CHAPTER 7

ORGANISATION AND STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP

LEARNING OUTCOMES

After studying this chapter, you will be able to:

❑ Understand the importance of organizational structure in strategy implementation.

❑ Examine the relationship between strategy and structure.

❑ Understand how to establish strategic business units (SBUs).

❑ Highlight the role of leadership in the execution of strategy.

❑ Learn how to build a supportive corporate culture.

❑ Explain the concepts of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship.

A management truism says structure follows strategy. However, this truism is often ignored. Too many organizations attempt to carry out a new strategy with an old structure.

– Dale McConkey

CHAPTER OVERVIEW 👉

Organisation and Strategic Leadership
- Organisation Structure
  - Simple Structure
  - Functional Structure
  - Divisional Structure
  - Multi Divisional Structure
  - Strategic Business Unit (SBU) Structure
  - Matrix Structure
  - Network Structure
  - Hourglass Structure
- Strategic Leadership
  - Transformational
  - Transactional
- Strategy Supportive Culture
- Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship

🕐 7.1 Introduction

A competitive advantage is created when there is a proper match between strategy and structure. Ineffective strategy/structure match may result in company rigidity and red tapism, given the complexity and need for rapid changes in today's competitive landscape. Thus, effective strategic leaders seek to develop an organizational structure and accompanying controls that are superior to those of their competitors.

Selecting the organizational structure and controls that result in effective implementation of chosen strategies is a fundamental challenge for managers, especially top-level managers. This is because companies must be flexible, innovative, and creative in the global economy if they are to exploit their core competencies in the pursuit of marketplace opportunities. Companies must also maintain a certain degree of stability in their structures so that day-to-day tasks can be completed efficiently.

To act and contribute as a manager and employee in today's emerging business scenario, skills related to strategic, organizational and leadership processes are necessary.

7.2. Organization Structure

> The ideal organizational structure is a place where ideas filter up as well as down, where the merit of ideas carries more weight than their source, and where participation and shared objectives are valued more than executive order.
>
> – Edson Spencer

Changes in corporate strategy often require changes in the way an organization is structured for two major reasons. First, structure largely dictates how operational objectives and policies will be established to achieve the strategic objectives. For example, objectives and policies established under a geographic organizational structure are couched in geographic terms. Objectives and policies are stated largely in terms of products in an organization whose structure is based on product groups. The structural format for developing objectives and policies can significantly impact all other strategy-implementation activities.

The second major reason why changes in strategy often require changes in structure is that structure dictates how resources will be allocated to achieve strategic objectives. If an organization's structure is based on customer groups, then resources will be allocated in that manner. Similarly, if an organization's structure is set up along functional business lines, then resources are allocated by functional areas.

According to Chandler, changes in strategy lead to changes in organizational structure. Structure should be designed or redesigned to facilitate the strategic pursuit of a firm and, therefore, structure should follow strategy. Chandler found a particular structure sequence to be often repeated as organizations grow and change strategy over time. There is no one optimal organizational design or structure for a given strategy. What is appropriate for one organization may not be appropriate for a similar firm, although successful firms in a given industry do tend to organize themselves in a similar way. *For example*, consumer goods companies tend to emulate the divisional structure-by-product form of organization. Small firms tend to be functionally structured (centralized). Medium-size firms tend to be divisionally structured (decentralized). Large firms tend to use an SBU (strategic business unit) or matrix structure. As organizations grow, their

structures generally change from simple to complex as a result of linking together of several basic strategies.


Figure: Chandler's Strategy-Structure Relationship

Every firm is influence by numerous external and internal forces. But no firm could change its structure in response to each of these forces, because to do so would lead to chaos. However, when a firm changes its strategy, the existing organizational structure may become ineffective. Symptoms of an ineffective organizational structure include too many levels of management, too many meetings attended by too many people, too much attention being directed toward solving interdepartmental conflicts, too large a span of control, and too many unachieved objectives. Changes in organisational structure can facilitate strategy-implementation efforts, but changes in structure should not be expected to make a bad strategy good, to make bad managers good, or to make bad products sell.

