reducing costs and improving quality; as such, it tends to have a short-term outlook because cost and quality are production goals that are short-term in nature. R&D workers often have a longer term perspective since improvements to the production process may take years to materialise. Coordination becomes difficult, if not impossible, when distinct functions have divergent points of view. Organisations look for new or better methods to integrate functions that is, to encourage collaboration, coordination, and communication across various subunits in order to prevent the communication issues that might result from horizontal differentiation. The majority of big corporations now utilise sophisticated IT systems that enable several services or divisions to exchange information, memos, and reports—often in real time. Businesses are bringing together various activities more often by using electronic communication tools including email, teleconferencing, and enterprise management systems. For instance, Walmart's home office buyers utilise television linkups to demonstrate to each individual shop how to properly display things for sale. Advanced enterprise management systems are used by Nestlé to provide all functions with thorough information on the ongoing operations of other departments.

Integrating Mechanisms and Integration

A significant problem for managers is figuring out how to promote communication and collaboration across subunits. The evolution of component orientations, which makes communication challenging and complicated, is one cause of issues on this front. Another factor contributing to poor coordination and communication is that managers often neglect to integrate organisational subunits using the proper tools and methods. Integration is the process of organising different activities, divisions, and functions so they cooperate rather than compete. The simplest mechanism is a hierarchy of authority, while the most complex is a department established specifically to coordinate the activities of various functions or divisions. Includes examples of how a company like Johnson & Johnson might use each of the seven types of integration mechanisms as it manages one major product. We look at each mechanism in isolation.

Hierarchy of Authority

The organization's hierarchy of authority, which distinguishes individuals based on the level of authority they have, is the simplest integrating strategy. The hierarchy unifies different organisational responsibilities by dictating who reports to whom. To encourage coordination, managers must properly divide and distribute power both inside a function and between one function and another. For instance, at Becton Dickinson, a high-tech medical instrument manufacturer, disputes over product specifications were routinely heard between the marketing and engineering teams. Marketing contended that in order to satisfy consumers, the company's goods required additional features. Because the director of marketing reported to the head of engineering, the engineering department intended to simplify product design to save costs. The two departments were unable to come to an agreement. Becton Dickinson changed their organisational structure to have both marketing and engineering report to the head of the Instrument Product Division in order to overcome this dispute. The head of the division was a neutral person with the power to hear both managers' arguments and choose the course of action that would benefit the organisation as a whole.

A second integrating technique is direct interaction between members of various subunits, although employing it successfully often presents greater challenges than using the hierarchy of power. The main issue with cross-functional integration is that managers in one function do not have power over managers in another. If two functions clash, only the CEO or a senior management above the functional level has the authority to step in. In order to solve the issues caused by distinct subunit orientations, it is essential that individuals at all levels in various roles create personal and professional connections with one another. When managers from various departments can interact directly with one another, they may collaborate to find solutions to shared issues and work to avoid them altogether. The ability for both sides to appeal to a shared superior who is close to the issue's location is crucial if disagreements do yet arise. One or a few people from each subunit are often assigned the main task to collaborate to coordinate subunit operations when the necessity for communication between two subunits becomes more crucial, frequently due to a quickly changing environment. These liaisons or linking jobs allow their holders to forge close bonds with members of other subunits. Subunit barriers are reduced by this interaction. As liaison team members develop their ability to work together, they will eventually be more adaptable in their ability to meet the needs of other subunits.

Task Forces: As an organization grows in size and complexity, it may become necessary for more than two components to collaborate in order to address shared issues. For instance, manufacturing, marketing, engineering, and R&D may need to contribute to improving an organization's capacity to serve its consumers successfully. A task force, or temporary group formed to address a particular issue, is often the best option for a solution. A task force that meets often until a solution to the issue is discovered is formed with one or a few representatives from each function. The task force members are then in charge of presenting the solution to respective departments for their feedback and approval. The meetings of task forces are often presided over by a senior management who does not belong to any of the participating roles [10]–[12].

Teams: A task force becomes permanent when the problem it is addressing develops into an ongoing strategic or administrative problem. An ongoing task force or committee is a team. For instance, the majority of businesses today have established teams for product development and customer service in order to track and address the constant difficulties of greater competition in a global market. One of the most prosperous film companies, Lucas Arts, switched to a team-based structure to maximize the abilities of its creative designers. Teams provide managers the chance for the face-to-face interaction and continuing adjustment they need to deal successfully with ongoing complicated situations. Managers spend roughly 70% of their time in committee meetings. Managers always struggle to establish a committee system that allows them effective control over organizational operations when they build up a team structure. Teams sometimes lose their effectiveness over time when organizational issues change but team composition and structure don't. Because being a member of a team offers a person authority in the organisation, people often fight to protect their team or remain on a committee. However, this authority does not always advance organisational objectives. The appliance manufacturer Whirlpool's former CEO David Whitwam led the way in establishing hundreds of mini-management teams throughout the whole organisation in order to bring about change, enhance quality control, and simplify production. What is Whitwam trying to accomplish? To boost engagement and foster innovation among managers by using teams to alter power and decision-making processes.

Integrating Roles or Departments: Communication barriers across functions and divisions are expected to rise as organisations get big and complicated. For instance, managers in departments producing various goods may never cross paths. It may be particularly challenging to coordinate components in organisations with thousands of employees. The development of integrating roles that coordinate subunits is one strategy for overcoming these obstacles. A full-time administrative job known as an "integrating role" was created specifically to enhance communication across departments. An integrating role's objective is to encourage knowledge exchange in order to better achieve organisational objectives including product innovation, more flexibility, and enhanced customer service. Senior managers who have chosen to relinquish control over a particular department and concentrate on company-wide integration are often the people in integrating positions. They often serve as major task force and team chairs and provide regular reports to upper management. A corporation establishes an integrating department to oversee the operations of all subunits when a large number of personnel are employed in integrating jobs. The chemical manufacturer Du Pont, along with Microsoft and IBM, all have departments with around 200 individuals working in integrating positions. Generally speaking, the integration mechanisms an organisation requires to overcome communication and coordination obstacles across functions and divisions are more complicated the more complex and highly diverse the organisation is.

CONCLUSION

For long-term success in a setting that is changing quickly, organisations must be created that promote a culture of adaptation, encourage innovation, and support cooperation across teams and departments. Organisational design must be intentional and methodical in order to meet these issues. Organisations must do in-depth studies of their internal resources, external environment, and strategic goals. To guide their design choices, they must take into account elements including market trends, the competitive environment, technological improvements, and talent needs. In conclusion, organisational design poses a number of difficulties that must be overcome if structures supporting success are to be created. The main issues that organisations confront include balancing centralization and decentralisation, managing complexity, coordinating structure and strategy, and encouraging adaptation and innovation. Stakeholder participation, thorough analysis, and an emphasis on developing structures that are adaptable, responsive, and in line with the organization's strategic goals are all necessary for addressing these issues.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. M. Burton and B. Obel, "The science of organizational design: fit between structure and coordination," *J. Organ. Des.*, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s41469-018-0029-2.

[2] M. Aubry and M. Lavoie-Tremblay, "Rethinking organizational design for managing multiple projects," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.05.012.

[3] A. Ingrams, "Organizational Design in Open Government: Two Cases from the United Kingdom and the United States," *Public Perform. Manag. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/15309576.2018.1562947.

[4] C. Curado, "Organisational learning and organisational design," *Learning Organization*. 2006. doi: 10.1108/09696470610639112.

[5] M. D. Burton, M. G. Colombo, C. Rossi-Lamastra, and N. Wasserman, “The organizational design of entrepreneurial ventures,” *Strateg. Entrep. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/sej.1332.

[6] R. Turner and M. Miterev, “The Organizational Design of the Project-Based Organization,” *Proj. Manag. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/8756972819859746.

[7] L. Mosca, M. Gianecchini, and D. Campagnolo, “Organizational life cycle models: a design perspective,” *J. Organ. Des.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s41469-021-00090-7.

[8] I. Lemus-Aguilar, G. Morales-Alonso, A. Ramirez-Portilla, and A. Hidalgo, “Sustainable business models through the lens of organizational design: A systematic literature review,” *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11195379.

[9] A. De Massis, K. A. Eddleston, and P. Rovelli, “Entrepreneurial by Design: How Organizational Design Affects Family and Non-family Firms’ Opportunity Exploitation,” *J. Manag. Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/joms.12568.

[10] C. Ponsiglione, L. Cannavacciuolo, S. Primario, I. Quinto, and G. Zollo, “The ambiguity of natural language as resource for organizational design: A computational analysis,” *J. Bus. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.052.

[11] F. Sipayung, L. Ginting, and M. L. L. Sibarani, “Organisational Design, Organisational Climate and Burnouts in Health Services Companies,” *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Chang. www.ijicc.net*, 2021.

[12] N. J. Foss, J. Lyngsie, and S. A. Zahra, “The role of external knowledge sources and organizational design in the process of opportunity exploitation,” *Strateg. Manag. J.*, 2013, doi: 10.1002/smj.2135.

CHAPTER 10

INTEGRATION VERSUS DIFFERENTIATION IN ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN

Dr. Lakshmi Prasanna Pagadala, Associate Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:lakshmi.prasanna@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The purposeful arrangement of an organization's structure, procedures, and systems in order to successfully accomplish its goals is known as organizational design. The harmony between integration and distinctiveness is a key factor in this design. This abstract examines the relevance of the notions of integration and differentiation in organizational design, as well as how they affect cooperation, performance, and coordination. Integration describes the level of interaction and cooperation between various organizational components. To guarantee effective communication, information exchange, and collaboration, it requires coordinating activities, processes, and functions. Integration promotes synergy and efficiency by facilitating the movement of resources, information, and feedback among diverse groups. When activities are interconnected, need tight cooperation, and require centralized decision-making for efficient coordination, high degrees of integration are advantageous. Differentiation, on the other hand, refers to the division of labour, specialization, and the establishment of unique departments or units within an organisation. Differentiation enables organisations to distribute resources and duties in accordance with certain tasks or areas of competence. Within each unit, specialisation improves productivity and skill growth. When activities call for specialised knowledge, abilities, and expertise, differentiation is good. It makes it possible for businesses to innovate, adapt to changing market demands, and efficiently meet the requirements of individual clients. Additionally, encouraging leadership and a culture that emphasises both teamwork and individual expertise are necessary for effective integration and distinction. While encouraging cooperation and fostering a common understanding of organisational objectives, leaders should also recognise and recognise individual efforts.

KEYWORDS:

Decision-Making, Distinction, Integration, Organization.

INTRODUCTION

Managers must decide on a level of integration that corresponds to the organization's degree of differentiation. Managers must strike the right balance between integration and distinction. To successfully coordinate its operations, a complex organisation that is significantly differentiated requires a high degree of integration. On the other hand, when an organisation has a very straightforward, well defined job structure, it often simply has to apply simple integrating methods. Its managers can discover that the organisational objectives can be accomplished with the control and coordination provided by the hierarchy of authority. Managers must take great care to avoid overly differentiating or integrating their organisation. In terms of the number of managers hired and the quantity of management time spent on organising organisational operations, differentiation and integration are both costly. For instance, every hour that staff members spend working on committees that are not really necessary costs the company thousands of dollars since they are not being used to their fullest potential. Managers must carefully direct the process of differentiation so an organisation builds the core competencies that give it a competitive advantage. They must also carefully fully integrate the organisation by selecting appropriate coordinating mechanisms that allow subunits to cooperate and work together to strengthen its core competences [1]–[3].

Decentralisation and Centralization in Balance

When talking about vertical differentiation, it's important to remember that creating a hierarchy of authority is meant to make an organisation run better since it makes individuals accountable for their actions. The hierarchy identifies each person's area of power within the company. However, many businesses complain that when a hierarchy emerges, employees constantly look to their superiors for guidance. When a new or unusual problem arises, employees would prefer not to handle it or pass it on to their superior rather than take ownership and the risk of handling it. Due to members' failure to seize new possibilities to put their core competencies to use, organisational performance declines as members' sense of responsibility and willingness to take risks rises. Nobody is ready to accept responsibility, which slows down decision-making and makes the organisation inflexible—that is, unable to adjust to changing circumstances. Employees at Levi Strauss, for instance, frequently told former CEO Roger Sant that they felt they couldn't do something because "They wouldn't like it," even though they had difficulty identifying "they" when questioned. Despite this, the employees believed they lacked the power or responsibility to make changes. Sant launched the "Theybusters" campaign to renegotiate authority and responsibility relationships so that employees could take on new responsibilities. The solution involved decentralising authority, which meant giving employees at lower levels in the hierarchy the power to decide how to handle problems and issues that came up while they were performing their jobs. All organisations face the fundamental design dilemma of deciding how much to centralise or decentralise the power to make decisions.

Authority should either be centralised or decentralised. One who has authority has the ability to decide how to allocate organisational resources and to hold other individuals responsible for their actions. The B.A.R. and Grille example demonstrated that vertical differentiation entails decisions over how to distribute power. The issue of how much decision-making power to assign to each level must be resolved even when there is a hierarchy of authority. The ability of managers at the top of the hierarchy to make crucial choices may be included into organisational design. It is the responsibility of the superior to provide commands, and subordinates must follow them to the letter. They lack the power to take initiative or make use of resources for their own priorities. Authority is said to be highly centralised when the decision-making power is retained by managers at the top of the hierarchy. In contrast, authority is highly decentralised when the decision-making power over organisational resources and the ability to launch new projects is distributed to managers at all levels of the hierarchy.

Each approach has its benefits and drawbacks. Centralization has the benefit of enabling senior management to coordinate organisational operations and maintain the organization's focus on its objectives. However, when senior managers are overworked and heavily involved in operational decision-making on ongoing resource problems, centralization becomes a problem. When this occurs, they have limited time for making long-term strategic decisions and fail to prepare crucial upcoming organisational actions like choosing the appropriate strategy for global competition. Decentralisation has the benefit of encouraging flexibility and responsiveness by empowering lower-level managers to make quick choices. Managers may take on more responsibility and possibly profitable risks while yet being held accountable for their actions. Additionally, when power is distributed, managers may make crucial choices that let them show off their unique talents and competencies and could be more motivated to work hard for the organisation. The drawback of decentralisation is that it makes planning and coordination exceedingly difficult if enough power is transferred so managers at all levels may make their own judgements. Consequently, too much decentralisation might result in an organisation losing control of its decision-making! Of Organisational Insight shows several of the problems with this design decision. The design issue for managers is to choose the ideal ratio between centralization and decentralisation of decision-making in an organisation, as these examples demonstrate. Managers may pursue their own functional aims and ambitions at the cost of organisational goals if power is too decentralised. In contrast, managers further down in the hierarchy become reluctant to make new judgements and lack the flexibility to address issues as they occur in their own groups and departments if power is too centralised and top management takes all significant decisions [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

The ideal scenario is one in which there is a balance between centralization and decentralisation of authority, allowing middle and lower managers who are closest to the action to make significant choices while top managers' main duty shifts to managing long-term strategic decision-making. As a consequence, there is a good balance between developing long-term strategies and fostering short-term flexibility and creativity since lower-level managers can react swiftly to issues and environmental changes as they arise. An earlier management group had centralised power so that it could continue to have daily control over crucial decision-making. However, the company's performance declined as a result of senior management focusing only on day-to-day tasks and losing track of shifting consumer demands and altering fashion trends. The newly appointed senior management team understood the need of giving operational decision-making power to lower-level managers so that they could focus on making long-term strategic decisions. As a result, senior management dispersed power until they felt they had found the ideal equilibrium.

As was already said, managers' choices regarding how the organisation will function directly affect how managers and workers act in an organisation. Managers who aim to limit their ability to influence their employees' performance and prevent risk-taking centralise power. Managers that seek to promote innovation and risk-taking decentralise power. For instance, in the army, the top brass often wants to prevent lower-level officers from acting independently because if they did, centralised command would lose its influence and the army would fragment. As a result, the army has a highly centralised system of decision-making that follows tight guidelines and has a well-defined hierarchy of power. In contrast, workers at Amgen and Becton Dickson, a manufacturer of medical equipment, have more autonomy and are given access to a wider range of resources, allowing them to make decisions and take risks as long as they are in line with the company's overall strategy. High-tech businesses often decentralise power because doing so promotes innovation and risk-taking. As an organisation evolves—that is, as it expands and diversifies—decisions regarding how to allocate decision-making power alter as well. The management work requires constant decision-making over how to balance power; it is not a design choice that can be made once and left alone.

Harmonising Mutual Adjustment and Standardisation

Important kinds of behaviour control in organisations include written regulations, standard operating procedures, and unwritten values and conventions. They lay forth the duties and responsibilities connected with each organisational job, as well as how employees are to carry out their roles. However, many businesses lament the fact that staff members sometimes adhere too strictly to both written and unwritten rules rather than tailoring them to the demands of a given circumstance. Strictly adhering to the rules may stifle innovation since there is little opportunity for originality or imaginative solutions to unique situations in the comprehensive regulations that outline how choices are to be made. Decision-making thus becomes rigid, and organisational performance suffers. For instance, Dell was widely recognised for attempting to be accessible to and receptive to its customers. However, when Dell expanded in the 2000s, it evolved a standard answer to client demands; in order to control costs, it only provided consumers with a small selection of PCs and a small number of alternatives. Giving consumers what they wanted, such as more powerful laptops that came in a variety of colorssomething that was driving increased sales at Apple and HP had lost priority in favour of standardising procedures to save costs. Additionally, Dell's quick expansion caused communication issues within the company's various departments. As a result, product development was slowed and Dell was less able to provide customers with new PCs that could compete with Apple and HP in terms of design and features. Dell has yet to make a full recovery from this issue. Its new computer lines were still failing to draw in sufficient consumers in 2011, and IBM was losing market share to Apple, which seemed to be able to foresee what users would want from new computing devices like tablets. Apple designs new models swiftly because a dedicated team of workers was in charge of each of its many product lines, such as iPhones and iPads, and they were always looking for ways to enhance.

The difficulty of creating a structure that strikes the correct balance between standardisation and mutual adjustment is shared by all organisations, no matter how big or small. Conformity to certain models or examples that are seen to be appropriate in a particular circumstance as defined by established sets of rules and standards is referred to as standardisation. Mutual adjustment, on the other hand, is the evolving process by which people use their current best judgement of events rather than standardised rules to address problems, guide decision making, and promote coordination. Standardised decision-making and coordination through rules and procedures make people's actions routine and predictable. The ideal balance allows workers to operate freely so they may adapt their behaviour to new and changing circumstances and makes many acts predictable so that continuing organisational tasks and objectives are fulfilled [7]–[9].

Officialization: Written Regulations

Formalisation is the process of standardising activities via documented rules and procedures. Rules are formal, written declarations that outline the proper methods for achieving desired outcomes. People act in line with some predetermined principles when they obey rules. Everything is carried out according to procedure in an organisation where formalisation and standardisation are very prevalent—such as the military, FedEx, or UPS. There is no opportunity for mutual adjustment; workers are responsible for abiding by the rules, which outline how individuals are to carry out their responsibilities and make choices. Additionally, workers are not allowed to flout the law. Centralization of power is often indicated by a high degree of formalisation. A low degree of formalisation suggests that decision-making is a dynamic process in which staff members use their talents and abilities to adapt to change and solve issues, and that coordination is the result of mutual adjustment among individuals from various organisational roles. Because workers must have the power to bind the organisation to specific actions when they make choices, mutual adjustment often means decentralisation of authority.

Socialisation: Acquaintance with Norms

Norms are norms or patterns of behaviour that are accepted as typical or indicative of a certain population and that also control and guide that population's behaviour. A norm is followed by group members because it represents a widely accepted code of conduct. As individuals collaborate over time, many informal conventions develop. Despite having a technically designated one-hour lunch break, workers often take an hour and a half for lunch at certain workplaces, while no one typically departs until 6:30 pm—or before the boss. Norms gradually shape and direct how individuals and social groupings see and react to certain events and circumstances. Many organisational standards do not support organisational performance, despite the fact that many do, such as always treating customers politely and keeping the workspace clean. According to studies, groups of workers might establish norms that lower performance. According to a number of studies, workplaces may directly affect how quickly or quickly work is completed by enforcing unofficial consequences against staff members who violate unwritten rules of conduct. An employee who works too rapidly is dubbed a "ratebuster," while an employee who works too slowly is called a "chiseler." Having established a group standard, workers aggressively enforce it by physically and emotionally punishing offenders.

All organisational levels go through this procedure. Let's say a group of middle managers has accepted the standard of not upsetting the organisational apple cart by altering ineffective working procedures, even though doing so would lead to greater productivity. A new manager who joins the scene will quickly learn from the others that upsetting the status quo does not pay as other managers look for methods to penalise the new person for deviating from this standard, even if the organisation might need a little shaking up. Even a new manager at the top of the hierarchy will struggle to alter the unwritten rules of the company. Another influence rules have on behaviour has to do with how well an organisation operates. We pointed shown in the Levi Strauss example that people's behaviour does not change immediately even when an organisation modifies its work regulations. Why do people act rigidly when the rules change? The cause is that rules eventually internalise, or become a part of a person's psychological make-up, turning them from external norms into internalised ones. When this occurs, people find it very difficult to break an established norm and adhere to a new one; they also tend to revert to their previous behaviours. Think about how difficult it is to maintain fresh goals and kick old habits, for instance [10]–[12].

Ironically, an organisation often seeks to ingrain a certain set of corporate rules and values in its members. For example, to regulate and standardise the conduct of highly competent organisational members, Apple, Google, and Intel establish technical and professional standards and values. However, it is incredibly difficult to modify these conventions after they have been established. People also find it challenging to change their behaviour when an organisation wishes to pursue new objectives and promote new standards. This issue cannot be solved easily. Before they realise they do not have to apply the previous set of internalised standards to new circumstances, organisational members often need to go through a significant period of relearning. Many organisations, like Ford and IBM, have gone through significant change in order to have their employees "unlearn" outmoded conventions and internalise new ones, such those that promote innovation and customer responsiveness. Socialisation is the term used to describe the process by which members of an organisation become familiar with its standards and internalise these unspoken codes of behaviour. Organisations may generally support the creation of creative or conventional solutions.

CONCLUSION

For an organisation to function effectively, integration and difference must be balanced. Integrating too much may result in a lot of red tape, delayed decision-making, and limited flexibility. On the other hand, overemphasising difference may lead to organisational silos, a lack of coordination, and less cross-unit cooperation. To fully capitalise on the advantages of both integration and distinctiveness, the proper balance must be struck. For successful organisational design, striking the correct balance between integration and distinction is essential. While difference allows for specialisation, flexibility, and creativity, integration encourages cooperation, synergy, and efficiency. To achieve the correct balance, which fosters cooperation and coordination while allowing for individual skill and adaptation, organisations must align their structures, processes, and cultures. Organisations may improve their performance, competitiveness, and capacity to negotiate the difficulties of the changing business environment by attaining an ideal integration-differentiation balance.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. M. Burton and B. Obel, "The science of organizational design: fit between structure and coordination," *J. Organ. Des.*, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s41469-018-0029-2.

[2] M. Aubry and M. Lavoie-Tremblay, "Rethinking organizational design for managing multiple projects," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.05.012.

[3] A. Ingrams, "Organizational Design in Open Government: Two Cases from the United Kingdom and the United States," *Public Perform. Manag. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/15309576.2018.1562947.

[4] K. M. Dirschel, "Decentralization or centralization striking a balance," *Nurs. Manage.*, 1994.

[5] A. Lecours, "Dynamic de/centralization in Canada, 1867-2010," *Publius*. 2019. doi: 10.1093/publius/pjx046.

[6] I. V. Irkhin, "Subsidiarity Principle: In Search of a Balance between Centralization and Decentralization (State Legal Aspect)," *Actual Probl. Russ. Law*, 2020, doi: 10.17803/1994-1471.2020.120.11.160-171.

[7] G. P. Monteiro, A. Hopkins, and P. F. Frutuoso e Melo, "How do organizational structures impact operational safety? Part 2 – Designing structures that strengthen safety," *Saf. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2019.104534.

[8] S. Cummings, "Centralization and decentralization: The neverending story of separation and betrayal," *Scand. J. Manag.*, 1995, doi: 10.1016/0956-5221(95)00002-D.

[9] E. B. Ferlie and S. M. Shortell, "Improving the Quality of Health Care in the United Kingdom and the United States: A Framework for Change," *Milbank Q.*, 2001, doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.00206.

[10] M. Mutebi *et al.*, "Breast cancer treatment: A phased approach to implementation," *Cancer*, 2020, doi: 10.1002/cncr.32910.

[11] V. E. Dementiev, "Viability of Hierarchical Organizations under Variability of Economic Environment," *Russ. Manag. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.21638/spbu18.2019.304.

[12] W. Ricciardi and R. Tarricone, "The evolution of the Italian National Health Service,"

CHAPTER 11

MANAGEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Dr. Akhila Udupa, Associate Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:akhila.udupa@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

An essential component of good leadership and organisational performance is the management of organisational culture. The importance of organisational culture, its influence on employee behaviour and organisational outcomes, and the most effective methods for managing and influencing culture within an organisation are all covered in this abstract. Individuals' behaviour and attitudes inside an organisation are influenced by the common values, beliefs, conventions, and practises that make up an organisational culture. It affects how workers communicate, decide, and approach their task. Improved performance, creativity, and organisational resilience are all products of a strong and supportive organisational culture that supports employee dedication, engagement, and satisfaction. Aligning organisational culture with the strategic goals and intended values of the company is part of managing organisational culture. To achieve this, leaders must clearly define the intended culture, effectively convey it, and reinforce it via a consistent set of behaviours. As cultural role models inside the organisation, leaders are vital in establishing the tone and exhibiting the necessary behaviours. Furthermore, controlling organisational culture depends heavily on good communication. Leaders may express the required values and reinforce them through routine communications when there are open and consistent lines of communication. Employee participation and cultural ownership are facilitated through open communication and feedback methods. Cultural aspects must also be periodically assessed and measured as part of managing organisational culture. Surveys, focus groups, and other data collecting techniques can assist determine whether the organization's planned culture and the actual culture are in harmony. This evaluation offers insightful information for identifying areas for improvement, strength, and required solutions.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Culture, Organization, Time, Value.

INTRODUCTION

An intended manner of behaviour is an instrumental value. Organisations promote a variety of behaviours, such as working hard, upholding traditions and authority, being prudent and careful, being thrifty, being imaginative and brave, being honest, taking chances, and upholding high standards. Thus, the end states that an organisation aspires to accomplish and the behaviour patterns that it supports make up its culture. Instrumental values should ideally aid the organisation in achieving its ultimate objectives. Indeed, since they have diverse sets of terminal and instrumental values, various organisations have different cultures. For instance, a computer software and hardware company like Google or Apple, whose cultures place a strong emphasis on the terminal value of innovation, might achieve this result by fostering the growth of instrumental values like creativity, risk-taking, sharing new product ideas, and teamwork. A culture of entrepreneurship is produced by the union of terminal and instrumental values. You need a strong product-oriented culture, even in a technological firm, according to Apple CEO Steve Jobs. Many businesses employ many brilliant engineers and intelligent individuals. The control the kind of coordination and motivation that arises from an organization's culture, however, serves as the gravitational force that eventually binds everything together. However, it may not be suitable for certain organisations to uphold principles and conventions that favour innovative, "out-of-the-box" thinking. For instance, a package delivery firm like UPS or FedEx may emphasise prudence, attention to detail, speediness, and conformance to work standards and standard operating procedures in order to decrease expenses. The end consequence will be a conservative culture, which will act as UPS's compass. FedEx has copied UPS's strategy. FedEx, for instance, employs a GPS positioning system to guide its drivers on how to travel their routes as efficiently as possible in order to save expensive fuel. For instance, to cut down on travel time and distance, they often turn right at crossings; UPS undoubtedly employs a similar strategy [1]–[3].

Studying an organization's mission statement and official objectives, which inform members and other stakeholders of the kind of values and ethical standards it wants its members to employ in decision-making, is a common way to find terminal values. An organisation creates certain norms, rules, and SOPs that represent its instrumental values in order for members to grasp them and know the types of behaviour that are required of them as they work towards desirable end states. Norms are standards or behavioural patterns that are seen as usual or acceptable for a group of individuals, as stated in Chapter 4. An organisation whose instrumental values include helping others and working hard would establish particular standards of being polite and maintaining a safe and clean workplace, for example. Incompatibilities between cultures that cause conflict are known as cultural friction. For instance, managing workers from a lesser power distance society may be challenging for a more hierarchical culture. Chinese businesses are now more equipped than ever to expand internationally in search of resources and new customers for their goods. Chinese companies are accomplishing this by buying Western companies in distant Europe or North America. As a result, there have been the predicted cultural confrontations. For instance, when the Chinese television company TCL purchased the French television manufacturer Thomson and a portion of the French company Alcatel's equipment business in recent years, a number of issues arose. TCL had cultural conflict that caused them to have financial issues after their takeover. Additionally, senior manager Mr. Li Dongsheng of TCL stated that he had trouble organising meetings and workdays since his French teammates turned off their cell phones during the weekend. The top management at TCL further said that the French managers did not comprehend the significance of the job or the level of difficulty of the competition. However, the French workers stated that the Chinese managers require individuals to be at their beck and call and work every day.

Some of these issues could have arisen as a result of the combined company's hasty global development plans. For instance, TCL finished its significant international investment in Thomson and Alcatel in under three months. Some believed that the corporation rushed too quickly through the purchase stage and refused to pay the consulting expenses necessary to fully investigate the acquisition and determine the optimum method for integrating the two businesses. Another Chinese manufacturing company, which began out with a joint venture with a North American technology business, moved a bit more slowly than TCL but ran into some of the same issues. Due to its partly state ownership, the Chinese company was structured along fairly conventional lines, with a hierarchical structure, limited challenge of choices made by superiors, and little empowerment of middle or lower management. When the Chinese company exported their system and immediately forced it on the North American company, this led to quite a deal of conflict. The micromanaging hierarchical structure irked the North American managers, who had previously always enjoyed autonomy in their previous company. They discovered their new supervisors keeping track of when they arrived for work and how long they spent at lunch. Finally, the company's new Chinese owner made the decision to build a lunch café in the rear of the manufacturing facility, partially so they could serve Chinese cuisine and, others speculated, to keep workers on-site. This was important in that the management desired greater interaction between the Chinese staff and the purchased division. However, not everyone like to eat there.

The extremely little variety of sandwiches did not appeal to one American manager, but he still want to travel to the adjacent Subways sandwich shop for lunch. The manager later discovered that one of the reasons his supervisor had given him a poor pay evaluation was because he didn't make an effort to network with other managers. Many of an organization's strongest and most important values are not documented. They are only present in the common expectations, presumptions, conventions, and modes of behaviour that employees use to interact with one another and with outsiders as well as to identify and address organisational issues. In order to perceive and react to varied events in a manner that is compatible with the organization's established ideals, members learn from one another. Over time, members learn to select and adhere to suitable principles without even being aware that they are doing so. In other words, organisational values become a part of members' mindsets people own value systems and influence how they interpret a situation. This is another reason why the cultures of various companies can vary so greatly [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

Organisational conventions, regulations, SOPs, and objectives all reflect relatively persistent values that form the foundation of organisational culture. When making decisions and following through on them, as well as when dealing with ambiguity and uncertainty both inside and outside of the organisation, people in that organisation draw on these cultural values. This increases the reliability of members' behavior. In this context, reliability does not necessarily imply consistently submissive or passive behavior. The infamous, now-defunct auditing company Arthur Andersen was widely recognised for its demand that its staff adhere to its strict, stifling norms of behaviour. Employees were required to dress in dark blue suits and black shoes, with some branches' managers insisting that the shoes be lace-up style or face reprimands. Additionally, an extensive and rigorous MBO system was in place, and workers' performance was regularly assessed. Its core principles were built on respect for partners, adherence to established rules and SOPs, and observance of business policies. On the surface, the company's requirement that its personnel adhere to its cultural values and norms would seem to be smart business practise for an organisation whose operations rely on the precise measurement and accounting of the resources utilised by its customers. It is not surprising, then, that the business world was shocked when it emerged in the early 2000s that some of Arthur Andersen's most senior partners had been instructing their subordinates to overlook or ignore anomalies in its client books in order to obtain large consulting fees in order to maintain the clients' business, and to save money. Accounting is a relatively precise science, and the last thing an accounting firm needs is for its employees to practise "creative accounting." The paradox is that since Arthur Andersen's principles were so powerful, subordinates were compelled to disregard the "real" ethics of what they were doing in favour of adhering to its "distorted" ethics. Because of the huge position and influence the partners had as well as the danger of punishment if anybody broke the rules, it seems that Arthur Andersen's culture was so powerful that it had a cult-like impact on its members.

Global Values and Norms

The conventions and values of other nations can impact organisational culture. In fact, disparities in national values and conventions across nations' cultures assist to highlight the significant influence that organisational culture has on behaviour. For instance, firms often utilise global outsourcing nowadays to save costs, which clearly calls for managers and workers in several nations to coordinate their efforts. However, a recent research indicated that cultural differences are a significant obstacle to effective cooperation. Cultural differences, which include diverse communication styles, task-approach differences, conflict-resolution styles, and decision-making styles, are significant barriers to coordination in outsourcing relationships that call for cooperation between individuals from various nations. Consider what transpired when a U.S. and a Mexican corporation attempted to collaborate in a joint venture to get a sense of the implications of these disparities in cultural values and norms on organisational behaviour. After extensive negotiations, Corning Glass, located in Pittsburgh, and Vitro, a Mexican glass manufacturer, established a joint venture to exchange technology and promote one another's glass goods throughout Mexico and the United States. The North American Free Trade Agreement, which opened the markets of both nations to one another's goods, offered them with possibilities, and they created an alliance to take advantage of these opportunities. Both businesses were excited about the potential for their partnership at the time the joint venture was signed.

Managers reported that the organisational cultures of the two businesses were comparable. Both businesses had top-level management teams that were still mostly made up of members of the founding families, they were both global businesses with diverse product offerings, and both had a history of successfully managing business relationships. Nevertheless, two years after Vitro had paid Corning $150 million for access to its technology, Corning Glass ended the joint venture and returned the money. Why did the project fail? Managers from Vitro and Corning were unable to collaborate because of the vast differences in their respective organisations' cultures and ideals. The Mexican corporation Vitro conducted business in line with the norms of Mexican culture. Compared to the US, commerce is performed more slowly in Mexico. Mexican businesses have a tendency to take a back seat and make choices in a "very genteel," cooperative manner since they are used to a protected market. Typically, managers go to work at 9 A.M., have a two- or three-hour lunch break, often at home with their families, and then work late, sometimes until 9 P.M. The business culture in Mexico is built on paternalistic, hierarchical norms, and the most crucial decisions are centralized in the hands of a small group of senior management. Mexican managers and their employees are also intensely loyal to and respectful to their superiors. Because intermediate managers won't act on a solution they have come up with without upper management's permission, this centralization hinders decision-making. Building trust with new businesses in Mexico requires time and effort since it happens gradually. Therefore, building personal relationships over time between managers of various businesses is crucial to doing business in Mexico [7]–[9].

The American corporation Corning operated in line with the principles that were ingrained in American society. In order to depart early in the evening, American managers either work through lunch or take brief lunch breaks. Lower-level managers in many American businesses are given the power to make crucial choices and commit their organizations to certain courses of action. Managers like to act swiftly and worry about the results afterwards. Managers from Corning and Vitro attempted to reach a compromise and develop a working style that was acceptable to both parties despite the contrasts in their ways to doing business. The managers of the two organizations decided to have lengthy working lunches. Mexican management agreed to stay at work after lunch, while American managers promised to stay a little later to speak to Vitro's senior executives to hasten decision-making. However, over time, managers from both organisations started to get irritated by the disparities in management style and working methods. The decision-making process was too sluggish, which annoyed Corning's supervisors. The stress put on Vitro's management by Corning's managers to do everything promptly irritated them. When Corning's managers in Mexico saw that Vitro and Corning's organisational cultures weren't really that comparable, they made the decision to return home. The executives at Vitro likewise came to the conclusion that continuing the project was futile given the size of the discrepancies.

Conducting business abroad is different from conducting business at home, as Corning and numerous other American businesses who have engaged into international partnerships have discovered. Foreign-based American managers shouldn't anticipate doing business in the U.S. manner. Managers working overseas must have an understanding of and ability to deal with cultural variations since values, conventions, traditions, and etiquette vary from one nation to the next. Companies that acquire other companies, even American companies, like Microsoft, Google, and Oracle, use seasoned teams of "merger culture" experts who take the necessary steps to blend the cultures of the merged companies because organizational culture differences can be so significant that many mergers fail as a result. Similar to this, some businesses are aware in advance that their cultures are too dissimilar for them to unite. For instance, Microsoft considered merging with SAP, a top global software company with headquarters in Germany, but after their top managers started talking, it became evident that, despite the benefits of the combination, their two cultures couldn't successfully combine their expertise and resources to add value.

There are a variety of ways that culture may motivate and support the intensive team and personal interactions needed to build organisational competence and gain a competitive edge. First, cultural values play a crucial role in facilitating interpersonal acclimatisation inside an organisation. Employees do not need to spend much time building rapport and overcoming discrepancies in their interpretations of events when shared cultural norms serve as a common reference point. Interactions between members of an organisation might be facilitated by cultural values. People who share an organization's values may grow to identify closely with it, and their membership in it may give them a sense of self-worth. Employees of organisations like Google, Southwest Airlines, and Groupon, for instance, appear to value and be dedicated to their membership in the organisation. In addition, organisational culture is a loosely defined kind of informal organisation that supports organisational structure operations. It has a significant effect on how workers perceive their jobs and responsibilities. It explains to them, for instance, whether they should follow the established rules and procedures and simply follow orders or whether they are free to make suggestions to their superiors, come up with better or more original ways to carry out their duties, and feel confident showcasing their competency in front of their peers and superiors without fear of retaliation.

This is no little matter. One of the most frequent grievances made by employees and junior managers in organisations is that, despite knowing that certain tasks or roles could be accomplished more effectively and should be carried out in alternative ways, their company's values and norms forbid them from advising or challenging their superiors higher up the organisational hierarchical structure. They have a sense of being imprisoned, become dissatisfied, and often depart an organisation, leading to high turnover. Some businesses, like GE, Google, and Microsoft, have direct channels of contact with the CEO that don't go via the immediate superior to help alleviate this issue. These corporations also make a point of creating equitable and fair values that show their dedication to rewarding workers who act in the organization's best interests rather than their own. The self-centered managers at GE even have a name: "Type 4" managers. Based on input from employees, these managers are often asked to resign in order to create place for those who can inspire and drive their staff. The way GE conducts business demonstrates its ideals to its employees.

How Do Members Experience an Organization's Culture?

The process through which members absorb the organization's values directly affects the culture's capacity to inspire workers and boost organisational performance. Organisational members are taught fundamental principles via both the official socialisation procedures used by the organisation and the informal storytelling, rituals, and organisational language that emerge as the culture of the organisation evolves [10]–[12].

Socialisation strategies and socialisation

Can they work from 10 A.M. to 5 P.M.? Newcomers to an organisation must acquire the principles and norms that direct its current members' behaviour and decision-making. To 7 P.M. rather than at 8 a.m. to 5 P.M.? Can they contest the views of their superiors and peers, or should they just listen and keep quiet? Newcomers are outsiders, and they won't be recognised as insiders until they have absorbed and internalised an organization's principles and behave in line with its rules and customs. Newcomers must learn about cultural values in order to understand an organization's culture. By seeing how current members act and drawing conclusions about what behaviours are suitable and improper, they might indirectly acquire values. However, the indirect approach poses a danger from the organization's standpoint since newcomers could see and pick up bad practises. From the perspective of the organisation, socialization is the process through which members acquire and internalise the norms of an organization's culture is the best approach for newcomers to learn suitable values. A socialisation model created by Van Maanen and Schein offers suggestions for how organisations might set up the socialisation process so that newcomers learn the values the organisation wants them to. Role orientation is the distinctive method in which newcomers react to a situation: Do they react passively and faithfully to directions and orders? As a result, these values affect the roles that the newcomers assume. Are they imaginative and inventive while looking for answers to issues?

Twelve socialisation techniques that affect a newcomer's role orientation were discovered by Van Maanen and Schein. When various combinations of these strategies are used, two distinct role orientations result: institutionalised and individualized. Institutionalised role orientation occurs when people are instructed to react to a new situation in the same manner that other members of the organisation do. An institutionalised mindset promotes compliance with and adherence to laws and standards. The following list contrasts the strategies used to socialise newcomers to an institutionalised orientation with those used to develop an individualised orientation. Individuals are allowed and encouraged to be creative and experiment with changing norms and values, which helps an organisation better achieve its values.

1. Individual vs. group

Collective strategies provide newcomers shared learning opportunities aimed at producing a standardised response to a circumstance. Distinctive techniques provide for the distinctive learning experiences of each newcomer as well as the teaching of fresh, situation-specific reactions.

2. Formally versus casually

Formal strategies separate newcomers from current organisational members while they are learning. With informal methods, new employees gain knowledge while working as a team.

3. Random versus sequential

As new employees move within an organisation, sequential techniques explicitly inform them of the order in which they will complete new tasks or assume new jobs. With random tactics, training is dependent on the interests and requirements of each person as there is no predetermined order in which they should advance through the organisation.

4. Variable vs. Fixed

Fixed strategies provide beginners with exact timing information for finishing each learning level. Because training is based on an individual's requirements and interests, variable approaches cannot predict when newcomers will reach a certain level in their learning process.

5. Disjunctive versus Serial

Existing organisational members serve as mentors and role models for newcomers when serial techniques are used. Disjunctive procedures demand that newcomers choose and establish their own manner of acting; they do not provide them instructions.

6. Investing against Divestiture

With divestment, current organisational members withhold assistance until newcomers learn the ropes and adhere to established standards, giving newcomers negative social support—that is, they ignore or tease them. Newcomers are encouraged to be themselves after investiture and get instant positive social support from other organisational members. For instance, military-style socialisation results in a highly institutionalised orientation. New recruits are assigned to platoons with other new recruits; they are separated from more seasoned members of the organisation; they go through predetermined drills and learning experiences; they know exactly how long this will take them and what they must do; superior officers serve as their role models; and, until they have mastered their responsibilities and "gotten with the programme," they are treated with the utmost contempt. As a consequence, brand-new hires acquire an institutionalised role orientation in which abiding by organisational standards and principles and conforming to them are considered evidence of success. By the time the socialisation process is complete, the new members are clones of the existing organisational members since those who cannot or won't act in accordance with these norms and values depart.