Structure can also influence strategy. If a proposed strategy required massive structural changes it would not be an attractive choice. In this way, structure can shape the choice of strategy. But a more important concern is determining what types of structural changes are needed to implement new strategies and how these changes can best be accomplished. We will examine this issue by focusing on the following basic types of organizational structure: functional, divisional by geographic area, divisional by product, divisional by customer, divisional process, strategic business unit (SBU), and matrix.

In order to implement and manage strategies that have been formulated, all companies need some form of organizational structure. And, as companies formulate new strategies, increase in size, or change their level of diversification, new organizational structures may be required.

Organizational structure is the company's formal configuration of its intended roles, procedures, governance mechanisms, authority, and decision-making processes. Organizational structure, influenced by factors such as an organization's age and size, acts as a framework which reflects managers' determination of what a company does

and how tasks are completed, given the chosen strategy. The most important issue is that the company's structure must be congruent with or fit with the company's strategy.

7.2.1 Simple Structure

Simple organizational structure is most appropriate for companies that follow a single-business strategy and offer a line of products in a single geographic market. The simple structure also is appropriate for companies implementing focused cost leadership or focused differentiation strategies. A simple structure is an organizational form in which the owner-manager makes all major decisions directly and monitors all activities, while the company's staff merely serves as an executor.

Little specialization of tasks, few rules, little formalization, unsophisticated information systems and direct involvement of owner-manager in all phases of day-to-day operations characterise the simple structure. In the simple structure, communication is frequent and direct, and new products tend to be introduced to the market quickly, which can result in a competitive advantage. Because of these characteristics, few of the coordination problems that are common in larger organizations exist.

A simple organizational structure may result in competitive advantages for some small companies relative to their larger counterparts. These potential competitive advantages include a broad-based openness to innovation, greater structural flexibility, and an ability to respond more rapidly to environmental changes. However, if they are successful, small companies grow larger. As a result of this growth, the company outgrows the simple structure. Generally, there are significant increases in the amount of competitively relevant information that requires processing. More extensive and complicated information-processing requirements place significant pressures on owner-managers (often due to a lack of organizational skills or experience or simply due to lack of time).

Thus, it is incumbent on the company's managers to recognise the inadequacies or inefficiencies of the simple structure and change it to one that is more consistent with company's strategy.

To coordinate more complex organizational functions, companies should abandon the simple structure in favour of the functional structure. The functional structure is used by larger companies and by companies with low levels of diversification.

7.2.2 Functional Structure

A widely used structure in business organisations is functional type because of its simplicity and low cost. A functional structure groups tasks and activities by business function, such as production/operations, marketing, finance/accounting, research and development, and management information systems. Besides being simple and inexpensive, a functional structure also promotes specialization of labour, encourages

efficiency, minimizes the need for an elaborate control system, and allows rapid decision making.


Figure: Functional Structure

The functional structure consists of a chief executive officer or a managing director and supported by corporate staff with functional line managers in dominant functions such as production, financial accounting, marketing, R&D, engineering, and human resources. The functional structure enables the company to overcome the growth-related constraints of the simple structure, enabling or facilitating communication and coordination.

However, compared to the simple structure, there also are some potential problems. Differences in functional specialization and orientation may impede communications and coordination. Thus, the chief executive officer must integrate functional decision-making and coordinate actions of the overall business across functions. Functional specialists often may develop a myopic (or narrow) perspective, losing sight of the company's strategic vision and mission. When this happens, this problem can be overcome by implementing the multidivisional structure.

7.2.3 Divisional Structure

As a firm, grows year after year it faces difficulty in managing different products and services in different markets. Some form of divisional structure generally becomes necessary to motivate employees, control operations, and compete successfully in diverse locations. The divisional structure can be organized in one of the four ways: *by geographic area, by product or service, by customer, or by process.* With a divisional structure, functional activities are performed both centrally and in each division separately.

Chief Executive

- Corporate Finance
- Corporate Legal/PR
- General Manager Division A
  - Marketing
  - Production
  - Finance
- General Manager Division B
  - Marketing
  - Production
  - Finance

Figure: Divisional Structure

A divisional structure has some clear advantages. First and the foremost, accountability is clear. That is, divisional managers can be held responsible for sales and profit levels. Because a divisional structure is based on extensive delegation of authority, managers and employees can easily see the results of their good or bad performances. As a result, employee morale is generally higher in a divisional structure than it is in centralized structure. Other advantages of the divisional design are that it creates career development opportunities for managers, allows local control of local situations, leads to a competitive climate within an organization, and allows new businesses and products in be added easily.