The military is the only organisation that has such extensive control over its members, although other. Similar methods are used by organisations to socialise their members. The Arthur Andersen programme was quite institutionalised, as was previously discussed. Candidates for employment were carefully chosen because they seemed to have the qualities that Arthur Andersen's partners desired, such as being diligent, cautious, obedient, and thorough. All new hires went through a six-week course at the company's training facility outside of Chicago after being employed, where they were collectively indoctrinated into Arthur Andersen's corporate philosophy. Existing organisational members acted as role models and explained expectations to newcomers in formal eight-hour sessions. Newcomers also gained informal understanding of what it meant to work with Arthur Andersen while eating and having fun. By the time this socialisation process was complete, they had acquired the organization's ideals as well as the standards and guidelines that govern how they are expected to conduct themselves while speaking on behalf of Andersen's customers. Until its unethical, unscrupulous partners, wanting to maximise their earnings at the cost of other stakeholders, took advantage of its strong culture to mislead its workers, this attempt to establish an institutionalised role orientation worked effectively.

Should a company promote an institutionalised role orientation where new hires accept the status quo and carry out their tasks in accordance with the directives and instructions they receive? Or should a company promote an individualised role orientation where new hires are given the freedom to come up with original solutions to the tasks that the company assigns to them? The organization's mission will determine the response to this query. A financial institution wants to have control over the actions of its personnel since its credibility and reputation with customers rely on its honesty. To establish a solid reputation for integrity and dependability, it must implement a robust socialisation programme that will reaffirm its cultural values and standardise how its personnel carry out their duties. Therefore, financial institutions like Bank of America and insurance firms like State Farm would benefit from establishing an institutionalised perspective. The ability it offers individuals at the top of the organisation to control events is one risk associated with institutionalised socialisation. The similarity it could cause among organisation members poses a second risk. How will the organisation be able to evolve and adapt when the external environment changes if all workers have been socialised to have the same point of view? Employees indoctrinated into outdated values won't be able to establish new values that would enable them to innovate when faced with changes in the organisational environment. They are unable to adjust to the new circumstances and so neither can the organisation.

An organisation whose goal is to provide clients new goods should support casual, unplanned encounters from which employees may learn what they need to know while doing their jobs. The effectiveness of many Internet businesses, including Google, Groupon, and Amazon.com, is based not on standardising individual behaviour but rather on innovation and the ability of members to come up with new and improved solutions to Internet-related problems, like Amazon.com'spu service. These businesses take this approach because their effectiveness depends not on standardising individual behaviour but rather on innovation and the ability of members to come up with new and improved solutions to Internet-related problems. For instance, it established a consulting group to market its IT expertise to any interested businesses, as proposed by lower-level staff, and it is now acting swiftly to seize chances in cloud computing. In the 2010s, it is using its strong standards and principles to assist its quick entrance into a variety of new virtual marketplaces and the sale of an ever-expanding selection of goods. The socialisation practises of an organisation not only assist members in learning the organization's cultural values and the rules and norms that govern behaviour, but they also support the organization's mission by strengthening them over time. In this way, employees in every market know how they should work to meet its goals because they are "Amazonians."

CONCLUSION

Organisational culture may be managed and shaped through a variety of tactics. First and foremost, recruiting procedures and selection standards must to be in line with the intended cultural traits. A good cultural fit is ensured and desired behaviours are perpetuated by recruiting people who share the organization's values and culture. Effective culture management has several advantages. Employee morale, contentment, and retention are all improved by a healthy organisational culture. It fosters a friendly and effective work atmosphere by encouraging cooperation, teamwork, and creativity. In addition to recruiting top people and fostering long-term organisational success, a good organisational culture may improve the reputation of the company. In conclusion, managing organisational culture is critical to building a successful and high-performing business. Leaders may create a positive culture that fosters organisational success by coordinating culture with strategic objectives, putting effective methods into place, and involving people. Effective culture management improves staff satisfaction, output, and overall organisational performance, which helps an organisation maintain a competitive edge in the fast-paced corporate world of today.

REFERENCES:

[1] V. Akpa, O. Asikhia, and N. Nneji, "Organizational Culture and Organizational Performance: A Review of Literature," *Int. J. Adv. Eng. Manag.*, 2021.

[2] N. Sarhan, A. Harb, F. Shrafat, and M. Alhusban, "The effect of organizational culture on the organizational commitment: Evidence from hotel industry," *Manag. Sci. Lett.*, 2020, doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2019.8.004.

[3] K. S. Schuldt and G. Gomes, "Influence of organizational culture on the environments of innovation and organizational performance," *Gest. e Prod.*, 2020, doi: 10.1590/0104-530x4571-20.

[4] A. B. Tulcanaza-Prieto, I. E. Aguilar-Rodríguez, and C. Artieda, "Organizational culture and corporate performance in the ecuadorian environment," *Adm. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/admsci11040132.

[5] M. Azeem, M. Ahmed, S. Haider, and M. Sajjad, "Expanding competitive advantage through organizational culture, knowledge sharing and organizational innovation," *Technol. Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101635.

[6] A. Ipinazar, E. Zarrabeitia, R. M. R. Belver, and I. Martinez-De-alegría, "Organizational culture transformation model: Towards a high performance organization," *J. Ind. Eng. Manag.*, 2021, doi: 10.3926/jiem.3288.

[7] M. A. Khan, F. B. Ismail, A. Hussain, and B. Alghazali, "The Interplay of Leadership Styles, Innovative Work Behavior, Organizational Culture, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior," *SAGE Open*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2158244019898264.

[8] H. B. Magsi, T. S. Ong, J. A. Ho, and A. F. S. Hassan, "Organizational culture and environmental performance," *Sustain.*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/su10082690.

[9] Z. Zhen, Z. Yousaf, M. Radulescu, and M. Yasir, "Nexus of digital organizational culture, capabilities, organizational readiness, and innovation: Investigation of smes operating in the digital economy," *Sustain.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13020720.

[10] N. AlShehhi, F. AlZaabi, M. Alnahhal, A. Sakhrieh, and M. I. Tabash, "The effect of organizational culture on the performance of UAE organizations," *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2021.1980934.

[11] A. Asatiani, J. Hämäläinen, E. Penttinen, and M. Rossi, "Constructing continuity across the organisational culture boundary in a highly virtual work environment," *Inf. Syst. J.*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/isj.12293.

[12] W. A. Srisathan, C. Ketkaew, and P. Naruetharadhol, "The intervention of organizational sustainability in the effect of organizational culture on open innovation performance: A case of thai and chinese SMEs," *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2020.1717408.

CHAPTER 12

ORGANIC VS MECHANISTIC ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

Dr. Nalin Chirakkara, Associate Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:nalinkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

When it comes to establishing the internal operations and procedures of an organisation, there are several solutions available. Organic and mechanistic organisational structures are two popular strategies. The qualities, benefits, and drawbacks of each structure are examined in this abstract, along with their consequences for decision-making, flexibility, creativity, and employee empowerment. Formalised hierarchies, well defined roles and duties, and centralised decision-making are characteristics of mechanistic organisational systems. Control, standardisation, and efficiency are highlighted by these structures. Roles and responsibilities are very specialised, and official channels are generally used for communication. Mechanistic structures perform effectively in stable settings and in professions that need a high degree of stability and control. Organic organisational structures, on the other hand, place a greater emphasis on cooperation and adaptation, as well as flexible roles and decentralised decision-making. These organisations place a high value on innovation, open communication, and employee empowerment. Decentralised power and decision-making provide more autonomy and speedy reaction to changing conditions. In dynamic sectors, knowledge-intensive organisations, and situations where quick decision-making and adaptation are necessary, organic structures are often seen.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Decision-Making, Organic, Organization, Stable.

INTRODUCTION

Managers must figure out the best methods to standardise behaviour using rules and norms while also allowing for mutual adjustment to provide staff the chance to find new and more effective ways to accomplish organisational objectives. In order to coordinate their actions, people at higher levels of the hierarchy and in functions that perform complex, uncertain tasks rely more on mutual adjustment than on standardisation. Managers who must strike a balance between these two needs must remember this. For instance, a company could want its accountants to carry out their duties in accordance with normal procedures, yet it might wish to foster innovative behaviour in R&D. Many of the previously stated integrating mechanisms, such as task forces and teams, may boost mutual adjustment by giving individuals a chance to get together and figure out better ways to accomplish things. Additionally, a company might emphasise, as Levi Strauss did, that regulations are only practical suggestions for doing tasks and are not infallible. Norms and values that place more emphasis on change than stability may also be promoted by managers. However, for all organisational responsibilities, the ideal balance between these two factors is one that fosters both successful organisational performance and innovative and conscientious employee behaviour, as described in Focus on Information Technology. Every design issue has an impact on how an organisation as a whole and the individuals within it behave and perform. Mechanistic structure and organic structure are two helpful concepts for comprehending how managers use all these challenges collectively to influence how an organisational structure functions [1]–[3].

Mechanistic Buildings

Mechanistic arrangements are intended to encourage predictable, accountable behaviour in humans. Information primarily moves vertically along a well-defined hierarchy, decision-making power is centralised, and subordinates are strictly overseen. The responsibilities of each function in a mechanistic organisation are also made explicit. A person and a task often have a one-to-one connection. Each employee has a unique area of expertise, is aware of their particular responsibilities, and is discouraged or forbidden from acting inappropriately for their position. Each function is distinct at the functional level, and the person in charge of communicating with and cooperating with other functions at the top of the hierarchy is in charge of doing so. As a result, the hierarchy serves as the primary integrating mechanism both inside and across functions in a mechanical system. Tasks are set up to avoid misunderstandings, so the organisation doesn't need to utilise elaborate integrating procedures. Standardisation is the main method used to coordinate tasks and roles, and formal written rules and procedures outline the duties of each function. The hierarchy and standardisation are the primary mechanisms for organisational control. The organisation is particularly status aware as a result of this focus on the vertical command structure, and "protecting one's turf" rules are widespread. Each employee's advancement within the organisation may be tracked for years to come since promotions are often gradual, consistent, and based on performance. A mechanistic structure is best suited to organisations that operate in stable conditions due to its rigidity.

Organic Components

Mechanistic structures are at one extreme of the organisational design spectrum, while organic structures are at the other. Organic forms provide flexibility, enabling individuals to make changes and swiftly adjust to changing circumstances. People assume the power to make choices as organisational requirements need in organic structures because decision-making authority is decentralised and spread across the hierarchy. Roles are ill-defined, and employees constantly learn new sorts of work abilities to carry out duties that are always changing. Each individual completes each of the three jobs, which leads to combined specialisation and greater productivity. To address issues, workers from various roles collaborate; they become interested in one another's pursuits. Therefore, a high degree of integration is required so that workers can exchange information and resolve issues brought on by variations in sub-unit orientation. Task forces and teams are effective complicated mechanisms used to integrate functions. Mutual adjustment is necessary for coordination to occur when individuals and functions negotiate their roles and responsibilities. Additionally, informal rules and norms develop as a result of continuing interactions among organisational members [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

A mechanical approach to decision-making is significantly unlike from this organic one. For instance, getting a decision made at IBM in the 1990s was like "wading through a tub of peanut butter," as one engineer put it. But as Google grew quickly in the 2000s, there have been complaints that its organic approach, which heavily relied on mutual adjustment, is being threatened by the rising number of rules and committees now used to evaluate new product ideas and innovation. Google has thus been looking for novel techniques to maintain its organic approach and prevent the "peanut butter" issue. In an organic framework, certain standards and principles emerge that place a strong emphasis on individual skill, knowledge, and the flexibility to take creative risks. According to the hierarchy and philosophy promoted by Google, Netflix, and Apple, status is granted by the capacity to exercise creative leadership rather than by holding any official position. Because of slow and cumbersome decision-making and managers who are reluctant to rock the boat, many organisations, including IBM and Ford, whose mechanistic structures made job grade, seniority, and loyalty the foundation of their norms and values, have suffered in the past. However, this has all changed in recent years as their new CEOs have championed an organic approach.

It is obvious that the consequences of organic and mechanical systems on human behaviour are significantly different. Is a mechanistic structure superior than an organic structure? It seems to stimulate cooperation and self-management to enhance quality, customer service, and shorten the time required to bring new items to market, which are all seen as desirable creative behaviours. But would you want to direct the armed forces via an organic structure? Most likely unlikely, given the many authority and status issues that would crop up in trying to get the army, air force, marines, and navy to work together. Would you prefer a living being inside a nuclear power plant? Most likely not, especially if employees respond ingeniously to a crisis or commit blunders due to human error that might have disastrous consequences. Would you even want an organic structure in a restaurant where waiters play the part of chefs and chefs play the role of servers, and power and authority connections are negotiated on a regular basis? Probably not, since each restaurant employee is able to carry out his or her duties in the most efficient way possible due to the one-to-one relationship between person and position. On the other hand, at a high-tech business like Apple or Google where innovation is a product of teams of creative software engineers working together on a project, would you want to utilise a mechanistic structure?

The Organisational Design Contingency Method

The choice of designing an organic or mechanistic structure depends on the specific context or situation an organisation faces, including the environment it operates in, the technology it uses, how complex the tasks it completes, and the skills of the people it employs—as well as how quickly these are changing. In general, an organization's design is influenced by the risks or sources of uncertainty it faces. The organisational structure is tailored using the contingency approach to organisational design to the sources of uncertainty that an organisation must deal with. The structure is made to be responsive to a variety of contingencies, which are potential events that must be prepared for. The environment's makeup is one of the most crucial of these. According to contingency theory, in order to manage its environment successfully, an or- ganization should build its structure to fit with the environment in which the organisation operates. In other words, an organisation must design its internal structure to regulate the exterior environment. Failure results from a poor fit between structure and environment; success results from a good fit. Two research on the interaction between structure and environment provide evidence in favour of contingency theory. These experiments were carried out by Tom Burns and G. Paul Lawrence, Jay Lorsch, and Jay Lorsch. M. Stalker, is then studied [7]–[9].

Differentiation, Integration, and the Environment: Lawrence and Lorsch

The degree of differentiation inside an organisation is directly influenced by the strength and complexity of the forces in the general and specific surroundings. An organization's requirement to control interactions with the forces in its environment is reflected in the number and magnitude of its functions. Which department deals with communications with distributors and suppliers? Management of materials does. Which department deals with customer exchanges? marketing and sales. in conjunction with the government and consumer organisations? public relations and legal. The complexity of environmental demands is partially addressed by the emergence of a functional structure. Paul Lawrence and Jay Lorsch investigated how companies in various industries differentiate and integrate their structures to fit the features of the industry environment in which they compete. They chose three industries that, in their opinion, experienced varying degrees of uncertainty as measured by factors like rate of environmental change. The plastics sector, which they said had the highest amount of uncertainty, the food processing industry, and the container or can manufacturing business, which they claimed had the lowest level of uncertainty, were the three industries. Plastics saw the greatest level of uncertainty due to the fast speed of technical and product development. It was lowest in the container industry, where businesses manufacture a consistent line of goods that don't alter much from year to year. Companies that prepare food fall in the middle because, although introducing new items often, their manufacturing technology is quite stable.

Lawrence and Lorsch evaluated the level of difference between a group of businesses in each industry's manufacturing, R&D, and sales divisions. They were curious in the extent to which each department developed a unique internal set of policies and guidelines to organize its operations. Differences in subunit or functional orientations were also detected. They were particularly interested in how each department saw the significance of various organizational goals, such as sales or production targets or short- and long-term objectives. They assessed the degree to which businesses across various sectors integrated their functional operations. They discovered that each department's attitudes and orientation significantly changed when each of the three departments thought the environment was very complicated and unstable. Each department created a unique set of ideals, perspectives, and methods of operation that were appropriate for the area of the particular environment it was working with. As a result, organisations operating in unstable settings saw larger levels of departmental difference than those operating in stable ones.

Additionally, Lawrence and Lorsch discovered that organisations that are less formal, more decentralised, and more dependent on mutual adjustment perform better in environments that are seen as unstable and unpredictable. Organisations that are more centralised, formalised, and standardised perform better when the environment is seen as being more stable and certain. Additionally, they discovered that successful businesses in many sectors had integration levels that matched their degrees of distinctiveness. extremely successful organisations were extremely distinct but yet highly interconnected in the hazy plastics business. High-performing companies in the comparatively stable container business had modest levels of differentiation and integration, and they were also very effective. The degree of differentiation and integration among businesses in the somewhat uncertain food processing sector was comparable to that of the other two. As order for distinct departments to effectively handle the complexity of their particular environments, each must adopt a unique attitude towards its work. Such organisations need greater coordination as a consequence of the high degree of differentiation. They employ information sharing across departments' functions more often so that the organisation as a whole may formulate a coordinated response to the environment. In contrast, since the hierarchy, regulations, and SOPs offer enough coordination, no complex integrating mechanisms, such as integrating roles, are seen in businesses in stable contexts. According to Lawrence and Lorsch's research, for organisations to be successful, their structures must be modified to fit the environment in which they function. This outcome supported one from a Burns and Stalker investigation [10]–[12].

Organic vs mechanistic structures and the environment: Burns and Stalker

Burns, Tom, and G. When an organisation needs to adapt and respond to environmental change, M. Stalker also discovered that different types of organisational structure are necessary.34 Specifically, they discovered that organisations with an organic structure performed better in unstable, changing environments than organisations with a mechanistic structure. The opposite was true in a stable environment: there, the decentralised team approach that is typical of an organic organisation performed better than the centralised, formalised, and standardised method of coordinating and motivating individuals. What is the cause of such outcomes? Lower-level personnel must have the capacity to make crucial judgements when the environment is fast changing and quick decisions must be made; in other words, they must be empowered. Furthermore, in order to adapt to client requests and create new goods, quick communication and information exchange are often required in complex environments35. In contrast, when the environment is stable, complicated decision-making processes are not required. Re-source transactions are simple to handle, and by retaining power in the hands of the senior management team and leveraging top-down decision-making, performance may be improved. Organisations should construct their structure to meet the dynamism and unpredictability of their environment, according to Burns and Stalker's findings.

The selection of the right organisational structure to address various strategic and technical eventualities is thoroughly covered in later chapters. Mechanistic and organic structures are valuable for examining how organisational structure impacts behaviour, but it's vital to understand that they are ideals at this point since they're unlikely to exist in their purest forms in any real-world organisation. The majority of organisations are a hybrid of the two. In fact, the most effective organisations are those that have found a balance between the two, such that they are both mechanical and organic, according to one increasingly popular theory of organisational design. An organisation may lean more one way than the other, but in order to be successful, it must be able to act both ways. For instance, the army is widely renowned for having a mechanical organisation with well-defined hierarchical reporting ties. This mechanical command structure, however, enables the army to become organic and adaptable in times of conflict as it reacts to the uncertainties of the rapidly shifting battlefield. Similar to this, an organization's structure may be created such that certain functions operate mechanistically while others adopt a more organic method of doing their duties. Organisations must make the right decisions if they want to strike the tricky balance between being mechanical and organic. The difficulties associated with developing organisational structure and culture to increase organisational performance are covered in further depth in the following three chapters. According to research by Burns and Stalker and Lawrence and Lorsch, organisations should modify their organisational structure to reflect the level of uncertainty in their environment. In a stable climate, businesses with a mechanistic structure often do well. Generally, organisms that have an organic structure do the best in a volatile, shifting environment.

CONCLUSION

Different facets of how an organisation operates are impacted by the choice between organic and mechanical structures. Mechanistic frameworks provide accountability, transparency in reporting, and effective procedures. They can guarantee dependability and consistency in operations, but they could restrict employee liberty, innovation, and creativity. Due to their inflexible hierarchies, mechanistic organisations may find it difficult to adjust to quick changes and may also hinder communication. The choice between organic and mechanical organisational structures, in conclusion, has significant effects on how an organisation functions. Mechanistic structures give efficiency and control, but they may also stifle employee creativity and innovation. Organic architectures encourage adaptability and invention but may struggle with consistency and coordination. Finding the proper balance is essential, and businesses should match their organisational structure to their objectives, market trends, and the need for adaptation in their specific environment.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Asif, "Strategic leadership and ambidextrous learning: Exploring the role of dynamic capabilities and intellectual capital," *Int. J. Qual. Serv. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/IJQSS-03-2019-0034.

[2] A. S. Sitar and M. Škerlavaj, "Learning-structure fit part I: Conceptualizing the relationship between organizational structure and employee learning," *Learn. Organ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/TLO-09-2015-0050.

[3] M. Asif, "Strategic leadership and ambidextrous learning," *Int. J. Qual. Serv. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/ijqss-03-2019-0034.

[4] T. Leadership and P. Empowerment, "Transformational Leadership Transformational Leadership , Psychological Empowerment , and the Moderating Role of Mechanistic-Organic Contexts Key Words□: Transformational Leadership□; Psychological Empowerment□; Organizational Structure," *JOB - peer Rev.*, 2013.

[5] R. A. Wienclaw, "Mechanistic and Organic Organizations," *Salem Press Encycl.*, 2021.

[6] M. Temesgen Tariku and A. Awol Adem, "An Integrative Review On Factors Affecting Kaizen Implementation In Private And Government Owned Organizations In Ethiopia-Gaps On Existing Literatures And Insights For Future Researchers," *ICTACT J. Manag. Stud.*, 2020.

[7] B. E. Ashforth, A. M. Saks, and R. T. Lee, "Socialization and newcomer adjustment: The role of organizational context," *Hum. Relations*, 1998, doi: 10.1177/001872679805100703.

[8] J. Bueschken, "Stage-Specific Effects of Organizational Structure and Boundary-Spanning on the Performance of New Product Development Teams," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2012, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1394229.

[9] J. Kim, "Organizational structure and change process outcomes in facility-based and home-based long-term care," 2011.

[10] F. Authors *et al.*, "Management Research□: Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management Article information□: Research Note Organic Vs . Mechanistic Structures Construction and Validation of a Scale of Measurement," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2008.

[11] R. D. Freeze and J. K. Hodges, "Building knowledge capabilities in education," in *15th Americas Conference on Information Systems 2009, AMCIS 2009*, 2009.

[12] R. Schultz and M. Mumford, "The impact of leader-group value similarity and organizational culture on group performance," 2004.

CHAPTER 13

AUTHORITY IN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE DESIGN

Dr. Pramod Pandey, Associate Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:pramodkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Effective management requires careful consideration when designing the organisational structure since it establishes how power is allocated and decision-making procedures are formed inside an organisation. This abstract examines the relevance, varieties, and effects of authority in organisational design on decision-making, accountability, and organisational performance. The term "authority" describes the rightful power given to people or positions within an organisation to make choices, issue commands, and ensure compliance. It offers the structure for information flow, decision-making, and responsibility distribution. Clarity, efficiency, and accountability within an organisation depend on understanding and properly establishing power structures. Hierarchical authority, functional authority, and project-based authority are only a few examples of the many ways that organisational power may be expressed. A definite chain of command, whereby decision-making power passes from upper-level management to lower-level staff, defines hierarchical authority. On the other hand, functional authority gives decision-making power to those who have competence in certain functional areas, enabling them to have an impact on choices within their domain. Project-based power is transitory and given to people in charge of certain projects, allowing them to decide on matters pertaining to the objectives and results of such projects.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Decision-Making, Development, Organization, Work.

INTRODUCTION

The way authority structures are built affects how decisions are made. Centralised authority structures concentrate authority for making decisions at the top of the hierarchy, allowing for swift and reliable decision-making but perhaps restricting employee empowerment and innovation. Decentralized authority arrangements spread decision-making authority across different levels or functional areas, fostering autonomy and creativity but perhaps creating coordination issues and inconsistent decision-making results. Optimising the efficacy and efficiency of decision-making requires striking the correct balance between centralised and decentralised authority structures. Authority hierarchies and accountability are intertwined. Establishing who is in charge of making decisions and performing those decisions makes responsibility easier. Individuals or positions may be held responsible for their actions and results when power and responsibility are in line. Effective authority structures guarantee that decision-makers have the power and resources they need to do their duties and are held responsible for their choices [1]–[3].

Authority: The Causes and Effects of Vertical Differentiation

Choosing how much power to centralise at the top of the organisational structure and how much authority to decentralize to middle and lower levels is a fundamental design dilemma. But what establishes the hierarchy, or the number of levels of power inside an organisation, in its form? This inquiry is crucial because an organization's structure affects how well its decision-making and communication processes function. The amount of vertical differentiation in an organisation is determined by the choices managers make about the hierarchy's structure and the ratio of centralised to decentralised decision-making.

The Development of Hierarchy

As an organisation expands, employees become more numerous and start to specialise, performing a wide variety of tasks. As a result of this growing level of specialisation, it becomes harder for managers to effectively coordinate and motivate employees, which leads to the emergence of an organisational hierarchy. Similar motivational issues are brought on by specialisation and the division of labour. It may be difficult to determine how much each person truly contributes to a work when they each only accomplish a little portion of a larger activity. As a result, it can be challenging to evaluate each employee's performance. Additionally, it is sometimes hard to monitor, assess, and reward personnel based on their individual performance levels when they work together to accomplish a goal. How does a manager know how much each server contributed, for instance, if two servers work together to serve tables? How will the specific contributions of each chef to the quality of the cuisine be evaluated and recognised if two chefs collaborate to prepare a meal? An organisation increases the number of managers it employs to oversee, evaluate, and reward employees as well as the number of levels in its managerial hierarchy to gradually heighten the hierarchy of authority in order to better control—that is, coordinate and motivate—its members.4 Doing both of these things increases vertical differentiation and gives the organisation direct face.

Direct supervision enables managers to mould and influence subordinates' behaviour as they cooperate directly to achieve a company's objectives. Because managers may constantly question, prod, and confer with subordinates about difficulties or brand-new concerns they are encountering to acquire a better understanding of the situation, direct supervision is an essential way of control. Additionally, it makes sure that employees are working efficiently and aren't withholding any information that can later lead to issues. Personal control also increases possibilities for competence development and on-the-job task learning, as well as opportunities to prevent free-riding or shirking. Additionally, when managers oversee employees directly, they provide a good example for others to follow. This encourages employees to improve their own management abilities. At GE, for instance, a lot of emphasis is placed on each manager's responsibility to help their employees grow and increase their prospects of promotion. One of GE's fundamental competencies is the continuous enhancement of managerial abilities at all levels. Those who mentor the lower-level managers who are most likely to succeed get promoted up the hierarch- structure, whereas any manager who fails in this role is swiftly identified and sacked. Personal supervision may thus be a highly effective strategy for inspiring workers and encouraging actions that boost productivity. The most important or tangible factor that brings individuals together, ties them to the group, and affects how well they perform in an organisation is probably the personal authority connection [4], [5].

Height of Hierarchies Issues

Selecting the proper number of managers and hierarchical levels is crucial since it affects the efficiency of the organisation. Specifically, this decision has the potential to improve or degrade bottom-line profitability, motivation, and communication.

Communication Problems

Excessive layers of hierarchy may obstruct communication. Communication between managers at the top and bottom of the hierarchy takes longer as the chain of command becomes longer. Fast decision making is a requirement for success at FedEx, so the company only has five hierarchical levels because it believes that with any more levels the speed of communication and decision making would suffer. Decision making slows, and the slowdown hurts the performance of organisations that need to respond quickly to customers' needs or the actions of competitors. Similar to this, Liz Claiborne took special effort to maintain a flat hierarchy inside her company in order to maximise the organization's capacity to adapt to rapidly shifting fashion trends. Distortion is a serious issue in communication. Experiments have shown that a message that starts at one end of a chain of people can have quite a different meaning by the time it reaches the other end of the chain; people interpret messages according to their own needs and interests so by accident the meaning of the message changes. Information becomes distorted as it flows up and down the hierarchy through many levels of management.

DISCUSSION

Additionally, managers at all levels of the organisation may purposefully falsify information to advance their own agendas. The top of the hierarchy may lose control over the bottom if managers block information flow or feed them particular facts. According to research, managers may influence others to make certain choices. Low-level managers may likewise selectively communicate information up the hierarchy only when it benefits them. A sensible subordinate, for instance, could opt to only share information with a superior that enhances both their reputations. According to studies, communication issues worsen as the number of hierarchical levels rises. Therefore, it makes sense for managers to work to limit and restrain the development of the organisational hierarchy. When there are more than seven or eight layers, communication issues might result in a loss of control and delayed, unresponsive decision-making. The goal has been to flatten the organization's structure in order to increase customer responsiveness while at the same time lowering the operational expenses of DuPont's management hierarchy by more than $1 billion annually.

Motivation Problems

As the hierarchy's levels rise, managers' relative degrees of power and the scope of their responsibilities shrink, creating motivational issues. Since there are fewer managers and hierarchical levels in a flat organization than in a tall organization, managers in the former have a greater degree of power and responsibility. Numerous studies have shown that when managers and workers are given greater power and responsibility, they are, on average, more motivated to carry out their organizational tasks. As a result, motivation in a flat-structured organization may be greater than motivation in a tall one. Additionally, when a hierarchy has numerous levels, it is simple for managers to delegate their own responsibilities to managers above them, which only makes the issue of sluggish decision-making and poor communication worse.

Bureaucratic Costs

Hiring managers is expensive. The bureaucratic expenses, or those related to managing and administering an organisation, increase with the number of managers and hierarchical levels. A middle manager's pay, bonuses, perks, and office are all projected to cost $300,000 or more annually. Therefore, hiring 1,000 additional manager’s costs a company $300 million a year a huge amount that businesses often realise years later they do not need to pay. It is usual for a corporation to proclaim it would lower the number of levels in its hierarchy and lay off superfluous personnel in order to cut bureaucratic expenses due to the cost of a tall and bloated hierarchy, particularly during a recession. For instance, Ford said in 2005 that it will cut two levels from its hierarchy and fire 600 managers to save $500 million. Dell said in 2008 that it has eliminated 12,000 positions, saving a billion dollars annually. Other significant businesses that streamlined their executive pyramids in the 2000s include HP, GM, and Xerox. These organisations have saved billions of dollars.

Why do businesses feel the unexpected need to substantially cut their personnel, submitting workers to the uncertainty and suffering of the unemployment line with no advance notice? Why don't businesses plan ahead and limit the development of managers and hierarchical levels to prevent significant layoffs? Sometimes layoffs are unavoidable, such as when an entirely unanticipated circumstance occurs in the organization's environment. For instance, innovation may render technology obsolete or uncompetitive, or an economic crisis brought on by occurrences like the subprime mortgage fiasco may abruptly reduce demand for an organization's products. However, drastic changes in employment and structure are often just the outcome of poor management.

When an organization is doing well, managers often fail to see the need of controlling, pruning, and managing the hierarchy as the organization deals with novel or shifting conditions. Or they could be aware of the need yet choose to take very little action. As organizations expand, managers often pay less attention to the hierarchy since meeting consumer wants by launching goods or services as soon as feasible is their top priority. As a result, hierarchical levels grow as new employees are hired without any consideration for the long term effects. An organization's structure is likely to become more streamlined as it grows because, for instance, many management jobs may be consolidated into one and hierarchy levels may be abolished to enhance decision-making and save expenses. The processes through which managers simplify hierarchies and fire managers and employees to save bureaucratic expenses are referred to as restructuring and downsizing [6], [7].

C. Northcote Parkinson, a former British civil servant, found some intriguing data while researching administrative procedures in the British Navy. He found that, between 1914 and 1928, the number of ships operating in the British Navy decreased by 68%, but the number of dockyard officials in charge of maintaining the fleet increased by 40%, and the number of top navy officers in London the officials in charge of managing the fleet had increased by 12%. Why had this circumstance arisen? According to Parkinson, two factors govern the expansion of managers and hierarchical levels: "Officials make work for one another," and "An official wants to multiply subordinates, not rivals." Managers appreciate their position in the hierarchy, regardless of their grade or level. Their "empire" is bigger and their position is higher when there are fewer managers at their level in the hierarchy and more managers below them. Therefore, it is not unexpected that managers want to have more subordinates. The hierarchy then becomes higher and taller as a result of these subordinates realising the status benefits of having subordinates and trying to increase the number of their subordinates. As the number of levels rises, managers must devote more of their time to overseeing and regulating the activities and conduct of their subordinates, adding more work to their own workloads. More management result in more work, which is how the British Navy fared. Parkinson also argued that if organizational hierarchies are not regulated because managers cooperate with one another, his ideas apply to all hierarchies inside organizations. Parkinson's law states that "work expands so as to fill the time available."

The Minimum Chain of Command: The Optimal Number of Hierarchical Levels Managers should base their choice to hire a new management on the discrepancy between the value they brought as the previous manager and the expense they incurred. However, as Parkinson pointed out, a person can have no qualms about using the company's funds to elevate their own position, prestige, and influence. Simple guidelines like "Any new recruitment has to be approved by the CEO" are used by well-managed organisations to control this issue because they force upper-level managers to consider if the need for another lower-level management or another hierarchical level really exists. The minimal chain of command idea is an even broader guideline for creating hierarchies. The minimum chain of command principle states that an organisation should select the fewest number of hierarchical levels that are consistent with its objectives and the environment in which it operates. In other words, an organisation should be kept as flat as possible, and top managers should be judged on their capacity to oversee and manage its operations with the fewest number of managers as possible.

A flat-structured company will also have less issues with cost, motivation, and communication than a tall company. An organisation should only pick a tall structure over a flat structure when it requires a high degree of personal supervision and direct control over subordinates. For example, nuclear power facilities often feature highly high hierarchies so that managers can maintain effective operating oversight at all levels. Managers constantly monitor and double-check the work of managers below them to make sure regulations and SOPs are adhered to precisely and consistently since any mistake might result in a catastrophe. The owner of the reactor was accused of not implementing new rules to build safety barriers to stop such storm surges because such barriers cost billions of dollars, even though stabilising the reactor might take a decade. Such barriers are essential when extraordinary events like the earthquake and tsunami that engulfed Japan's nuclear reactors in 2011 occur. At situations in which tall buildings are the best option because of things like technology and task characteristics. Hierarchical levels in this case should be kept to a minimum to enable organisations to carry out their objectives. Parkinson's law and other organisational issues do not serve the interests of any stakeholder since a new management team will eventually find them and eliminate any surplus managers by removing them from the hierarchy. In the 2000s, this occurred at several businesses including IBM, GE, and Time Warner.

A notable illustration of how to flatten an organisation is EMI, the British record label that started the careers of the Beatles, Rolling Stones, and Garth Brooks. Although EMI was once the most profitable company in the sector, its performance plummeted in the 2000s as a result of being run by a top-heavy team of overpaid executives who were unable to either identify and promote new talent or assist their subor- dinates in developing that ability. Alain Levy, EMI's new CEO, set out to reorganise the company's management structure. He sacked around 2,000 long-tenured executives and split the management structure into three tiers. Then he increased the scope of responsibilities for his existing managers and did away with the previous compensation structure that was centred on signing new hires. From that point forward, EMI managers were given contracts, and their performance incentives were determined by how well the artists they signed up and promoted would do in the future. Managers must maintain high performance to preserve their positions since executives with declining performance are given shorter contracts than managers with a proven track record of achievement [8]–[10].

Period of Control

Too-tall organizations always have significant coordination and communication issues. However, a developing organization has to be able to keep an eye on and manage the actions of new hires. How can a company effectively manage its personnel while avoiding becoming too tall? One strategy is to increase each manager's span of control, or the number of subordinates they directly supervise. If this strategy is successful, the number of managers or hierarchical levels will not rise in direct proportion to increases in the workforce. Instead, each manager oversees the work of more subordinates, and the organisation replaces a growth in hierarchical levels with a rise in the span of control.

Control: Elements Affecting Hierarchy Shape

Organisations must discover other methods of activity control when managers' direct, personal monitoring is not always effective. Organisations often select how to react to the other design problems after increasing the amount of horizontal difference. Remember that for organisational design to be effective, managers must address each of these issues at once.

Horizontal Differing

Specialised divisions or functions occur as a result of horizontal differentiation. The horizontal division of an organisation into five functions. The elements of each of the five primary triangles represent a certain function and carry out similar tasks. The triangles come together to form the pyramid, which represents the whole organisation. There are numerous distinct hierarchies inside a subdivided organisation, not just one. There are various hierarchies for each individual division, function, or department within a function. In situations when an organisation is unable to raise the number of levels in its organisational hierarchy due to the sorts of issues previously covered, horizontal differentiation is the second most important method by which it maintains control over its workforce. Because more component hierarchies are created as horizontal differentiation rises, vertical differentiation also increases within an organisation. But since so many component hierarchies may arise, the organisation can stay flat, avoiding many of the issues associated with towering hierarchies. However, issues with horizontal differentiation, such as divergent subunit orientation development, might cause further issues with motivation and coordination. By making informed decisions about standardisation, centralization, and the impact of the informal organisation, managers can manage these issues.

Centralization

There are more communication and coordination issues as the hierarchy becomes higher and there are more supervisors. Organisational effectiveness declines when managers spend less time planning and defining goals and more time monitoring and overseeing their employees. Decentralising power can help with this issue since less direct administrative oversight is required anymore. When power is distributed across the hierarchy rather than concentrated at the top, individuals are given the ability to make important choices. The burden of monitoring is lessened on top managers thanks to the delegation of power, which also eliminates the necessity for "managers to monitor managers." Breakfast cereal company Quaker Oats took action to decentralise power and flatten its structure as a result of poor performance after seeing that rivals like Kraft and Heinz were advancing with new inventive product concepts while it was being left behind. Robert Morrison, the company's then-CEO, determined that the issue was that corporate managers, who were above the heads of its many food divisions, had the inappropriate degree of power the divisional chiefs of the food departments. So he did something. He started by firing every executive at the top, despite the fact that they were capable managers. He then changed the way reporting relationships were structured to delegate responsibility for the food items under their control to the division heads, who now reported directly to him. He as a consequence decentralised and flattened control inside the company.

In the 2000s, Coca-Cola Enterprises, the soft drink company's bottling division, had a similar issue. Then-CEO Summerfield Johnston made notice of his company's incapacity to swiftly adapt to the shifting demands of the many geographic areas where Coke is bottled. Johnston came to the conclusion that the bottling operations suffered from centralised control. Many regional issues were being handled slowly due to the lengthy chain of command, and administrators at the headquarters often were not aware of the issues that individuals encountered on the front lines. The management hierarchy was redesigned by Johnston. At the corporate office, he let go more than 100 managers and removed a number of rungs on the ladder. The vice presidents in charge of each of the organization's ten regional units were then given operational control, and they were each tasked with streamlining their respective regions' operations and reducing costs. Decentralization does not eliminate the need for numerous hierarchical levels in a big, complex organization. However, since it requires less direct supervision, even a moderately tall building may be more adaptable in how it responds to changes in the surrounding environment.

Standardization

By establishing norms for behaviour that make workers' activities predictable, managers may also exert control over them. Because norms and SOPs take the place of direct supervision and face-to-face interaction, standardisation lowers the need for managers to exert personal control over employees and the requirement to create new levels in the hierarchy. That managers standardise activities by establishing specific work standards as well as by educating staff members about organisational norms and values. Less supervision is needed and a manager's scope of control may be expanded when subordinates' work become more standardised and regulated by rules and norms. For instance, salespeople are often held to account by a mix of written reports that they are obliged to produce after calling on their customers and sales goals that they are expected to meet. Managers may assess salespeople's performance using those two standardised output controls, so they are not required to see them firsthand. Upper-level managers may assign responsibility with greater assurance when their subordinates are following precisely defined processes thanks to standardization. As we've seen, an organization may exert control over its members and their behavior in a variety of methods, from direct personal control by managers in the hierarchy through formal and standard control to informal control via norms and values. Making choices about all the various control systems is necessary while structuring an organization to address control issues. Every organization has a somewhat unique structure since it is a reflection of the specific challenges it must overcome. But there are some broad generalizations that can be made about how businesses design their organizational structures to efficiently manage their workforce and resource allocation. In order to make the organization as flat as feasible and to maintain a proper balance between centralization and decentralization, managers first raise the amount of vertical differentiation. Second, they improve vertical differentiation through improving horizontal differentiation. Third, they determine how much activity may be regulated by rules, SOPs, and norms. The necessity for managers and higher levels of the management hierarchy will diminish the more they can utilise them and the less they will depend on direct supervision from the hierarchy. Because all of these choices must be made concurrently and have an impact on one another, organisational design is challenging. For instance, managers often begin by creating a flat hierarchy and organic structure that relies on conventions and values rather than laws to guide organisational actions. To retain control, they are swiftly obliged to create new levels in the hierarchy and SOPs as the organisation expands. Managers confront a new set of control issues when their organisation adopts a mechanical structure before they even realise it. If an organisation wants to keep its competitive edge, it must manage the continually changing organisational structure.

CONCLUSION

The layout of authority hierarchies has an impact on how well an organisation performs. Clear communication lines, efficient coordination, and prompt decision-making are all fostered by effective authority structures. They encourage adherence to organisational objectives, facilitate effective resource management, and improve the organization's capacity for adapting to changing conditions. On the other hand, poorly planned authority structures may result in organisational inefficiencies, communication breakdowns, and delayed decision-making that reduce performance. Creating authority structures is a fundamental component of organisational design, to sum up. It establishes responsibility, how decision-making authority is allocated, and how organisational performance is affected. The kinds of authority structures that best fit an organization's objectives, setting, and desired degrees of employee empowerment must be carefully considered. Organisations may optimise decision-making procedures, promote accountability, and boost performance by developing efficient authority structures.

REFERENCES:

[1] N. R. Moşteanu, "Challenges for organizational structure and design as a result of digitalization and cybersecurity," *Bus. Manag. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.24052/bmr/v11nu01/art-29.

[2] R. M. Burton and B. Obel, "The science of organizational design: fit between structure and coordination," *J. Organ. Des.*, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s41469-018-0029-2.

[3] D. Nugroho and S. M. F. Azam, "Influence Of Organizational Structure, Work Design And Competency Toward Nurses Performance Satisfaction," *Eur. J. Manag. Mark. Stud.*, 2021, Doi: 10.46827/Ejmms.V6i2.1014.

[4] H. Tohidi and M. M. Jabbari, "CRM in Organizational Structure Design," *Procedia Technol.*, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.protcy.2012.02.126.