The divisional design is not without some limitations. Perhaps the most important limitation is that a divisional structure is costly, for a number of reasons. First, each division requires functional specialists who must be paid. Second, there exists some duplication of staff services, facilities, and personnel; for instance, functional specialists are also needed centrally (at headquarters) to coordinate divisional activities. Third, managers must be well qualified because the divisional design forces delegation of authority better-qualified individuals requires higher salaries. A divisional structure can also be costly because it requires an elaborate, headquarters-driven control system. Finally, certain regions, products, or customers may sometimes receive special treatment, and It may be difficult to maintain consistent, company wide practices. Nonetheless, for most large organizations and many small firms, the advantages of a divisional structure more than offset the potential limitations.

A divisional structure by geographic area is appropriate for organizations whose strategies are formulated to fit the particular needs and characteristics of customers

in different geographic areas. This type of structure can be most appropriate for organizations that have similar branch facilities located in widely dispersed areas. A divisional structure by geographic area allows local participation in decision making and improved coordination within a region.

The divisional structure by product (or services) is most effective for implementing strategies when specific products or services need special emphasis. Also, this type of structure is widely used when an organization offers only a few products or services, when an organization's products or services differ substantially. The divisional structure allows strict control over and attention to product lines, but it may also require a more skilled management force and reduced top management control. General Motors, DuPont, and Procter & Gamble use a divisional structure by product to implement strategies.

When a few major customers are of paramount importance and many different services are provided to these customers, then a divisional structure by customer can be the most effective way to implement strategies. This structure allows an organization to cater effectively to the requirements of clearly defined customer groups. For example, book-publishing companies often organize their activities around customer groups such as colleges, secondary schools, and private commercial schools. Some airline companies have two major customer divisions: passengers and freight or cargo services. Bulks are often organised in divisions such as personal banking corporate banking, etc.

A divisional structure by process is similar to a functional structure, because activities are organized according to the way work is actually performed. However, a key difference between these two designs is that functional departments are not accountable for profits or revenues, whereas divisional process departments are evaluated on these criteria.

7.2.4 Multi Divisional Structure

Multidivisional (M-form) structure is composed of operating divisions where each division represents a separate business to which the top corporate officer delegates responsibility for day-to-day operations and business unit strategy to division managers. By such delegation, the corporate office is responsible for formulating and implementing overall corporate strategy and manages divisions through strategic and financial controls.

Multidivisional or M-form structure was developed in the 1920s, in response to coordination- and control-related problems in large firms. Functional departments often had difficulty dealing with distinct product lines and markets, especially in coordinating conflicting priorities among the products. Costs were not allocated to individual products, so it was not possible to assess an individual product's profit contribution. Loss of control meant that optimal allocation of firm resources between

products was difficult (if not impossible). Top managers became over-involved in solving short-run problems (such as coordination, communications, conflict resolution) and neglected long-term strategic issues.

Multidivisional structure calls for:

◆ Creating separate divisions, each representing a distinct business

◆ Each division would house its functional hierarchy;

◆ Division managers would be given responsibility for managing day-to-day operations;

◆ A small corporate office that would determine the long-term strategic direction of the firm and exercise overall financial control over the semi-autonomous divisions.

This would enable the firm to more accurately monitor the performance of individual businesses, simplifying control problems, facilitate comparisons between divisions, improving the allocation of resources and stimulate managers of poorly performing divisions to seek ways to improve performance.

When the firm is less diversified, strategic controls are used to manage divisions. Strategic control refers to the operational understanding by corporate officers of the strategies being implemented within the firm's separate business units.

An increase in diversification strains corporate officers' abilities to understand the operations of all of its business units and divisions are then managed by financial controls, which enable corporate officers to manage the cash flow of the divisions through budgets and an emphasis on profits from distinct businesses.

However, because financial controls are focused on financial outcomes, they require that each division's performance be largely independent of the performance of other divisions. So, the Strategic Business Units come into picture.