[5] P. Olivi, "Organizational structure and design.," *Radiol. Manage.*, 2006, doi: 10.4324/9781315646312-17.

[6] J. Drysdale, "The organizational structures of instructional design teams in higher education: A multiple case study," *Educ. Leadersh.*, 2018.

[7] E. Gurianova and S. Mechtcheriakova, "Design of Organizational Structures of Management According to Strategy of Development of the Enterprises," *Procedia Econ. Financ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/s2212-5671(15)00695-4.

[8] L. E. Bohorquez Arévalo, N. S. Castillo Rodríguez, and M. S. Farfán González, "Design of the organizational structure and coordination of an observatory based on collective intelligence," *Ing. Solidar.*, 2020, doi: 10.16925/2357-6014.2020.01.10.

[9] D. A. M. Idárraga, "Organizational structure and its design parameters: Descriptive analysis in industrial Bogota SMEs," *Estud. Gerenciales*, 2012, doi: 10.1016/S0123-5923(12)70204-8.

[10] L. Shkurti, "Structure, Strategy and Organizational Design in Albanian Context," *Eur. J. Multidiscip. Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.26417/ejms.v1i1.p233-248.

CHAPTER 14

FUNDAMENTALS OF BUREAUCRACY INDESIGNING ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Mr. Ram Srinivas, Assistant Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:ramsrinivas@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

In organisational design, the idea of bureaucracy has received both acclaim for its effectiveness and criticism for its rigidity. The principles of bureaucracy are examined in this abstract along with its main traits, benefits, and drawbacks when constructing organisational structures. It emphasises how crucial it is to comprehend bureaucracy as a tool for accomplishing organisational objectives while also taking into account the need for flexibility and agility in the fast-paced corporate world of today. The hierarchy of power in an organisation should be set up according to the six principles of bureaucratic theory. Bureaucracy provides a number of benefits. It is just and equitable, and through enhancing organisational design, it may increase organisational effectiveness. However, issues may develop if managers permit the organisation to grow too large and centralised and if bureaucratic norms are not observed. To improve organisational effectiveness, managers must be aware of how the informal organisation influences the official hierarchy of power and ensure that the two are compatible. Managers are increasingly utilising IT, forming self-managed work teams of empowered employees, and/or relying on temporary labour in an effort to maintain the flattest organisational structure feasible.

KEYWORDS:

Bureaucracy, Organizational, Responsibilities, Task, Team.

INTRODUCTION

A German sociologist named Max Weber developed guidelines for structuring hierarchies so that they effectively distribute decision-making power and resource control. Weber was interested in finding a system of organisation or organisational structure that could enhance how organisations function, that is, increase the value they produce and make them more effective. People may be held accountable for their acts in a bureaucracy because they are obligated to follow well defined and accepted standards and standard operating procedures. In order to divide task responsibility and decision-making power in a manner that maximises organisational success, Weber's bureaucratic organising principles provide explicit prescriptions on how to design and distinguish organisational structures. It is interesting to look at the six bureaucratic principles that Weber believed underlie an efficient organisational structure because of how influential his work has been in organisational design. These guidelines together describe a bureaucracy or bureaucratic system. The power that a person has as a result of their position within an organisation is known as rational-legal authority. In a bureaucracy, a person's degree of power and responsibility is determined by the organisational position they have, not by any personal traits they may have. Instead, they are held to a higher standard of compliance. Since a police officer occupies the status of police officer, which entails particular authorities, rights, and obligations that compel obedience, we obey them rather than because they are armed and wear an outstanding outfit. A bureaucracy is, in principle, impersonal. The opinions and views of individuals have little bearing on how a bureaucracy functions. Effectiveness diminishes if employees base judgements and directives more on their own preferences than on organisational objectives [1], [2].

According to Weber's first principle, decisions affecting the hierarchy of an organisation should be made based on the needs of the task, not the needs of the person performing the task.28 As a result, subordinates obey the CEO because of the position's authority and power, not because of the person holding it at the time. However, for a bureaucracy to function well, it is important to understand that positions are appointed; they are not owned by the individuals who occupy them. People hold positions in a well-designed hierarchy because they are capable of doing the job, not because of who they are or who they know. Although this rule appears obvious and the rational approach to manage a company, it is often disregarded. For instance, anybody who had the money could purchase an officer's appointment in the British Army up to 1850. The cost of the commission increases with rank. Because of this, the majority of officials were wealthy aristocrats with little to no professional military training, which led to several military mishaps. In many organisations and sectors today, hiring decisions are influenced more by so-called "old-boy networks," or personal connections and relationships, than by the qualifications needed for the position. An organisation may suffer if such criteria are used to fill positions since brilliant individuals may be passed over.

Choosing the best candidate for the position seems like a no-brainer. However, putting this theory into practise is a challenging procedure that calls for managers to assess all possible applicants impartially. People must always keep in mind that, in a legal sense, their duty in the organisation entails using its resources properly for the benefit of all stakeholders, not just themselves. The organisational function is defined by Weber's first two principles as the fundamental part of the bureaucratic system. The following three rules outline how to regulate the differentiation process. According to Weber's third principle, the basis for organisational performance is a distinct pattern of vertical differentiation and horizontal differentiation. People in such jobs are aware of their level of influence over others' behaviour when the boundaries of authority and control for each role within an organisation are clearly defined. Similar to this, when the responsibilities of distinct jobs are made explicit, persons in those functions understand exactly what is expected of them. Therefore, a stable system where each individual has a clear expectation and knowledge of the rights and obligations related to other organisational positions arises with those two parts of a person's function in an organisation well established. In such a stable structure, everyone is aware of the maximum amount that either their superior or their subordinate may ask of them. Additionally, employees are able to interact effectively with others who are on the same level as them within the organisation but under whose control they do not have, and vice versa.

A clear definition of responsibilities helps prevent numerous issues that might occur when individuals interact. People in those jobs can have to compete for the same resources or claim responsibility for the same duties, for instance, if certain task responsibilities are split across many roles. Who should respond to information demands from customers: sales or marketing? Who is in charge of intrusive operations in hostile territory—the commander of the army or the commander of the air force? The military is a sizable bureaucracy where the allocation of duties among the armed services is constantly renegotiated to avoid the emergence of such issues. Role conflict and role ambiguity are reduced when there is a clear pattern of vertical and horizontal differentiation. Role conflict happens when two or more persons have competing ideas about what another person should do, leading to demands that are made on the individual. The individual could be trapped in the middle of a conflict between the demands of two functional groups or two superiors. When a person's responsibilities or authority are unclear, they feel hesitant to take action or accept responsibility. This is known as role ambiguity. Conflict and ambiguity issues are resolved by providing clear explanations of task and authority connections. When individuals are aware of their roles within an organisation, it becomes simpler for them to accept accountability for their actions and to engage with one another.

The organisation should be set up hierarchically so that everyone can understand the chain of command in order to control vertical authority relationships. The organisation should delegate to each person holding a role the authority necessary to make specific decisions and use specific organisational resources. The company may then hold the employee responsible for how those resources were used. A person at a low level in the hierarchy may approach someone at a higher level to resolve issues at the low level, which is also made evident by the hierarchical pattern of vertical differentiation. For instance, in the U.S. legal system, parties to a case may seek a higher court to review a lower court's judgement if they believe it was issued in error. In the event that a subordinate believes that his or her immediate superior has made a poor or unjust choice, the ability to appeal to a higher organisational level also has to be mentioned. Rules and SOPs are formal written directives that outline a set of steps to be done in order to accomplish a certain goal; for instance, if A occurs, then do B. Norms are unspoken guidelines or patterns of conduct that direct people's behaviour and cause them to act in predictable ways. Rules, SOPs, and norms provide behavioural guidelines that may boost productivity since they outline the ideal methods for carrying out certain tasks. These rules ought to evolve over time when better methods of accomplishing things are found. The objective is continuous achievement of organisational objectives.

Rules, SOPs, and norms help individuals understand what to expect from one another and avoid misunderstandings about who is responsible for what and how much authority to use. These rules may stop a manager from unilaterally raising a worker's burden and stop a worker from avoiding duties that are a necessary component of the job. a straightforward set of guidelines created by the janitorial worker's supervisor at Texas A&M University creating clearly defined job duties and objectives. Rules and norms facilitate the coordination and integration of organisational responsibilities between various levels and functions. To achieve organisational objectives, the organisation is divided into diverse functions through vertical and horizontal differentiation.31 Rules and norms are crucial components of integration. They outline how roles interact and provide guidelines that individuals should adhere to while working together to complete a job. Or, an unwritten rule can compel idle servers to assist those that are running behind in servicing consumers.

DISCUSSION

Unfortunately, these actions were too late to salvage the business; nothing destroys a restaurant more than a bad reputation for its cuisine. By word of mouth, customers inform their friends, and the information spreads. The China Coast story serves as an excellent example of a crucial organisational design lesson: Managers must have a structure conceived, developed, and tested before embarking on audacious expansionary efforts. For this reason, before beginning a chain of restaurants or any other type of business, a prototype is created and tested at a typical location. All operational bugs are then fixed, rules and SOPs are created, and everything is then codified in operations manuals before the concept is implemented. Written policies and judgements serve as the organization's official operating manuals. As a result, even when an employee departs a company, the written records of the company still have information about what they performed. A bureaucratic structure gives an organisation memory, and its members are responsible for preparing their replacements and preserving the organisational hierarchy. Additionally, the existence of written documents guarantees that organisational history cannot be changed and that individuals can be held responsible for their choices [3]–[5].

A Benefits of Bureaucracy

The main benefit of a bureaucracy is that it establishes the guidelines for creating an organisational hierarchy that effectively manages interactions between organisational levels. Bureaucracies are present in almost every organisation. There is no ambiguity about each person's position within the organisation due to the explicit definition of vertical authority and horizontal task linkages that bureaucracy provides. People may be held responsible for their actions, and thus decreases the transaction costs that result from having to constantly define and negotiate their organisational positions. Similar to how defining roles and using rules, SOPs, and norms to control how activities are carried out lower the costs of supervising subordinates' work and promote integration within the organisation. Last but not least, documented rules for employee rewards and punishments like those for promotions and termination reduce the expenses associated with enforcing them and assessing employee performance. The separation of the job from the individual is another benefit of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy gives people the chance to develop their skills and pass them on to their successors. The fairness and equity of bureaucratic selection, evaluation, and reward systems encourage organisational members to advance the interests of all organisational stakeholders and meet organisational expectations. In this way, a bureaucracy encourages differentiation, expands an organization's core competencies, and enhances the organization's capacity to compete in the market against other organisations for limited resources. Bureaucracies also give an organization's members the stability they need to take a long-term perspective on the organisation and how it interacts with its surroundings.

One of the issues that develops inside a bureaucracy over time is that managers do not effectively regulate the growth of the organizational hierarchy, as Weber would have it. These organisations thus often grow to be extraordinarily tall, centralised, and rigid. Because managers start doing one other's job, decision-making slows down, the organisation starts to stagnate, and administrative expenses rise. Another issue with bureaucracy is that it leads to individuals of the organisation being too reliant on rules and SOPs when making choices, which renders them unresponsive to the requirements of customers and other stakeholders. Members of the organisation tend to forget that their responsibility is to provide value for stakeholders. Instead, they prioritise adhering to policies and processes as well as deferring to authority in order to safeguard their own positions and interests. When an organisation has these issues, it is often said that it is bureaucratic or managed by bureaucrats. We must be cautious to distinguish between bureaucracy's guiding ideas and those in charge of running bureaucratic organisations anytime we hear this assertion, however. Never forget that bureaucracies are not inherently evil or ineffective. When an organisation becomes overly bureaucratic, it is the managers' fault. These managers should be held accountable because they prioritise their own career protection over that of their organisations, use resources to advance their own interests over those of stakeholders, and pursue power and status over operating efficiency. Management by goals (MBO) is, in fact, a technique that may be used to reduce these issues, but caution must be taken to verify that an MBO system is founded on Weber's principles.

Control by Objectives

Many organisations use management by objectives, a system of evaluating subordinates on their ability to achieve specific organisational goals or performance standards, as well as to meet operating budgets, to provide a framework within which to evaluate subordinates' behaviour and, in particular, to allow managers to monitor progress towards achieving goals. Because setting objectives without checking to see whether they are being met is meaningless, MBO is used in some capacity by the majority of organisations. MBO entails the following three steps:

STEP 1: At each level of the organisation, specific goals and objectives are developed

When senior managers set overarching organisational goals, such as precise financial performance targets, management by objectives may begin. When managers at the divisional and functional levels define their goals to meet corporate objectives, this cascades down to all levels of the organisation. Finally, first-level managers and staff members collaborate to develop goals that will help them reach functional ones [6], [7].

STEP 2: The objectives of the subordinates are decided upon jointly by the manager and the subordinate.

The participative aspect of management by goals is a key feature. Every level of management meets with the subordinate managers who directly report to them, sets realistic objectives for the subordinate, and negotiates the budget the subordinate will need to accomplish these goals. Subordinates' commitment to attaining their objectives and sticking to their budgets may be strengthened by including them in the process of establishing them. Another reason why it is crucial for subordinates to be involved in goal setting is so they may communicate with supervisors about what they believe they can accomplish.

STEP 3: Managers and their staff members examine the subordinates' accomplishments on a regular basis.

Managers are responsible for achieving the goals they have set for themselves after they have been agreed upon at each level of management. They often meet with their subordinates to discuss their progress. Goal-setting is often associated with income increases and job promotions, and managers who meet their objectives are typically rewarded more generously than those who don't. Management by goals operates slightly differently in organisations when teams, especially cross-functional teams, are given decentralised responsibility for the creation of products and services. Every team is asked by their managers to create a set of performance targets and goals that align with the organisational objectives. Then, managers bargain with each team to determine its ultimate objectives and the financial resources required to achieve those objectives. The incentive scheme is based on team performance, not that of any one team member. The largest producer of power supply for computers and other electronic equipment, Zytec Corporation, is one business that has invested significant effort in creating a formal MBO system. Every management and employee at Zytectakes part in creating goals.

To build a five-year strategy for the company and to outline general objectives for each function, top managers first organise cross-functional teams. Then, staff from various divisions of the organisation examine this strategy. They assess the plan's viability and provide recommendations for revisions or enhancements. The broad objectives in the plan are then used by each department to create more detailed goals for each manager and team inside the organisation; these goals are then discussed with senior management. At Zytec, the MBO system is completely participative throughout the whole organisation, and performance is assessed over both an annual and a five-year time horizon. The MBO system from Zytec has been highly successful. The firm not only saw a dramatic reduction in organizational expenses, but it also received the Baldrige Award for quality.

The Impact of Informally Organised Groups

The management-designed hierarchy of authority, which assigns personnel and resources to organisational tasks and functions, serves as a guide for how things should operate. However, decision-making and coordination regularly occur outside of the nominally intended channels at all levels of the organisation when employees engage professionally on the job. Furthermore, rather than being formally created by managers, many of the conventions and regulations that workers follow while doing their jobs come through informal interactions between individuals. Managers therefore create an informal social structure that may have unforeseen effects on behaviour in addition to the formal framework of connected jobs. The new management team completely altered the informal organisation that had been dictating the way employees believed they should behave by reinstalling the plant's official structure of power. The rules that had kept the factory operating efficiently were shattered by the alterations. But because of the strikes, the informal organisation had to be changed, which led to poorer output. The informal rules that keep the organisation running smoothly are often disrupted when the official structure is changed. Managers must leverage the informal organization's strength to further organisational objectives since an organisation is both a hierarchy of formal task and authority ties and a network of informal social relationships.

In organisations, people go to great efforts to elevate their status and prestige, and they constantly want others to be aware of and acknowledge their rank. Every organisation has a well-established informal structure that is familiar to all workers but does not show on any official charts. An organization's informal structure is often used to accomplish tasks in ways that are hidden from view by the organisational chart. When modifying the methods they lead and coordinate their teams, managers must carefully analyse the effects of the interplay between the formal and informal hierarchies. Organisational effectiveness may really be improved by informal organisation. According to new theories of organisational design, managers must harness the power of the informal organisation to boost employee engagement and provide them access to informal channels for enhancing organisational performance. Although the formal hierarchical structure serves as the primary means of control, managers should also utilise the informal structure to help employees come up with solutions to their issues.

IT, Team Self-Management, and Empowerment

The usage of empowered employees, self-managed teams, cross-functional teams, and contingent or temporary labour is a significant trend that is rising as a consequence of IT advancements. IT is making it much simpler for managers to create a cost-effective structure and control system that provides them with much better and more detailed information on the activities of their subordinates, evaluates functional performance, and allows them to take necessary action to better accomplish organisational objectives. IT is a key tool for behaviour management because it offers a mechanism to standardise behaviour via the use of a dependable, often cross-functional software platform. It is simpler to track target progress when all staff members or functions utilise the same software platform to offer up-to-date information on their actions. This codifies and standardises organisational knowledge. IT gives workers at all levels of the organisation access to more information and knowledge that they need to efficiently carry out their responsibilities. workers, for instance, may quickly get information from other workers using cross-functional software systems that tell them of changes that will affect their operations in product design, engineering, manufacturing schedules, and marketing plans. In this manner, IT supports and overlays the hierarchy of duties and responsibilities that is often referred to as the "real" organisational structure [8]–[10].

As a result, organisations are using teams more often and decentralising power as a result of the growing usage of IT. As was previously said, organizations grow flatter as a result of delegating responsibility to lower-level workers and grouping them into teams, which minimises the need for managers to provide direct, one-on-one supervision. Giving workers at various echelons of an organization's structure the power to make crucial choices and take accountability for their results is the process of empowerment. Self-managed teams are formal work groups made up of individuals who share leadership responsibilities and are given the freedom to make decisions on their own. Cross-functional teams are formal work groups comprising personnel from several departments within an organisation who are given the authority to lead and plan the value-creation activities required to finish various programmes or projects.

According to several reports in the popular press, the drive to flatten organizations by empowering people in this manner has grown gradually since the 1990s and has had remarkable success. Although some observers have predicted the "end of hierarchy" and the rise of new organisational structures based solely on horizontal interactions both inside and across functions, other commentators are not as certain in their predictions. They contend that in order for an organisation to have enough control over its operations, it is necessary for it to maintain a hierarchy, a minimum set of rules, and standard operating procedures (SOPs) even in a flat, team-based structure with empowered employees. The challenge for managers is to blend the finest elements of both systems—of bureaucratic structure and empowered work groups—because organisations only forgo the benefits of bureaucratic structure at their risk. In essence, this means that managers must ensure they have the proper ratio of mechanical and organic structure to handle any unforeseen circumstances. By empowering individuals and making teams the primary method of raising the amount of integration within an organisation, managers should apply bureaucratic principles to create a mechanical framework and improve the organization's capacity to operate organically.

The practise of hiring contingent labour to save operational expenses has been growing as organisations have flattened their organisational structures. employees who are hired by an organisation on a temporary basis and do not get any indirect benefits, such as health insurance or pensions, are referred to as contingent employees. Contingent employees may execute a functional duty for an organisation on a day-to-day, weekly, or monthly basis, or they may enter into a contract with the company in exchange for payment to provide a certain service. at instance, a company may hire 10 temporary accountants to "do the books" when the time comes, or it can hire a software developer to create some specialised software at a certain price. An organisation may gain from contingent employees since they are easier to fire when their services are no longer required and are less expensive to hire because they don't get any indirect benefits. However, using contingent employees has significant drawbacks as well. Due to the lack of a chance for advancement or job stability, temporary employees may be less motivated to perform at a high level, which might lead to coordination and motivation issues. In order to achieve a competitive edge, organisations must establish core competencies in their roles, and it is doubtful that contingent employees would assist them in doing so because they do not commit to the organisation and do not stay with it for very long. Nevertheless, managers are attempting to discover new methods to cut administrative expenses, and it has been estimated that 20% of the U.S. workforce today is made up of contingent labour. In fact, managers are already using network architectures and outsourcing.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, building organisational structures that strike a balance between efficiency, control, and flexibility requires a grasp of the principles of bureaucracy. Despite its benefits for clarity, coordination, and control, bureaucratic structures may also be a barrier to innovation and responsiveness. When introducing bureaucratic features into their structure, organisations should carefully assess their unique aims, the context of their business, and the need for flexibility. Organisations may build structures that support their goals and enhance performance in the complex business environment by striking the correct balance.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Almashat and S. Thabet, "State survival bureaucracy (SSB): state sustainability after Arab revolutions," *Rev. Econ. Polit. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/REPS-09-2018-0001.

[2] F. Martela, "What makes self-managing organizations novel? Comparing how Weberian bureaucracy, Mintzberg's adhocracy, and self-organizing solve six fundamental problems of organizing," *J. Organ. Des.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s41469-019-0062-9.

[3] W. G. Ouchi, "Conceptual Framework For The Design Of Organizational Control Mechanisms," *Manage. Sci.*, 1979, doi: 10.1287/mnsc.25.9.833.

[4] G. J. Ikenberry, M. Barnett, and M. Finnemore, "Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics," *Foreign Aff.*, 2004, doi: 10.2307/20034152.

[5] S. Sheets, "A Moral Bureaucracy: Enforcement of EU Fundamental Values in Central and Eastern Europe," *Claremont-UC Undergrad. Res. Conf. Eur. Union*, 2019, doi: 10.5642/urceu.201901.07.

[6] M. Fatemi and M. R. Behmanesh, "New Public Management Approach and Accountability," *Int. J. Manag. Econ. Soc. Sci.*, 2012.

[7] C. Jaye, L. Richard, C. Amos, and G. Noller, "Managing Sick Leave in the University: Bureaucracy and Discretion," *Humanist. Manag. J.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s41463-020-00094-7.

[8] B. Bozeman, "Causes, Effects and Effectiveness of Bureaucratization in Nations' Public Administration: Developing Reforms Sensitive to Unique Political Cultures," *Rev. DEL CLAD REFORMA Y Democr.*, 2015.

[9] T. Muriany and V. S. Ruhunlela, "Reformasi Birokrasi Lokal Berbasis Kepulauan di Kecamatan Tanimbar Selatan Ditinjau dari Dimensi Manajemen Tata Kelola Pemerintahan," *KAMBOTI J. Sos. dan Hum.*, 2021, doi: 10.51135/kambotivol1iss2pp193-203.

[10] O. S. Hamzah and L. Tamba, "Determinants of implementation of bureaucracy behavior in health service in community health center," *Indian J. Public Heal. Res. Dev.*, 2018, doi: 10.5958/0976-5506.2018.00225.5.

CHAPTER 15

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE & DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Srinivasan Palamalai, Associate Professor
Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University, Bangalore, India
Email Id:srinivasanp@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Organisational growth and change are essential processes that help organisations adapt to changing business conditions, expand, and stay competitive. The principles of organisational growth and change, their importance, and the strategies used to support effective transformation within organizations are all explored in this abstract. In order to increase organisational performance and promote positive change, a variety of planned interventions are included in organisational development. It entails identifying organisational problems, creating interventions, putting new ideas into practise, and assessing the results. Enhancing many elements, such as organisational culture, leadership development, employee engagement, collaboration, and communication, is the goal of organisational development. Contrarily, change describes the process of moving from the present condition to a desired future one. Various circumstances, including as technical developments, market changes, competitive pressures, or internal issues, might lead to change efforts. Stakeholder participation, careful planning, good communication, and the development of a supportive organisational culture are all necessary for successful transformation. Organisations use a variety of strategies to promote organisational growth and transformation. Structure adjustments, process reform, training and development initiatives, team-building exercises, and communication techniques are a few examples of these methods. Additionally, organisations may use approaches like Kotter's eight-step process or Lewin's three-stage model (unfreeze, change, refreeze) to direct their change initiatives.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Knowledge, Organization, Social, Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Both a professional area of social activity and a discipline of study is organization development. The activities that make up organization development practise span a broad range and have what seems like unlimited variety. Examples of organization development include team development with senior corporate management, structural reform in a municipality, and job enhancement in a manufacturing company. Similar to this, the study of organization development covers a wide variety of issues, such as the results of change, organizational change strategies, and the variables affecting organization development success. There are several organization development definitions. The emphasis varies significantly between each definition. Burke's description, for instance, emphasises culture as the change's purpose, French's definition emphasises on organization development's long-term objectives and the employment of consultants, while Beckhard's and Beer's definitions speak to the organization development process. Burke and Bradford's definition, which is more modern, broadens the scope and interests of organization development. According to Worley and Feyerherm, a process cannot be referred to as organizational development unless it focuses on or changes a particular aspect of the organizational system, involves learning or the transfer of knowledge or skills to the organization, and either shows improvement in the organization's effectiveness or has the intention to do so. The definition used in this book, which takes into account the majority of these viewpoints, is as follows: Organisation development is the systematic application and transfer of behavioural science knowledge to the planned development, enhancement, and reinforcement of the strategies, structures, and procedures that contribute to organizational effectiveness. This definition places emphasis on a number of characteristics that set organization development apart from other methods for bringing about organizational change and development, including management consulting, project management, and operations management [1]–[3].

First, organization development pertains to adjustments made to a whole system, such as a company, a single plant in a multiplant company, a department or work group, or a specific function or job. For instance, a change programme focused at changing an organization's strategy can concentrate on the organization's interactions with its external environment and how to strengthen those ties. To complement the changes in approach, it could include modifications to how individuals are organised into task-specific groups as well as communication and problem-solving techniques. Similar to this, an organizational development (organization development) programme aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of a top-management team would concentrate on group dynamics and task coordination. This approach might lead to senior management having a better understanding of how to address structural and strategic issues inside the organization. This contrasts with methods that concentrate on only one or a small number of system components, such quality assurance or technical innovation. These methods focus on the development of production or service delivery functions, or the enhancement of certain goods or processes.

Second, organization development is built on the application and transmission of behavioural scientific knowledge and practise, encompassing macroapproaches like strategy, organization design, and culture change, as well as microconcepts like leadership, group dynamics, and job design. These topics set organization development apart from other applications that focus on the economic, financial, and technical elements of organizations, such as management consulting, technological innovation, or operations management. These methods often disregard a system's social and human features. Furthermore, organization development stands out due to its intention to transmit behavioural science expertise so that the organizational structure is better equipped to implement planned change in the future.

Third, managing planned change is a problem for organization development, but not in the formal sense that is generally associated with management consulting or project management, which typically include programmatic and expert-driven approaches to change. organization development is more of an adaptive planning and change-implementation process than it is a set of instructions. It requires preparation to identify and address organizational issues, but these plans are adaptable and often updated as more data is acquired as the change process moves forward. A reorganization process can start with plans to evaluate the existing connections between the worldwide divisions and the corporate headquarters and, if required, redesign them. This is the case, for instance, if there were concerns about the performance of a group of overseas subsidiaries. If the evaluation revealed that the majority of the senior management teams in the subsidiaries had not received sufficient cross-cultural training before to their overseas assignments, these plans would be amended.

The fourth aspect of organization development is the planning, execution, and subsequent reinforcement of change. The focus shifts from the short-term worry of ensuring that the new activities continue inside the organization to a longer-term concern. Implementing self-managed work teams, for instance, may concentrate on how managers can offer employees greater say in how work is done. After employees gained greater power, focus would go to making sure that managers remained free to do so. As part of that assurance, rewards for participatory management practises may be given to managers. This emphasis on reinforcement is comparable to training and development strategies that deal with maintaining new abilities or behaviours, but it varies from other change perspectives that do not take sustainability of a change into account [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

Organization development is also focused on enhancing organizational performance. The greatest way to assess effectiveness is along three dimensions. First, organization development asserts that a successful organization is capable of resolving its own issues and advancing continuously. By including them in the change process, organization development aids organization members in acquiring the abilities and knowledge required to carry out these tasks. The second characteristic of an efficient organization is strong financial and technical performance, which includes sales growth, tolerable profits, high productivity, and quality goods and services. organization development assists organizations in achieving these goals by using social scientific methodologies to reduce costs, enhance goods and services, and boost productivity. A successful business also has satisfied and devoted clients or other external stakeholders in addition to an engaged, content, and learning workforce. The requirements of external parties that provide the organization resources and legitimacy, including as stockholders, consumers, suppliers, and governmental organizations, are met by the organization's performance. Additionally, it has the power to draw in and inspire talented people, who go on to exhibit better levels of performance. The emphasis of other organizational transformation processes obviously diverges from that of organization development. For instance, management consulting mostly focuses on financial performance, while operations management or industrial engineering mostly addresses productivity.

Organizational change and change management are distinct from organizational development. The successful implementation of planned change is a topic covered by both organization development and change management. Both of them are interested in the order of events, the procedures, and the leadership that result in organizational advances. Their fundamental value orientation, however, varies. In addition to performance and competitive advantage, the behavioural scientific underpinning of organization development promotes values of human potential, involvement, and development. Because organization development is concerned with the transfer of knowledge and skill so that the organization is better equipped to handle change in the future, this is what sets it apart from change management, which concentrates more narrowly on the values of cost, quality, and schedule. Transfer of these abilities is not always necessary for change management. In essence, all organizational development (organization development) entails change management, but not always. Similar to organization development, organizational transformation is a more expansive notion. Organisation development may be used to manage organizational change, as was before mentioned.

However, its main focus is on managing change so that knowledge and skills are transferred to increase the organization's capacity to accomplish objectives and address issues. The organization is meant to be changed in a certain way, towards better problem-solving, responsiveness, and effectiveness. Contrarily, organizational change has a broader emphasis and may refer to any kind of change, including managerial and technological advances, the collapse of an organization, or the development of a system through time. These adjustments may or may not be made with the intention of developing the organization in the way that organization development suggests. The behavioural sciences have produced practical theories and techniques that may help businesses adapt to shifting conditions, aggressive rival tactics, technological innovation, globalisation, or restructuring. They support administrators and supervisors in controlling the transition process. This book describes many of these ideas and methods, especially as they relate to managing change.

The Development of Organizational Development and Its Relevance

We have argued in each of the past versions of this book that organizations need to evolve to keep up with the complex and unpredictable developments in technology, the economy, politics, and culture. Additionally, we made the argument that organization development might support an organization in developing powerful reactions to these changes and, in many instances, actively influencing the strategic course of the company. Our ideas are supported by the recent years' quickly shifting circumstances, which emphasize their applicability. Numerous analysts claim that businesses are experiencing unprecedented levels of instability and turmoil, and that only a management revolution can rescue them. Globalization, information technology, and management innovation are the three main factors influencing change in organizations. First, as the globe becomes smaller and more linked on an economic, social, and ecological level, it is also transforming the markets and settings in which organizations operate. The economic interconnectedness of countries and organizations has grown as a result of significant cross-border flows of products and services, technology, people, and money.

Globalization makes it possible for businesses to access new markets, sources of innovation, and capital, but it also increases the chance that economic issues in one area of the globe might quickly spread to others. The fiscal crisis that the United States experienced in 2007–2008 swiftly turned into a "global recession" that hurt the economy of countries across practically all continents and plunged the European Economic Union into financial ruin. Global markets have also become more unpredictable, complicated, and contentious as a result of societal divisions along cultural, political, and religious lines. The effects of ongoing tensions in the Middle East have affected businesses all across the world, increasing their vulnerability to terrorist attacks, deepening diplomatic and military confrontations, and interrupting energy supplies. Organisations' access to natural resources is increased by globalisation, but the world is also more vulnerable to exploitation by businesses with dubious environmental policies and governments with lax environmental legislation. Globalization's ecological effects are being understated in the expanding worldwide discussions about climate change and requests for more ethical and sustainable organizational practices [7]–[9].

Second, information technology is altering how work is done, how knowledge is used, and how the cost of doing business is determined. How an organization gathers, stores, manipulates, uses, and transmits information can reduce costs and raise the value and quality of goods and services. The foundation of developing e-commerce strategies and organizations is information technology. The collapse of the dot-com boom left some companies like Amazon.com and eBay standing, while Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter are revolutionising how we communicate and connect with one another on both a personal and professional level. Microsoft's primary rival Google has arisen, and double-digit growth rates are predicted for the amount of commerce done online. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that the fundamental pace of innovation would decrease. A few years ago, cloud computing was a cutting-edge technical application. Today, it is a common commercial practise. The way that information and education are delivered is changing as a result of digital publication and online courses. The ability to transport information quickly and cheaply inside and across organizations has accelerated corporate downsizing, delayering, and restructuring. The Internet has made it possible for new types of work to be done, like virtual teams and telecommuting. It has also made it possible for many businesses to outsource customer care tasks to international locations where labour costs are comparatively low. Lastly, information technology is altering how businesses produce and use knowledge. To find underlying trends and patterns that might guide strategic decision-making, enormous data collections, or "big data," are being analysed. Information is also frequently disseminated throughout the company. Since workers now have access to the same crucial information that senior managers historically used to guide decision-making, this lessens the concentration of power at the top of the organization.

Third, management innovation has amplified the effects of globalisation and information technology on organizations by responding to these developments. Organisations now have new approaches to consider how to produce things and offer services thanks to new organizational forms including networks, strategic alliances, and virtual businesses. For instance, the strategic partnership has become one of the essential elements in strategy implementation. There is no one company that can manage the environmental and commercial unpredictability it confronts, not even IBM, Toyota, or General Electric. Additionally, new large group interventions, like the search conference and open space, have accelerated organizational change, downsizing and reengineering have drastically reduced the size of organizations and increased their flexibility, and organization learning interventions have utilised knowledge as a crucial organizational resource. All types of organizations, including those in the industrial and service industries as well as those in the public and private sectors, must operate in a highly unpredictable and complicated environment as a result of their interaction. Fortunately, an increasing number of businesses are making the organizational reforms necessary to thrive in the modern world. They are becoming more streamlined, nimble, sensitive to outside pressures, and socially and environmentally sustainable. They're including workers in important choices and paying for results rather than for time. Instead than just reacting to what has already occurred, they are driving innovation and managing change.

Organisational development is crucial in assisting organizations in changing who they are. It aids organizations in self- and environment-assessment, revitalization, and process- and structure-rebuilding. Organisational development (organization development) aids team members in acquiring the abilities and information required to transform and strengthen the organization. It enables participants to alter their basic beliefs and attitudes, going beyond outward changes. More and more government agencies, manufacturing companies, multinational enterprises, service sectors, educational and healthcare institutions, and not-for-profit organizations are adopting the many ideas and methodologies covered. Organization development may have never been more adaptable and realistically applicable to organizations' demands to function well in a very complex and changing environment. For individuals who want to pursue a career in the area, whether as an internal consultant engaged by an organization or as an external consultant working with several organizations, organization development is undoubtedly crucial. Working with managers and workers to enhance organizations and workplaces may be a very satisfying career path in organizational development (organization development). organization development specialists are in high demand in the current climate. For instance, in order to compete, large professional services organizations need to have efficient "change management" procedures. Career opportunities in organization development should keep growing both domestically and internationally.

Even people without any desire to become practicing professional's value organizational growth. The supervision, training, and development of employees, as well as the enhancement of the performance of their departments, are the duties of all managers and administrators. The same is true for all staff professionals, including financial analysts, engineers, accountants, information techs, and market researchers, who must provide managers with advice and guidance as well as introduce new approaches and procedures. Finally, organization development is crucial to general managers and other top executives since it may improve the innovation, adaptability, and efficiency of the whole organization. Managers and staff members may work more productively when their organizations are developed. It may provide people the information and abilities needed to form successful teams and interpersonal connections. It may demonstrate to staff how to collaborate successfully when identifying difficult issues and coming up with workable solutions. It may encourage others to adopt the solutions, which improves the likelihood that they will be put into practise.

An Overview of Organisational History

A quick overview of organization development's history may assist to make sense of the term's development as well as some of the issues and misunderstandings that have surrounding it. The first was the expansion of the National Training Laboratories and the creation of training groups, sometimes referred to as T-groups or sensitivity training. In the second stem of organization development, social scientists who were interested in using research to manage change undertook the standard work on action research. A method known as survey feedback was a key component of action research. T-groups, survey feedback, and action research were all developed in part by Kurt Lewin, a renowned thinker, researcher, and practitioner of group dynamics and social change. His work inspired the development of organization development and continues to be a significant contributor to its theories and practises. A normative perspective of organization development is reflected in the third stem. There is a "one best way" to create and run organizations, according to Blake and Mouton's Grid organization development and Rensis Likert's participatory management framework. The emphasis on productivity and the quality of the working environment constitutes the fourth backdrop. The most recent effect on contemporary practise comes from the fifth stem of organization development, which deals with organizational transformation and strategic change.

Background of Strategic Change

The context of strategic transformation has recently influenced the development of organization development. The scope and complexity of organizational transformation have grown as organizations have become more global and information-intensive and as their surroundings have become complicated and unpredictable. These developments have prompted planned change processes at the organizational and multi organizational levels and created a need for a strategic view on organization development. Enhancing alignment between an organization's design, strategy, and environment is a key component of strategic transformation. Interventions for strategic change aim to enhance the organization's interaction with its surroundings as well as the compatibility of its technological, structural, informational, human resource, and cultural elements. The need for strategic change is often brought on by a significant disruption to the business, such as the removal of regulatory restrictions, the development of new technology, or the hiring of a new CEO from outside the company.

The use of open-systems planning by Richard Beckhard was one of the first examples of strategic transformation. He concentrated on the atmosphere and strategy of an organization. The gap between what the environment required and how the organization reacted might be narrowed and performance could be enhanced based on the organization's primary purpose. Since then, change agents have put forth a range of large-scale or strategic-change models;

each of these theories acknowledges that strategic change is frequently led from the top by strong executives, entails multiple organizational levels and a shift in the organization's culture, and has significant effects on performance. More recently, mergers and acquisitions, corporate alliances, and network growth have all been included into strategic approaches to organizational development. The strategic transformation context has had a big impact on organization development practise. For instance, achieving strategic change necessitates that organization development practitioners have a working knowledge of team building, action research, marketing, finance, and competitive strategy. These abilities have increased organization development's value to organizations and their managers when combined.

Organizational Development Evolution

These five theoretical foundations, together with the trends influencing organizational transformation, have a significant impact on how organization development is being practised. The strong humanistic emphasis that guides organization development practise is clear evidence of the foundations of the discipline, which may be found in laboratory training, action research and survey feedback, normative, and QWL. The relevance and rigour of organization development practise have significantly increased under the more recent impact of the strategic transformation context. They have expanded on organization development's standard metrics of job satisfaction and personal development by include financial and economic markers of performance. The transfer of knowledge and skills to the organization in order to improve its ability to handle change in the future is supported by all of the backgrounds. The preceding trends of globalisation and information technology are now having an increasingly large impact on the area.

Many more nations and organizations that operate internationally are using organization development practices. This is leading to the development of an entirely new set of interventions as well as adjustments to conventional organization development practise. Additionally, organization development is modifying its techniques to accommodate the technology present in organizations. Organizational development (organization development) involves managing change processes both face-to-face and virtually as information technology continues to have an impact on organizations and their surroundings. The number of professional organization development practitioners, the types of organizations working with organization development, the variety of nations where organization development is practised, and the types of interventions used to transform and improve organizations have all grown significantly as a result of the diversity of this developing subject [10], [11].

Numerous organizations have made a range of organization development-related endeavours. Organisations have often been at the forefront of developing new organizational structures, transformation strategies, and methodologies. General Electric, Boeing, Kaiser Permanente, Texas Instruments, American Airlines, DuPont, Intel, Hewlett-Packard, Microsoft, General Foods, Procter & Gamble, IBM, Raytheon, Wells Fargo Bank, the Hartford Financial Services, and Limited Brands are some of the bigger companies that have used organization development. Historically, most of the work was kept private and was deemed confidential. However, organizations are now sharing the lessons learned from their organization development initiatives with the public in greater numbers.

Additionally, organization development work is carried out in communities, schools, and the local, state, and federal governments. There have been several studies of organization development initiatives focused on organization development in public administration. The army, navy, air force, and coast guard all conducted extensive organization development work, however organization development activity and research activities fluctuated in response to changes in the size and reach of the military. Early in the history of organization development, group training and survey feedback were both used in public schools. The programmes often took place in middle-class suburban schools where there were less racial and socioeconomic inequalities between consultants and clients and fewer urban stressors and strains. The use of organization development approaches has recently been expanded to colleges and universities as well as urban schools.

CONCLUSION

In today's fast-paced corporate climate, organisational growth and transformation are continual processes. Businesses that value innovation and continual development are better equipped to respond to shifting consumer expectations and capture new opportunities. Organisations may learn, improve their methods, and maintain the beneficial changes over time by conducting regular assessments, feedback, and evaluations of change efforts. To sum up, organisational growth and change are crucial procedures for businesses looking to prosper in a world that is changing quickly. Organisations may improve their performance, stimulate creativity, and foster a culture that welcomes and adapts to change by embracing these processes and using efficient techniques. Strong leadership, stakeholder involvement, and an encouraging organisational culture that values continuous improvement are necessary for organisational growth and change initiatives to be successful.

REFERENCES:

[1] K. E. Weich and R. E. Quinn, “Organizational change and development,” *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 1999, doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.361.

[2] M. Beer, “Reflections: Towards a Normative and Actionable Theory of Planned Organizational Change and Development,” *J. Chang. Manag.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/14697017.2021.1861699.

[3] D. T. Holt, A. A. Armenakis, H. S. Feild, and S. G. Harris, “Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale,” *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.*, 2007, doi: 10.1177/0021886306295295.

[4] R. Hofmann and J. D. Vermunt, “Professional learning, organisational change and clinical leadership development outcomes,” *Med. Educ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/medu.14343.

[5] W. Judge and T. Douglas, “Organizational change capacity: The systematic development of a scale,” *J. Organ. Chang. Manag.*, 2009, doi: 10.1108/09534810910997041.

[6] A. H. Olafsen, E. R. Nilsen, S. Smedsrud, and D. Kamaric, “Sustainable development through commitment to organizational change: the implications of organizational culture and individual readiness for change,” *J. Work. Learn.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/JWL-05-2020-0093.

[7] K. K. Gabriel, “Organizational Development, Organizational Culture and Organizational Change,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2015, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2686104.

[8] M. McKendall, “The tyranny of change: Organizational Development revisited,” *J. Bus. Ethics*, 1993, doi: 10.1007/BF00871929.

[9] M. A. Bond and S. J. Blevins, "Using Faculty Professional Development to Foster Organizational Change: a Social Learning Framework," *TechTrends*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11528-019-00459-2.

[10] S. Krogh, "Anticipation of organizational change," *J. Organ. Chang. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/JOCM-03-2017-0085.