7.2.5 Strategic Business Unit (SBU) Structure

The concept is relevant to multi-product, multi-business enterprises. It is impractical for an enterprise with a multitude of businesses to provide separate strategic planning treatment to each one of its products/businesses; it has to necessarily group the products/businesses into a manageable number of strategically related business units and then take them up for strategic planning. The question is: what is the best way of grouping the products/businesses of such large enterprises?

An SBU is a grouping of related businesses, which is amenable to composite planning treatment. As per this concept, a multi-business enterprise groups its multitude of businesses into a few distinct business units in a scientific way. The purpose is to provide effective strategic planning treatment to each one of its products/businesses.

The three most important characteristics of a SBU are:

• It is a single business or a collection of related businesses which offer scope for independent planning and which might feasibly stand alone from the rest of the organization.

• It has its own set of competitors.

• It has a manager who has responsibility for strategic planning and profit performance, and who has control of profit-influencing factors.

Historically, large, multi-business firms were handling business planning on a territorial basis since their structure was territorial. And in many cases, such a structure was the outcome of a manufacturing or distribution logistics. Often, the territorial structure did not suit the purpose of strategic planning.

When strategic planning was carried out treating territories as the units for planning, it gave rise to two kinds of difficulties: (i) since a number of territorial units handled the same product, the same product was getting varied strategic planning treatments; and (ii) since a given territorial planning unit carried different and unrelated products, products with dissimilar characteristics were getting identical strategic planning treatment.

The concept of strategic business units (SBU) breaks away from this practice. It recognises that just because a firm is structured into a number of territorial units, say six units, it is not necessarily in six different businesses. It may be engaged in only three distinct businesses. It is also possible that it is engaged in more than six businesses. The endeavour should be to group the businesses into an appropriate number of strategic business units before the firm takes up the strategy formulation task.

The SBU structure is composed of operating units where each unit represents a separate business to which the top corporate officer delegates responsibility for day-to-day operations and business unit strategy to its managers. By such delegation, the corporate office is responsible for formulating and implementing overall corporate strategy and manages SBUs through strategic and financial controls. Hence, the SBU structure groups similar products into strategic business units and delegates authority and responsibility for each unit to a senior executive who reports directly to the chief executive officer. This change in structure can facilitate strategy implementation by improving coordination between similar divisions and channelling accountability to distinct business units.

```
                          ┌─────────────┐
                          │  President  │
                          └─────────────┘
```

Figure: SBU Structure

A strategic business unit (SBU) structure consists of at least three levels, with a corporate headquarters at the top, SBU groups at the second level, and divisions grouped by relatedness within each SBU at the third level.

This enables the company to more accurately monitor the performance of individual businesses, simplifying control problems. It also facilitates comparisons between divisions, improving the allocation of resources and can be used to stimulate managers of poorly performing divisions to seek ways to improve performance.

This means that, within each SBU, divisions are related to each other, as also that SBU groups are unrelated to each other. Within each SBU, divisions producing similar products and/or using similar technologies can be organised to achieve synergy. Individual SBUs are treated as profit centres and controlled by corporate headquarters that can concentrate on strategic planning rather than operational control so that individual divisions can react more quickly to environmental changes.

For example, Sony has been restructuring to match the SBU structure with its ten internal companies as organised into four strategic business units. Because it has been pushing the company to make better use of software products and content (e.g., Sony's music, films and games) in its televisions and audio gear to increase Sony's profitability. By its strategy, Sony is one of the few companies that have the opportunity to integrate software and content across a broad range of consumer electronics products.

The principle underlying the grouping is that all related products-related from the standpoint of "function"-should fall under one SBU. In other words, the SBU concept helps a multi-business corporation in scientifically grouping its businesses into a few distinct business units. Such a grouping would in its turn, help the corporation carry out

its strategic management endeavour better. The concept provides the right direction to strategic planning by removing the vagueness and confusion often experienced in such multi-business enterprises in the matter of grouping of the businesses.

The attributes of an SBU and the benefits a firm may derive by using the SBU Structure are as follows:

♦	A scientific method of grouping the businesses of a multi-business corporation which helps the firm in strategic planning.

♦	An improvement over the territorial grouping of businesses and strategic planning based on territorial units.

♦	An SBU is a grouping of related businesses that can be taken up for strategic planning distinct from the rest of the businesses. Products/businesses within an SBU receive same strategic planning treatment and priorities.