[11] A. H. Busari, S. N. Khan, S. M. Abdullah, and Y. H. Mughal, "Transformational leadership style, followership, and factors of employees' reactions towards organizational change," *J. Asia Bus. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/JABS-03-2018-0083.

CHAPTER 16

CHARACTERISTICS OF PLANNED CHANGE IN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Malcolm Homavazir, Associate Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS Skill Tech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-Malcolm.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

A key idea in organisational development is planned change, which acts as a methodical strategy to support deliberate and purposeful changes inside organisations. This abstract examines the features of planned change and its importance in organisational growth, as well as the essential components, procedures, and difficulties involved in carrying out initiatives for planned change. A purposeful and organised procedure intended to bring about desired improvements in an organisation is referred to as planned change. It entails determining what needs to change, creating objectives, and putting interventions in place to help you get there. Initiatives for planned change are often based on a comprehensive analysis of the organization's present situation, goals for the future, and external environmental influences. In organisational development, planned change is defined by a number of traits. It is first and foremost proactive as opposed to reactive, enabling organisations to foresee and react to new possibilities and difficulties. Planned change helps organisations to take a proactive approach in defining their future rather of waiting for issues to occur. A feeling of shared responsibility for the intended results is fostered by including stakeholders early on in the change process. Planned change prioritises input and ongoing learning. Organisations collect input and assess the success of interventions along the way since change is seen as an iterative process. This enables the change tactics to be modified and improved, increasing their overall success.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Information, Knowledge, Organization, Transformation.

INTRODUCTION

Change is a constant in organisational life due to the speed of global, economic, and technical growth. Change that affects an organisation, however, may be separated from change that its members have intended. Change will only be used to refer to intentional change in this text. Organisational development aims to implement deliberate change to boost an organization's productivity and adaptability. It is often started and carried out by managers, frequently with the assistance of an outside or internal organisational development practitioner. Organisations may utilise planned change to address issues, learn from past mistakes, reinterpret shared beliefs, adapt to changes in the external environment, boost performance, and have an impact on future changes. Every method of treating OD is predicated on a premise of planned change. The theories outline the many phases that planned change may take in organisations and explain the timing of implementing OD techniques to assist organisation members in managing change. The Lewin's change model, the action research model, and the positive model are the three main theories of organisational change that are described and compared in this chapter. Then, including the prior models and new conceptual developments in OD, we provide a generic model of planned change. After that, we go through several change scenarios and how the change process may alter. We conclude by outlining a number of criticisms about anticipated change [1]–[3].

Planned Change Theories

Concepts of planned change have a tendency to concentrate on the implementation of change in organizations1. Dubbed "theories of changing," these frameworks outline the steps that must be taken to successfully begin and execute organisational change. In this section, Lewin's change model, the action research model, and the positive model are three theories of change that are described and contrasted. These frameworks have drawn a lot of attention in organisational development (OD) and are the cornerstone of a broad paradigm of planned change.

Lewin's Change Model

Kurt Lewin offered one of the early models of intentional change. He defined change as a modulation of the factors that maintain a system's stable behaviour. The factors that push for change and those that work to protect the status quo, respectively, result in a certain set of behaviours at each given time. To modify that condition, one may either enhance the pressures pushing for change, reduce the forces supporting the existing state, or use a mix of both to retain current behaviours in what Lewin called a state of "quasi-stationary equilibrium." For instance, a work group's performance level may remain steady because group norms supporting that level are equal to pressure from the supervisor to move to higher levels. This level may be raised by either modifying the group norms to encourage greater levels of performance or by increasing the pressure placed on employees by their supervisors to perform at higher levels. According to Lewin, reducing the factors that support the status quo results in less tension and resistance than boosting the forces for change, making it a more successful change approach. According to Lewin, this transition process includes the three processes:

1. Unfreezing

This stage often entails lowering the pressures that are keeping the organization's behaviour where it is. Members may be encouraged to participate in change efforts by presenting information that demonstrates disparities between behaviours wanted by organisation members and those behaviours now exhibited. This technique of "psychological disconfirmation" is occasionally used to unfreeze people.

2. Moving

This action elevates the organisation, division, or person's behaviour to a new level. It entails influencing the system by altering organisational structures and procedures in order to promote new behaviours, values, and attitudes.

3. Refreezing

In this stage, the organisation is stabilised at a new equilibrium state. It is typically done by the employment of supportive mechanisms, such as organisational culture, incentives, and structures, that strengthen the new organisational state.

A broad foundation for comprehending organisational transformation is provided by Lewin's model. The three phases of transformation have been explored in great detail since they are rather wide. Lewin's model, for instance, is broken down into seven steps in the planning model created by Lippitt, Watson, and Westley: scouting, entry, diagnosis, planning, action, stabilisation and evaluation, and termination4. Kotter's eight-stage process can also be mapped onto Lewin's phases: establishing a sense of urgency, creating the guiding coalition, developing a vision and strategy, and communicating the change vision; empowering broad-based action, generating short-term results However, Lewin's model continues to be intimately associated with the topic of organisational development and is used to show how different forms of change might be achieved. Lewin's three-step approach, for instance, has been used to describe how information technology might be used more successfully [4]–[6].

Action Research Model

The traditional action research paradigm emphasises planned change as a cyclical process in which preliminary analysis of the organisation yields knowledge that directs further action. The action's outcomes are then evaluated in order to offer new knowledge that will impact future decisions, and so forth. Members of the organisation and OD practitioners collaborate significantly throughout this cyclical cycle of study and action. Prior to action planning and execution, it lays a strong focus on data collecting and diagnosis, as well as meticulous outcomes assessment.

DISCUSSION

Action research is often intended to assist particular organisations in implementing planned change as well as to provide more general information that may be used in other contexts. The cyclical stages of planned change as specified by the original action research model. Although action research was initially designed to have this dual focus on change and knowledge development, it has been modified for OD activities where the main emphasis is on planned change. There are eight key actions.

1. Acknowledging the issue

This stage often starts when an executive inside the organisation or someone with authority recognises that there may be one or more issues that might be resolved by an OD practitioner.

2. A meeting with a behavioural science specialist

The OD practitioner and the client carefully evaluate one another at the first interaction. The practitioner has their own normative, developmental theory or frame of reference and must be aware of those values and presumptions. By discussing these with the client right away, an environment of openness and collaboration is created.

3. Collecting of information and early diagnosis

The OD practitioner typically completes this stage, often in collaboration with group members. To identify the root causes of organisational issues, it entails gathering pertinent information and analysing it. Interviews, process observations, surveys, and organisational performance data are the four fundamental ways to collect data. One method of diagnosis starts with observation, moves on to a semi-structured interview, and ends with a questionnaire to measure precisely the issues revealed by the earlier steps.10 OD practitioners may exert influence over the participants when gathering diagnostic information. Any activity taken by an OD practitioner may be considered an intervention since it will have an impact on the organization in some way.

4. Remarks for a significant customer or group

The diagnostic information is provided to the client as a result of the collaborative nature of action research, often during a group or work-team meeting. Members may identify the advantages and disadvantages of the organisation or unit under investigation by using the information acquired by the OD practitioner in the feedback stage. The consultant gives the customer all pertinent and helpful information. It goes without saying that the practitioner will safeguard secret sources of knowledge and, sometimes, may even withhold information. Determining what is relevant and valuable entails taking ethical and privacy concerns into account as well as making a judgement call on whether the group is ready for the material or whether the client would become unduly defensive if it were provided.

5. Joint evaluation of the issue

Members now consider the input and decide along with the OD practitioner if they wish to work on the issues that have been highlighted. Data collection, feedback, and diagnosis are closely related since the consultant collects the fundamental information from the client members and delivers it to them for confirmation and further diagnosis. As Schein points out, it's crucial to keep in mind that the action research method differs significantly from the doctor-patient paradigm, in which the consultant enters the situation, provides a diagnosis, and then recommends a course of action. He believes that "most companies have drawers full of reports by consultants, each loaded with diagnoses and recommendations which are either not understood or not accepted by the 'patient'." Schein notes that the failure to establish a common frame of reference in the client-consultant relationship may lead to a faulty diagnosis or to a communication gap whereby the client is sometimes "unwilling to believe the diagnosis or accept the prescription."

6. Preparing a joint action

Next, the client members and the OD practitioner decide together on next steps to be done. The organisation is starting to move as it determines the optimum way to arrive at a new quasi-stationary equilibrium. The particular course of action to be done at this point relies on the organization's culture, technology, and environment, the problem's diagnosis, and the intervention's duration and cost.

7. Action

The real transition from one organisational state to another takes place at this point. Rearranging structures and work designs, using new techniques, and encouraging new behaviours are some examples. As the organisation transitions from the current state to the anticipated future state, such activities are often not able to be performed right away.

8. After-action data collection

Since action research is a cyclical process, data must also be collected after the action has been conducted in order to gauge its impact, ascertain its consequences, and report the findings to the organisation. This might then result in a new diagnosis and course of treatment. The majority of modern methods to planned change are based on the action research paradigm, which is sometimes confused with OD. It has recently been improved upon and expanded to new contexts and applications, and as a result, academics and practitioners have made the necessary adjustments to its fundamental structure.

Action research application trends include a shift away from individual organisations and towards larger systems and communities. Action research is more complicated and political in these bigger contexts than it is in smaller ones. As a result, the cycle of action research integrates many change processes and involves a variety of stakeholders with an interest in the organisation. Action research is being used more and more internationally, especially in impoverished countries in the Southern Hemisphere.16 The action research paradigm, nevertheless, has "Northern Hemisphere" assumptions about transformation. For instance, action research generally considers the change process more cooperatively than Latin American and African countries, and it sees change more linearly than Asian cultures. Action research is adapted to match cultural presumptions in order to be successful in these contexts. The most prominent examples of how action research is used to foster social change and innovation are community development and global social change initiatives. These apps, which mainly emphasise values, aim to address disparities in the distribution of power and resources among various groups. In the sometimes tumultuous and contentious process of transformation, action researchers often take on an activist role [7], [8].

Modern action research applications have significantly enhanced the level of member participation in the change process in light of these broad tendencies. The majority of the change activities were carried out by consultants with the cooperation and approval of management in typical methods to planned change. There is an increasing trend to include organisation members in understanding their organisation and how to improve it, even if consultant-dominated change still prevails in OD. This method to planned change, also known as "participatory action research," "action learning," "action science," or "self-design," emphasises the need for organisation members to experience planned change directly if they are to develop the knowledge and abilities necessary to alter the organisation. Some contend that OD must go beyond resolving specific issues to assisting members in developing the competence required to alter and enhance the organisation continuously in the complex and changing environment of today.

The function of OD consultants in this adaptation of action research is to collaborate with participants to speed up the learning process. Neither side dominates the change process; rather, they work together to diagnose the organisation, develop changes, then execute and evaluate them. Instead, each person contributes specific knowledge and experience to the table, and they pool their efforts to discover how to alter the organisation. Consultants, for instance, are skilled in creating diagnostic tools and OD solutions, while employees within an organisation have "local knowledge" about the organisation and how it runs. The process of transformation teaches each participant something. Members of the organisation get knowledge on how to alter, hone, and enhance it. OD consultants get knowledge on how to support challenging organisational learning and change. In the foreseeable future, the action research paradigm will remain the preeminent methodological foundation for deliberate change. However, the fundamental scientific tenets that conventional action research is based on are also changing and are outlined here.

The Beneficial Model

Lewin's model and the action research procedure are significantly modified by the third model of change, the positive model. These models are largely deficit-based and concentrate on the issues facing the organisation and how to address them for improved performance. The organization's strengths are highlighted in the positive model. It enables members to recognise when their organisation is functioning at its peak and builds on those strengths to produce even greater outcomes. This optimistic approach to change is consistent with a developing field of study in the social sciences called "positive organisational scholar- ship," which focuses on organisational positive dynamics that produce extraordinary results. Considerable research on expectation effects also supports this model of planned change. It demonstrates that people frequently act in ways that bring about their expectations. Positive expectations for the organisation might thus produce an anticipation that animates and guides behaviour towards bringing about those beliefs. As a "reformist and rebellious" form of social constructionism, appreciative inquiry explicitly incorporates a positive value orientation into analysing and changing organizations. Social constructionism presupposes that organisation members' shared experiences and interactions affect how they perceive the organisation and behave in it. Because such shared meaning can determine how individuals behave in the organisation, appreciative inquiry has been used to analyse and change a variety of organisations. It encourages widespread member participation in forging a consensus on the organization's good potential. This mutual admiration offers a strong and inspiring vision of what the organisation may be.

The constructive model of planned change includes five stages, which are:

Start the investigation: The topic of change is decided at this first stage. It places a strong emphasis on member engagement to determine which organisational problem they are most motivated to fix. Members might choose to seek for examples of consumer satisfaction, successful male-female cooperation, notably effective work teams, or product development procedures that expedited the introduction of new ideas to market. The transformation process itself will exhibit these beneficial characteristics if the aim of the investigation is genuine and important to organisation members.

Ask about the best practises: Information on the "best of what is" inside the organisation is gathered at this stage. Members contribute to the creation of an interview procedure that gathers tales of novel concepts that were created and put into practise inside the organisation if the theme is organisational innovation. Members of the organisation interview one another and share experiences of invention in which they have directly participated. These accounts are used to generate a body of knowledge that portrays the company as an inventive system.

Learn the topics: In the third stage, participants look at all the tales, big and little, to find a collection of themes that reflect the universal aspects of people's lives. Stories of innovation may, for instance, include topics such as how leaders encouraged employees to test out novel concepts, how colleagues offered support, or how exposure to clients stimulated original thought. No subject is too little to be portrayed, and it's crucial to detail all of the underlying processes that gave rise to and supported each theme. The themes serve as the foundation for changing the focus from "what is" to "what could be."

Imagine the ideal future: Members then consider the themes that have been found, challenge the present, and paint a compelling picture of the future. The group envisions the organization's future based on its previous achievements and creates "possibility propositions"—statements that connect the organization's present best practises with ideal scenarios for potential future organising. These ideas ought to provide a very intriguing, thought-provoking, and plausible image of the future. Members identify the relevant stakeholders and crucial organisational processes that must be in alignment to facilitate the formation of the desired future based on these possibilities. The vision turns into an assertion of "what should be."

Create and deliver strategies for the future: The creation and delivery of strategies for shaping the future are part of the final phase. It outlines the tasks and makes the plans required to carry out the vision. It then moves on to stages of action and evaluation similar to those of the action research that was previously outlined. The process is continued by revisiting the talks about the best of what is as members make changes, evaluate the outcomes, make required modifications, and so on as they progress the organisation towards the vision and maintain "what will be."

Models of Change Comparisons

The stages of planned change in organisations are described by all three models—Lewin's change model, action research model, and positive model. The models overlap in that they place a strong focus on taking action to execute organisational change, which is preceded by a preparation stage and is followed by a closure stage, as illustrated in Figure 2.1. All three strategies also place a strong emphasis on applying behavioural science knowledge, vary the extent to which organisation members participate in the change process, and acknowledge that any contact between an OD practitioner and an organisation constitutes an intervention that could have an impact on that organisation. Lewin's change model, in contrast to the other two, emphasises the whole process of planned change as opposed to particular OD actions. In terms of the degree of participation of the participants and the area of change, Lewin's model and the action research model diverge from the positive approach. Both the Lewin's model and conventional action research place a strong emphasis on the practitioner's participation in the change process. On the other hand, modern implementations of the positive model and action research approach both OD consultants and participants as co-learners who play a significant role in intended change. Lewin's model and action research are also more interested in solving issues than in concentrating on and using the organization's strengths [9]–[11].

Generalised Model of Change

A broad framework for planned change is suggested by the three types of planned change. The framework outlines the four fundamental tasks that practitioners and organisation members collaborate on to establish an organisation. The model's arrows that link the various tasks depict the normal flow of events, from entering and contracting through diagnosing, planning and executing change, assessing the change, and institutionalising it. The dotted lines between the activities highlight how organisational transformation is not a simple, linear process but instead contains significant overlap and feedback across the activities.

Contracting and Entering

The initial set of planned change actions focuses on entering and contracting. These situations aid managers in determining if they want to continue participating in a planned change programme and allocating resources to it. In order to comprehend the issues the organisation is experiencing or to identify promising topics for investigation, basic data must be gathered before entering the organisation. After this data has been gathered, managers and other organisation members debate the issues or possibilities to create a contract or agreement to implement intended change. The contract outlines upcoming change initiatives, the resources that will be allocated to the project, and the involvement of OD practitioners and organisation members. Many times, disagreements regarding the need of change emerge, resource constraints are faced, or alternative approaches for change seem more realistic, preventing organisations from moving beyond this first stage of planned change. The entering and contracting process must be attentive to the environment in which the change is occurring when OD is utilised in unconventional and multinational contexts.

Diagnosing

The client system is extensively examined throughout this phase of proposed change. The diagnosis may concentrate on comprehending organisational issues, including their sources and effects, or on gathering examples of the organization's strengths. One of the most crucial processes in OD is the diagnostic procedure. It involves selecting the best model for comprehending the organisation, as well as collecting, examining, and relaying information to managers and other organisation members about any issues or chances. Diagnostic methods for issue analysis look at three levels of activity. The most advanced level of study involves system-wide concerns with organisation. The effectiveness of departments and groups is related to group-level concerns. Concerns at the individual level relate to the planning and execution of employment. The main change actions in diagnosis are data gathering, analysis, and feedback. The methods for gathering data are discussed and include observations, surveys, interviews, and the use of archive materials like organisational charts and meeting minutes. It discusses the evaluation and analysis of data. Organisational members debate the data and its implications for change with one another, often in conjunction with an OD practitioner.

CONCLUSION

There are difficulties in putting planned change efforts into action. People sometimes struggle with resistance to change because they may feel frightened or uneasy by its uncertainties. To overcome opposition and win support, effective communication, engagement, and resolving concerns are essential. Managing the complexity of organisational structures and dynamics is another difficulty. Change projects can have an influence on several organisational dimensions, necessitating thorough coordination to achieve integration and reduce unexpected consequences.

The ability to produce deliberate and purposeful changes via planned change is an important part of organisational growth. Organisations can predict and influence their future because to its proactive and methodical approach, which involves stakeholders and emphasises continual learning. Organisations may successfully execute change initiatives, improve their performance, and adapt to changing circumstances by recognising the features of planned change and successfully navigating its hurdles.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Beer, "Reflections: Towards a Normative and Actionable Theory of Planned Organizational Change and Development," *J. Chang. Manag.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/14697017.2021.1861699.

[2] F. Lunenburg, "Organizational development: Implementing planned change," *Int. J. Manag. Bus. …*, 2010.

[3] G. G. Cummings, J. A. Spiers, J. Sharlow, P. Germann, O. Yurtseven, and A. Bhatti, "Worklife Improvement and Leadership Development study: A learning experience in leadership development and 'planned' organizational change," *Health Care Manage. Rev.*, 2013, doi: 10.1097/HMR.0b013e31824589a9.

[4] R. E. Schwering, "Focusing leadership through force field analysis: new variations on a venerable planning tool," *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.*, 2003, doi: 10.1108/01437730310498587.

[5] F. Pettersson, "Understanding digitalization and educational change in school by means of activity theory and the levels of learning concept," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10639-020-10239-8.

[6] M. McKendall, "The tyranny of change: Organizational Development revisited," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 1993, doi: 10.1007/BF00871929.

[7] R. R. V. Tenkasi and L. Zhang, "A test of the theory of planned behavior: Influencing behavioral change to go 'Green,'" *Res. Organ. Chang. Dev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/S0897-301620180000026004.

[8] D. a Elam and K. Brands, "Planned Change in a Chinese Company: A Participatory Action Research Approach.," *J. Manag. Policy Pract.*, 2013.

[9] N. A. M. Worren, K. Ruddle, and K. Moore, "From organizational development to change management: The emergence of a new profession," *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.*, 1999, doi: 10.1177/0021886399353002.

[10] O. Sheehan Pundyke, "Change management in higher education: an introductory literature review," *Perspect. Policy Pract. High. Educ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/13603108.2020.1809545.

[11] D. Przywara and A. Rak, "Monitoring of time and cost variances of schedule using simple earned value method indicators," *Appl. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/app11041357.

CHAPTER 17

PLANNING AND PUTTING CHANGE INTO ACTION IN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Malcolm Homavazir, Associate Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-Malcolm.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Planning and implementing change are crucial stages in the organisational development process because they help organisations turn their strategic goals into observable results. This abstract examines the importance of planning and execution in organisational change, as well as the major factors, tactics, and difficulties associated with successfully carrying out change projects. A key component of organisational growth is planning, which lays the groundwork for implementing changes successfully. It entails establishing the change goals, doing a thorough study of the present situation, determining the ideal future situation, and creating a complete strategy to close the gap between the three. Planning makes ensuring that change efforts are in line with the overall objectives, resources, and capacities of the organisation. After the planning stage is over, attention turns to implementing change. In order to achieve this, planned change activities must be carried out, and the transition from the present condition to the desired future state must be managed. Effective leadership, stakeholder involvement, and a well-organized change management strategy are necessary for successful implementation. The execution of change projects may be improved by a number of ways. This involves using good communication to make sure that everyone involved is aware of the change, its goal, and the anticipated advantages. Employee involvement and engagement in the change process increases ownership, commitment, and lowers resistance. For a successful transition, it's also essential to provide staff the right tools, training, and support throughout the implementation period.

KEYWORDS:

Cultural, Leadership, Organization, Planning, Transformation.

INTRODUCTION

Members of the organization and practitioners work together to design and carry out OD interventions at this level. They create action plans to carry out the interventions they devise to accomplish the organization's vision or objectives. The organization's preparedness for change, its present change capacity, its culture and power structures, and the skills and talents of the change agent are some of the factors for creating interventions. There are four main categories of interventions in OD, depending on the results of the diagnosis:

1. Interventions in human processes at the individual, social, and systemic levels.
2. Modifications to a company's technology and organizational structure.
3. Interventions in human resources aimed at enhancing member performance and wellbeing.
4. Manage the organization's connection to its external environment and the internal processes required to support a business plan via strategic interventions.

Specialized knowledge for OD in organizations attempting to bring about global social change and those looking for long-term effects. The unique uses of OD in unconventional organisations including schools, hospitals, family-owned enterprises, and the public sector. Leading and managing the change process are important aspects of putting interventions into practise. Creating a desired future vision for the organisation, garnering political support, managing the transition towards the goal, and maintaining momentum for change are all part of it [1]–[3].

Evaluation and Change Institutionalisation

The evaluation of the intervention's outcomes and the institutionalisation of effective change programmes are two key components of planned change management. Members of the organisation get feedback about the effectiveness of the intervention, which helps determine if the changes should be maintained, changed, or put on hold. Successful improvements must be institutionalised by being reinforced via training, prizes, and feedback. the start of a deliberate transformation process inside a government institution. It goes into great depth, notably, on how to include people in the planning and implementation stages of change.

Various Forms of Change That Are Planned

The basic model of planned change explains how the organisational design process normally progresses. The various stages are not nearly as well-organized in real practice as the model suggests. The phases are often modified or adjusted by OD practitioners to suit the circumstances. Depending on the demands and objectives of the client, the abilities and principles of the change agent, and the context of the organization, several steps in planned change may be undertaken. As a result, planned change might vary greatly depending on the circumstance. Planned change may be compared across situations on three crucial aspects, including the size of organizational change, the degree of client system organisation, and whether the environment is local or foreign, to better comprehend the variations.

Size of the Change

Planned change initiatives can be categorised as falling along a continuum ranging from incremental changes, which involve fine-tuning the organisation, to fundamental changes, which require fundamentally altering how it operates. Incremental changes typically only affect a small number of organisational levels and dimensions, such as the decision-making processes of work groups. They take place in the framework of the company's current business strategy, structure, and culture and are intended to improve the current situation. On the other side, fundamental reforms aim to dramatically modify how the organisation functions. They often include various aspects of the organisation, such as the structure, culture, incentive structures, information flow, and job design. Additionally, they include altering a number of organisational levels, from top-level management down through departments and work groups to individual employment. Historically, incremental change has been dealt with via planned change. In the 1960s and 1970s, organisations focused primarily on adjusting their bureaucratic structures by finding solutions to many of the social issues that arose with growing size and formalisation. In certain circumstances, planned change entails a rather limited range of actions for fixing issues. Managers frequently hire OD specialists to assist them address certain issues in particular organisational systems, such poor communication within a work team or low consumer satisfaction in a department store. Diagnostic and change efforts are typically restricted to the issues that have been identified, although other concerns may arise that need attention. Similar to this, the change process tends to concentrate on the organisational systems that are experiencing particular issues, and it typically comes to a conclusion when the issues are fixed. Of course, the OD specialist may accept a job to assist with further issues [4]–[6].

Fundamental transformation has been a bigger issue for OD recently. The increased competition and unpredictability of today's environment have prompted an increasing number of organisations to fundamentally modify how they do business. Because fundamental change affects the majority of the organization's characteristics and levels, it is often led from the top, where corporate strategy and values are established. In such circumstances, planned change is more difficult, comprehensive, and long-term than when applied to incremental change. Senior executives might envision a desirable future organisation with the aid of OD practitioners, who then energise action in that direction. They also assist them in creating the organisational structures needed to oversee the changeover from the current to the future organisation. These structures can include a programme management office, a number of overlapping steering committees, and redesign teams, for example. Many aspects of the company, including performance metrics, awards, planning procedures, job designs, and information systems, may also be redesigned by staff expertise.

DISCUSSION

Due to the complexity and breadth of fundamental change, OD professionals often collaborate in teams with people who have complementary but distinct areas of expertise. The relationship between consultants and managers endures for comparatively long times and involves a lot of renegotiation and experimenting. Diagnose and change seem more like discovery than issue solution because the limits of the change attempt are more ambiguous and diffuse than those in incremental change. It is crucial to stress that fundamental change might be developmental in character or not. Without considerably improving their ability to deal with difficulties, make changes in the future, and achieve high performance and a good quality of life at work, organisations may fundamentally shift their strategic direction and method of operation. For instance, businesses might simply alter their marketing mix by eliminating or including certain goods, services, or clients; they might drastically reduce their size by eliminating unprofitable operations and firing managers and staff members; or they might tighten managerial and financial controls in an effort to get more productivity out of their workforce. However, from a developmental standpoint, organisations may make major changes. They may try to increase their level of competitiveness by investing in their human resources, including managers and staff members more in problem-solving and creativity, and encouraging flexibility and direct, open communication. In today's context of fast change and competition, the OD approach to fundamental transformation is particularly pertinent. Companies like General Electric, Kimberly-Clark, Asea Brown Boveri, IBM, and Banca Intesa are shifting from control-oriented bureaucracies to high-engagement organisations capable of altering and improving themselves continuously in order to compete in this environment.

Organisational Level

The degree of organisation within an organisation or within a client system may also influence planned transformation attempts. Various variables, including leadership styles, job designs, organisational structures, and policies and procedures, are excessively stiff and too specified in overorganized settings, such as in highly mechanical, bureaucratic organisations. Employee apathy, repressed communication between management and staff, and the avoidance of confrontation are typical. On the other side, in poorly organised organisations, there aren't enough restrictions or rules to ensure efficient work completion. Poorly defined leadership, organisation, job design, and policy make it difficult to successfully guide task behaviours. Employees' efforts are wasted due to a lack of direction, fractured communication, and unclear work assignments. In sectors like product development, project management, and community development, where connections among many organisations and individuals must be managed around challenging, unpredictable tasks, underorganized circumstances are often seen. Planned change often aims to reduce restrictions on behaviour in overorganized settings, where most of OD practise has traditionally taken place. Changes in leadership, job design, structure, and other aspects are intended to unleash repressed energy, improve the exchange of pertinent information between staff members and managers, and support the peaceful settlement of disputes. The standard phases of planned change entry, diagnosis, intervention, and evaluation are meant to break through a department or organisation that is relatively closed off and make it more receptive to self-diagnosis and revitalization. This loosening process is attempted to be mirrored in the interaction between the OD practitioner and the management team. The consultant retains flexibility in their interactions with the organisation, fosters open communication and conflict resolution, and shares leadership of the change process with management [7]–[9]. Planned change, when used in organisations that struggle with underorganization, aims to improve organisation by defining leadership positions, organising manager-employee communication, and defining job and departmental duties. The following four stages are included in these activities, which call for a modification of the conventional phases of planned change:

1. Identification

In this stage, the relevant individuals or groups that must be included in the change programme are identified. People and departments may become so disjointed in many underorganized environments that it might be unclear who should be involved in problem-solving. For instance, managers from several departments may argue or be unsure about which departments should be included in producing a new product or service when they only seldom contact with one another.

2. Convention

In this stage, the necessary company personnel or divisions are gathered to start organising for job execution. Department managers can be requested to participate in a series of organising meetings, for instance, to talk about the allocation of tasks and the cooperation needed to launch a new product.

3. Organization

In order to arrange the increasingly necessary relationships between individuals and departments, several organising systems are devised. This might include developing new leadership roles, communication channels, and suitable plans and procedures.

4. Evaluation

The results of the organisation stage are evaluated in this last step. The assessment may indicate that the organising procedure needs to be changed or that further identification, convention, and organisation actions are necessary.

The partnership between the OD practitioner and the client system makes an effort to strengthen the organising process while implementing these four processes of planned change in underorganized conditions. The consultant establishes a clearly defined leadership position, which during the early phases of the change programme may be directive. The consulting relationship is similarly well-defined and precisely described. In essence, the interaction between the client system and the consultant helps to bring about order as a whole. The change agent in this situation is a member of the business community who recognises a complex issue: university research that may be beneficial to industrial organisations is not being structured, coordinated, or transmitted. He creates an organisation to strengthen the bonds between the two parties in response.

Comparing Domestic and International Settings

The use of planned change initiatives is becoming more common outside of North America and Europe. OD was developed in Western societies and reflects the underlying values and assumptions of these cultural settings, such as equality, involvement, and short-term time horizons. It works fairly well in these circumstances. The implementation of OD may be challenging in other civilizations since they may operate under a distinct set of cultural norms and presumptions. The cultures of most Asian nations are, for instance, more hierarchical and status aware, less open to addressing personal difficulties, more concerned with "saving face," and have a longer time horizon for outcomes than Western society. Due to these cultural variations, OD implementation may be more challenging, particularly for North American or European practitioners who may not be familiar with the societal norms and values.

In the United States, for instance, tolerance for ambiguity, equality amongst individuals, individualism, and achievement incentives are examples of cultural values that influence OD practise. An OD process is evaluated favourably if it fosters interpersonal openness, high levels of engagement, and behaviours that support enhanced effectiveness. It is also considered that the OD practitioner upholds these principles and exemplifies them while leading planned change. Many of the documented examples of OD include Western-based organisations employing practitioners educated and skilled in Western culture and the conventional paradigm. The action research approach must be modified to meet the cultural context when OD is implemented outside of North America or Europe. For instance, there are several approaches to alter the diagnostic phase, which aims to comprehend how the organisation now operates. The diagnosis process might be led from the top, carried out by an external consultant or internal consultants, include a large number of organisation members or simply senior executives, and involve in-person interviews or organisational records. The cultural environment must be properly mapped against each phase in the broad model of planned transformation.

For OD practitioners, doing OD in foreign contexts may be quite demanding. They must become acutely aware of their own cultural prejudices, be willing to consider many topics from a different angle, be fluent in the values and presumptions of the host nation, and comprehend the economic and political environment of doing business in the host country if they are to succeed. In order to traverse the cultural, operational, and political subtleties of change in that culture, the majority of OD practitioners work with a "cultural guide," who is often a member of the client organisation since they are unable to fulfil all of those requirements.

Objections to Planned Change

Although they are constantly being improved, planned change models and practises are still in their infancy and have a lot of space to grow. The way planned change has been conceptualised and applied has a number of issues, according to OD critics.

Visualisation of Change That Is Planned

Typically, planned change has been described as including a number of tasks necessary to carry out efficient organisational growth. While existing models indicate a basic set of activities to be taken, much more information is required to specify how those processes should be carried out in particular circumstances. The key to organisational change, according to Porras and Robertson, is a change in behaviour. In a thorough review and critique of planned change theory, they made the case that planned change activities should be guided by information about the organisational features that can be changed, the intended outcomes from making those changes, the causal mechanisms by which those outcomes are achieved, and the contingencies upon which successful change depends. Porras and Robertson came to the general conclusion that much more study and thought are required to fill the gaps in the knowledge required to steer transformation. Knowledge regarding how the phases of intended transformation vary depending on the environment is another relevant area where current thought is lacking. Most models include a broad set of procedures that are meant to be used in the majority of change initiatives. However, the earlier part of this chapter demonstrated how change activities might differ based on the size of the change, how organised the client system is, and whether the change is being implemented domestically or internationally. Finding contextual circumstances that could need adjusting the broad phases of planned change will take a lot more work. This would probably result in a wide range of planned change models, each tailored to a particular set of situational circumstances. Planning for change requires a significant deal of contingency thinking. Another common way to define planned change is as an organised, rationally managed process [10], [11].

They point out that planned change has a more chaotic nature, often including changing aims, discontinuous actions, unanticipated occurrences, and unexpected combinations of changes. Critics have countered that while this perspective may be comfortable, it is significantly misleading. For instance, leaders often start changes without having plans that define their strategy and objectives. As the shift takes place, new stakeholders can show up and demand changes that take into account unmet or unspoken demands. Planned change is a far more chaotic and dynamic process than is often shown as a result of these emergent conditions, and conceptions must reflect this reality. A process's beginning, middle, and finish are commonly described in most explanations of planned change. The idea that an organisation will "refreeze" into some sort of equilibrium following change has been criticised as being reinforced by planned change models that support evaluation and institutionalisation processes. However, given the rate of globalisation and technological advancement, it is unlikely that change will ever be complete.

In many organisational elements that are not readily apparent in the majority of models of planned change, executives, managers, and organisation members must be ready for ongoing change. Finally, little is known about how planned change affects organisational effectiveness and performance. OD has always struggled to determine if treatments are having the desired effects. Weak assessment of OD initiatives has been attributed to the complexity of the changing situation, the absence of sophisticated analytics, and the lengthy time periods for achieving outcomes. Additionally, managers have often used post-hoc testimonials, projections of potential future advantages, and appeals to support OD as the proper thing to do in order to justify their efforts in OD. Without thorough evaluation and measurement, it is difficult to decide how to allocate resources to change programmes and to identify the treatments that are most successful in certain circumstances.

Utilizing Planned Change

Critics have pointed up a number of issues with how planned change is implemented.37 They are more concerned with the process of change than the intended change model itself, as well as the training and practises of OD practitioners. A rising number of OD practitioners have opted to specialise in a particular methodology after developing their abilities in it, such as team building, total quality management, appreciative inquiry, big group interactions, or benefit sharing. Despite the fact that such specialisation may be required, given the intricate web of methods that constitute OD, it may produce a certain myopia. Some OD practitioners choose some procedures over others that could be more effective because they tend to view organisational issues as necessitating the preferred methodology. Thus, it is common to see consultants promoting techniques like diversity training, reengineering, organisation learning, or self-managing work teams as answers to the majority of organisational issues, for instance. An accurate diagnostic of how the organisation is operating is necessary for effective transformation. The diagnosis reveals the root reasons of organisational issues, such as subpar product quality and unsatisfied employees, or establishes the advantageous chances that need promotion. Some businesses are unwilling to make the required time and financial investments since it takes both. Instead, they depend on preconceived notions about what the issue is and employ consultants with the necessary expertise to address it. Managers could employ a job enrichment specialist to conduct a transformation programme because they believe, for instance, that work design is the issue. However, job enrichment would not be acceptable since other issues, such as bad incentive practises, may be the root of the issue. A thorough diagnosis may assist to prevent such errors.

Planned change is a protracted process needing significant on-site innovation and learning when it comes to circumstances necessitating substantial organisational adjustments. It takes a lot of effort and dedication, as well as a willingness to adapt and fine-tune modifications as the situation calls for. Some businesses want faster resolutions for their issues and turn to professionals for speedy fixes. Sadly, some OD consultants are more than happy to provide fast fixes. They market readymade initiatives for businesses to use. These programmes appeal to managers because they often come with a specific formula to follow, common training materials, and unambiguous schedule and budget constraints. However, the fast remedies struggle to garner widespread organisational support and commitment, and they seldom provide the promised benefits.

Other organisations have not acknowledged how systemic transformation is. Too often, they assume that changing just one feature or section of the organisation would solve the issues, and they are unprepared for any further adjustments that could be required to support a specific intervention. For instance, at Verizon, the advantages of an employee participation programme did not start to materialise until after the company had changed its compensation structure to encourage the cross-functional cooperation required to address very difficult challenges. To maintain a proper alignment while changing one aspect or feature of an organisation, modifications are often needed in the other aspects. Therefore, while fast fixes and change programmes that concentrate on only one area or feature of the organisation may be able to handle certain particular issues, they often do not result in complicated organisational change or improve the capacity of members to implement change.

Theories of planned change outline the steps involved in changing an organization's strategies, structures, and procedures in order to improve its effectiveness. Different perspectives on the stages through which planned change happens in organisations are provided by Lewin's change model, the action research model, and the positive model. Planned change is seen as a three-step process of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing in Lewin's change model. It gives a broad overview of the intended transformation process. Planned change is highlighted in the action research model as a cyclical process including cooperative efforts between organisation members and OD practitioners. Problem identification, consultation with a behavioural science expert, data gathering and preliminary diagnosis, feedback to a key client or group, joint diagnosis of the problem, joint action planning, action, and data gathering after action are some of the steps that are involved in the process. Prior to action planning and execution, as well as after action has been taken, the action research paradigm puts a strong focus on data collection and diagnosis. Additionally, change tactics are often adjusted based on ongoing diagnoses, and the success of one OD programme may inspire additional work in other divisions of the company. The positive approach focuses on what the company is doing well. It aims to capitalise on favourable scenarios that may result in exceptional performance. A generic model may include planned change ideas. To define how change is implemented in organisations, four sets of activities entering and contracting, diagnosing, planning and executing, and assessing and institutionalizing can be employed. The overall arrangement of the chapters in this book is likewise outlined by these four groups of activities.

Planned change may be broadly adapted using the generic approach. It describes the OD activities required to bring about change and highlights the usual processes an organisation takes to do so. There are several sorts of change depending on the circumstance, even if the planned change models just outline the broad phases of how the OD process develops. The scope of the change, the degree to which the client system is organised, and whether the environment is local or foreign may all affect planned change initiatives in different ways. Plans for transformation might differ significantly when circumstances are different on those dimensions. Many issues with the conceptualization and application of planned change have been brought out by critics of OD, as well as particular areas where planned change might be strengthened.

CONCLUSION

Planning well needs giving different variables due thought. Understanding stakeholder requirements and expectations, evaluating organisational culture and change preparedness, and taking into account possible risks and obstacles related to the change process are all part of this. Along with identifying roles and duties, roles and responsibilities should be established as part of planning. Timelines and milestones should also be realistically specified. To sum up, planning and implementing change are essential parts of organisational growth. Strong leadership, stakeholder involvement, and organised change management techniques are necessary for effective implementation, which ensures that change efforts are well-aligned with organisational objectives. Organisations may successfully manage the difficulties of change and achieve the results they are aiming for in their organisational development initiatives by taking important factors into account, using effective tactics, and tackling problems head-on.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Mertkan, “Planning for educational change: putting people and their contexts first,” *Comp. A J. Comp. Int. Educ.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/03057925.2010.503450.

[2] G. White, A. Zink, L. Codecá, and S. Clarke, “A digital twin smart city for citizen feedback,” *Cities*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cities.2020.103064.

[3] K. Oerlemans, “Planning for educational change: putting people and their contexts first,” *J. Educ. Policy*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/02680939.2010.518060.

[4] R. R. Bailey, “Goal Setting and Action Planning for Health Behavior Change,” *Am. J. Lifestyle Med.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1559827617729634.

[5] C. Daniel and C. Pettit, “Digital disruption and planning–use of data and digital technology by professional planners, and perceptions of change to planning work,” *Aust. Plan.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/07293682.2021.1920995.

[6] M. Romanello *et al.*, "Monitoring climate change and child health: The case for putting children in all policies," *J. Paediatr. Child Health*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/jpc.15757.

[7] M. Kosinska, "City of Well-Being: A Radical Guide to Planning," *Cities Heal.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/23748834.2017.1472842.

[8] H. Antonson, K. Isaksson, S. Storbjörk, and M. Hjerpe, "Negotiating climate change responses: Regional and local perspectives on transport and coastal zone planning in South Sweden," *Land use policy*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.12.033.

[9] Z. Asadolahi, A. Salmanmahiny, Y. Sakieh, S. H. Mirkarimi, H. Baral, and M. Azimi, "Dynamic trade-off analysis of multiple ecosystem services under land use change scenarios: Towards putting ecosystem services into planning in Iran," *Ecol. Complex.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ecocom.2018.09.003.

[10] M. Cashmore and A. Wejs, "Constructing legitimacy for climate change planning: A study of local government in Denmark," *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.09.019.

[11] A. M. Hersperger *et al.*, "Urban land-use change: The role of strategic spatial planning," *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.05.001.

CHAPTER 18

RESPONSIBILITIES AND FEATURES OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS

Dr. Malcolm Homavazir, Associate Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-Malcolm.homavazir@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The effective implementation of change efforts inside organisations is driven and facilitated by organisational development (OD) professionals. This abstract examines the duties and characteristics of OD experts, emphasising their distinct skill set, fundamental duties, and significant characteristics that enhance their efficiency in assisting organisational development. Professionals having a thorough knowledge of organisational dynamics, human behaviour, and change management concepts are known as OD experts. They are able to negotiate complicated organisational situations and support constructive reforms because of their mix of technical know-how, interpersonal abilities, and strategic mentality. The duties of OD experts include a broad spectrum of tasks. They work together with organisational leaders to evaluate the organization's existing condition, pinpoint opportunities for development, and create change-driven initiatives. Interventions including leadership development programmes, team-building activities, cultural assessments, and change management strategies are designed and carried out by OD professionals. Additionally, they provide counselling and direction to both individuals and teams, promoting teamwork, communication, and performance enhancement. Additionally, OD experts have analytical and problem-solving skills, which enable them to evaluate complicated organisational difficulties, spot trends, and create focused responses. Due to the fact that they must negotiate a variety of organisational cultures, structures, and industrial settings, they exhibit a great degree of adaptability and flexibility.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Knowledge, Organization, Skill.

INTRODUCTION

Describe the responsibilities and traits of practitioners of organisation development. Describe the skills necessary for practitioners of organisation development to be successful. Compare practitioners of organisation development who work internally vs outside. Recognise the moral principles that govern the practise of organisation development. An explanation of the nature of planned change as well as an outline of the topic of organisation development. By focusing on the individuals who carry out organisation growth, this chapter broadens the scope of the earlier section. Understanding how and why organisation development depends so largely on interpersonal interactions between practitioners and organisation members may be learned by taking a deeper look at practitioners in the area. The majority of the literature on practitioners of organisation development sees them as internal or external consultants offering expert services—diagnosing systems, creating interventions, and assisting in their implementation. Recent perspectives broaden the practice's scope to include specialists in related fields like industrial psychology, human resource management, and strategic management, as well as line managers who have acquired the organisational development skills necessary to transform and develop their companies. The knowledge and abilities required to be a successful practitioner of organisation development have received a lot of attention in opinion and certain research investigations. A thorough list of fundamental abilities and information that every proficient practitioner of organisation development should possess is provided by studies of the field [1]–[3].

The majority of the relevant literature discusses the responsibilities and careers of professionals who specialise in organisational development. The function of an organisation development practitioner depends on where they are in the organisation: internally, externally, or as part of a team including both internal and external consultants. The marginality of the organisation development practitioner's position within the organisation, the emotional demands placed on the practitioner, and the position of the practitioner along a continuum from client-centered to consultant-centered functioning should all be considered when examining the job of the organisation development practitioner. Last but not least, organisation development is a young profession that offers different options for learning new skills and building a career. But since assisting professions are so demanding, organisation development professionals may have to deal with the danger of burnout. Values and ethics, just as in other helpful professions like medical and law, are crucial in directing organisational growth practise and lowering the possibility of neglecting or abusing customers.

The Practitioner of Organisation Development

Organisation development practitioners are referred to as at least three different groups of persons throughout this work. People who specialise in organisation development as a vocation make up the most evident category of practitioners. They may be internal or external consultants who provide organisations' senior managers, leaders of functional departments, and employee groups with expert services. Professionals who work in organisation development have typically adhered to a set of humanistic ideals that encourage open dialogue, employee engagement, and individual growth and development. They often share training, expertise, and experience in the social dynamics of organisations. Organisation development specialists now pay more attention to the technical, structural, and strategic aspects of organisations in addition to the traditional values and skill sets. They are more concerned with organisational effectiveness, competitiveness, and bottom-line results. A more varied group of organisation development experts aimed towards assisting organisations in coping with these challenges has emerged as a consequence of this growth, primarily in reaction to the increasingly competitive expectations confronting contemporary organisations.

Professionals that specialise in areas that are connected to organisation development, such as human resource management, organisation design, quality control, information technology, and business strategy, are the second group of professionals to whom the term "organisation development practitioner" applies. Particularly as organisation development projects have become more thorough, covering many features and different organisational elements, these content-oriented disciplines are progressively integrating with organisation development's process orientation. For instance, combining organisation development with business strategy led to the integrated strategic change intervention and the dynamic strategy-making intervention. A rising number of professionals in these linked professions are developing their knowledge and skills in organisation development, mostly through working with experts in the field on significant projects and by attending training sessions. For instance, the majority of the major accounting firms have diversified into management consulting and change management3. However, most professionals in these related fields do not fully subscribe to traditional organisation development values and do not have a wealth of training or experience in the field. Instead, they have formal education and experience in their chosen fields, such as information technology, business strategy, or industrial engineering. They are organisation development practitioners in the sense that they use their unique expertise inside a process resembling organisation development, often by hiring managers and specialists in the field to create and execute change initiatives. They also engage in organisational development when they apply their knowledge of the discipline to their particular areas of expertise, bringing an organisational development perspective to bear on issues like labour relations, work design, and strategic planning [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

The term "organisation development practitioner" is used to describe a third group of people the growing number of managers and administrators who have become proficient in organisation development and use it in their own workplaces. According to studies and recent articles, managers increasingly use organization development rather than professionals. These studies claim that the fast-paced change affecting organisations today emphasises the importance of the manager in managing change. As a result, organisation growth has to be a general management competency. Along similar lines, Kanter researched a rising number of companies, including General Electric, Hewlett-Packard, and 3M, where managers and staff have developed into "change masters," with the knowledge and skills to implement change and innovation throughout the company. Managers often build their organisational development skills by working with professionals in the field on real change projects. The National Training Laboratories, USC's Centre for Effective Organisations, the Centre for Creative Leadership, the Gestalt Institute, UCLA's Extension Service, the Tavistock Institute, the Institute for Socio-Economic Enterprises, and others frequently supplement this on-the-job training with more formal organisation development training. Line managers are attending these external programmes in greater numbers. Additionally, an increasing number of businesses, such as Capital One, Disney, and General Electric, have put in place internal training programmes to teach managers how to expand and transform their work units. Managers who become proficient in organisation development are its most fundamental practitioners.

The differences between the three groups of organisation development practitioners are becoming less clear in practise. An increasing number of managers have transitioned, either permanently or temporarily, into the field of organisational development. Companies like Procter & Gamble, for instance, have trained managers and cycled them into full-time organisation development jobs so they may get the knowledge and experience necessary for higher-level management positions. Additionally, it is becoming more frequent for managers and staff experts to work as external consultants leveraging their expertise in organisational development. Organisation development specialists are becoming more proficient in fields like strategic planning, incentive systems, and business process reengineering. On the other hand, numerous experts in those associated fields are developing their organisational development professional competency. A more thorough and complicated kind of organisation development practitioner is being created via cross-training and integration; this practitioner has a wider range of values, abilities, and experience than a typical practitioner.

Qualities of a Successful Organisation Development Professional

Organisation development competencies are described in literature as a combination of personality qualities, experiences, knowledge, and abilities that are thought to support successful practise. For instance, research on the traits of successful change practitioners yields the following list of qualities and skills: diagnostic ability, fundamental behavioural science techniques knowledge, empathy, knowledge of the theories and methods within the consultant's own discipline, goal-setting ability, problem-solving ability, self-assessment ability, ability to see things objectively, imagination, flexibility, honesty, consistency, and trust. The skills and knowledge needed by practitioners of organisation development have been defined, organised into categories, and given a priority in two initiatives. A large group of renowned practitioners and scholars were requested to examine and update a list of professional abilities for the first attempt. The survey produced a list of 187 statements covering nine areas of organisation development practise, such as entry, start-up, assessment and feedback, action planning, intervention, evaluation, adoption, separation, and general competencies. The statements covered everything from "staying centred in the present, focusing on the ongoing process" and "understanding and explaining how diversity will affect the diagnosis of the culture" to "basing change on business strategy and objectives."

Worley and his colleagues gathered data from 364 organisation development practitioners to determine the relative value of this lengthy list. The typical responder was a United States citizen with a master's degree and around eight years of experience in organisation development. The outcomes pointed to a list's fundamental structure. A total of 23 competences were created, reflecting both the personal qualities required to be a successful practitioner of organisation development and the abilities and knowledge required to carry out planned change processes. The abilities included the capacity to assess change, collaborate on significant change initiatives, develop implementation strategies, and manage diversity, much like earlier lists. But one of the more unexpected outcomes was the rise of "self-mastery" as the most crucial talent. The findings confirmed the widely held notion that strong organisational development practitioners are aware of their own capabilities and that this awareness serves as the foundation for successful practise.

The second project, funded by the Academy of Management's Organisation Development and Change Division, aimed to create a list of competences to direct the creation of graduate organisation development programmes' curricula. The first is that basic competencies are focused on summaries of an existing system. They include information on group dynamics, management and organisation theory, psychology, organisational behaviour, research methodologies, and commercial practises. The second goal of core competencies is to address how systems change over time. They involve skills needed to manage the consulting process, analyse and diagnose systems, design and select interventions, facilitate processes, build clients' capacity to manage their own change, and evaluate organisational change. They also include knowledge of organisation design, organisation research, system dynamics, organisation development history, and theories and models for change [6]–[8].

Organisation development professionals are most affected by the information. They believe that having the aforementioned knowledge and skills is appropriate, especially given the complexity and rising variety of organisational development interventions. It is debatable whether the other two categories of organisation development practitioners—managers and experts in related fields also need that comprehensive set of abilities. Acquiring proficiency in those areas may require a significant amount of time and effort. It appears more logical to propose that a portion of the factors should be relevant to all practitioners of organisation development, regardless of whether they are managers, organisation development experts, or other related specialists. These would be the practitioner's fundamental abilities and information. Beyond that background, it's probable that the three different kinds of organisation development practitioners have different areas of focus. Managers would concentrate on functional understanding of business sectors, related experts would focus on abilities in their fields, and organisation development professionals would broaden their skill set across the other categories. According to the information and other research, all organisation development practitioners need the following fundamental abilities and information to be successful.

Personality traits or "Self-Management" ability

Despite the field's complexity and expanding knowledge base, organisation development is still a human art. Practitioners often need to assess complicated, confusing information and make educated decisions regarding its relevance to organisational challenges since they are the main instrument of diagnosis and change. As mentioned above, self-inquiry is a fundamental skill in organisational development and is included in the core competency. Practitioners must have the personal centering to be aware of their own values, feelings, and purposes as well as the integrity to act responsibly in a helping relationship with others. One of the creators of organisation development, Bob Tannenbaum, said that self-knowledge is the most essential component of the practise and that practitioners are getting too fixated on skills and procedures. His point of view is supported by data. Organisation development is a highly uncertain process that necessitates constant adjustment and innovation, so practitioners must have active learning skills and a reasonable balance between their rational and emotional sides. A study of 416 organisation development practitioners found that 47% agreed with the statement, "Many of the new entrants into the field have little understanding of or appreciation for the history or values underlying the field." Finally, practitioners must be able to manage their own stress since organisation development work may be very difficult and cause early burnout.

Interpersonal Competence

Practitioners must establish and preserve productive connections with people and groups inside the organisation and aid them in developing the skills required to handle challenges on their own. Group dynamics, comparative cultural views, and business functions are included as fundamental knowledge, whereas managing the consulting process and facilitation are listed as essential competencies. These interpersonal skills all support strong helpful connections. Such relationships require listening to members' perceptions and feelings to understand how they see themselves and the organisation, which is a process known as "active listening." This understanding provides a starting point for joint diagnosis and problem solving. In order for practitioners and organisation members to communicate openly and productively, they must build trust and rapport. This necessitates the ability to communicate with each other in the member's native tongue and to provide and receive input on the state of the relationship. Practitioners need to behave as role models of what is anticipated in order to assist members in learning new abilities and behaviours. They must behave in a manner that gives organisation members confidence and provide them the coaching and counselling they need to grow and evolve. Practitioners must be able to negotiate an agreeable role and handle shifting expectations and demands since the helping relationship is mutually established.

Skills in General Consultation

Both the capacity to manage the consulting process and the capacity to create interventions are included as fundamental abilities that all practitioners of organisation development need to have. Organisational development begins with a diagnosis of a department or organisation to understand how it currently functions and identify potential development areas. Practitioners of organisational development should have a basic understanding of how to conduct an efficient diagnostic. They need to be able to assist group members diagnose problems, encourage them to ask the proper questions, and gather and evaluate data. A manager, for instance, should be able to collaborate with subordinates to identify the department's or organization's strengths and challenges. The manager should be familiar with fundamental diagnostic inquiries, information-gathering strategies like interviews or surveys, and information-analysis methodologies like force-field analysis or statistical means and distributions. Organisation development professionals should be able to diagnose problems as well as plan and carry out interventions. They must be able to create an action plan and get support for the initiative. Additionally, they must be able to adapt the intervention to the circumstance, utilising data on the development of the change to direct execution. Managers should be able to create action plans, for instance, for a conversation with subordinates. They need to be able to win their support for the programme, sit down with them, evaluate how it is going, and, if required, make adjustments.

Theory of Organisational Development

A broad understanding of organisation development, such as that provided in this book, is the last fundamental tool that practitioners of organisation development should possess. They have to have a basic understanding of planned change, the action research model, and effective methods for handling change. They should be knowledgeable with the variety of treatments that are available and the significance of assessing change initiatives. The role that organisation development practitioners play in the developing field of organisation development, whether as professionals in the subject, managers, or experts in adjacent fields, is perhaps the most crucial.

Professional practitioners of organisational development

People who specialise in organisation development as a career have received the majority of attention in the literature regarding organisation development practitioners. We go through the function and typical career trajectories of organisation development specialists in this part.

Positions in Organisation Development Play a Role

Professionals in organization development might work for the organisation from either an inside or external role. Internal consultants are employees of the company who may work in the human resources division or who are subordinates to a line manager. Many large organisations, including Boeing, Raytheon, Disney, Microsoft, Philip Morris, Procter & Gamble, Weyerhaeuser, Kimberly-Clark, and Citigroup, have established specialised organisation development consulting groups. They may perform the organisation development role exclusively or they may combine it with other tasks, such as compensation practises, training, or employee relations. These internal consultants often work with both line and staff departments, servicing a range of customers inside the organisation.

1. External consultants often work for consulting firms, universities, or themselves; they are not employees of the client organisation. When an organisation needs a certain knowledge that cannot be provided internally, a different and maybe more objective viewpoint has to be brought into the organisation growth process, or power changes need to be signalled, external consultants are often hired.

2. Internal consultants have certain benefits throughout the entrance process. They speak the company's language, have connections with customers, and have insights into the underlying causes of many of the company's issues. Internal consultants may quickly determine the culture, unofficial procedures, and sources of authority inside an organisation as a result. They have access to a wide range of data, such as rumours,

company reports, and firsthand observations. Additionally, entrance is more productive and welcoming, and their compensation is secure. However, one benefit of using external consultants is that they may choose the customers they wish to engage with based on their own standards. Internal consultants have less formal meetings during the planning stage and worry less about costs, but they have less options over whether to finish the task. Both kinds of consultants must deal with concerns about confidentiality, run the danger of the client terminating the project, and play a third-party role. Internal consultants have a foundational level of trust and rapport with many organisation members, which comes in handy throughout the diagnosing process. However, external consultants often have a better position than internal consultants, which allows them to delve deeper and provide an impartial evaluation of the organisation. Both types of consultants need reliable information, the ability to make an informed decision, and internal commitment to be successful during the intervention phase. However, internal consultants may be overly cautious due to their close ties to the company, especially when influential others can have an impact on a career. Additionally, internal consultants may not have the necessary knowledge and expertise to help organisations transform. Insiders could have a little edge in that they can navigate the system and cross important organisational barriers. Finally, the success and reward metrics used in the assessment process are different from those used by the external practitioner.

Being a part of an internal-external consulting team allows external consultants to combine their specialised expertise and objectivity with the inside knowledge and acceptance of internal consultants, which is a promising strategy for gaining the benefits of both internal and external organisation development consultants. By sharing the burden and using their complementary consulting talents, the two parties may be able to achieve more than they could if they worked alone. For instance, internal consultants might maintain almost constant communication with the customer, but their external counterparts can provide specialised services on occasion, such as two or three days each month. Additionally, external consultants may aid in the training of their organisational partners, imparting organisational development expertise. Although internal-external consulting teams have not received much attention, studies indicate that for such teams to be successful, members must establish solid, encouraging, collegial connections. The consulting team has to be developed over time, with individual differences addressed and suitable responsibilities and connections established. Members must commit to learning from one another as well as giving each other ongoing feedback. Internal-external consulting teams may be more problematic and less productive than either internal or external consultants working alone in the absence of these team-building and learning activities [9], [10].

Marginality The question of marginality is at the heart of a potential line of study on the professional organisation development role. A marginal person is someone who effectively straddles the border between two or more groups with different objectives, moral standards, and behavioural patterns. The marginal role is now seen in a more favourable light than it was in the past, when it was always thought to be dysfunctional. Salesperson, buyer, first-line supervisor, integrator, and project manager are just a few examples of marginal jobs in organisations. There is growing evidence that certain individuals are more adept at playing supporting roles than others. It seems that those who excel at it possess traits such as low dogmatism, neutrality, open-mindedness, objectivity, flexibility, and flexible information-processing abilities. They thrive in controversy, uncertainty, and tension rather than being distressed by it.

Individuals with marginal orientations are more likely than others to make integrative choices that bring together and reconcile the points of view of competing organisational groupings and are more likely to stay impartial in contentious circumstances. Therefore, evidence shows that when a person with a marginal attitude fills the marginal function, it may have favourable impacts. Such a person may be more objective and more equipped to succeed in tasks that require integration, linkage, or dispute resolution. According to research of both internal and external practitioners of organisation development, external professionals felt more at ease playing a supporting role. More experienced internal consultants were slightly oriented than were those with less experience. These results, together with previous studies on marginal roles, point to the value of preserving the flexibility, independence, and boundary-spanning traits of the marginal role of the organisation development practitioner.

Psychological Demands

The practitioner position in organisation development is emotionally taxing. Understanding emotions and how they affect a practitioner's effectiveness is important, according to research and practice. Research on "emotional intelligence" in organisations suggests a set of skills that can help organisation development practitioners carry out successful change initiatives. The capacity to recognise and express emotions in the right ways, to utilise emotions in reasoning and making choices, and to control one's own and other people's emotions is referred to as emotional intelligence. Therefore, it is a distinct form of intelligence than conceptual understanding, engineering aptitude, or the capacity to solve problems. Emotions aid in prioritising thinking by drawing attention to significant information that isn't included in models and theories, which impacts and enriches traditional knowledge and ability. In this regard, some studies contend that emotional intelligence is as crucial to cognitive intelligence.

Practitioners of organisation development have reported on the value of emotional intelligence in their work. Organisation development professionals must have a thorough understanding of emotions from the client's viewpoint in order to connect to and assist organisation members in addressing resistance, commitment, and ambiguity at each step of planned change. Almost every change process must handle significant and challenging problems that elicit emotions like the fear of rejection, the dread of the unknown, anxiety, and wrath, despite the predominate emphasis on reason and efficiency. Organisation development professionals may provide tools, reframe clients' views, model healthy emotional expression, and offer psychological support. Practitioners of organisational development must also be aware of their own emotions. Ambiguity, unfamiliarity, or the suppression of emotions might cause interventions to be made improperly or at the wrong moment. For instance, a practitioner who finds conflict unpleasant could step in to diffuse a dispute between two managers out of discomfort rather than because the confrontation is harmful. In such a situation, the practitioner is addressing a personal need as opposed to intervening to increase the efficiency of the system. Research also supports the idea that emotional intelligence may be increased via personal development procedures including sensitivity training, counselling, and therapy. Evidence demonstrates that emotional intelligence rises with age and experience. It would seem acceptable to recommend that professionals working in organisational development commit to a long-term growth plan that involves gaining both cognitive learning and emotional intelligence.

Use of Knowledge and Experience continuum that ranges from client-centered to consultant-centered descriptions of the professional organisation development position. Organisation development consultants have always operated at the client-centered end of the spectrum. Organisation development specialists have traditionally been expected to maintain their neutrality and refrain from providing expert advice on organisational issues, instead focusing mostly on process consulting and team building. Instead of hiring a consultant to work on a specific problem, they typically collaborate with organisation members to identify problems and potential solutions, to study what they are doing now and consider alternative behaviours and solutions, and to help them determine whether the consultant and they can actually learn to do things better. The organisation development specialist has traditionally done this by listening to members' thoughts and ideas, reflecting on them, and helping to explain and understand their communications and behaviours. That constrained definition of the professional organisation development job has been enlarged to cover the consultant-centered end of the continuum due to the recent expansion of organisation development interventions in the structural, human resource management, and strategy sectors. With the consent and cooperation of organisation members, the consultant may be required to assume a modified position of an expert in many of the more recent techniques. For instance, managers seeking to implement a significant structural redesign can lack the knowledge and experience necessary to plan and manage the change and need the assistance of an organization development practitioner with experience in this field.

The consultant's job description may include presenting the fundamental concepts and ideas before collaborating with the management to choose a strategy that could benefit the organisation and choose how it should be implemented. In this scenario, the organisation development specialist prescribes or proposes specific adjustments and actively plans their implementation. But this knowledge is always imparted rather than forced. The organisation development professional's position must be seen as falling along the full continuum from client-centered to consultant-centered with the creation of new and diverse intervention methodologies. When identifying and resolving issues, the consultant will sometimes depend primarily on the information and experiences of organization members. At other instances, acting in the position of an expert will be more suitable, with managers gradually stepping down from that role as they acquire more insight and experience.

CONCLUSION

OD professionals also need to be well-versed in the theories and practises of change management. They are skilled at handling opposition to change, winning over stakeholders, and clearly explaining the rationale and advantages of suggested changes. They keep an eye on and assess the development of change projects, making modifications as needed to guarantee success. In conclusion, OD professionals are essential to organisational growth because they use their knowledge, experience, and strategic perspective to promote progress. Their duties range from assessing organisational problems to creating and putting into effect solutions. Strong interpersonal skills, intellectual prowess, and knowledge of change management are required of effective OD professionals. The success of organisational development initiatives, the promotion of a culture of continuous improvement, and increased organisational efficiency are all made possible by OD professionals carrying out their duties and exhibiting these characteristics.

REFERENCES:

[1] W. I. Gorden, “Individual Commitment and Organizational Change; A Guide for Human Resource and Organizational Development Specialists.,” *Empl. Responsib. Rights J.*, 1993.

[2] M. T. H. Carpenter, “Cheerleader, opportunity seeker, and master strategist: ARL directors as entrepreneurial leaders,” *Coll. Res. Libr.*, 2012, doi: 10.5860/crl-192.

[3] D. Fields, *Taking the Measure of Work: A Guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosis*. 2012. doi: 10.4135/9781452231143.

[4] J. Suchan, "Changing organizational communication practices and norms: A framework," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*. 2006. doi: 10.1177/1050651905281038.

[5] P. J. Davis, "How HR can create competitive advantage for the firm: Applying the principles of resource-based theory," *Hum. Resour. Manag. Int. Dig.*, 2017, doi: 10.1108/HRMID-09-2016-0122.

[6] G. Coetzer, "An empirical examination of the mediating influence of time management on the relationship between adult attention deficit and role stress," *Pers. Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.1108/PR-04-2015-0105.

[7] J. Bur, K. Missen, and S. Cooper, "The impact of intellectual disability nurse specialists in the United Kingdom and Eire Ireland: An integrative review," *Nursing Open*. 2021. doi: 10.1002/nop2.690.

[8] S. Whitcomb and D. Whitcomb, "The Kahuna as Professional and Organizational Development Specialists," *To Improv. Acad.*, 1985, doi: 10.3998/tia.17063888.0004.003.

[9] N. Jones, G. B. Teague, J. Wolf, and C. Rosen, "Organizational Climate and Support Among Peer Specialists Working in Peer-Run, Hybrid and Conventional Mental Health Settings," *Adm. Policy Ment. Heal. Ment. Heal. Serv. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10488-019-00980-9.

[10] S. L. Dörr, M. Schmidt-Huber, and G. W. Maier, "The LEaD competence model: Leading effectively in the context of digital transformation," *Grup. Interaktion. Organ. Zeitschrift fur Angew. Organ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11612-021-00582-w.

CHAPTER 19

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS' CAREERS

Prof. Ameya Ambulkar, Assistant Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-ameya.ambulkar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Organization development (OD) professionals embark on a dynamic and fulfilling career path that calls for a certain combination of abilities, knowledge, and experience. The main facets of OD specialists' careers are examined in this abstract, including their educational backgrounds, core competences, career paths, and the field's prospects going forward. OD experts often have strong educational backgrounds in business administration, industrial-organizational psychology, organisational psychology, or human resources. They may have PhD or master's degrees, which provide them a thorough grasp of organisational dynamics, human behaviour, and change management concepts. Core OD professional competences include a wide variety of talents and skills. Strong interpersonal and communication skills, coaching and facilitation skills, data analysis and research capabilities, project management know-how, and a thorough comprehension of organisational development theories and techniques are a few of these. Additionally, OD practitioners have a strong grasp of how to move through challenging organisational landscapes, persuade stakeholders, and promote innovation. As more organisations see the value of efficient change management and continuous improvement, the future is bright for OD specialists. OD specialists play a critical role in assisting effective organisational changes in light of the quickly changing business environment and the need for organisations to adapt to new technology, market demands, and international trends. As businesses seek to improve their performance overall and increase their agility, innovation, and creativity, the need for qualified OD specialists is anticipated to rise.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Ethical, Ethics, Knowledge, Organization.

INTRODUCTION

Unlike professions with a long history, like medicine and law, organization development is still developing the traits of a profession, like a common body of knowledge, educational requirements, a recognised code of ethics, and rules and methods for regulating behaviour. People with a variety of educational and professional backgrounds pursue professions in professional organisation development. They may choose when to begin or end a career in organisation development, as well as whether to work as an internal or external consultant, since they are not required to adhere to a predetermined professional path. The majority of professionals have received specialised training in organisation development notwithstanding the field's looseness or flexibility. This training might take the form of brief courses, programmes, and seminars held either within or outside of organisations. Master's programmes and doctorate courses are two examples of longer, more formal organisation development training. when may be predicted, when individuals have more education and work experience in organisational development, their job options expand. Internal consultants are more likely to have a little education and often take on organisation development jobs as temporary assignments before moving up to higher management or staff positions. Master's degree holders are equally distributed among internal and external consultants, on average [1], [2].

Doctoral holders may work as adjunct professor at a university while consulting on the side, join a consulting business, or look for employment as a reasonably high-level internal consultant. Compared to internal practitioners, external consultants are often older, have greater management experience, and spend more time on organisation development. One study, however, suggested that there were no differences in pay or years of consulting experience between internal and external consultants. It's possible that the most typical career path is to start as an internal consultant, gain experience and visibility through successful interventions or publishing, and then transition to becoming an external consultant. According to a field research, internal consultants improved their competency by working with external consultants who ostensibly assisted in their development. This development occurred as a result of an organisational instructional setup of collaborative diagnosis and intervention, which allowed the internal consultants to see and absorb the model provided by the external consultants.

There is growing evidence that a career in organisation development may be stressful, sometimes resulting in burnout. Burnout is caused by working too hard, taking on too many duties, and being overcommitted. Constant travel is the top issue among organisation development professionals. This task often necessitates six-day workweeks with some days lasting as long as 15 hours. A consultant could work with one company or division for a week before spending the weekend getting ready for the next client. They could live in hotels, vehicles, aeroplanes, conference rooms, and restaurants for 50% to 75% of the time they are on the road. The majority of organisation development consultants, according to one expert, would say, "Quality of work life for consultants" like follows: "Quality of work life? To consultants? Professionals in organisation development are doing more to deal with burnout. To get more stable hours or minimise travel, they could switch occupations, switching from external to inside positions. They could discover how to properly pace themselves and steer clear of taking on too much work. Many people use stress-reduction strategies in addition to participating in fitness and wellness programmes.

Personal Principles

Values have been crucial to the growth of organisations from their inception. Organisation development specialists have traditionally championed a set of humanistic ideals, such as an interest in open research, democratic principles, and individual well-being. They have aimed to support organisations in fostering member self-control, open problem-solving environments, and member trust and cooperation. Organisation development professionals have more recently added environmental sustainability and increased organisational performance to these humanistic ideals. When practising organisation development, they have shown a growing ambition to advance human, economic, and ecological goals. Executives, workers, labour leaders, government officials, and international organisations like NATO have all shown increasing support for the values of humanising organisations, enhancing their effectiveness, and preserving the environment, as well as for the profession of organisation development as a whole. It would be impossible not to support those shared concerns, in fact.

However, in reality, promoting human, economic, and ecological values simultaneously is extremely difficult. More practitioners are coming across circumstances where there is a conflict between employees' needs for more meaning and the organization's needs for a more effective and efficient use of its resources. For instance, highly routineized and programmed costly capital equipment may function most effectively, but humans may not find joy in using such technology. Should maximising efficiency come at the price of ensuring that people are satisfied? Is it possible to modify technology while keeping it effective to make it more enjoyable to humans? What kind of agreements are possible? When these trade-offs are used in various geographic cultures, how do they change? In order to maximise human benefits, organisational performance, and environmental sustainability, these value challenges must be overcome.

DISCUSSION

Organisation development professionals increasingly deal with value disputes with influential outside parties in addition to value challenges inside their own organisations. Organisations are open systems that function in tumultuous settings. For instance, task contexts in hospitals are complicated and dynamic. External stakeholders having an interest in the operation of the organisation have multiplied as a result, including patients, suppliers, medical organisations, insurance companies, employers, the government, shareholders, unions, the press, and numerous interest groups. These outside parties often use contrasting and conflicting standards to evaluate the functioning of the organisation. For instance, stockholders could assess the company's profits per share, the government's adherence to equal employment opportunity laws, the quality of treatment provided to patients, and environmental organisations' handling of hazardous waste. Organisations cannot simply disregard these conflicting beliefs since they must depend on these external groups for resources and credibility.

They must react to them in some way and make an effort to reconcile the various interests. The need for new interventions and expertise in organisation development is suggested by recent efforts to assist corporations manage external relationships. They must be able to manage their own position and values in connection to those dynamics, as well as the power dynamics, conflicts of interest, and moral problems that are inherent in managing external relationships. This, according to research, is particularly true for interorganizational and global applications of organisation development. In this wider setting, interventions fostering cooperation and trust may be unsuccessful, particularly when there are power and dominance dynamics across organisations and competition for limited resources. In certain circumstances, organisation development practitioners may need additional power-oriented interventions, including coalition building, pressure tactics, and bartering, which are often not connected to the field. Organisations are under growing pressure, for instance, to match their practises with ethical ecological ideals. Global warming, hazardous waste, and the loss of natural resources are all issues that have strong nonprofit organisations, citizen action groups, and lobbyists fighting for them.

Additionally, a growing number of consulting companies are advertising their services to assist organisations in developing a more sustainable connection with the environment. In response, an increasing number of businesses have "gone green," disclosed donations to environmental funds, and formed partnerships with nonprofit environmental organisations. These modifications, according to their detractors, are more political than practical, more public relations than substantial, and more window dressing than actual transformation. Fair enough, a rising number of organisations are altering their business practises, strategy, and resource allocations in significant ways. As a consequence, there are a variety of interactions between businesses and environmental groups, from friendly to antagonistic to cooperative. In order to properly manage their constituents, organisations may increasingly require the assistance of organisation development practitioners. A stronger focus on how the organisation development practitioner's own beliefs align with those of the organisation will be necessary for this endeavour, as will political savvy [3]–[5].

Occupational Ethics

How practitioners conduct their assisting relationships with organisation members is at the centre of ethical concerns in organisation development. Any helpful connection has the risk of misbehaviour and client abuse. Organisation development professionals may allow their own morals to get in the way of ethical behaviour, misuse their position of authority by mistreating employees, or favour one set of stakeholders over another.

Ethical Principles

To its credit, the organisation development industry has always showed concern for the moral behaviour of its professionals. Several symposia and essays have been written regarding ethics in organisational growth. Additionally, the American Society for Training & Development, Organisation Development International, and a group of professional organisations in organisation development have sponsored declarations of ethics guiding the practise of organisation development. The consortium has supported an ethical code that was developed as part of a sizable project at the Illinois Institute of Technology's Centre for the Study of Ethics in the Professions. The project's objectives included developing critical incidents describing ethical conundrums and using that information for preprofessional and continuing organisation development education; offering an empirical foundation for a statement of values and ethics for organisation development professionals; and starting a process for making the ethics of organisation development practise explicit on a regular basis. The appendix to this chapter contains the project's ethical principles.

Ethical Conundrums

Organisation development professionals still face moral conundrums despite the fact that adhering to codes of ethics may assist to reduce the emergence of ethical difficulties. A process model that describes how ethical conundrums might emerge in organisation growth. An organisation development practitioner and a client system with differing aims, values, requirements, skills, and talents are two examples of the antecedent circumstances. These disparities are meant to be addressed and made clear throughout the entrance and contracting phase of planned change. However, it would be unrealistic to suppose that all of the conflicts would be found and settled. In such cases, role conflict and role ambiguity will almost probably arise throughout the ensuing intervention process or role episode. Regarding relative obligations, neither the client nor the organisation development practitioner is clear. Each side has distinct objectives, and each is working towards those objectives utilising various talents and principles. Five different ethical quandaries may result from role conflict and ambiguity: deception, data abuse, coercion, conflict between values and goals, and technological incompetence.

Misrepresentation Organisation development professionals misrepresent when they assert that an intervention will result in outcomes that are inappropriate for the change programme or the circumstance. The customer may contribute to the issue by expressing erroneous wants and ambitions. In either scenario, there is an ethical conundrum since one or both sides are acting dishonestly. For instance, in the notorious case of "The Undercover Change Agent," an effort was made to implement sensitivity training at a company whose senior management was unprepared for it and did not comprehend it. The organisation development consultant promoted this interpersonally demanding intervention as the solution to the organization's difficulties. The consultant was sacked when the firm's president paid a surpise visit to the location of the training because the type and approach of the sensitivity training ran directly counter to the president's ideas about leadership.40 When the first consulting connection is being built throughout the entering and contracting stages of planned change, misrepresentation is likely to happen. Organisation development professionals must be clear on the objectives of the change effort in order to avoid misrepresentation. They also need to openly discuss these objectives with the client and inquire about the client system's relevance, the intervention's projected consequences, and the practitioner's technical proficiency [6]–[8].

Data Misuse

Information obtained throughout the organisation development process is misused when it is used as punishment. Invariably, throughout the organisation development process' entrance and diagnostic stages, a significant quantity of information is gathered. Although the majority of organisation development professionals place a high importance on transparency and trust, it is crucial that they be informed of how such data will be utilised. Humans have a propensity to utilise facts to strengthen their position of power. Being open is one thing, but releasing incorrect information may have negative effects on both the organisation and its employees. It is simple for a consultant to compile information regarding a manager's performance under the premise of gathering information. An ethical conundrum that is difficult to address is if, when, or how this knowledge may be utilised. Practitioners should agree with organisation members up front on how data gathered throughout the change process will be utilised in order to prevent abuse of data. Periodically reviewing this agreement in light of evolving circumstances is advised.

Coercion

When organisation members are coerced into taking part in an organisation development intervention, coercion has occurred. If people are to have the independence to handle their own issues, they should have the flexibility to decide whether or not to take part in a reform programme. For instance, in team building, team members should have the choice to opt out of the intervention. Team building should not be decided by management alone as beneficial to employees. The ability to choose, however, requires understanding of organisational evolution. Many members of the organisation are unaware of organisation development interventions, what they entail, and the nature and effects of participating in them. This makes it essential for organisation development professionals to inform customers about interventions before making decisions on how to put them into practise. For the collaborative connection between organisation development professionals and organisation members, coercion may also provide moral conundrums. Any connection that provides assistance has the potential to include undue reliance and manipulation, both of which are forms of coercion. With regard to behaviour change, Kelman noted that it "inevitably involves some degree of manipulation and control, and at least an implicit imposition of the change agent's values on the client or the person he [or she] is influencing." This puts the practitioner in a difficult situation since, regardless of how little, every effort at change is a change and, hence, a manipulation, and there is no formula or strategy for structuring a change situation such that manipulation can be completely avoided. Kelman emphasised freedom of choice in order to combat the first component of the conundrum, considering any action that restricts freedom of choice to be morally dubious or worse. The second part, according to Kelman, requires the organisation development practitioner to be acutely aware of their own value systems and on guard against the risk of imposing those values on clients. Making the change effort as transparent as feasible, with the participants' free agreement and understanding, is, in other words, an effective strategy to overcome this problem [9]–[11].

Dependency is the second aspect of compulsion that may cause moral conundrums in the helpful relationship. Dependency develops between individuals who need assistance and those who provide it in helping situations almost always. By assisting customers in developing the knowledge and abilities to solve organisational issues and manage change on their own, organisation development aims to reduce clients' reliance on consultants. However, in certain circumstances, particularly in the beginning of the partnership, gaining independence from organisation development practitioners may lead to clients being either counterdepen- dent or overdependent. Consultants may openly and clearly discuss with the client how to address the dependence problem, particularly what the client and consultant expect of one another, in order to overcome dependency concerns. Another strategy is to concentrate on issue solving. The customer often seeks a fix for an issue they see. The consultant may focus the attention on a better joint diagnostic so that both parties can focus on identifying and resolving issues. This action shifts the client's energy away from dependence. Changing the client's expectation from being assisted or controlled by the practitioner to a greater emphasis on the need to address the situation may also minimise reliance. Such a shift in emphasis might strengthen the notion that the consultant represents the client and provides help at the client's choice.

Goal and Value Differing When the aim of the change endeavour is unclear or when the client and the practitioner differ on how to get there, there is an ethical conflict. The crucial practical question for organisation development consultants is whether it is acceptable to unilaterally refuse to provide services to a company that disagrees with their principles or practises. Gordon Lippitt, a pioneer in organisational development, claimed that this is the actual query: Doesn't the consultant have a duty to attempt to influence the change in the most positive manner possible if some kind of change is going to happen anyhow?

An internal consultant or a consultant who already has an ongoing connection with the client may find that inquiry to be more important and relevant. Argyris takes an even stronger stance, arguing that professional organisation development practitioners have obligations to their customers similar to those of attorneys or doctors, who are often not allowed to decline to provide their services. As long as the help does not undermine the consultant's ideals, he contends that the very least the consultant can do is provide "first aid" to the organisation. According to Argyris, a consultant ought to be willing to help if the Ku Klux Klan requested it and the consultant could at least ascertain whether the KKK was genuinely interested in evaluating itself and willing to commit itself to everything that a valid assessment would entail regarding both itself and other groups. The consultant would be allowed to leave the project without facing any consequences if it turned out that the Klan's goals had not been accurately communicated.

Technical Illiteracy This third ethical conundrum arises when organisation development professionals seek to execute interventions for which they lack the necessary expertise or when a client tries to undertake a change before it is ready. The choice of an appropriate intervention is essential to the success of any organisation development programme, and it relies on a comprehensive diagnostic of the organisation. The values, competencies, and talents of the practitioner are very relevant when choosing an intervention. Many organisation development experts place a strong emphasis on a certain intervention or approach when it comes to resolving organisational issues, such as team building, total quality management, or self-managed teams. They let their own principles and worldview to guide the reform process. Problems with technical ineptness may also arise when interventions do not match the organization's capacity to put them into practise. Once again, a comprehensive diagnosis may show to what degree an organisation is prepared to make a change and has the expertise and knowledge to put it into effect.

CONCLUSION

OD professionals must continue to be proactive in their professional development if they want to thrive in their jobs. They should maintain their knowledge and abilities, keep up with industry best practises and new trends, and look for networking and cooperation opportunities with other experts. The success and continuous advancement of OD experts' careers are influenced by the development of strong professional networks, getting relevant qualifications, and participating in ongoing learning activities. In conclusion, OD professionals have a dynamic and rewarding career path that calls for a broad skill set, ongoing learning, and a commitment for bringing about good change in organisations. In today's quickly shifting corporate world, OD specialists substantially contribute to the success and effectiveness of organisations through their knowledge of organisational dynamics, change management, and human behaviour.

REFERENCES:

[1] I. Marzec and A. Austen, "The role of training in improving employability, job satisfaction and the career success of public sector employees," *Argumenta Oeconomica*, 2021, doi: 10.15611/aoe.2021.2.08.

[2] M. A. Mancini, "An Exploration of Factors that Effect the Implementation of Peer Support Services in Community Mental Health Settings," *Community Ment. Health J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10597-017-0145-4.

[3] A. A. N. B. Aristayudha, K. R. P. Richadinata, and V. F. C. Rettobjaan, "CONTINUOUS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN HEALTHCARE," *E-Jurnal Manaj. Univ. Udayana*, 2021, doi: 10.24843/ejmunud.2021.v10.i02.p04.

[4] E. Loyarte-López, I. García-Olaizola, J. Posada, I. Azúa, and J. Flórez, "Sustainable career development for R&D professionals: Applying a career development system in Basque country," *Int. J. Innov. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijis.2020.03.002.

[5] C. Solomon and S. Van Coller-Peter, "How coaching aligns the psychological contract between the young millennial professional and the organization," *SA J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.4102/sajhrm.v17i0.1146.

[6] "Impact of Professional Stress and Career Development on Organizational Commitment Among Nurses," *J. Heal. Med. Nurs.*, 2019, doi: 10.7176/jhmn/62-09.

[7] M. Huemann, C. Ringhofer, and A. Keegan, "Who Supports Project Careers? Leveraging the Compensatory Roles of Line Managers," *Proj. Manag. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/8756972819857895.

[8] M. L. Louws, K. van Veen, J. A. Meirink, and J. H. van Driel, "Teachers' professional learning goals in relation to teaching experience*," *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/02619768.2017.1342241.

[9] M. Zaharee, T. Lipkie, S. K. Mehlman, and S. K. Neylon, "Recruitment and Retention of Early-Career Technical Talent: What Young Employees Want from Employers A study of the workplace attributes that attract early-career workers suggests that Millennials may not be so different from earlier generations.," *Res. Technol. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/08956308.2018.1495966.

[10] E. A. Vail *et al.*, "The role of professional organizations in fostering the early career development of academic intensivists," *Annals of the American Thoracic Society*. 2020. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201908-573PS.

[11] N. Ellemers, "Women at Work: How Organizational Features Impact Career Development," *Policy Insights from Behav. Brain Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/2372732214549327.

CHAPTER 20

DESCRIBE THE PROBLEMS ARISE IN OD PROCESS

Prof. Ameya Ambulkar, Assistant Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-ameya.ambulkar@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The planned change process outlined in typically begins when one or more managers or administrators perceive an opportunity for their department, group, or organisation, believe that new capabilities are required, or decide that organisation development could boost performance. Even if the organisation is successful, there is always space for development. It could be about to experience environmental circumstances that call for a modification in the way it functions. The company can be dealing with specific issues like subpar product quality, excessive absence rates, or dysfunctional departmental clashes. Contrarily, the issues may seem less clear-cut and merely stem from thoughts that the company may be "more innovative," "more competitive," or "more effective."

KEYWORDS:

Customer, Department, Development, Organization, Time.

INTRODUCTION

The first phases in the organisation development process are entering and contracting. They include developing a collaborative connection between the organisation development practitioner and members of the client system about how to work on those issues after first outlining the organization's challenges or possibilities for growth. The first guidelines for carrying out the future stages of organisation development diagnosing, planning and executing changes, as well as assessing and institutionalising them were established through entering and contracting. They aid in defining who will carry out such activities, what problems will be addressed by them, and how they will be carried out. Depending on the circumstance, entering and contracting might range in intricacy and formality. Entering and contracting often include the manager and group members meeting to discuss what problems to work on and how they will jointly reach the objectives they establish.

This is especially true in situations when the manager of a work group or department doubles as his or her own organisation development practitioner. Entering and contracting are rather easy and casual in this situation. With the least amount of formal processes possible, they immediately include all pertinent individuals in the process. Entering and contracting tend to be more complicated and formal in circumstances where managers and administrators are thinking about using professional organisation development practitioners, either from within or outside the organization. Organisation development practitioners might need to gather preliminary data to help define the problematic or development issues. Instead of the whole membership, they may need to meet with representatives of the client organisation to formalise their separate responsibilities and the flow of the change process. When significant and strategic changes are expected, formal offers from several consulting companies may be obtained, and contracts may be draft [1]–[3].The actions and content-specific concerns associated with beginning and contracting for an organisation development effort are covered in the first section of this chapter. We'll concentrate on intricate procedures involving consultants in organisation growth and client businesses. But even the most straightforward organisation development initiatives, where managers act as practitioners of organisation development for their own work units, need to confront similar entering and contracting challenges. The organisation development process won't go smoothly and effectively if there isn't consensus and clarity regarding the problems to be worked on, who will address them, how that will be done, and what schedule will be followed. A study of the interpersonal process concerns involved in beginning and contracting for organisation development work finishes the chapter.

Establishing a relationship for organisational growth

An organisation development process typically begins when a member of the organisation or unit contacts an organisation development practitioner about potential assistance in resolving an organisational issue. The member of the organisation could be a manager, staff specialist, or another key participant, and the practitioner could come from either inside or outside the organisation. Clarifying the nature of the organization's current functioning, the issue that needs to be addressed, the pertinent client system for that issue, and the appropriateness of the specific organisation development practitioner are usually necessary before deciding whether the two parties should enter into a relationship for organisation development. To assist in assessing these issues, the organisation development practitioner may need to gather preliminary information about the organisation. The organisation may also need to learn more about the practitioner's skills and experience. Having this information will enable both parties to decide if they should go forward with creating a contract for their co-operation. This section outlines the steps necessary to begin an organisation development partnership, including defining the organisational challenge, identifying the relevant client, and choosing the best practitioner.

Understanding the Organisational Problem

Organisations often start with a presenting problem the issue that prompted them to think about an organisation development process when they ask for assistance from organisation development practitioners. It might be either specialised or generic. There is often an inferred or explicit solution to the presented difficulty. For instance, managers can think that firing employees from their department is the obvious solution to excessive expenses. They could even provide a remedy to the current issue, such as, "We need to downsize our organisation." But often, the issue at hand is really a sign of something more serious. High expenses, for instance, may be the consequence of a number of underlying factors, such as ineffective processes for developing new products or producing them, ineffective customer service policies and procedures, or friction between two interdependent groups. To ensure that future diagnostic and intervention actions are appropriately targeted, the problem affecting the organisation or department must be identified early in the organisation development process [4]–[6].

Collecting preliminary data may be necessary to gain a clearer understanding of the organisational issue. Organisation development professionals frequently look through company records and speak with a few important individuals to get a general understanding of the organisation, its setting, and the nature of the presenting issue. These data are collected during a brief period of time, usually over the course of one or two days. They are designed to provide the two parties a basic understanding of the organisational problem so they can decide how to go on with the contracting procedure. The diagnostic stage of organisation development entails a far more thorough evaluation of the developmental problem than does the entering and contracting stage. The diagnosis may also reveal other problems that need attention, or it may force a redefinition of the original problem that was noted during the entering and contracting stage. This is a perfect illustration of how the organisation development process is emergent: things might alter when new data is obtained and new events take place.

Finding the Relevant Customer

Determining the relevant client for addressing the organisational issue is the second step in beginning an organisation development relationship. Typically, the relevant client is comprised of organisation members who can directly affect the change issue, whether it involves solving a specific problem or enhancing an already successful organisation or department. They could refuse to support and commit to the organisation development process if they aren't recognised and involved in the entry and contracting process. For instance, in order to increase efficiency at a unionised manufacturing facility, managers, staff members, and union representatives may all need to be part of the appropriate customer. It is not uncommon for an organisation development project to fall short due to an improper definition of the relevant customer. Depending on the circumstance, the intricacy of identifying the relevant customer might change. Client definition is rather simple when the organisational problem can be solved inside a certain organisational unit. The relevant customer is made up of those in that unit. The entry and contracting procedure must include them or their agents. For instance, the manager and team members would be the pertinent clients if the manager requested assistance in enhancing the team's decision-making process. There is little chance that organisation development will enhance team decision making unless they are actively engaged in selecting an organisation development practitioner and designing the ensuing transformation process.

Finding the relevant customer becomes more difficult when the organisational problem cannot easily be solved by a single unit. Here, it can be required to broaden the definition of the customer to include individuals from various organisational units, at various levels of the hierarchical structure, and even from outside the company. As an example, the manager of a production department could look for assistance in settling disputes between his or her division and other divisions within the company. Because the manufacturing department cannot fix the problem on its own, the relevant customer would go outside the department's boundaries. The customer might be the CEO to whom all of the department’s report, as well as representatives from each department engaged in the issue. The relevant client may include members of such organisations if the interdepartmental dispute also involves significant outside clients and suppliers [7]–[9].

DISCUSSION

In such complicated circumstances, organisation development practitioners must acquire more data about the organisation to identify the relevant customer. Typically, this is done as part of the preliminary data gathering that takes place while defining the problem that needs to be solved. Practitioners might look to identify the major participants and organisational units by reviewing corporate data or speaking with employees. They may, for instance, enquire of the organization's members: Who has direct control over the problem? Who has a personal stake in it? Who has the authority to accept or reject the organization's endeavour to develop? Who is the appropriate customer for the entering and contracting stage may be determined with the aid of the answers to those questions. However, when new information is received and changes take place in the latter phases of the organisation development process, the customer may alter. If so, participants may need to go back and change this first phase of the organisation building endeavour. The last step in beginning an organisation development partnership is choosing a practitioner who has the knowledge and experience to collaborate with members on the organisational problem. Unfortunately, there is little systematic guidance on how to select a capable organisation development professional, whether from within or outside of the organization. Organisations may request that formal proposals be submitted to help reduce the uncertainty of selecting from among external organisation development practitioners. In these situations, an overview of the potential process must be created by the organization development practitioner using all of the data obtained in the earlier phases. One perspective of the main components of such a proposal. It advises include project goals, summaries of proposed procedures, a list of roles and responsibilities, suggested interventions, and suggested fees and costs in a written proposal.

The late Gordon Lippitt, a pioneering practitioner in the field, proposed several criteria for choosing, assessing, and developing organisation development practitioners. Lippitt listed areas that managers should take into account before choosing a practitioner, including their capacity to develop trusting interpersonal relationships, the degree of focus on the problem, the practitioner's skills in relation to the problem, the practitioner's experience in the field, and the practitioner's track record. References from previous customers are crucial. Although a customer may not appreciate the consultant's work, it is important to understand both the causes for satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Whether the consultant approaches the organisation honestly and insists on diagnosis, or whether the practitioner seems to have a set programme that can be applied to almost any issue or organisation, is a crucial factor to take into account. Organisational development consulting is undoubtedly a person as well as a job specialisation. The ability to apply oneself as a change agent requires more than just a technical skill set for an organisation development expert. It also requires personality and interpersonal aptitude. Regardless of technical experience, the consultant must be able to hold a boundary position while coordinating with diverse divisions and departments and blending disciplines, theories, technologies, and research results in a natural rather than mechanical fashion. The practitioner may be the most significant organisation development tool at your disposal [10]–[12].

The fundamental question, "How effective has the person been in the past, with what kinds of organisations, using what kinds of techniques?" is therefore possibly the most crucial consideration when choosing an organisation development practitioner.To put it another way, references need to be verified. Even con artists have outstanding interpersonal skills and connections, yet interpersonal interactions are of utmost importance. Not all of the responsibility for selecting an effective organisation development practitioner should fall on the client organization. As discussed in the Ethical Dilemmas, consultants are heavily accountable for determining whether their knowledge and skills match those of the organisation or department. Few managers have the sophistication to recognise or comprehend the nuanced distinctions in knowledge amongst organisation development specialists, and they often do not recognise the distinction between intervention specialisations. Therefore, practitioners should assist in educating prospective customers by being open and honest about their strengths, flaws, and level of expertise. Organisation development specialists should let clients know if they cannot provide a good fit and assist them in finding other sources of assistance. The admission procedure was primarily "virtual" since the researchers collaborated with two consultants who regularly carried out organisation development initiatives. The story illustrates how organisation development work may occur in many ways and through various channels. It also illustrates the speed at which the "entry" process may move. The Alegent project will be referenced in a number of apps, the first of which is this one.

Create a Contract

A vital step before creating an organisation development contract is to engage in relationship-building activities. They outline the main objectives of contracts, together with the relevant parties. The organisation development process is clarified by contracting, a logical extension of the entry procedure. It generally lays down the parties' expectations, the time and money that will be spent, and the guidelines by which the parties will conduct themselves. Making a wise choice for how to carry out the organisation development process is the aim of contracting. It might be rather informal and merely include a verbal agreement between the customer and the organisation development practitioner. For instance, a team leader with expertise in organisational development could express concerns to team members about how the team is operating. They could decide after some debate to set aside an hour during a subsequent meeting to diagnose the team with the leader's assistance. In this place, entrance and contracting are done jointly and casually. Contracting may sometimes take longer in certain circumstances and result in a legal document. That often happens when businesses hire consultants in organisation development from outside the company. For instance, government agencies often have procurement rules that apply to hiring outside consultants.

Any organisation development process that leads in a verbal or written agreement must include some type of explicit contracting, regardless of the formality. Such a contract makes it clear what the customer and the practitioner anticipate from the organisation development process. Without shared knowledge and agreement of the process, there is a significant danger that someone's expectations won't be met. This might result in decreased commitment and support, inappropriate action, or an early conclusion of the process. The contracting phase of organisation development often focuses on three crucial areas: creating mutual expectations, or what each party hopes to achieve from the process; allocating the necessary time and resources; and establishing the ground rules for collaboration.

Joint Expectations

The expectations of the customer and the organisation development practitioner are the main emphasis of this step in the contractual process. The client outlines the services and results that the organisation development practitioner is to provide and outlines the expectations the organisation has for the process and the consultant. Typically, clients are able to articulate the intended objectives, such as reduced expenses or increased work satisfaction. A successful contract may be created by encouraging people to express their desires in terms of results, working relationships, and personal successes. The organisation development practitioner should also explain what outcomes they want to achieve via the approach. This may include the chance to test out novel therapies, share the outcomes with other prospective clients, and get just pay or recognition.

Time and Materials

Change requires time and money, which must be invested by both the organisation and the practitioner of organisation development. Each individual must be clear about how much time, effort, and money they will put into the transformation process. An organisation development attempt might be easily ruined if the required needs of a change process are not made clear. For instance, a customer can make it clear that the project entails identifying the factors that contribute to a work group's low productivity. However, the customer can anticipate that the practitioner would do the assignment without communicating with the employees. Clients often ask questions like how long the task will take to finish, who has to be engaged, how much it will cost, and so on. According to Peter Block, resources may be split into two categories. Essential requirements are those that must be present for the change process to be successful. They might include having access to important individuals or information, having adequate time to complete the task, and having the support of certain stakeholder groups, according to the practitioner. The organization's important needs may include guarantees that the project will be completed at the lowest cost or a quick diagnosis. Knowing the limitations of the assignment will make the contracting process easier and increase the likelihood of success. Desirable needs are things that are desirable to have but are not strictly required, such access to specialised resources or written reports as opposed to spoken ones.

Specifying how the customer and the organisation development practitioner will collaborate is the last step in the contractual process. Confidentiality, whether and how the organisation development practitioner will get involved in personal or interpersonal matters, how to end a relationship, and whether the practitioner is expected to provide expert advice or assist the manager in making decisions are possible parameters that may be included in the parameters set. Organisational dynamics make it particularly crucial for internal consultants to address questions of how to handle sensitive material and how to give "bad news." Such process concerns are just as crucial as the required substantive changes. If the concerns aren't addressed, the client or the practitioner may be making incorrect assumptions about how the procedure will go. In this instance, the entrance procedure was more simpler than the contracting process. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this case, in your opinion?

The actions and content-oriented challenges involved with starting an organisation development project were covered in the earlier sections on entering and contracting. The interpersonal concerns an organisation development practitioner has to be aware of to create a successful agreement are covered in this section's conclusion. Most of the time, the client's expectations, resource needs, and expectations for the working relationship won't quite match the fundamental and ideal requirements of the organisation development practitioner. It may be difficult to negotiate differences with others in order to increase the probability of success. The initial communications between a customer and a practitioner of organisation development are entering and contracting. The likelihood that the client's intended goals will be realised and that the organisation development practitioner will be able to enhance the organization's capability to manage change in the future are increased when a good connection is established from the beginning. The customer could feel exposed, inadequate, or vulnerable on the one hand. The customer may interpret the organization's existing performance and the need for assistance as an admission by the organisation that it is unable to address the issue or provide the leadership required to produce a certain set of outcomes. Additionally, customers are entering a partnership where they could feel powerless to influence the practitioner's actions in organisational growth. Due to their reliance on the practitioner for aid, they therefore feel vulnerable. Feelings of vulnerability, inadequacy, or exposure may cause customers to resent signing the contract, whether consciously or subconsciously. The expert in organisation growth must be aware of the warning signals of resistance, such as excessive detail requests, and be able to deal with them tactfully.

The organisation development practitioner, on the other side, could experience sentiments of reliance, unworthiness, and empathy. The practitioner could sympathise with the client's problems too strongly and wish to be so supportive that they accept unrealistic timelines or little funding. The practitioner may agree to work on a project for which they lack the necessary knowledge or expertise out of a wish to be seen as capable and deserving. Finally, the practitioner may question the client's motive in response to acceptable client demands and exhibit defensiveness. The power and impact of entry and contracting as an intervention in and of themselves are too frequently underestimated or ignored, according to Schein. Even with the most basic request for assistance, there are a variety of things the organisation development practitioner does not know when entering a system for the first time. Care must be taken while establishing a client connection; the first interactions and discussions must serve as an example of how the organisation development process will be carried out. As a consequence, really reaching an understanding at the contracting stage may be challenging and demanding. Organisation development professionals need to be aware of both their own perspectives as well as that of their clients given the complex emotional and psychological concerns that are at play. The chance of success will be increased by paying attention to both those concerns and the contract's provisions.

CONCLUSION

The organisation development process's first operations are entering and contracting. They provide the criteria for the subsequent stages of planned change, including diagnosis, planning, and implementation, evaluation, and institutionalisation. Clarifying the organisational issue or presenting problem, identifying the relevant client, and choosing an organisation development practitioner are all necessary for organisational entrance. Making an informed choice about whether to go forward is the emphasis of creating an organisation development contract, which also enables both the client and the organisation development practitioner to define expectations for how the change process will play out. Setting expectations for both parties, negotiating time and resources, and creating ground rules for cooperation are all part of contracting.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. L.Anderson, “Organization Development- The Process of Leading Organizational Change,” *SAGE Publ. Inc.*, 2017.

[2] G. N. McLean and S. K. DeMars, “Organization development: Principles, process, performance,” *Perform. Improv.*, 2006, doi: 10.1002/pfi.4930450809.

[3] J. M. Ballaro, M. A. Mazzi, and K. Holland, “Organization development through effective communication, implementation, and change process,” *Organ. Dev. J.*, 2020.

[4] P. Millar and A. Doherty, “Capacity building in nonprofit sport organizations: Development of a process model,” *Sport Management Review*. 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.smr.2016.01.002.

[5] W. Burke and D. A. Noumair, *Organization Development - A Process of Learning and Changing*. 2015.

[6] A. S. C. M. Shukree, M. M. Arshad, I. A. Ismail, and S. N. Alias, “Sustainabiility of Non-Profit Organisations; Organizational Development Process Model,” *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i16/8313.

[7] D. C. Korten, “Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach,” *Public Adm. Rev.*, 1980, doi: 10.2307/3110204.

[8] S. Nowshin, “An Analysis of Organization Development Process in Telecom Industry in Bangladesh,” *J. Bus. Manag.*, 2013, doi: 10.12735/jbm.v2i4p49.

[9] A. G. L. Romme and I. C. M. Damen, “Toward science-based design in organization development: Codifying the process,” *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.*, 2007, doi: 10.1177/0021886306297011.

[10] R. J. Bullock and D. J. Svyantek, “The Impossibility of Using Random Strategies to Study the Organization Development Process,” *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.*, 1987, doi: 10.1177/0021886387232008.

[11] L. D’Alvano and A. Hidalgo, “Innovation management techniques and development degree of innovation process in service organizations,” *R D Manag.*, 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9310.2011.00663.x.

[12] E. A. Aleshina, E. G. Kiryanova, D. A. Sitnikova, and B. Sayfidinov, “Organization Development Strategy,” *Sci. Dev. TRENDS Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.18411/lj-05-2019-65.

CHAPTER 21

TENETS OF DIAGNOSIS AND ITS FUNCTION IN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Nikita Nadkarni, Assistant Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-nikita.nadkarni@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The diagnosis process is a key step in organisational development since it may be used to assess the existing status of an organisation, pinpoint areas for improvement, and direct efficient change initiatives. The main ideas, procedures, and advantages of diagnosis are highlighted in this abstract, which also examines its foundations and role in organisational growth. Organisational development's diagnostic tenets are founded on a number of fundamental ideas. In order to make a diagnosis, an organization's architecture, operations, culture, and dynamics must first be thoroughly and methodically examined. It delves into the underlying elements that affect the performance and effectiveness of organisations rather than focusing just on the obvious findings. A data-driven methodology is used for diagnosis, second. It makes use of a range of qualitative and quantitative data collecting techniques, such as surveys, interviews, observations, and document analysis. With the use of this information, decision-makers may build change plans while having objective insights on the organization's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and dangers. Organisational development uses diagnosis in a variety of ways. It first offers a baseline evaluation of the organization's existing condition, highlighting any areas of misalignment, inefficiencies, or success hurdles. Organisations may create focused interventions that address the underlying causes of organisational challenges by setting reasonable objectives and using this information to guide their development.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Diagnosis, Effectiveness, Growth, Organization.

INTRODUCTION

The overall paradigm of planned change outlined in Chapter contains two key phases, the second of which is diagnosis. It comes after the contracting and entry step and comes before the planning and execution stage. When done correctly, diagnosis identifies a set of suitable intervention activities that will increase the effectiveness of the organisation and directs the organisation and the practitioner of organisation development towards those activities. The process of diagnosing include learning how a system is currently operating. It entails gathering relevant data about present operations, analysing that data, and coming to conclusions about the causes of current performance and the possibility for improvement. A thorough diagnosis gives the organised, methodical knowledge required to create effective therapies. Organisation development interventions, which involve specific activities aimed at enhancing organisational functioning, are therefore derived from diagnosis. Different facets of the diagnostic procedure are covered in this and the next chapter. In this chapter, the term "diagnosis" is defined broadly and the need of diagnostic models for process guidance is covered. In order to diagnose organisations, groups, or occupations, practitioners of organisation development use diagnostic models, which are derived from notions of how organisations work. They act as a guide for figuring out how things are currently working.

On the basis of open-systems theory, a universal, comprehensive diagnostic model is developed. The approach is then explained and used to diagnose problems at the organisational, group, and job levels. By addressing data collection, analysis, and feedback procedures [1]–[3].

Why Make a Diagnosis?

The process of diagnosis entails ascertaining how the organisation is presently operating and providing the data required to create change interventions.1 In general, diagnosis comes after successful entrance and contracting, which provide the ground for effective diagnosis. These procedures aid in deciding which organisational challenges to concentrate on, how to gather and examine data to comprehend them, and how to collaborate to create actionable recommendations from the diagnosis. In another sense, diagnoses take place often. Managers, team members, and practitioners of organisation development are always attempting to comprehend the factors that influence an organization's success as well as how and why changes are happening the way they are. Unfortunately, when used in reference to organisations, the word "diagnosis" may be deceptive. It provides an organisational change model that is comparable to the medical model of diagnosis: An organisation in need of assistance turns to an organisation development practitioner, who studies the organisation, determines the root of the issue, and recommends a course of action. However, organisation development diagnosis is far more collaborative than such a medical approach suggests, and it rejects the underlying assumption that there is a problem with the organisation.

First, according to the moral principles and values that guide organisation growth, identifying the factors that influence existing organisational performance should engage both practitioners and organisation members. Similar to this, both parties should actively participate in developing and putting into practise relevant treatments. A manager may, for instance, ask an expert in organisation development for assistance in lowering departmental absenteeism. The management and an organisation development expert may opt to jointly examine the company's absence records and conduct interviews with a sample of workers to determine the root of the issue. Instead, they can look at employee loyalty and identify the organisational factors that motivate employees to stick around. Analysis of such data may reveal factors that affect departmental loyalty or absenteeism, assisting the manager and an organisation development specialist in collaboratively developing a suitable intervention to solve the problem.

Second, the medical paradigm of diagnosis also suggests that the patient has a problem and that the disease' root cause has to be found. When an organisation does experience particular issues, diagnostics may be problem-focused and geared towards finding solutions. On the other side, as shown by the example of absenteeism above, the client and the organisation development practitioner may decide to adopt one of the more recent perspectives on organisational transformation and frame the problem favourably. The customer and the organisation development practitioner can also be considering methods to improve how the organisation now functions. Many managers working on organisational development may not specifically have organisational issues. In this case, diagnosis is growth-oriented. It evaluates how the organisation is now operating to identify potential opportunities for growth in the future. For instance, a manager can be motivated to use organisational development to enhance a department that seems to be operating well now. An overall evaluation of the department's ability to fulfil its assigned tasks as well as the effect of the department on each of its individual employees may be part of the diagnosis. The goal of this procedure is to identify specific areas where the department's performance may be improved in the future. Contrary to what a medical definition may imply, the term "diagnosis" is used more generally in organisational development. To gather relevant data, analyse it, and draw conclusions for action planning and intervention, organisation members and the organisation development practitioner work together in a collaborative process. The goal of diagnosis may be to identify the root causes of a particular issue, to comprehend successful procedures, or to evaluate the general operation of the organisation or department to identify potential future growth areas. In order to provide effective solutions for resolving issues and boosting effectiveness, diagnosis offers a comprehensive knowledge of organisations [4]–[6].

Diagnostic Models: A Need

It may be necessary to comprehend a system as a whole or a specific component, procedure, or aspect of the organisation as a consequence of entry and contracting activities. Organisation development professionals and organisation members need to have a plan for what data to gather and analyse in order to diagnose an organisation. The choices made on what to search for are always influenced by the conception of the organisation. These ideas might range from gut instincts to scientific explanations of how organisations work. "Diagnostic models" are conceptual frameworks that organisation development practitioners use to comprehend organisations. They explain the interactions between various organisational elements as well as the environment and effectiveness of the organisation. In order to evaluate how an organisation is operating, diagnostic models outline the areas to look at and the questions to ask. However, as all models simplify reality, they highlight certain organisational elements as essential while downplaying others. A diagnosis might be skewed if one pays attention to some traits, often at the expense of others. For instance, a diagnostic model that links team performance to how interpersonal conflict is handled might prompt a practitioner of organisation development to inquire about member connections, decision-making procedures, and conflict resolution techniques. Despite being pertinent, the queries disregard additional group difficulties including member expertise, the difficulty of the tasks the group does, and task interdependencies. To address the organization's current challenges and to guarantee comprehensiveness, organisation development practitioners must carefully choose diagnostic models and techniques.

DISCUSSION

There are several potential diagnostic models. A diagnostic model might possibly be any set of ideas and relationships that aims to characterise a system or explain its efficacy. Numerous books and articles that examine, explain, and analyse how organisations work are important sources of diagnostic models in organisation development. They include details on how and why certain organisational structures, procedures, or functions work well. The studies often focus on a particular aspect of organisational behaviour, such as stress among employees, leadership, inspiration, problem-solving, group dynamics, job design, and career development. Additionally, they may include the whole organisation as well as its environment, strategy, structure, and culture. The dimensions or factors that are connected to an organization's effectiveness might be noted in order to develop diagnostic models. Organisation development practitioners' experience working with organisations is another source of diagnostic models. So-called "field knowledge" provides a plethora of useful understanding about how businesses function. Sadly, only a tiny portion of that enormous amount of knowledge has been converted into diagnostic models that reflect the expert opinions of individuals with extensive expertise in organisational diagnostics. The models often connect the diagnosis to certain organisational processes, including team problem-solving, employee motivation, or manager-employee communication. For diagnosing these processes, the models provide particular questions.

Instead of attempting to address the variety of organisation development diagnostic models, this chapter gives a generic framework for diagnosing organisations. The framework includes some of the most well-known diagnostic models and explains the systems viewpoint that is widespread in organisation development today. The systems approach is a helpful place to start when assessing businesses, teams, and individual tasks.

Model of Open Systems

This section presents systems theory, a body of ideas and connections that describe the traits and actions of systems, such as groups, organisations, and employment. Systems are seen as cohesive wholes made up of components or subsystems; they combine the parts into a working whole. Organisational systems, for instance, are made up of departments or groups like sales, operations, and finance. The purpose of the organisation is to coordinate the actions of its departments so that they work together to achieve a goal or implement a plan. The "open-systems model" is the broad conceptual framework that guides the majority of organisational development diagnosis.

Companies as Open Systems

The open-systems approach acknowledges, that organisations function within a broader environment that influences how they function and, in turn, is influenced by how they interact with it. According to the approach, businesses take certain environmental inputs and alter them via social and technological processes. The results of the transformation process are released into the environment, and details on the effects of those results are fed back into the operation of the organisation. The open-systems concept also proposes that groups and individual jobs, which are subsystems of organisations, have a number of fundamental characteristics that explain their structure and operation. Open systems, as an example, provide a hierarchical ordering. Systems at the level of society are made up of organisations, which are made up of groups, which are made up of individual jobs, and so on. Each higher level system is made up of lower level systems. Systems at various levels differ from one another in many respects, such as size and complexity, but they also share a number of traits since they are open systems. Below are descriptions of the environments, inputs, outputs, boundaries, feedback, and alignment open-systems attributes [7]–[9].

Environments Everything outside of the system that might directly or indirectly impact its outputs is referred to as an environment. Organisations and groups are examples of open systems that share resources and information with their surroundings. Organisations are unable to fully manage their own behaviour due to the system's influence from these outside factors. For instance, the availability of labour and human resources, raw materials, consumer needs, competition, and governmental laws all have an impact on organisations. Some of the internal behaviour of the organisation may be explained by understanding how these external influences impact it. Inputs, Transformations, and Outputs Three connected properties—inputs, transformations, and outputs—make up organisational systems. Human capital and other resources from the environment, such as data, energy, and materials, are examples of inputs. For instance, a manufacturing company buys raw materials from a third party source. Similar to this, the attending physician provides information about a patient's status to the hospital nursing unit. Every time, the system draws resources from its surroundings.

The processes of transforming inputs into outputs are known as transformations. In organisations, changes are often carried out by a production or operations function made up of both social and technology components. People and their interactions at work make up the social component, whilst tools, techniques, and production or service delivery methods make up the technical component. Complex systems have been created by organisations to convert entering resources into products and services. Deposits, for instance, are converted into mortgage loans and interest revenue by banks. Schools make an effort to raise pupils' levels of education. Both the organisational and individual levels are capable of undergoing transformational processes. For instance, R&D teams may turn the most recent scientific discoveries into fresh product concepts, and bank tellers can turn consumer demands into valuable services.

The outcomes of what the system transforms and sends into the environment are called outputs. Transformed inputs thus indicate outputs that come from the system. Group health insurance businesses import payments to hospitals and doctors, convert them via record-keeping, and collect premiums and medical bills. The concept of borders aids in separating organisational systems from their surroundings. Boundaries—the system's boundaries or limits—assure that the appropriate inputs and outputs enter and exit the organisation, protecting or buffering its transformation process from outside interruptions. The permeability of an organisational system's borders may vary, with certain systems—like a highly integrated work team on the factory floor—being more accessible to the outside world than others, like a field sales force.

Organisational borders may be established for management, technological, or social objectives in addition to being based on geographical location. For instance, in order to facilitate managerial control, a department's boundaries could include all members who report to the same administrator; in order to facilitate a smooth workflow, they could also include suppliers, employees, and clients who are located along the same supply chain; or in order to promote cohesion among members, they could include those who have certain social connections and outlooks. Organisation development practitioners may need to decide early on whether the client system's boundaries are acceptable for the intended aim of the change endeavour since organisational borders may serve a variety of objectives. Before diagnosis can start, this may lead to the client's limits being redefined or altered. An organisation chart's borders, for instance, could be a good place to start when trying to solve a unit's leadership problems. However, if the goal of organisation growth is to enhance coordination across interdependent work groups, the client system's boundaries may need to be expanded to encompass additional connected departments [10].

Feedback is information on the actual performance or outputs of the system. But not all of this data is criticism. Only data that is utilised to influence how the system will operate in the future is regarded as feedback. Feedback may assist an organisation adjust to changing conditions or keep the system in a stable state. For instance, McDonald's maintains stringent feedback procedures to guarantee that a meal in one outlet is as comparable to a meal in any other outlet as is humanly feasible. On the other side, a field salesman may complain that business is slow and want an organisational change to boost business. The marketing division could suggest a modification to the organization's advertising strategy as a result of a market research study. Alignment a system's overall performance is partially based on how effectively its many components and aspects work together.

This fit or alignment refers to the relationships between the organisation and its surroundings as well as between the parts that make up the organization's design. The degree of alignment shows how well one component's functions and characteristics contribute to another component's effectiveness. The components of an organisational system must work together for it to be functional, much as the teeth in a watch's wheels must properly mesh for the watch to keep time. It is necessary to diagnose environmental linkages and interactions between the different components of an organisational system from "a systemic perspective," which contends that diagnosing often entails looking for misalignments between the different components of an organisational system.

CONCLUSION

In organisational growth, diagnosis has a lot of advantages. It makes it possible for organisations to take well-informed choices that are based on a thorough grasp of their present situation and desired future state. As resources and efforts are concentrated on regions with the highest potential for effect, diagnosis also aids in prioritising solutions. Through the participation of stakeholders in the change process, diagnosis also promotes transparency and confidence within the organisation. Finally, it should be noted that the principles of diagnosis are an essential part of organisational growth. Organisations get significant insights into their existing situation via diagnosis, which employs a rigorous, data-driven, and collaborative approach. It also directs the creation of successful transformation initiatives. An organisation may fulfil its objectives, improve performance, and prosper in a dynamic business environment by using diagnosis as a tool that covers baseline evaluations, systemic problem identification, and progress tracking.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. A. Smylie, "The Enhancement Function of Staff Development: Organizational and Psychological Antecedents to Individual Teacher Change," *Am. Educ. Res. J.*, 1988, doi: 10.3102/00028312025001001.

[2] M. Coetzee and M. S. Bester, "Exploring the reciprocal correspondence among workplace relationships, career goal instrumentality, career satisfaction, and organisational commitment," *South African J. Psychol.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0081246320948366.

[3] V. Sundquist and L. Melander, "Mobilizing resources in product development by organizational interfaces across firms, units and functions," *J. Bus. Ind. Mark.*, 2021, doi: 10.1108/JBIM-10-2019-0445.

[4] Y. Xie, D. Liang, J. Huang, and J. Jin, "Hospital ownership and hospital institutional change: A qualitative study in guizhou province, china," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16081460.

[5] M. S. Wang and S. T. Lu, "Can organisation capital improve corporate performance through direct path or mediating effect surveillance of board function: evidence from Taiwan?," *Technol. Econ. Dev. Econ.*, 2017, doi: 10.3846/20294913.2015.1072753.

[6] A. Vujovic, Z. Krivokapic, M. Stefanovic, and J. Jovanovic, "Development of expert system by using logical comparative conclusion in the function of organizational performance improvement," *Teh. Vjesn.*, 2019, doi: 10.17559/TV-20171225111754.

[7] B. J. Weiner, "A theory of organizational readiness for change," *Implement. Sci.*, 2009, doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-4-67.

[8] H. D. Jayathilake, D. Daud, H. C. Eaw, and N. Annuar, "Employee development and retention of Generation-Z employees in the post-COVID-19 workplace: a conceptual framework," *Benchmarking*, 2021, doi: 10.1108/BIJ-06-2020-0311.

[9] R. van Ingen, P. Peters, M. De Ruiter, and H. Robben, "Exploring the Meaning of Organizational Purpose at a New Dawn: The Development of a Conceptual Model Through Expert Interviews," *Front. Psychol.*, 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.675543.

[10] S. W. Hussaini, "A Systemic Approach to Re-inforce Development and Operations Functions in Delivering an Organizational Program," in *Procedia Computer Science*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.09.209.

CHAPTER 22

A STUDY ON ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEM DIAGNOSIS

Nikita Nadkarni, Assistant Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-nikita.nadkarni@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

An essential step in comprehending the intricacies and dynamics of an organisation is organisational system diagnostics. The idea of organisational system diagnostics, its importance, and the techniques used to evaluate and analyse the many elements and interactions inside an organisational system are all explored in this abstract. An organization's structures, procedures, culture, and relationships are systematically examined as part of organisational system diagnostics in order to acquire understanding of how the organisation is operating and pinpoint opportunities for improvement. Effective organisational development interventions and change management programmes may be built on top of it. Organisational system diagnosis is significant because it may provide a thorough insight of an organization's strengths, weaknesses, and underlying problems. Diagnosis aids in identifying performance hurdles, areas of misalignment, and possibilities for development by assessing the interdependencies between various parts within the organisation, such as roles, relationships, communication patterns, and decision-making processes. Organisational system diagnostics uses a variety of techniques and equipment. Surveys, interviews, focus groups, observation, and data analysis are a few examples of these. Organisations may get a comprehensive understanding of their present situation and goals for the future by using organisational system diagnostics. It makes it easier to find the underlying problems, gaps, or misalignments that might obstruct performance generally, employee engagement, or organisational success. This knowledge is the foundation for creating focused interventions and strategies that target the areas that need improvement.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Market, Organization, Product, Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Organisations may be diagnosed at three levels when seen as open systems. The entire organisation, which comprises the business's strategy, framework, and procedures, is the highest level. At that level, it is also possible to diagnose large organisational entities like divisions, subsidiaries, or key business units. The group or department is the lowest level and comprises tools for managing interactions among members, such rules and work schedules, as well as group design. The position or employment held by a person is the lowest level. This comprises the methods used in job design to elicit necessary work behaviours. All three organisational levels may be diagnosed, or a specific level's problems can only be addressed. Knowing what to look for at each level and how the levels interact is essential for efficient diagnosis. For instance, diagnosing a work group needs understanding of the factors crucial for group functioning as well as how the wider organisation design influences the group. In fact, because organizational-level problems serve as critical inputs to understanding groups and occupations, it is crucial to have a fundamental awareness of them in practically every diagnostic.

The primary factor influencing organisational design choices is the environment. Group design, in turn, is an input to organisational design, which in turn is an input to job design. These cross-level linkages highlight the need for organisational levels to mesh with one another in order for the organisation to function properly. For instance, group task design must complement and support organisational structure, which in turn must complement and support individual job design. This chapter's subsequent sections on diagnosing at the organisational, group, and individual job levels discuss each of the three levels. The aspects that must be comprehended at each level are described in broad strokes. The many factors and relationships revealed in the substantial literature on organisations would go beyond the scope of this chapter. However, as an introduction to this stage of the planned change process, specific diagnostic questions are noted and real examples are provided [1]–[3].

Enterprise-Level Diagnosis

The widest systems viewpoint commonly used in diagnostic operations is the organisation level of analysis. Similar to other well-liked organization-level diagnostic models is the model. An organization's design components represent the way the organisation organises itself within an environment to achieve specific results. To comprehend how a total organisation functions, it is necessary to look at specific inputs, design components, and the alignment of the two sets of dimensions. These models include Weisbord's six-box model, Nadler and Tushman's congruency model, Galbraith's star model, and Kotter's organisation dynamics model.

Inputs

The general environment, the task environment, and the enacted environment are three categories of environments that have an impact on how organisations operate and produce outcomes. The general environment is made up of all external influences that may have an impact on an organisation either directly or indirectly. These forces may be social, technological, economic, ecological, political, or regulatory in nature. These factors could interact in unusual and unforeseen ways, posing serious risks and possibilities to the organisation. Each of the factors has the potential to have an indirect as well as direct impact on the organisation. An organisation could find it difficult to get raw materials from a supplier, for instance, if a national union is protesting the supplier's hiring policies, a government regulator is suing the company, or a consumer advocacy group is boycotting the supplier's goods. As a result, elements of the overall environment might have an impact on the organisation even if they are not directly related to it.

Another vital organisation component is the task environment. Supplier power, buyer power, threats of substitutes, threats of entry, and rivalry among competitors are the five forces that Michael Porter used to define an organization's task environment. First, an organisation needs to be aware of powerful suppliers who can drive up prices or force the organisation to prioritise the needs of the supplier over its own. For instance, unions are significant labour providers that may influence the costs of any company operating in a certain sector. Second, a company has to react to influential customers. Procter & Gamble, Johnson & Johnson, and other suppliers may be forced to decrease their prices or supply their goods in certain ways by strong merchants like Walmart and Costco. Third, an organisation has to be aware of the danger posed by new businesses entering the market. Due to how simple it is to open a new restaurant, profits in the restaurant industry are often modest. Fourth, a business has to react to the danger of new goods or services that might displace present ones. Because it is simple for a customer to buy frozen yoghurt or other forms of sweets in its place, ice cream companies must constantly control their expenses and pricing. Finally, a company has to be aware of competitiveness among current rivals. The organisation must be sensitive to product offers, pricing, and structures if it is to survive and grow in a market where numerous businesses are vying for the same clients. Whether it's a manufacturing or service company, a charitable organisation, or a government organisation, these five elements work together to determine an organization's success.

DISCUSSION

The objective pressures an organisation experiences are described by the general environment and task environment, but the organisation must first be aware of those forces. The general and task environments are seen and portrayed by organisation members as the enacted environment. Environments must be perceived before they can have an impact on decisions about how to react to them. Organisation members must actively notice, register, and make sense of the environment before it can have an impact on their choices for what to do. Thus, the environment that is really in place determines the organisational responses that are selected. The success or failure of such reactions, however, depends on the general and task settings. Members could, for instance, believe that consumers are mostly content with their goods and opt to make only minimal attempts to produce new ones. The meagre product development efforts might have devastating organisational repercussions if such impressions are incorrect and consumers are unhappy with the current items. In order for choices and actions of members to be successful, an organization's enacted environment must to appropriately represent its general and task contexts [4]–[6].

Environmental Dimensions

The pace of change in an organization's general environment or task environment may be characterised along a dynamic-static continuum. In addition to comprehending the inputs at play, the environment can also be defined in terms of its complexity and rate of change. While static surroundings evolve more gradually and reliably, dynamic environments change quickly and unexpectedly. The amount of various components in the general and task environments that have the potential to have a big impact on the organisation is referred to as the complexity of the environment. Some organisations, like software development companies, must operate in complicated and changing contexts. Technology, rules, customers, and suppliers all change quickly and are crucial to the existence of the business. On the other hand, certain businesses, like those that make glass containers, operate in more predictable and straightforward conditions. Viewing environments as information flows that organisations must process in order to learn how to relate to their environments is a helpful way to comprehend how the rate of change and complexity of environments influence organizations. Information uncertainty, or the degree to which environmental information is ambiguous, is the key environment-related factor that affects information processing. Organisations work to make the environment less unclear so that they can deal with it effectively. For instance, businesses may use focus groups and surveys to ascertain client wants while attempting to comprehend competition plans via press releases, the actions of their sales staff, and knowledge of important employees. The more rapidly changing and complicated an organization's environment is, the more information uncertainty it encounters and, as a result, the more data it must analyse to understand the environment. Therefore, dynamic and complex settings provide organisations with challenging information processing issues. For many multinational organisations, for instance, global rivalry, technological advancement, and the financial markets have greatly stretched their ability to digest information and produced very unstable settings.

Design Elements

The design of an organisation is made up of four elements: technology, structure, management procedures, and human resource management systems. The organization's design must take into account both the intermediate input of strategy and the intermediate output of culture that surround it. In order to support their strategy and jointly encourage strategic behaviours, effective organisations first align their strategy with environmental inputs and then match the design components to one another.

Because a strategy describes how an organisation positions itself to compete in an environment, as an intermediate input between the environment and the four design components. A strategy represents the way an organisation uses its resources to achieve its goals and to gain a competitive advantage in a specific environment. An organization's mission defines its long-term goals, the variety of products or services it offers, the markets it serves, and the societal needs it addresses. A complete statement of strategy includes the organization's goals and objectives, strategic intent, and functional policies. The particular aims for attaining strategic success are included in goals and objectives. They serve as the cornerstone for organising operations and establishing performance standards because they provide clear direction, establish organisational objectives, and offer guidance for management choices. The phrase "strategic intent" may be used to sum up how an organisation wants to use three resource dimensions to accomplish its aims and objectives: breadth, aggressiveness, and distinction. For instance, in 2013, Nokia's objectives to regain financial confidence were driven by a turnaround strategic purpose. A closer focus on certain markets and products, greater aggressiveness shown by higher marketing spending and internal cost savings, and enhanced differentiation via its partnership with Microsoft and its Windows 8 operating system may all be used to describe this turnaround. The strategies, processes, laws, or administrative practises that direct decision-making and translate strategic goals into actions are referred to as functional policies. For instance, Intel has a strategy of investing around 30% of sales to R&D in order to preserve its dominance in the manufacturing of microprocessors in the semiconductor industry.

The method an organisation transforms inputs into goods and services is what technology is concerned with. Production techniques, work processes, and equipment are all included since it symbolises the fundamental transformation process. Technical interdependence and technical uncertainty are two characteristics of the technological core that have been proven to affect other design elements. Technical interdependence refers to how closely connected the various components of a technological system are. Tasks with high dependency must be carefully coordinated, as can be the case when departments must collaborate to release a new product. Technical uncertainty describes how much information processing and decision-making are needed to complete a job. In general, jobs that need a lot of information processing and judgement are challenging to plan and routineize. Manufacturing technology for cars is fairly interconnected and comparatively certain. As a consequence, the behaviours that employees should display and how their job should be organised may be predetermined by the car industry.

Structure is the fundamental organising method for breaking down an organization's overall work into manageable subunits that can assign tasks to teams or individuals and coordinate these subunits to complete the overall work. As a result, structure must be closely correlated with the organization's technology. Work may be divided up according to function, product or service, client, or any mix of the three. Through the administrative hierarchy or a number of lateral mechanisms, such as plans and schedules, budgets, project managers, liaison roles, integrators, cross-departmental task forces, and matrix links, structures may coordinate activities across subunits. The amount of uncertainty in the environment, the degree to which subunits differ from one another, and the degree of interdependence among subunits determine how much coordination is necessary in a structure. As uncertainty, subunit difference, and interdependence increase, more sophisticated coordinating devices are required. Management processes are techniques for processing data, making decisions, and managing the operation of the organisation. They support the organization's ability to assess its performance, identify and manage goal deviations, make pertinent choices, and communicate the outcomes. Management procedures, which are closely connected to structural coordination, keep an eye on organisational activities and provide managers and team members with information about work activities so they can better comprehend current performance, make informed choices, and coordinate work. Effective information, decision-making, and control systems give accurate, intelligible, and timely information; they are recognised as genuine by organisation members; and they provide advantages that outweigh their costs. They are intimately tied to strategic goals.

Systems for managing human resources include methods for choosing, training, evaluating, and rewarding employees. These affect the range of abilities, individual traits, and behaviours among organisation members. The technology and strategy used by an organisation provide crucial details about the abilities and expertise necessary for success. By recognising performance that aids in achieving objectives, incentive systems complete the cycle by determining if those skills and knowledge are being applied to the task. In order to assign prizes depending on measurable outcomes, reward systems may be linked to measurement systems. The fundamental presumptions, beliefs, and standards held by organisation members are represented by organisational culture. These cultural components, which are often taken for granted, direct members' perceptions, ideas, and behaviours. For instance, the culture of McDonald's values effectiveness, swiftness, and consistency. It introduces staff members to the objectives of the firm and offers examples of the behaviours required for success. Because culture is both a consequence and a constraint, as an intermediate output from the four design components. The principles of an organization's founder serve as the foundation for its culture, which is then reinforced and maintained via processes of organisation selection and socialisation. It is also the result of previous decisions made about the strategy, technology, structure, management practises, and human resource management systems, as well as the organization's history and surroundings. Organisational culture is personally internalised, making it difficult to modify and limiting the capacity of an organisation to change its strategy and organisational design elements.24 In this way, culture may either impede or support organisational change. It is important to fully comprehend an organization's culture in order to assess how well it aligns with its strategy and four design pillars.

Outputs

How successfully an organization's design contributes to organisational performance is gauged by its results. This may lead to one of three sorts of results. First, financial results like sales, profits, return on investment, or earnings per share are referred to as organisational performance. Performance for government and charitable organisations often relates to how well budgets or expenses were fulfilled. Second, productivity refers to metrics used internally to gauge effectiveness, such sales per employee, waste, mistake rates, product quality, or units generated per hour. Third, the level of stakeholder satisfaction reveals how effectively the company has lived up to the expectations of various interest groups. Customer loyalty, for instance, can be assessed through market share or focus group data, employee engagement through an opinion survey, investor satisfaction through stock price or analyst predictions, and environmental sustainability through the organization's carbon footprint.

Alignment:

Understanding the aforementioned components is necessary to assess how well they align or fit together to diagnose an organization's effectiveness. How well does the organization's strategy match the inputs? An organization's strategy must be adaptable to both the overall environment and the task environment in order to be successful. When deciding on a purpose, goals and objectives, strategic intent, and functional policies, it is important to take into account external influences, threats, and opportunities. These decisions are made by the organisation depending on how its members see their surroundings. In order for the organization's perceptions and strategic decisions to correctly reflect external reality, the information-processing and strategy-making skills of the organisation must meet the information uncertainty of the general and task contexts. Highly unpredictable environments include those that change quickly and are complicated. In these circumstances, organisations must continuously analyse information, monitor large portions of their surroundings, and make strategic decisions that can be swiftly adjusted to changing external conditions. On the other hand, when the information uncertainty of their general and task environments is generally low, organisations may regularly analyse chosen aspects of the environment and make strategic decisions that are stable over moderate to long periods of time.

Do the organisational design elements complement one another and work together to support the strategy? For instance, the design elements must mutually support and encourage agile and adaptable organisational behaviours if the organization's strategy is extremely flexible and sensitive to external change. Successful Silicon Valley businesses, like Apple and Oracle, often use adaptable tactics that encourage innovation and change. Leading-edge technologies that are complex and uncertain are part of their organisational design, as are flexible structures that prioritise agility and quick responses, management procedures that deliver information and feedback quickly and encourage employee decision-making, and human resource practises that identify, nurture, and reward talented employees. These adaptable and agile businesses prioritise technical proficiency, teamwork, innovation, and client fidelity in their organisational cultures.

Analysis

Examining outputs and determining the organization's present efficacy are good places to start. In the premium grand piano industry, Steinway has a significant market share, a track record of improved financial results, and a dedicated following of clients. The information on employee satisfaction is contradictory, with both long-tenured employees and signs indicating some employees are leaving for other positions. Comparing financial gains to industry averages reveals that they are minimal. A review of the inputs and organisational design is the first step in determining the root causes of these effectiveness problems. Next, the alignments between the various components are assessed. Two inquiries are crucial for diagnosing the inputs.

What is the atmosphere in general at the company? The external environment of Steinway is not very complicated or unclear. Socially speaking, Steinway is significant to a nation's fine arts and creative culture. It must be aware of flimsy musical trends and exhibit the proper sensitivity to them. The company is a worldwide player in politics, and as a result, its distribution and sales networks must be sensitive to the demands of many governments and nations. The manufacturing facility in Hamburg, Germany, raises the possibility of a significant political reliance that has to be recognised. In terms of technology, Steinway seems to be really concerned about the most recent developments in piano design, materials, and construction. Although they are aware of new technology, like the Yamaha assembly line, they still choose the tried-and-true techniques. Steinway has to be environmentally conscious. Because their product needs timber, they are quite picky about the options and reject many components. Environmentalists could voice their disapproval of how Steinway exploits this natural resource. These environmental factors provide a picture of relative moderate unpredictability when taken as a whole. Most of these problems are solvable and have some degree of predictability. Furthermore, not all environmental factors although there are many that must be addressed are of the utmost significance. The setting is not very complicated [7], [8].

What is the task environment at the company? The five primary drivers may be used to depict the profit pressures in Steinway's moderately competitive sector. First off, there is not much of a danger of entrance. There are certain significant obstacles that must be overcome if an organisation wants to enter the piano industry. For instance, the dealer networks and brands of Steinway, Yamaha, and Baldwin are particularly strong. Any new competitor would have to get beyond these negative perceptions in order to sell their goods. Second, there is a minor risk from alternative items. On the one hand, electronic keyboards have advanced significantly and provide an affordable substitute for grand and upright pianos. On the other hand, there may not be many alternatives to a concert grand piano given the sophistication of many of the performers and spectators. Third, suppliers have strong negotiating leverage, including those who supply labour and raw materials. Grand piano manufacturers and assemblers are highly sought-after artisans who are effectively under the jurisdiction of the labour union. The company must invest significant money to keep these highly qualified staff since most high-end piano manufacturers find it challenging to retain them.

Similar to how wood is essential to the finished product, timber suppliers might certainly have a big impact. Fourth, different market segments have different buying power. Although consumers are certainly ready and able to pay more for quality, the high-end market has a relatively limited and intelligent buyer base, and the restricted supply of high-quality pianos means that customers may push pricing. The number of purchasers is much higher and more dispersed in the middle and lower divisions. They are unlikely to be able to affect prices on their own. Finally, fierce competition exists among businesses. There are several well-known and well-funded local and foreign rivals. They are vying for the same customers and have almost all adopted production and marketing strategies like to Steinway's in the high-end market. For instance, the substantial resources Yamaha has access to as a keiretsu member indicate that it is a potent and long-term rival that will make a significant effort to dethrone Steinway from its position. Therefore, the piano market is only moderately appealing and Steinway's main sources of uncertainty are strong customers and suppliers as well as fierce rivalry. The impressions of Steinway executives about the general and task settings seem to be true overall.

In order to evaluate Steinway's strategy and organisational structure, it is critical to ask the following questions:

1. What is the business's plan? A comprehensive niche and differentiation strategy is the cornerstone of Steinway's business strategy. It makes an effort to fulfil its financial and other objectives by providing smart artists with a distinctive and high-quality output. Its product lineup, however, distorts the strategy's main objectives. One can question Steinway's commitment to the niche approach with the Boston and Steinway brands, as well as the upright and grand models. The case does not explicitly state its official purpose or objectives, which makes it difficult to assess the strategy's efficacy. But it appears logical to believe that

the company has a clear intention to maintain its dominance in the high-end market. However, it is also appropriate to wonder if the 1995 acquisition of new owners, which implied completely different strategies, has resolved the aims of profitability or revenue growth.

2. What are the company's technological, organisational, managerial, human resource, and cultural aspects? First off, the foundational technology of Steinway is both relatively interconnected and very uncertain. Craft-based production relies on the characteristics of the materials. The unique qualities of the wood are taken into consideration while constructing and tuning each piano. So much so that as a consequence of the production process, each piano has a unique sound. Due to the fact that the key phases in the process are not tightly connected in time, the technology is only moderately interdependent. For instance, the "action sets" creation process is separate of the "bellying" procedure. Similar to this, the concert bank, the main marketing initiative, is independent of production. Second, although the piano subsidiary seems to have a functional organisation, the corporate structure is divisional. Manufacturing, distribution, and sales are the primary activities.

It is also logical to suppose that there will be a group for finance, human resources, and procurement. Third, the production system is the main focus of management activities. Inspections conducted by the worker and the organisation are specifically mentioned. For instance, 100% inspection requires time and resources but is unquestionably important for quality. Additionally, there has to be a method for monitoring inventories for concert banks, completed items, and work-in-progress. Fourth, the method for managing human resources is quite advanced. It consists of an hourly and piece rate pay structure, a unionised employee relationship, programmes to keep employees, as well as international recruiting, compensation, benefits, and training policies. Fifth, Steinway's culture may be deduced despite the lack of explicit facts. A culture of quality, workmanship, and responsiveness is shown by the predominance of the high-end market, the handcrafted character of the manufacturing process, the significance of the concert bank programme, and the long history of family involvement. These principles are shown in the way the business selects its raw materials, the way it treats its most valued clients, the care it takes throughout manufacturing, and the image it seeks to maintain [9], [10].

After evaluating the organization's inputs, design elements, and outputs, it is now time to determine how well they fit together. The strategy's compatibility with environmental inputs is the first area of consideration. The moderate complexity and unpredictability of the job and general settings support the need for a strategy that is formal enough to regulate a complex production process but flexible enough to manage the few key dependencies. The relative breadth of Steinway's product range and its emphasis on the high-end sector of the market assist this adaptability. By offering distinctive, high-quality pianos to the high-end category, it plainly seeks to differentiating its product. However, unless Steinway wants to compete fiercely in the developing Asian markets where the Asian companies have an advantage due to proximity, the market for higher-priced and more specialised concert grands is much smaller than the market for lower-priced uprights. Entry into new markets would be challenging because to Steinway's overall lack of defined strategic objectives and strategies that favour neither expansion nor profitability. The adaptable and responsive production method used by Steinway supports and maintains its position as the leading producer of grand pianos worldwide. Additionally, it mitigates the strong buyer pressures in this market. The limited product range width of Steinway allows for some flexibility and efficiency. It has some manufacturing efficiencies in the upright and medium-market grand piano divisions, and the marketing of these goods is aided by the company's reputation. However, Steinway must exercise caution to avoid diluting its strategic emphasis on the high-end market by expanding its product range excessively. Overall, it looks that Steinway's strategy and environment are well-aligned.

CONCLUSION

The organisational system diagnostic procedure may provide difficulties. Obstacles might include resistance to change, data access restrictions, and organisational system complexity. In order to mitigate these issues, effective communication, stakeholder participation, and maintaining data integrity are crucial. Organisational system diagnostics is a useful procedure for comprehending and enhancing the operation of organisations. Organisations may discover opportunities for development and create focused interventions to bring about positive change by analysing the many elements and interactions that make up an organisational system. A mix of qualitative and quantitative techniques, in-depth knowledge of organisational dynamics, and the capacity to successfully negotiate obstacles are necessary for successful organisational system diagnostics. In the end, the knowledge gathered through organisational system diagnosis helps to improve performance overall, employee engagement, and organisational effectiveness.

REFERENCES:

[1] Z. Rezaee, A. Azar, A. M. B. Erz, and M. D. Nayeri, “Application of Viable System Model in Diagnosis of Organizational Structure,” *Syst. Pract. Action Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11213-018-9454-y.

[2] J. C. Puche-Regaliza, A. Jiménez, and P. Arranz-Val, “Diagnosis of Software Projects Based on the Viable System Model,” *Syst. Pract. Action Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11213-019-09491-y.

[3] M. Goulielmos, “Applying the organizational failure diagnosis model to the study of information systems failure,” *Disaster Prev. Manag. An Int. J.*, 2005, doi: 10.1108/09653560510605027.

[4] M. Schwaninger, “Governance for intelligent organizations: a cybernetic contribution,” *Kybernetes*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/K-01-2018-0019.

[5] C. A. Coruzzi, “Leading Change With Intelligence: The Power of Diagnosis in Creating Organizational Renewal,” *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0021886320953982.

[6] J. Simarmata and S. Almaududi, “Implementasi Diagnosis Organisasi pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta (PTS) di Kota Jambi,” *J-MAS (Jurnal Manaj. dan Sains)*, 2019, doi: 10.33087/jmas.v4i2.122.

[7] A. Vahidi and A. Aliahmadi, “Describing the Necessity of Multi-Methodological Approach for Viable System Model: Case Study of Viable System Model and System Dynamics Multi-Methodology,” *Syst. Pract. Action Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11213-018-9452-0.

[8] J. P. Ríos, “Models of organizational cybernetics for diagnosis and design,” *Kybernetes*, 2010, doi: 10.1108/03684921011081150.

[9] J. McMurray, L. Zhu, I. McKillop, and H. Chen, “Ontological modeling of electronic health information exchange,” *J. Biomed. Inform.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2015.05.020.

[10] C. Inquimbert *et al.*, "Concordance study between regular face-to-face dental diagnosis and dental telediagnosis using fluorescence," *J. Telemed. Telecare*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/1357633X19894111.

CHAPTER 23

INDIVIDUALIZED DIAGNOSIS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Yukti Khajanchi, Assistant Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-yukti.khajanchi@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

An emerging strategy in organisational development known as personalised diagnosis adapts the diagnostic process to particular organisational settings and demands while acknowledging the individuality and uniqueness of organisations. The idea of personalised diagnosis is examined in this abstract along with its importance in organisational growth and the crucial components of its execution. In organisational development, traditional diagnostic techniques often adopt a standardised methodology and provide broad frameworks and models for evaluating organisational performance. Personalised diagnosis, on the other hand, acknowledges that every organisation has its own unique traits, difficulties, and objectives. The need of adjusting the diagnostic procedure to the unique environment and needs of the organisation is emphasised. Personalised diagnosis is significant because it may provide businesses more precise, relevant, and useful information. Personalised diagnosis provides a better knowledge of the underlying elements that affect organisational performance and effectiveness by taking into consideration the distinctive organisational culture, structures, processes, and dynamics. It makes it possible for businesses to create specialised treatments that target their unique problems and make the most of their assets. The implementation of personalised diagnosis involves a number of important components. First, a cooperative and participative approach is necessary. It is possible to get a thorough knowledge of the organisation and guarantee that all viewpoints are taken into account throughout the diagnostic process by including important stakeholders, such as leaders, workers, and external consultants.

KEYWORDS:

Autonomy, Business, Growth, Identity, Task.

INTRODUCTION

The specific job or post represents the highest degree of organisational diagnosis. Numerous groups make up an organisation, and each group is made up of various particular vocations. The inputs, design elements, and relationship fits required for job diagnosis are covered in this section. The paradigm is comparable to other well-liked job diagnostic frameworks, such as Herzberg's job enrichment model and Hackman and Oldham's job diagnostic survey.

Inputs

Organisational design, cultural factors, group dynamics, and individual jobholder traits are the four main inputs that have an impact on job design. The broader organisation, in which a single job is the smallest unit, is the focus of organisational design. An important aspect of the whole environment around occupations is organisation design. Technology, organisational structure, managerial practises, and human resource management systems all have a significant influence on work design and employee experiences. For instance, corporate incentive programmes may direct staff towards certain work behaviours and affect perceptions of whether job performance is adequately rewarded. In general, technology is expected to encourage work designs that provide employees freedom and choice in carrying out tasks. Technology is characterised by very unpredictable jobs. On the other hand, low-uncertainty activities will probably encourage regular employment structures needing routinized work behaviours. The common standards and values of an organization's members are represented by its culture. They direct members' perceptions, ideas, and behaviours since they are often taken for granted. The types of job designs that organisations examine and that members believe to be legitimate might vary depending on culture. Job designs that are extremely flexible and include member decision-making are more likely to occur in organisations where member engagement and creativity are encouraged [1]–[3].

Group design pertains to the work group that contains the specific task. Group design, like organisational design, is crucial to the employment environment. Job design is influenced by factors including task structure, goal clarity, group dynamics, performance standards, and team dynamics. Compared to the more significant organisational design elements, they often have a more direct influence on occupations. The group task structure, for instance, may define whether individual tasks are placed together in groups that need coordination or ones that are made up of collections of independent work. The kind of persons that are available to fill positions might vary depending on a group's membership. The kind of work designs that are deemed acceptable, as well as the degree of jobholders' performances, may be influenced by group performance standards. Goal clarity aids in task prioritisation, and the effectiveness of a group's ability to influence individual job behaviours might vary. Group rules are more likely to be maintained and adhered to when members uphold tight bonds and the group is cohesive.

Age, education, experience, skills, and talents are only a few of the personal traits of people who hold employment. All of these factors may influence how individuals respond to job designs and application forms. An employee's work reactions might also be influenced by personal wants and expectations. For instance, individual differences in growth needs—the need for self-direction, learning, and personal accomplishment—can determine how much people are satisfied by jobs that offer high levels of skill variety, autonomy, and feedback on results. Similarly, people's expectations that they can perform a job well and that good job performance will lead to valued outcomes can have an impact on work motivation.

Design Elements

Each profession has five main characteristics: autonomy, task importance, task identity, and skill diversity. The degree to which a task demands a diversity of actions and skills to do the work is measured by skill variety. Because workers do a relatively small number of repeated tasks, assembly-line positions, for instance, often have little variability in skill sets. On the other hand, since individuals participate in a variety of activities and need a variety of abilities to complete their work, the majority of professional positions require a wide range of skills. The degree to which a task involves the completion of a relatively entire, distinguishable piece of work is measured by its task identity. Carpenters and other skilled artisans often have occupations with high degrees of task identity. They have the capacity to complete a task from start to finish. Assembly-line tasks are low on task identity and only entail a little amount of effort.

The importance of a task is measured by how much of an influence it has on other people's lives. Because hospital custodians are more likely to see their work as having an impact on someone else's health and wellbeing, these positions are likely to have more task relevance than equivalent employment in a toy factory. Autonomy measures how much flexibility and control an employee has over how they schedule their time and carry out their tasks. Most assembly-line occupations lack much liberty; the tempo of work is set and activities are carried out according to a predetermined plan. The autonomy of college teaching roles is greater. Even though they may not have much control over how classes are scheduled, professors can typically decide how a course is taught.

DISCUSSION

Feedback regarding outcomes refers to how well workers are informed directly and plainly about the efficacy of task performance. While assembly-line professions often provide high levels of input about outcomes, college teachers sometimes struggle with vague and indirect feedback regarding their performance in the classroom. These five job characteristics may be used to provide a comprehensive indicator of work enrichment. High degrees of skill diversity, task identity, task relevance, autonomy, and outcome feedback are characteristics of enriching occupations. They provide chances for self-direction, education, and self-actualization at work. Many individuals find very rewarding and stimulating occupations that are professionally enhanced [4]–[6].

Outputs

Both outputs related to how successfully the work is done and those related to how individuals feel their jobs are included in the concept of individual-job effectiveness. The amount, quality, time, and cost of creating a certain work output, such as a product or service, are used to quantify performance. Employment satisfaction, absenteeism, and personal growth are all signs of an individual's experience with their employment.

Alignment

Diagnostic model the job-design components we just discussed must cooperate to achieve positive work outcomes including high individual performance quality and quantity, minimal absenteeism, and high job satisfaction.

The wider organization's design, culture, and group design should be compatible with the job's design. Both the organisation and the group serve as strong settings for specific occupations or positions. They back up and strengthen certain task ideas. Richer occupations are compatible with highly adaptable organisational structures, participatory cultures, and teams where individuals may control their own behaviour. These organisational and group inputs foster individual work autonomy, flexibility, and creativity. On the other hand, work designs with poor scores on the five design components are consistent with bureaucratic organisations, cultures, and groups that depend on external controls. These social and organisational inputs support rote, regular tasks. As previously said, integration of the organisational, group, and job levels is promoted through congruence among various organisational design levels. Conflict is likely to occur if the levels do not match.

In order for jobholders to perform well and enjoy their work, the job design must also match their personal traits. People with high development needs are often well suited for enriched occupations. These individuals feel accomplished and satisfied when they work in positions that require a range of skills, autonomy, and feedback on outcomes. People with moderate to high levels of task-relevant talents, abilities, and knowledge are also suited for enriched occupations. Complex information processing and decision-making are typical requirements of enriching positions; to succeed well, individuals must possess equivalent skills and talents. Jobs fitting persons with basic skills and abilities and with modest growth demands tend to score poorly on the five job-design components. People who put a low priority on possibilities for self-direction and learning are better suited for simpler, more routine professions requiring less skills and expertise. However, as individuals may acquire expertise and development requirements via education, training, and experience, work designs must be constantly examined and modified as necessary to accommodate jobholders' evolving demands and expanded knowledge and abilities.

2. Do the elements of the work design complement one another? To offer a precise and consistent guidance for how the task should be executed, the five job-design components must cooperate with one another. Rich work designs indicate the requirement for flexibility, active participation, and decision-making by scoring well on the diversity of skills required, the task identity, the importance of the task, autonomy, and feedback of outcomes. On the other hand, conventional work designs that perform poorly on the design criteria show a necessity for repetitive and standardised job performances.

Analysis

The university is taking into consideration changing the job description for a programme administrator as part of a bigger cost-cutting drive. The application contains details about the administrator's current position. It may be determined whether or not the proposed modification makes sense by analysing the alignment of the individual-level components and their relationship to one another.

When individual-level inputs are diagnosed, the following questions are resolved:

Although the example indicates nothing about the structure and culture of the organisation, there are a few assumptions that might be drawn. The administration of the business school was aiming to reward the Programme Administrator with a more fulfilling position. This may indicate that employee engagement was encouraged by organisational culture. But an efficiency push was also taking into account the anticipated adjustment. The third-largest part-time MBA programme in the country is offered by the sizable institution. This explains why two EMBA programmes have been linked with a specialised master's degree in organisational development, which sets it apart from the conventional, part-time MBA programme. There may be challenging places of integration between the two kinds of programmes to the degree that the MSorganization development programme has distinct students or different marketing, delivery, and alumni relations methods than the EMBA programmes [7]–[9].

The kind of programme led to the grouping of three distinct roles. The programme office in this instance consists of a faculty director, a programme administrator, and an administrative assistant. The registrar's office, financial aid, and the teaching staff are only a few of the university and school operations that the office is obviously reliant upon. Although each of the three positions has distinct responsibilities, it is obvious that they are all very interdependent. The programme administrator must collaborate with the faculty director on choices relating to marketing, admissions, and curriculum as well as with the administrative assistant on matters pertaining to hiring, programme delivery, and standard administrative procedures. As a result, interaction is frequent while the activity is being completed, and even if certain exceptions are planned, there are often many of them.

The application offers some hints regarding the personality traits of the Programme Administrator. First off, his continued employment in the role for more than 15 years indicates devotion or commitment to the organization's growth strategy. Second, his employment has changed significantly, suggesting that at least modest development requires strength. The following design elements are involved in diagnosing specific jobs:

The programme administrator's job involves a wide range of duties, such as student recruitment, career guidance for current and prospective students, contribution to marketing strategies and tactics, management of routine and unusual administrative tasks, such as registration, grade changes, and graduation procedures, supervision of an administrative assistant, coordination with other functions and departments within the school and university, and travel to various locations.

The programme administrator's role is "all of a piece," requiring them to track applicants, students, and graduates through the whole application, enrollment, and graduation processes. It involves them personally, professionally, and as a part of a larger family or community.

Task importance is quite high for the position of programme administrator. It involves recruiting prospective students into a reputable programme, assisting them when they enrol, providing advice on their experiences there, and playing a significant role in their professional and personal growth. The task's relevance is further increased by the fact that it is a crucial component of a transformative educational process. The position of a programme administrator includes moderate to high levels of autonomy. It requires a lot of independent judgement without much oversight or outside restrictions. The position of programme administrator gets a lot of input. It comes from the faculty director about job performance, programme assessments on the quality of services, and student feedback regarding the level of assistance and direction received. Measures of work satisfaction, performance, absenteeism, and personal growth are used to evaluate individual-level outcomes. The programme administrator does a good job at his work and seems to be extremely happy with it and the opportunity it provides for personal growth. Despite the lack of information on his degree of absences, it would be fair to presume that it is quite low.

These encouraging results imply that the work design and the inputs, as well as the job design's constituent parts, are now well matched. When all of the job's elements are considered, the position of programme administrator offers significant opportunities for enrichment. A richer work experience is a consequence of high levels of task diversity, task identity, task relevance, autonomy, and feedback concerning outcomes. Because skill diversity and autonomy have grown through time, the amount of enrichment seems to have risen. However, there are certain uneven fits between the organisation design and the job design. The technology used by the business school for recruiting, teaching, and managing alumni is at the very least relatively questionable. Uncertain tasks need extensive information processing and decision-making. Such activities are appropriate for enriched positions, and the programme administrator position has steadily changed to accommodate the high degrees of work unpredictability.

The MSorganization development programme office, and the administrator position in particular, have developed to be structurally independent of the other programmes offered by the business school as a specialised master's degree that differs from an EMBA programme. Despite chances such student registration, graduation, book purchase, and others, there does not seem to be any sharing or coordination of duties among these various MBA programmes. Either the MSorganization development programme is sufficiently distinct from the EMBA programmes to justify such independence, or the proposed shift presents some significant prospects for increased efficiency. Additionally, it seems that the culture of the Graziadio School of Business and Management and the job description for the administrator only partially align. Both employee engagement and efficiency are encouraged by the culture, with the former supporting an enriching work and the latter sometimes preventing enrichment. The programme administrator's position closely interacts with the other positions in the programme office to create a team that is cohesive and mostly self-managed. This shows that the role of an enhanced programme administrator and the way the office team is set up match well together. Last but not least, the programme administrator job description fits the programme administrator well in terms of personality.

The proposed change to the position of programme administrator has to be carefully reviewed in the present environment. Will the modification likely boost quality, productivity, or work satisfaction? In general, it seems that the answer is "no." For instance, it is claimed that the proposed change would boost work variety, task identity, and task importance by introducing new duties. The increased administrative responsibilities of the EMBA courses do not, however, broaden the range of skills required for the position of programme administrator. In reality, administering such courses doesn't need any new talents, and adding these tasks can even upset the current skill mix. That is, under the proposed new job, the programme delivery component will more or less predominate the mix and will expand considerably in comparison to the other employment components. In fact, less diversity in the types of tasks may come from this.

The proposed adjustment asserts that task relevance will rise since the programme administrator position will have the power to influence both EMBA students and participants in the MSorganization development programme. This theory has some value, but it must be balanced with the possibility that task identity may decline. As stated in the application, the task identity for the position of programme administrator is high while that of the EMBA programme is rather low. Programme administrators in the EMBA programme only communicate with students while they are enrolled in the programme; they have little to no contact with them when they are being recruited or after they become alumni. Since only roughly half of those affected by the planned new employment will be affected, any increase in the number of individuals it impacts is likely to be mitigated [10]–[12].

The last assertion made in the proposed change is that the Programme Administrator will have less autonomy while receiving greater responsibilities. The new programme administrator will answer to the EMBA/PKE director and the director of the MSorganization development programme. With the MSorganization development programme director ensuring that the MSorganization development programme objectives are addressed and the EMBA/PKE programme director ensuring that his or her programme objectives are being addressed, the programme administrator will likely have more supervision, not less. The suggested alterations provide an intervention conundrum when compared to the job's design elements for the programme administrator. Should the management of the business school proceed with the suggested change? The anticipated effi- ciencies could or might not come to pass. The broad knowledge and abilities of the programme administrator may be used to boost output. Will it, nevertheless, come at the expense of his job satisfaction? Such a solution could not hold up over time. In the event that the change is put into place, organisation development interventions should likely be focused on reducing the negative impacts on task identity, task importance, and task autonomy. Working with the Programme Administrator, the EMBA/PKE director and the director of MSorganization development should establish clear guidelines for his new position. They must devise ways to let the programme administrator carry out the duties that he enjoys the most. Alternative structural arrangements within the EMBA programmes organisation may need to be looked at if the suggested adjustments are not adopted.

Synopsis

This chapter provided information for diagnosing groups, organisations, and specific professions. Organisation members and experts in organisation development work together to gather relevant data, analyse it, and make conclusions for action planning and intervention. This process is known as diagnosis. The goal of diagnosis may be to identify the root causes of a particular issue or it may be to evaluate an organisation or department to identify potential future growth opportunities. The diagnosis offers the required real-world knowledge to design actions for resolving issues and enhancing organisational efficiency. The diagnosis is based on conceptual models of how organisations operate. By outlining areas to look at and questions to ask when assessing how an organisation or department is running, such diagnostic models act as road maps. In this concept, organisations are seen as open systems. The purpose of the organisation is to coordinate the departmental behaviours. It is susceptible to interactions with the outside world and is impacted by external influences. Organisations, which are open systems, are hierarchically organised; that is, they are made up of groups, which are made up of individual tasks. The five fundamental open-systems characteristics that organisations exhibit are environments, inputs, transformations, and outputs; boundaries; feedback; and alignment. Three organisational levels organization, group, and individual job were covered by a thorough model for diagnosing organisational systems. It has many different outputs, including performance, productivity, and stakeholder satisfaction, as well as a set of design inputs. Understanding each component of the model at each organisational level is necessary for diagnosis, which is followed by an evaluation of how the design elements relate to one another and to the inputs. Good alignment is likely to lead to effective outputs.

CONCLUSION

In order to compile pertinent data on the organisation, it integrates a variety of qualitative and quantitative data collecting techniques, including focus groups, interviews, surveys, and observation. The selection of diagnostic methods and instruments is tailored to the organization's particular needs and environment. The need of interaction and feedback is further emphasised by personalised diagnosis. A common awareness of the organisational issues and possibilities may be achieved by promptly and constructively communicating diagnostic results to organisational stakeholders. Additionally, it promotes a feeling of pride in and dedication to the ensuing transformation activities. The relevance of adapting the diagnostic procedure to specific organisational settings is recognised by personalised diagnosis, which provides a useful strategy for organisational growth. Personalised diagnosis offers organisations pertinent and useful insights to create real change and improve organisational success by recognising the distinctiveness of organisations and using a collaborative, adaptable, and feedback-oriented approach.

REFERENCES:

[1] K. Tsuchiya, “Intervention in ‘time’ of organization: Case study of organizational diagnosis during organization development,” *JAPANESE J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, 2016, doi: 10.2130/jjesp.si2-5.

[2] R. Pech and B. Slade, “Memetic engineering: A framework for organisational diagnosis and development,” *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.*, 2004, doi: 10.1108/01437730410544764.

[3] H. Hardiyansyah and A. Sumantri, "Analisis Pengembangan Organisasi Pelayanan Publik melalui Proses Diagnosa dan Intervensi," *J. Ilm. Adm. Publik*, 2019, doi: 10.21776/ub.jiap.2019.005.01.6.

[4] J. M. McFillen, D. A. O'Neil, W. K. Balzer, and G. H. Varney, "Organizational Diagnosis: An Evidence-based Approach," *Journal of Change Management*. 2013. doi: 10.1080/14697017.2012.679290.

[5] M. Marjanis, H. Yazid, R. Rasdinal, and N. Gistituati, "Penerapan Diagnosing Organisasi Melalui Intervensi Technostruktural: Studi Literatur," *J. Ilm. Univ. Batanghari Jambi*, 2021, doi: 10.33087/jiubj.v21i2.1525.

[6] A. T. Cobb, "Political Diagnosis: Applications in Organizational Development," *Acad. Manag. Rev.*, 1986, doi: 10.2307/258306.

[7] V. A. García Navarro, "Desarrollo de un modelo de diagnóstico de cultura organizacional development a model of diagnosis of organizational culture," *Perspectivas*, 2017.

[8] R. E. McQuater, A. J. Peters, B. G. Dale, M. Spring, J. H. Rogerson, and E. M. Rooney, "The management and organisational context of new product development: Diagnosis and self-assessment," *Int. J. Prod. Econ.*, 1998, doi: 10.1016/S0925-5273(98)00063-2.

[9] B. Bin Saeed and W. Wang, "Sustainability Embedded Organizational Diagnostic Model," *Mod. Econ.*, 2014, doi: 10.4236/me.2014.54041.

[10] M. Khafidz Fuad Raya, "Resolusi Konflik dalam Institusi Pendidikan Islam (Kajian Empirik dan Potensi Riset Resolusi Konflik)," *J. Pendidik. Islam Indones.*, 2016, doi: 10.35316/jpii.v1i1.38.

[11] H. Meltzer and R. Stagner, "3. Understanding Organizational Behavior," *Prof. Psychol. Res. Pract.*, 1980, doi: 10.1037/h0078207.

[12] R. W. Woodman, "The Science of Organizational Change and the Art of Changing Organizations," *J. Appl. Behav. Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0021886314550575.

CHAPTER 24

SPECIALIZATION AND COORDINATION IN THE DESIGN OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Meena Desai, Assistant Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-meena.desai@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

The design of organisational structures must take specialisation and coordination into consideration. This abstract examines the importance of coordination and specialisation, their interactions, and how they affect organisational success. In an organisation, specialisation refers to the division of labour whereby people or departments concentrate on certain duties or functions that are consistent with their areas of competence. Employee productivity and efficiency grow as a result of the opportunity to acquire in-depth knowledge and expertise in their specialised fields. Organisations may take advantage of employee strengths, allocate resources efficiently, and gain economies of scale by specialising. Additionally, it makes it easier to create specialised positions and career tracks, which improves employee retention and happiness. It is important to strike the correct balance between coordination and specialisation when designing an organisational structure. Silos, a lack of cross-functional cooperation, and inefficient resource utilisation may result from excessive specialisation without enough coordination. On the other hand, very tight coordination without distinct specialisation may lead to a lack of responsibility, uncertainty in roles, and sluggish decision-making.

KEYWORDS:

Integration, Marketing, Organization, Product, Team.

INTRODUCTION

The underlying principle or cornerstone of horizontal differentiation is functional structure. An organisation divides various duties into distinct functions to improve the efficiency with which it accomplishes its main objective: offering clients high-quality goods at reasonable rates. As roles become more specialised, workers' aptitudes rise to the occasion, and the core competencies that provide a company a competitive edge start to take shape. As an organisation adapts to the more complicated job needs, several roles are created. For instance, a very tiny company owner could employ outside specialists to handle marketing and accountancy. However, when a company expands in size and complexity, these operations often get internalised since doing its own marketing and bookkeeping becomes more cost-effective than employing external contractors.

Organisations generate not just additional functions, but also greater specialisation within each function as they expand, which is how they get more complicated. Focus on New Information Technology, Part 4 shows how Amazon.com employed horizontal differentiation to create a functional structure as it evolved. By concentrating on the best way to segment the organization's overall task into functions and hiring functional managers with experience from other companies, like Walmart, to lead them, Bezos developed core competencies that allowed his online bookstore to successfully compete with physical bookstores. Due to their limited ability to stand out from the competition and provide clients the vast selection of books and easy service that Amazon.com can, many bookshops have closed their doors. Amazon.com has established a system to successfully handle its new information technology, which allows it to do this [1]–[3].

Benefits of a Functional Architecture

Functional organisation emerges primarily as a result of the opportunities it gives individuals to share knowledge, specialise, and increase productivity. When individuals with complementary talents are brought together to create a functional group, they may learn from one another the most effective ways to carry out tasks or address issues. The most qualified workers are promoted to supervisory and managerial positions and assigned the duty of training new hires. An organisation may expand its pool of talents and competencies in this manner. For instance, Google's capacity to create value is ingrained in its workers' skill sets as well as the way it organises and arranges them to maximise those talents. Google had 24,000 workers and annual sales of more than $31 billion in 2010. By June 2011, Google had hired about 3000 additional people to support its fast expansion into new industries, such as cloud computing services and mobile device apps. Another benefit of the functional organisation is that individuals who are grouped together based on shared talents may oversee and manage the behaviour of one another. We spoke about how each department constructs a hierarchy to help an organisation manage its operations. Peers in the same function may oversee and monitor one another and maintain work activities on schedule in addition to functional managers. When work is complicated and depends on collaboration, peer monitoring is extremely crucial because it is exceedingly difficult to provide supervision from above in these circumstances. Finally, individuals in a function who collaborate closely over a long period of time create norms and values that enable them to improve their performance. They develop into devoted team members who take part in organisational activities. This dedication could turn into a company's primary competency.

Problems with Control in a Functional Structure

Because specialisation and the division of labour are encouraged by this, which is a significant factor in increasing effectiveness, all organisations eventually split into autonomous roles. Functional structure fosters fundamental competencies that improve an organization's capacity to manage people and resources, much as it did for Amazon.com. However, functional structure causes additional issues when an organisation develops and diversifies. Problems often result from an organization's success because it becomes more difficult for it to offer enough functional support for its expanding product line as its knowledge base and capabilities improve and it is able to provide a larger range of products and services. For instance, it is becoming more and harder for sales and marketing to give new goods the thorough attention they need to launch, which results in missed sales goals. In a similar vein, demand increases when more consumers find an organization's offerings to be valuable. Manufacturing is under pressure from increased consumer demand to discover methods to boost output fast, which often leads to a drop in product quality and a rise in prices. As a result, R&D and engineering are put under increased pressure to boost product quality, variety, and complexity in order to keep ahead of the competition, as shown in Apple's drive to produce an endless stream of upgraded iPods and iPhones.

A successful organization's challenge is how to maintain control over operations that get more complicated as it expands and diversifies. Control issues make it increasingly difficult for managers to juggle the operations of an organisation when it produces more and more items, expands geographically, or experiences escalating consumer rivalry. Communication issues arise when an organization's functions multiply, each with a distinct hierarchy and a growing distance between them. For instance, sales believes that the organization's main issue is the need to quickly satisfy customer demands in order to increase revenues; manufacturing believes that the organization's main issue is the need to simplify products in order to reduce costs; and R&D believes that the biggest issue is the need to increase a product's technical sophistication. As a result, there are communication issues. Communication issues arise as a consequence of these perception gaps, which decrease the degree of coordination and mutual adjustment across departments and make it harder for the organisation to meet consumer and market needs. As a result, difference causes communication issues that businesses attempt to address in part by adopting more sophisticated integrating methods.

A task or activity must be measurable in order to be controlled; otherwise, there is no standard against which to compare how task performance evolves over time. However, when organisations expand and the quantity and complexity of their activities and products rise, it may be challenging to get the data required to assess how each function or product contributes to overall profitability. The challenge arises from the growing difficulty in measuring the cost of each function's contribution to the creation of each product. For instance, managers may not be aware that one or more items are really costing the firm money since they are unable to attribute functional expenses to specific goods. As a result, the company is not using its resources as effectively as it might.

Location Problems

As a business expands, it may be necessary to open offices and production or sales facilities in several locations to better service consumers. When centralised control from one geographic location stops this from occurring, geographic dispersion may cause control issues within a functional structure: Manufacturing, sales, and other support operations are not permitted to become responsive to the demands of each area. An organisation with several locations must create a control and information system that can strike a balance between the requirement to decentralise decision-making power to regional operations and the need to centralise decision-making authority. In reality, as Amazon.com grew, it created five major U.S. distribution centres, with locations in Kentucky, Kansas, Nevada, Delaware, and Nevada.

Customer Problems

As an organization's product line and quality expand, more and more consumers are drawn to it and they have a variety of wants. In a functional organisation, meeting the demands of many consumer groups and designing goods that fit their needs may be challenging. Production, marketing, and sales departments mostly handle customer service for the whole product line; they have limited chance to focus on the demands of a specific client segment. As a result, in a functionally structured company, sales opportunities may be missed due to a lack of capacity to recognise and meet client demands [4], [5].

Strategic Problems

As an organisation gets increasingly complicated, senior managers may be compelled to devote so much time on figuring out how to solve routine coordination issues that they run out of time to deal with the longer-term strategic issues the business is facing. For instance, they can be so busy fixing integration and communication issues across departments that they don't have time to prepare for new product development. The organisation thus loses focus.

Control Issues in a Functional Structure: Solutions

By altering the functional structure to improve integration across functions, managers may sometimes address control issues brought on by a functional structure, such as inadequate communication between functions. For instance, managing the interaction between sales and marketing is a persistent organisational difficulty. The conventional connection between them: Each is a distinct function with its own hierarchy. Numerous organisations have consolidated these tasks into a single function after seeing the necessity to change this design. This modification. By enhancing integration between functions, such modifications to the functional organisation boost control.

Divisional structure follows functional structure

Managers will be able to resolve many of the control issues connected with a functional structure if an organisation restricts itself to manufacturing a limited number of identical items, produces those products in one or a few locations, and sells them to just one main kind of consumer. However, when businesses expand over time, they start to generate an increasing number of goods, many of which vary greatly from one another. For instance, GE manufactures a huge variety of kinds of turbine engines, lightbulbs, appliances, and loan services. Additionally, when an organisation produces more and different sorts of products and services, it also needs to serve more and different kinds of clients, necessitating the opening of factories and offices in more and more places throughout the world. When organisations expand in this way, it is necessary to have a structure that will simultaneously give managers more control over each of the organization's distinct subunits so that those subunits can better meet customer and product needs, as well as give managers control over and integration over the overall operation of the business to ensure that all of its subunits are meeting organisational goals. When managers select for a more complicated structure the outcome of three design decisionsthey reclaim control over their organisations.

Vertical Differentiation Has Increased: Managers must increase vertical difference to recover control. Increasing the hierarchy's levels, selecting how much decision-making power to place at the top of the organisation, and determining how much to utilise rules, SOPs, and norms to standardise low-level workers' behaviour are typical aspects of this.

Horizontal Differentiation Has Increased: Managers must enhance horizontal difference to recover control. This entails layering another kind of subunit grouping on top of a functional grouping of activities, most often independent product teams or product divisions that are equipped with the necessary functional resources to achieve their objectives.

A Greater Level of Integration: Managers must strengthen the integration between subunits in order to restore control. The complexity of the integrating mechanisms that managers must use to regulate organisational activities increases with the extent of differentiation. Remember from that task forces, teams, and integrating roles are examples of complex integrating mechanisms. For their capacity to better coordinate operations and inspire workers, organisations must integrate their components more.

These three design decisions boost integration and distinction. The hierarchy of author- ity is the sole integrating mechanism used by the organisation, which has two levels in its hierarchy and three components. The results of growth and differentiation. The organisation has created three levels in its structure and eight subdivisions to handle its more complex functions. It required a higher level of integration due to the increased differentiation, which led to the creation of a number of task forces to regulate interactions between subunits. The more intricate organisational structures covered in the following chapters are all the outcome of managerial choices regarding vertical differentiation, horizontal differentiation, and integration. Changes to all three criteria are necessary to progress to a complex structure [6]–[8].

Making the switch to a divisional structure

The divisional structure is the one that organisations most often use to address the control issues that arise from manufacturing a wide variety of goods in a wide variety of places for a wide variety of clients. In a divisional structure, tasks are grouped in accordance with the unique requirements of the markets, customers, or goods. To divide an organisation into more manageable, compact pieces, a divisional structure was used. Managers' choice of divisional structure is based on the particular control issues that need to be resolved, as mentioned above.

DISCUSSION

The organisation organises its operations by product and adopts a product structure if the control issue is brought on by the quantity and complexity of goods. The organisation splits its operations by area and utilises a geographic structure if the control issue is brought on by the number of places where it produces and sells its goods. The organisation splits its operations by customer group and utilises a market structure if the control issue is brought on by the necessity to serve a variety of distinct consumer groups. We next go through several divisional structure kinds, which are created to address certain control issues. Each form of divisional structure utilises more intricate integrating mechanisms and has higher vertical and horizontal differentiation than a functional structure.

Three Different Types of Product Structure in Divisional Structure

A functional structure is less efficient at coordinating task activities when an organisation expands the types of products it produces or the services it offers. Imagine the coordination issues a furniture manufacturer like IKEA would have if it produced 100 different couch designs, 150 different table styles, and 200 different chair styles in the same production facility. It would be unable to exert adequate control over its value-creation operations. An organisation organises its operations not only by function but also by kind of product in order to preserve effectiveness and streamline control issues as the variety of its goods expands. A furniture manufacturer could set up three product groups or divisions to build tables, chairs, and couches in order to streamline control issues. A product structure is a divisional structure in which goods are organised into distinct divisions in order to enhance control, depending on their similarities or differences. When an organisation chooses to organise its operations by product, it must also determine how to integrate the activities of the product divisions with those of the supporting R&D, marketing, sales, and accounting departments. Generally speaking, an organisation has two options: centralise support functions at the top of the hierarchy so that one set of support functions serves all of the many product divisions, or establish separate sets of support functions for each product division. In general, the choice made by an organisation reflects the complexity and uniqueness of its goods. An organisation will decide to centralise support services and employ a product division structure if its goods are generally comparable and targeted at the same market. A company that sells widely varied goods and works in a variety of markets or sectors would opt for a multidivisional structure. A company will opt for a product team structure if its goods are technologically highly complicated or if their qualities change quickly to accommodate changing client requirements [9], [10].

Structure of Product Divisions

The manufacturing function is divided into multiple separate product lines or divisions in a product division structure. A centralised set of support functions then meets the demands of all of these product divisions. Food processors, furniture manufacturers, and businesses that produce personal care, paper, or other items that are generally comparable and need the same set of support activities sometimes adopt a product division structure. A big food processor like Heinz's product division organisation. Heinz established several product divisions that produce frozen veggies, frozen meals, canned soups, and baked products because coordinating the production of many diverse items inside a single manufacturing unit proved to be challenging and increased expenses. Because each division is a distinct production unit with its own hierarchy and product division manager in charge, this design choice promoted vertical diversification within the organisation. Each product division manager is in charge of the product-related operations within his or her division. To maximise their abilities and hence advance product development, the product division manager also collaborates with the central support functions like marketing and materials management. The position of product division manager elevates the hierarchy or degree of power within an organisation, increasing vertical difference.

This shows how support services including sales and marketing, R&D, materials management, and finance are centralised at the top of the organisation in a product division structure. Each product division uses the central support functions rather than having a separate set of support staff. It would be costly to develop separate support functions for each product division, and the expense could only be justified if the demands of the various divisions were so varied and divergent that distinct functional special- ists were necessary for each kind of product. Each support function is separated into functional specialised teams focused on the requirements of one specific product division. The R&D function is divided into four teams, each of which focuses on a different product division. Because of this design, each team may specialise and become an authority on meeting the demands of its particular product category. However, since each R&D team is a part of the same centralised function, they may communicate and exchange expertise. The R&D team for frozen dinners may benefit from learning about innovative techniques for quickly freezing veggies from the R&D team specialising in frozen vegetables. This kind of resource and expertise sharing improves a function's capacity to provide value across product divisions.

Multidivisional Organisation

The product division structure cannot give an organisation the control it needs as it starts to produce a wide variety of complex products, like many different car or truck models, or as it enters new industries and produces entirely new products, like appliances, lightbulbs, turbines, and financial services, as with GE. A multidivisional structure, in which each product division is given its own set of support services so they become self-contained divisions, is necessary to manage complex and diverse value-creation activities. Although a business like GE, IBM, Johnson & Johnson, or Matsushita could have 150 separate operational divisions, just four are shown in the illustration. Compared to the product division structure, the multidivisional structure is more complex. When managers decide to create an ever-increasing variety of distinct goods in various sectors, a multidivisional structure has two innovations that overcome the control issues a firm has with the product division structure. The independence of each division is the first innovation. Each division in a multidivisional system is autonomous and self-sufficient. When divisions are autonomous, each division has its own set of administrative tasks and manages its own value-generating operations. Because the demands of completely different goods, such cars, computers, and consumer electronics, cannot be met by a single centralised collection of support services, each division need its own set of support functions. In turn, horizontal difference becomes stronger.

A new level of management, a corporate headquarters staff, made up of corporate managers who are in charge of supervising the divisional managers in charge of the various divisions, is the second innovation in a multidivisional organisation.5 The employees of the corporate headquarters are functionally organised, and one of the duties of the corporate managers is to plan the divisions' operations. Managers at corporate headquarters, for instance, might support divisions in sharing information and learning from one another so that ideas within a division can spread fast across the organisation. As you may recall from Chapter 4, managers that behave in this manner are playing an integrating role. Vertical differentiation has risen as a result of the installation of corporate managers as a new level in the hierarchy, which offers greater coordination and control. Corporate headquarters and the divisions are connected by the heads of the divisions. A multidivisional structure offers greater differentiation and integration than a functional or product division structure, which makes it easier to manage more complex tasks.

A multi-divisional structure differs from a product division structure in two ways: a corporate staff and independent divisions. However, they also vary in other significant ways. A corporation may only employ a product division structure to manage its operations if it solely engages in that particular line of work. A multidivisional structure, on the other hand, enables a corporation to operate in a variety of industries. In a multidivisional organisation, each division is effectively a distinct company. Additionally, it is the duty of each divisional manager to create a divisional structure that best serves the requirements of the division's goods and clients. Therefore, a product division structure or any other structure might be used by one or more independent divisions within a multidivisional structure to coordinate their operations. Three divisions, each with a unique structure, make up the multidivisional organisation. The division that makes cars has a useful structure since it only produces a limited number of straightforward components. The PC division is organised into product divisions, each of which creates a certain kind of computer. The matrix structure of the consumer electronics industry reflects the requirement for speedy customer response. Over 150 distinct divisions make up GE. The whole GE empire is run via a multidivisional organisation, however its lightbulb division has a functional structure and its appliance division functions with a product division structure.

A multidivisional structure is used by the majority of Fortune 500 firms because it enables them to develop and extend their operations while still keeping control over their operations. The three main levels of management—corporate managers, who oversee the operations of all divisions, divisional managers, who oversee each individual division, and functional managers, who are in charge of fostering the organization's core competencies—only become part of the management hierarchy when an organisation has a multidivisional structure. GM's choice to adopt a multidivisional organisational structure is discussed in Organisational Insight 6.1, which also highlights the distinctions between a multidivisional structure and a product division structure. It also depicts many of the problems and concerns associated with managing a multidivisional organisation. Operating a multidivisional structure is not an easy undertaking, as the GM narrative illustrates. It is perhaps the toughest challenge that senior managers confront and the one that determines a company's greatest achievements or failures.

Given the popularity of the multidivisional structure, it is important to consider both its benefits and drawbacks.

Advantages of a Multidivisional Structure

A big, complex organisation may benefit from a number of factors when a multidivisional structure is handled well. Workforce Division Typically, a division of labour improves organisational performance. There is a distinct division of labour between corporate and divisional managers in a multidivisional organisation. Divisional managers are in charge of running their particular divisions on a daily basis and adjusting their actions to meet the demands of the clients. Corporate managers are in charge of long-term planning for the company as a whole and customising divisional missions to fit corporate objectives. Increased Control Corporate management keep a closer eye on divisional managers' operations. Divisional managers are encouraged to pursue internal organisational efficiency even more vigorously thanks to the additional oversight offered by the corporate office. Divisional managers may restrain their desire to grow their own staffs knowing they must answer to corporate management, elevating their standing and minimising expenses. They could also reconsider buying items that elevate their prestige but have little effect on improving business success. In a broader sense, as the GM example illustrates, the formation of self-contained divisions allows corporate managers to create control systems to contrast the performance of one division with that of another by gauging profitability or the length of time it takes to manufacture a product. when a result, corporate managers are well-positioned to step in and take specific action to address inefficiencies when they manifest.

Profitable Growth When each division is a separate profit centre, or when it is possible to assess each division's individual profitability, corporate headquarters can identify the divisions where an investment in capital will produce the greatest returns. As a result, corporate executives can allocate capital resources more effectively to support corporate growth. They may also manage a wider range of various enterprises and activities since their position is one of monitor rather than administrator. A corporation may expand using a multidivisional structure without experiencing the communication issues or information overload that might arise when the two positions are combined, as they are in the functional structure. Internal Labour Market Promotions to corporate managers are given to the most qualified divisional managers. Divisional managers are motivated to perform well since top office promotions are based on performance. An internal labour market, which exists in big divisional companies, motivates managers to work more to boost organisational performance.

Like all structures, multidivisional structures may eventually have certain issues. While most issues can be controlled by effective management, they cannot be completely solved. How Much Authority to Centralise at the Corporate Level and How Much Authority to Decentralise to the Operating Divisions is the Central Management Problem Posed by a Multi-Divisional Structure. On the one hand, decentralisation is a reasonable decision since each division is closest to its unique operational environment and is in the greatest position to establish strategies to boost its own effectiveness. However, headquarters' function is to have a long-term perspective and mould divisional operations to the requirements of the whole organisation, thus centralization has its benefits as well. A constant management of the two's equilibrium is required. Divisional managers may get entrapped by excessive centralization of power, losing control of decision-making to headquarters managers who are removed from the action, which may lead to subpar performance. The move by GM to centralise decision-making in order to save costs backfired since all GM vehicles began to have the same design. However, too much decentralisation might result in allowing divisional managers too much independence, which can cause them to lose focus and fail to keep expenses under control.

The interaction between the corporate and divisional levels must be continually handled. The choice of which managerial functions to centralise and which to decentralise will alter over time as the operational environment evolves.

Coordination Issues When a multidivisional structure is established, corporate headquarters may transfer funds to the divisions based on performance and analyse the efficacy of the divisions using metrics like return on investment. One issue with this strategy is that divisions could start vying with one another for resources, making it difficult for them to work together. When a company's efficiency relies on the divisions exchanging knowledge and information about innovations to improve the performance of all divisions, such competition might impair organisational performance. For instance, it would be detrimental if one of GM's divisions developed a brand-new, very efficient engine but kept the knowledge secret from the company's other divisions. The price at which one division sells a product or knowledge about innovations to another division is known as the "transfer price," and it is often the source of disputes between divisions. One division will seek a high transfer price to maximise its own return on investment, but doing so would penalise the other division, which is after all a member of the same organisation. Thus, coordination issues inside the organisation may arise when each section pursues its own objectives. According to Sloan of GM, the corporate center's responsibility is to handle these issues. Establishing integrating mechanisms that allow managers from many divisions to collaborate is crucial for multi-divisional organisations. In order to encourage collaboration, strategies like departmental and role integration are crucial. One kind of integrating department is the corporate office itself.

Costs of Administration

Operating multi-divisional structures is quite costly. There are complete support functions, including R&D, for each division. As a result, there is significant activity duplication inside the organisation, and corporate headquarters managers are expensive. A multidivisional structure has substantial running expenses that must be weighed against the advantages it offers the business. The corporation should also take action to lower the size of the corporate headquarters, the number of divisions, or the expenses of its support operations if the advantages compared to the costs decline. For instance, it could be conceivable for a company to switch to a product division structure or a product team structure and cater to the demands of all of its many products using a single set of centralised support services.

Communication Issues

Tall hierarchies may cause information to be distorted, which can lead to communication issues. Multidivisional organisational structures often have these issues since they are the highest of all organisational systems. The corporate headquarters and the divisions are separated by a wide chasm. In order to secure higher capital allocations, the head of a division may knowingly conceal declining divisional performance. With 200 divisions in a firm, this deceit may be difficult to spot. Additionally, it could take too long for headquarters to make choices and communicate them to divisions, resulting in too sluggish of replies to rivals. The more centralised an organisation is, the more difficult it will be to communicate.

Product Team Organisation

Members of support functions, such as marketing and R&D, collaborate with the various divisions as required in a product division structure, but their primary allegiance is to their function, not to the division. Because industry competitiveness has shifted to be more product-focused, organisations are discovering more and more that the functional orientation of experts is not in an organization's best interests. Customising goods to meet consumer expectations while limiting product development expenses is crucial nowadays. Furthermore, because of the increasing rivalry, it is critical to shorten the time it takes to create a new product by accelerating the process. A multidivisional structure with distinct support functions for each division might be one solution to this issue. However, as we just stated, this structure is incredibly costly to run, and poor communication across divisions may hinder the creation of new ideas and products. Many businesses have transformed their divisional structures into product team structures in their hunt for a new structure to address these issues.

A product team structure is a hybrid between the multidivisional structure, in which each division has its own support functions, and the product division structure, where the support functions are centralised. In a product team structure, experts from support function teams are united to form product development teams that are focused on the requirements of a certain category of product. Each team functions as its own independent division, with a product team manager in charge of overseeing all operational aspects of product development and production. The demands of one or a few related products are the main focus of the product teams, and they are loyal to the product team they join rather than their respective roles. The vice presidents of the functions at the top of the organisation still have general functional management, but team members now make decisions for each product, and each team is in charge of the project's success. This strategy of combining tasks and goods has proven to be a successful technique for Hallmark Cards to create new items fast.

In the past, Hallmark organised its operations using a practical framework. A wide variety of greeting cards were created by several artists, authors, lithographers, and designers who worked in various functional sectors. Since it was taking Hallmark two years to create a new card, the challenges of coordinating the efforts of 700 authors and artists across functional boundaries had become too complicated and challenging. Hallmark changed to a product team structure to address its issues with product development. Teams of authors and artists were created for certain greeting card subcategories, such as Mother's Day, Christmas, and so on. Mutual adjustment became simpler and work was completed much more rapidly when there were no discrepancies in subunit orientation to obstruct the flow of information. Time spent on product development decreased from years to weeks.

A product team structure is more decentralised than a functional structure or a product division structure, and experts in the different product teams are free to take immediate action, which is crucial in service organisations. Since each team is now responsible for every facet of its operations, the formation of independent product teams enhances integration. Team members actively participate in all facets of product development and market-specific product customization via tight teamwork. Additionally, teams' high degree of integration enables them to react swiftly to changing client needs and make judgements. After grouping activities by function, the division of activities by product is the second most popular strategy used by organisations to organise activities. Vertical and horizontal product differentiation are both boosted by product structure. Many big businesses have switched from one kind of product structure to another recently in an effort to save costs or make better use of their functional resources. Because the efficacy of their product structure directly affects the efficiency of their organisation, managers must constantly assess how well it is doing.

CONCLUSION

Organisations may reap several advantages when coordination and specialisation are properly matched. While coordination allows for the seamless integration and alignment of specialised activities, specialisation boosts productivity, innovation, and quality in specialised domains.

Improved organisational agility and adaptation in changing settings result from this. In summary, coordination and specialisation are essential elements of organisational structure design. Organisational efficiency depends on striking the correct balance between these two criteria. Specialisation helps people and departments to thrive in their fields of competence, and coordination makes sure that these specialised efforts are carried out in a coordinated manner. Organisations are better able to reach their strategic goals, react to market changes, and find long-term success when they strike the ideal balance between specialisation and coordination.

REFERENCES:

[1] T. Andersson, M. Cäker, S. Tengblad, and M. Wickelgren, "Building traits for organizational resilience through balancing organizational structures," *Scand. J. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2019.01.001.

[2] M. A. Sartor and P. W. Beamish, "Private Sector Corruption, Public Sector Corruption and the Organizational Structure of Foreign Subsidiaries," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10551-019-04148-1.

[3] P. R. Schulman, "Organizational structure and safety culture: Conceptual and practical challenges," *Saf. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104669.

[4] I. M. Martínez-León and J. A. Martínez-García, "The influence of organizational structure on organizational learning," *Int. J. Manpow.*, 2011, doi: 10.1108/01437721111158198.

[5] S. Gentile-Lüdecke, R. Torres de Oliveira, and J. Paul, "Does organizational structure facilitate inbound and outbound open innovation in SMEs?," *Small Bus. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11187-019-00175-4.

[6] S. J. Chión, V. Charles, and J. Morales, "The impact of organisational culture, organisational structure and technological infrastructure on process improvement through knowledge sharing," *Bus. Process Manag. J.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/BPMJ-10-2018-0279.

[7] W. Zheng, B. Yang, and G. N. McLean, "Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management," *J. Bus. Res.*, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.06.005.

[8] S. S. Chaurasia, N. Kaul, B. Yadav, and D. Shukla, "Open innovation for sustainability through creating shared value-role of knowledge management system, openness and organizational structure," *J. Knowl. Manag.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/JKM-04-2020-0319.

[9] N. Janićijević, "The mutual impact of organizational culture and structure," *Econ. Ann.*, 2013, doi: 10.2298/EKA1398035J.

[10] S. Lee, I. Choi, H. Kim, J. Lim, and S. Sung, "Comprehensive Simulation and Redesign System for Business Process and Organizational Structure," *IEEE Access*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3000248.

CHAPTER 25

GEOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE DIVISIONAL STRUCTURE

Meena Desai, Assistant Professor,
ISME - School of Management & Entrepreneurship, ATLAS SkillTech University, Mumbai, India,
Email Id-meena.desai@atlasuniversity.edu.in

ABSTRACT:

Organisations often use either the global structure or the divisional structure to meet a variety of operational and strategic requirements. This abstract examines the traits, benefits, and difficulties of these two structural methods. The geographic structure is a method of organising resources and activities according to regions or geographic areas. By allocating resources and decision-making power to each geographic division, it enables organisations to successfully manage activities across several locations. Because divisions may modify their goals and activities to fit the particulars of their individual areas, this organisational structure promotes local responsiveness. Additionally, it encourages effective collaboration and communication across divisions. The divisional structure, on the other hand, organises operations and resources depending on certain goods, services, or consumer segments. It establishes independent divisions, each with a set of operational departments like operations, finance, and marketing. Divisions may concentrate on their particular areas of competence, increase specialisation, and react quickly to market developments thanks to this organisational structure. Each division benefits from enhanced responsibility and autonomy, which may boost creativity and improve customer happiness. Additionally, coordination and communication across regional boundaries can become more difficult. Due to the divisional structure, there is a chance that silos may develop across divisions, which might make it more difficult for employees to collaborate and share expertise. It might be challenging to strike the right balance between centralised coordination and control requirements and divisional autonomy.

KEYWORDS:

Business, Geographic, Market, Network, Product.

INTRODUCTION

The multidivisional structure is the one that major organisations employ the most often out of the three kinds of product structures previously covered. When a business produces a large range of complicated goods or services or enters new markets and must deal with many stakeholder groups and competitive pressures, it offers the additional control that is crucial. However, a geographic divisional structure in which divisions are set up in accordance with the needs of the many places in which an organisation operates is accessible when the control issues that businesses encounter are a function of geography. An organization's consumer base often becomes national as it expands. It must modify its organisational structure when it expands into new areas of a nation in order to match the demands of clients in various geographical areas with its key competencies. Some tasks may be decentralised to a regional level while other can be centralised at one headquarters location according to a geographic structure. For instance, Crown Cork and Seal manufactures a large portion of the tens of thousands of cans used to preserve fruits, vegetables, and soft beverages. Establishing manufacturing facilities in the various regions of the nation where cans are most in demand makes sense since cans are heavy, costly things to carry. There is a limit to how many cans the firm can manufacture profitably at a single plant site; when economies of scale at one location run out, it makes sense to open a second factory in a different area. Crown Cork and Seal thus runs a number of production facilities in various parts of the United States and Canada in order to keep expenses to a low. Each facility has its own buying, quality control, and sales departments, but in order to save expenses, R&D and engineering are centralised at the company's headquarters [1]–[3].

The speciality department store Neiman Marcus has a regional structure as well, but for a different cause. Neiman Marcus only needed a functional structure to manage its operations when it was only present in Texas. However, when it began to build shops in a few locations around the country, it ran into a problem: how to cater to the wealthy clients' varied wants while still reaping the benefits of central purchasing's lower costs. The geographic organisation of its shops into regions was Neiman Marcus's response. A regional office oversees each individual shop and is in charge of organising the particular product requirements of the stores in its area, such as swimwear and sportswear in Los Angeles and hats, gloves, and down parkas in Chicago. The regional office relays customer-specific needs to the Dallas corporate office, where centralised buying processes decide on the best course of action for the whole business. In order to increase horizontal difference, both Crown Cork and Seal and Neiman Marcus overlaid a geographic grouping over their fundamental functional grouping. Vertical differentiation was further boosted by the addition of a new level in the hierarchy regional managers—and the decentralisation of power to regional hierarchies. In contrast to a single, centralised hierarchy, regional hierarchies provide more control and, in the examples of Crown Cork, Seal, and Neiman Marcus, greater effectiveness.

Market Structure Divisional Structure

When activities are organised by geography or product, the area or product becomes the centre of focus. A market structure, on the other hand, matches functional abilities and competencies with the product requirements of various client groups. It is marketing, not manufacturing, that determines how managers divide up organisational tasks into functional areas. A market structure with divisions made to cater to the interests of commercial, consumer, corporate, and government clients. The goal of each customer division is to provide goods that meet the demands of its unique clients. Each customer division has a distinct marketing emphasis. Centralised support functions are used by each division. Manufacturing adheres to each division's criteria while engineering customises goods to meet the diverse demands of each division. The organisation can rapidly identify changes in its market and adapt its actions to meet the changing demands of this significant stakeholder group since the market structure centres all activities of the company on the needs of the customer.

Matrix Organisation

Some businesses have opted for a matrix structure, an organisational design that simultaneously groups people and resources by function and by product in order to develop products and respond to customer needs. A matrix structure is both similar to and distinct from a product team structure. Let's first look at the similarities and differences between matrix structures. A matrix is a rectangular grid that displays a vertical flow of functional responsibility and a horizontal flow of product responsibility in the context of organisational design. The task grouping by function by the lines heading downward, and the task grouping by result is shown by the lines pointing from left to right. An organisation with a matrix structure may be segmented into whatever functions that are required to help it accomplish its objectives. The organisation as a whole is very flat, with few layers of hierarchy within each function and decentralised authority. While reporting to the leaders of their respective functions, functional staff are not directly supervised by them. Instead, membership in one of many cross-functional product teams led by a product manager determines the majority of the work of functional staff. Because they answer to both the product team manager and the functional manager, the team members are known as two-boss workers. The fact that team members have two superiors is what distinguishes a matrix organization [4]–[6].

The team serves as the matrix's fundamental construction component as well as its primary coordination and integration mechanism. Because the primary premise of a matrix organisation is that when team members are given more responsibility than they have formal authority, they are compelled to collaborate to complete the task, roles and authority connections are purposefully left ambiguous. The matrix therefore depends on maximum horizontal control through the employment of integrating mechanisms—teams—which encourage mutual adjustment and little vertical control from the formal hierarchy. One of the main types of biological structure is matrix structure. Teams are used in both matrix structures and product team structures to coordinate operations, but there are two key differences between them. The product team manager is the single boss of the team members in a product team organisation. In a matrix organisation, team members have split loyalties between their two superiors, the product manager and the functional manager. The needs of the function and the product must be balanced out. Second, team membership is flexible in the matrix structure. Team members switch between teams depending on which team most needs their talents. The matrix organisation should, in principle, be more adaptable than the product team structure, whose lines of authority and coordination are more fixed, because of these two distinctions. The matrix's purposeful design aims to overcome variations in members' functional orientation and compel integration.

Why a Matrix Structure Is Better

The usage of cross-functional teams is intended to lessen functional boundaries and overcome the issue of subunit orientation. A matrix structure offers four important benefits over more conventional models. Integration is simpler to do when functional differences are minimised. The team structure thus makes it easier for the whole organisation to adapt and learn. The team structure of the matrix is intended to make the company adaptable and able to act swiftly in response to changing client and product demands. Unsurprisingly, high-tech businesses where the capacity to create technologically complex items fast was essential to success were where matrix structures were initially used. The matrix system was created by American defence contractor TRW Systems to create the Atlas and Titan rockets that started the country's space programme in the 1960s.

The matrix structure's ability to facilitate communication amongst functional experts as well as provide team members from other functions the chance to grow professionally is its second benefit. The interaction of several experts leads to inventions that give a firm its core competencies, hence matrix structures enhance technological advancement. Third, the matrix allows an organisation to use the expertise of its specialised staff members who switch between products as necessary. For instance, basic R&D abilities are required at the start of a project, but following early invention, engineers' skills are required to design and manufacture the product. The team composition is continually changing to meet the demands of the product, with people moving throughout the matrix to where they are most required. Fourth, the combined functional and product emphasis encourages consideration of both price and quality. Functional experts' main objective is likely to be technical: creating the most creative, high-quality product feasible. The primary objectives of product managers, in contrast, are likely to be cost and development speed getting the job done as quickly and cheaply as possible. The team is kept on track and maintains technological potential in line with commercial realities thanks to this built-in emphasis on both quality and cost.

Problems with a Matrix Structure

The essential principles of matrix structures seem rational in theory. However, in practise, several issues develop. To find the causes of these issues, think about what is missing from a matrix. The benefits of a bureaucratic organisation are lacking in a matrix. The matrix lacks a control system that allows workers to establish consistent expectations of one another due to its flat hierarchy, absence of rules, and SOPs. Theoretically, team members constantly bargain over job duties with one another, and the ensuing give-and-take keeps the organisation adaptable. In actuality, a lot of individuals dislike the role ambiguity and conflict that matrix arrangements may create. For instance, the product boss, who is concerned with cost, and the functional boss, who is concerned with quality, often have conflicting expectations of the team members. Role conflict is the outcome. Team members become unsure about what to do, and a framework intended to foster flexibility may really accomplish the opposite if members start to shun taking charge. Conflict over the utilisation of resources may also arise between functions and product teams in the absence of a clearly established structure of power. According to theory, product managers should hire the functional experts on the team. Cost and resource allocation, however, become hazy in practise when items cost more than expected and experts are unable to solve technical issues. Product and functional managers get into power battles, and upper management is courted via political manoeuvring.

This shows that to maintain their flexibility, matrix structures need to be properly controlled. People who operate in matrices often lament the high levels of stress and uncertainty they experience since they do not always deliver the high degree of coordination that is promised for them. People who work in matrix structures may eventually feel a lack of authority and responsibility and decide to build their own informal organisations in order to provide themselves a feeling of structure and stability. In teams, unofficial leaders take over. A status hierarchy develops within teams as a result of these individuals being more widely acknowledged as specialists or as outstanding "team leaders." Team members often fight against being transferred to other teams in order to remain with their friends. Top managers sometimes attempt to exert more control over the matrix and more decision-making authority when they do not receive the desired outcomes. A system that began off fairly flat and decentralised transforms into a centralised, less flexible structure over time as individuals compete for power and authority [7]–[9].

If matrix arrangements are to have benefits that outweigh their drawbacks, careful management is required. However, matrix structures are not intended for usage in routine organisational settings. They are most suited when functional specialists need to work together closely because an organisation has to react swiftly to a changing environment. Many developing firms have opted to overlay a functional structure or a product division structure with product teams rather than attempting to manage a full-fledged matrix due to the challenges involved in managing a sophisticated matrix structure. Because it offers the added integration required to manage intricate value-creation operations, the use of IT considerably streamlines this process.

Structure of the Multidivisional Matrix

Although they are challenging to administer, multidivisional structures enable an organisation to efficiently coordinate tasks. A multidivisional structure's high degree of differentiation causes communication and coordination issues. A company with several divisions must thus ensure that it has enough integration mechanisms in place to manage its control demands. Sometimes the corporate centre is unable to fulfil this crucial integrating function because of how far removed it is from divisional activity. When this occurs, organisations may implement a multidivisional matrix structure at the top of the organisation, allowing for more integration between corporate and divisional management as well as between divisional managers. The picture illustrates how this structure enables senior vice presidents in the corporate centre to de- sign a functional action plan for each division, assign corporate-level experts to each division, and conduct an extensive review of their performance. Corporate managers and divisional managers collaborate to plan divisional operations and share expertise and information. Top managers from the divisions and company headquarters may collaborate and coordinate organisational operations considerably more easily thanks to the multi-divisional matrix structure.

Hybrid Architecture

As the explanation above implies, big complex organisations with multiple divisions often use a variety of distinct structures at the same time; in other words, they have a hybrid structure. As we previously noted, many multinational organisations that operate in several sectors have a multidivisional structure and establish independent divisions. The managers of each product division then choose the structure that best suits the demands of the specific environment, strategy, and other factors. Due to the nature of their goods or a desire to be more sensitive to their customers' demands, one product division may decide to operate under a functional structure, another under a geographic structure, and a third under a product team structure.

DISCUSSION

Companies that exclusively operate in one sector but wish to compete in other market sectors within that sector may also adopt a hybrid structure. For instance, Target separates its operations by kind of market/customer segment and by location and utilises a hybrid organisational structure in the retail sector. Target organises its various store chains as four autonomous divisions inside a market division structure. Mervyn's and Marshall Field's, which serves the demands of wealthy clients, Target Stores, which competes in the low-price market, and target.direct, Target's Internet subsidiary, which oversees online sales, make up its four market segments. Because Target Stores and Marshall Field's both utilise a geographic organisational system that divides stores into regions, there is another layer of structure behind this organisational layer. A regional office, which organises the market demands of the shops in its area and reacts to regional consumer needs, is in charge of each individual store. Decisions for all Target or Marshall Field's shops are made by centralised merchandising services at divisional headquarters, which receives information from the regional office.

Thus, organisational structure may be compared to an onion's layers. Each inner layer is the structure that each division chooses for itself in response to the variables it encounters, such as a geographic or product team structure. The upper layer offers the overall organisational framework, which is often some type of product or market division structure. When a change in technology or increased competition in the environment makes switching from a functional to a product team structure necessary, managers will find it much easier to change the structure of a large organisation into smaller units or divisions [10].

Boundaryless Organisation and Network Structure

The usage of network structures is another organisational design innovation that has been popular worldwide during the last ten years. Remember from that a network structure is a collection of several organisations whose operations are coordinated by contracts and agreements as opposed to a formal hierarchy of authority? In order to maximise effectiveness, one organisation often takes the lead in developing the network. For instance, a garment factory would look for methods to create and sell items more affordably. Instead of producing the clothing in-house, the firm chooses to contract with a low-cost Asian manufacturer. It also contracts with a sizable Madison Avenue advertising agency to create and execute its sales campaign. Also keep in mind that outsourcing involves relocating a value-creation activity from within an organisation to the outside, where it is carried out by a different business. As a business enters into agreements with a wide variety of suppliers, manufacturers, and distributors to outsource many of the value-creating activities required to create and sell products and services, network architectures can grow quite complicated.18 For instance, Nike has created an extremely intricate network structure to make its shoes, making it the biggest and most successful sports shoe company in the world. The hub of the network is Nike's Beaverton, Oregon-based product design and research division, where the company's designers pioneer cutting-edge developments in sports shoe design. Nearly every other functional specialty that Nike need to create and promote its shoes has been outsourced to businesses worldwide!

How does Nike oversee interactions between every business in its network? mostly through using contemporary IT. The shoe designs created by Nike's designers are created using computer-aided design, and all information on new products, including manufacturing instructions, is electronically maintained. After finishing their work, the designers electronically transmit all of the new product designs to Nike's network of Southeast Asian suppliers and manufacturers. For instance, instructions for a new sole design may be given to a Taiwanese supplier, whereas directions for leather uppers would be sent to a Malaysian source. The shoe components are then created by these vendors and transported to a Chinese manufacturer that Nike has partnered with for final assembly. These shoes are distributed in every nation by a company that Nike has partnered with in some capacity, such as via a long-term contract, and are transported from China to distributors there [11].

Benefits of Network Architectures

Why does Nike not carry out all of the functional operations alone but instead uses a network structure to manage the value generation process? Nike and other businesses may benefit from a number of benefits by using a network structure. First, production expenses are decreased to the extent that an organisation can locate a network partner who can carry out a certain functional activity consistently and at a cheaper cost.21 For instance, Nike produces almost all of its products in Asia since salaries there are far lower than those in the United States. Second, an organisation may avoid the high administrative expenses associated with running a complicated organisational structure to the extent that it enters into contracts with other organisations to carry out specified value-creation activities. For instance, fewer managers are required and the hierarchy may be maintained as flat as feasible. Additionally, Nike is able to maintain its modest size because it outsources a lot of functional tasks.

Teams designated to create each of the new sports and leisure shoe types for which Nike is renowned have control over the design process. Thirdly, an organisation may behave naturally thanks to a network structure. For instance, if the environment changes and new possibilities emerge, a company may swiftly adapt its network in response. For instance, it may cut ties with businesses whose services it no longer needs and forge new ties with businesses that do possess the expertise it requires. A company that handles every aspect of its functional operations in-house would react to changes more slowly. Fourth, new partners may be added if any of Nike's network partners fall short of expectations. Finally, a major factor in the growth of networks has been the ability of organisations to access low-cost international sources of inputs and functional knowledge, which is essential in the dynamic global context of today.

Problems with Network Structures

Although the network structure offers many benefits, there are certain instances when it might be disadvantageous. Imagine a high-tech business rushing to market with exclusive hardware and software before its rivals to get an idea of what these are. How simple would it be to outsource the functional tasks required to guarantee that the software and hardware are compatible with one another's software? Not at all simple. The groups of hardware and software programmers responsible for creating the various components of the system must work closely together as well as with the hardware and software divisions. To allow the groups to connect and share ideas with one another, learn from one another, and continuously enhance the final output, a significant amount of mutual adjustment is required. Additionally, supervisors need to be there to integrate group activities and ensure that they work effectively together. various businesses handling various aspects of the work process would cause massive coordination issues. Furthermore, for effective new product development, there has to be a great deal of trust between the various groups so they are eager to share their ideas.

Because managers lack the tools to properly coordinate and encourage the many network members, it is unclear that a network structure would provide an organisation the capacity to oversee such a complicated value-creation process. First, because independent enterprises have less motivation to make such an investment, it would be challenging to acquire the continual learning that develops core competencies over time inside a corporation.22 Many chances to reduce expenses and improve quality would be wasted as a result. Second, if one of Nike's suppliers didn't provide as promised, the company could quickly find a replacement by signing a deal with another. But how simple is it to track out reputable software providers that are capable of the task at hand and can also be relied upon to keep confidential information to themselves or to a company's rivals? In general, there are more issues with employing a network structure the more complicated the value-creation processes required to manufacture and sell products and services are. Network architectures, like the other structures covered in this chapter, are appropriate in certain circumstances but not others.

The Organisation Without Boundaries

The concept of the "bound-aryless organisation" has gained popularity since managers may design a network structure to manufacture or offer the products and services their consumers desire rather than constructing a complicated organisational structure to accomplish it. The members of the boundaryless organisation may seldom or never interact in person since they are connected through computers, fax machines, CAD systems, and video teleconferencing.24 Similar to a matrix structure, people come and go as their services are required, but they are not considered official members of an organisation. They are independent functional specialists who join forces with a company, carry out their responsibilities under the agreement, and then move on to the next project. As businesses become more aware of the many options they provide to save costs and boost flexibility, they are quickly expanding their use of outsourcing and network organisations. In order to boost organisational performance, managers must clearly weigh the relative advantages of having their own organisation carry out a functional activity or provide a specific contribution vs forming an alliance with another organisation to do so. In today's changing environment, designing organisational structure is becoming a more difficult management activity.

E-Commerce

E-commerce is business that is conducted online and between businesses as well as between businesses and consumers. Business-to-business trade occurs when two businesses transact with each other utilising IT and the Internet to connect and coordinate their respective value chains. Businesses embrace B2B commerce because it enables them to save operational expenses and perhaps improve product quality. The B2B marketplace, a sector-specific trade network created to link buyers and sellers via the Internet, is a key B2B network application. Companies agree to use the network software standard that enables them to look for and exchange information with one another in order to take part in a B2B marketplace. Companies may then gradually collaborate to develop methods to save costs or increase quality.

Business-to-customer commerce is the exchange of goods and services between a corporation and its network of individual clients using the Internet and other forms of technology. A corporation has more control over its network when they utilise IT to connect directly with clients. They may manage their own distribution and marketing, for instance, and do not need the assistance of intermediaries like wholesalers and retailers. One of the first businesses to develop a B2C network that enabled it to sell directly to customers and tailor its PCs to their requirements was Dell. Companies may provide clients with a far greater selection of items and much more information about these things in a very cost-effective manner by using online storefronts. A company's network becomes stronger over time as a result of being able to draw in more clients thanks to this. This is the aim of Dell, as well as Amazon.com, which has established more than 50 distinct types of storefronts in order to provide its millions of devoted consumers an ever-expanding selection of goods. Amazon.com is now aiming to increase the number of cloud computing storefronts available to its customers. These storefronts will enable customers to store their data, music, and movies on Amazon's servers as well as use the software and processing capacity on those servers to process their data and meet their software requirements. Amazon has significant difficulties in building this novel cloud-based network architecture since rivals like Google, Apple, and Dell are all developing their own virtual networks.

CONCLUSION

The divisional structure encourages each division's specialisation, customer focus, and effective decision-making. It enables the creation of distinctive goods or services catered to particular client requirements, increasing competition and patron pleasure. When deciding between the regional structure and the divisional structure, organisations must carefully take their strategic goals, industry dynamics, and organisational skills into account. Some businesses may decide to use a hybrid structure, which combines aspects of the two models, to take advantage of local specialisation and responsiveness while preserving centralised management and coordination. To sum up, organisations use the regional structure and divisional structure as organisational designs to meet certain operational and strategic goals. While the divisional structure encourages specialisation and customer focus, the geographic structure places an emphasis on local response and effective coordination across several areas. To attain maximum organisational performance and success, organisations must balance the benefits and drawbacks of each structure and fit them with their specific needs.

REFERENCES:

[1] G. Alblas, E. Wijsman, M. van Noort, and C. du Pon, “Organisational structure,” in *Organisational Behaviour*, 2020. doi: 10.4324/9781003022121-7.

[2] J. Gillikin, “Advantages & Disadvantages of Divisional Organizational Structure,” *Chron*, 2019.

[3] M. A. Hitt and R. D. Ireland, “Strategy, Contextual Factors, and Performance,” *Hum. Relations*, 1985, doi: 10.1177/001872678503800807.

[4] N. Stanford, “Chapter 3: Organisational structures.,” in *Guide to Organisation Design*, 2007.

[5] A. D. Chandler Jr., “Corporate Strategy and Structure: Some Current Considerations.,” *Society*, 1991.

[6] D. A. Garvin and L. C. Levesque, “The multiunit enterprise,” *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 2008.

[7] R. D. Miller and D. J. Springate, “The Relationship of Strategy, Structure and Management Processes.,” *Acad. Manag. Proc.*, 1978, doi: 10.5465/ambpp.1978.4976559.

[8] L. L. Morlock and J. A. Alexander, “Models of governance in multihospital systems: Implications for hospital and system-level decision-making,” *Med. Care*, 1986, doi: 10.1097/00005650-198612000-00005.

[9] Wildlife Research Section, “Statutory report on wildlife to the Nunavut Legislative Assembly, Section 176 of the Wildlife Act,” *Gov. Nunavut, Dep. Environ. , Final Wildl. Rep.*, 2007.

[10] “Encyclopedia of health care management,” *Choice Rev. Online*, 2004, doi: 10.5860/choice.41-4396.

[11] L. Zhang, “Complementarity, Organizational Structure, and Incentives,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2005, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.273285.

[12] I. Palmer and R. Dunford, “Design and Form: Organizational,” in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2001. doi: 10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/04245-5.