♦	The task consists of analysing and segregating the assortment of businesses/ portfolios and regrouping them into a few, well defined, distinct, scientifically demarcated business units. Products/businesses that are related from the standpoint of "function" are assembled together as a distinct SBU.

♦	Unrelated products/businesses in any group are separated. If they could be assigned to any other SBU applying the criterion of functional relation, they are assigned accordingly; otherwise they are made into separate SBUs.

♦	Grouping the businesses on SBU lines helps the firm in strategic planning by removing the vagueness and confusion generally seen in grouping businesses; it also facilitates the right setting for correct strategic planning and facilitates correct relative priorities and resources to the various businesses.

♦	Each SBU is a separate business from the strategic planning standpoint. In the basic factors, viz., mission, objectives, competition and strategy-one SBU will be distinct from another.

♦	Each SBU will have its own distinct set of competitors and its own distinct strategy.

♦	Each SBU will have a CEO. He will be responsible for strategic planning for the SBU and its profit performance; he will also have control over most of the factors affecting the profit of the SBU.

The questions posed at the corporate level are, first, whether the corporate body wishes to have a related set of SBUs or not; and if so, on what basis. This issue of relatedness in turn has direct implications on decisions about diversification relatedness might exist in different ways:

♦	SBUs might build on similar technologies or all provide similar sorts of products or services.

- SBUs might be serving similar or different markets. Even if technology or products differ, it may be that the customers are similar. For example, the technologies underpinning frozen food, washing powders and margarine production may be very different; but all are sold through retail operations, and U nil ever operates in all these product fields.

- Or it may be that other competences on which the competitive advantage of different SBUs are built have similarities. Unilever would argue that the marketing skills associated with the three product markets are similar, for example.

The identification of SBUs is a convenient starting point for planning. Once the company's strategic business units have been identified, the responsibilities for strategic planning can be more clearly assigned.

7.2.6 Matrix Structure

Most organizations find that organising around either functions (in the functional structure) or around products and geography (in the divisional structure) provides an appropriate organizational structure. The matrix structure, in contrast, may be very appropriate when organizations conclude that neither functional nor divisional forms, even when combined with horizontal linking mechanisms like strategic business units, are right for the implementation of their strategies. In matrix structure, functional and product forms are combined simultaneously at the same level of the organization. Employees have two superiors, a product or project manager and a functional manager. The "home" department - that is, engineering, manufacturing, or marketing - is usually functional and is reasonably permanent. People from these functional units are often assigned temporarily to one or more product units or projects. The product units or projects are usually temporary and act like divisions in that they are differentiated on a product-market basis.

A matrix structure is the most complex of all designs because it depends upon both vertical and horizontal flows of authority and communication (hence the term matrix). In contrast, functional and divisional structures depend primarily on vertical flows of authority and communication. A matrix structure can result in higher overhead because it has more management positions. Other characteristics of a matrix structure that contribute to overall complexity include dual lines of budget authority (a violation of the unity command principle), dual sources of reward and punishment, shared authority, dual reporting channels, and a need for an extensive and effective communication system.

Despite its complexity, the matrix structure is widely used in many industries, including construction, healthcare, research and defence. Some advantages of a matrix structure are that project objectives are clear, there are many channels of communication workers can see the visible results of their work, and shutting down a project is accomplished relatively easily.

In order for a matrix structure to be effective, organizations need planning, training, clear mutual understanding of roles and responsibilities, excellent internal communication, and mutual trust and confidence. The matrix structure is used more frequently by businesses because they are pursuing strategies add new products, customer groups, and technology to their range of activities. Out of these changes are coming product managers, functional managers, and geographic managers, all of whom have important strategic responsibilities. When several variables such as product, customer, technology, geography, functional area, have roughly equal strategic priorities, a matrix organization can be an effective structural form.

Matrix structure was developed to combine the stability of the functional structure with the flexibility of the product form. It is very useful when the external environment (especially its technological and market aspects) is very complex and changeable. It does, however, produce conflicts revolving around duties, authority, and resource allocation. To the extent that the goals to be achieved are vague and the technology used is poorly understood, a continuous battle for power between product and functional mangers is likely. The matrix structure is often found in an organization or within an SBU when the following three conditions exists: 1) Ideas need to be cross-fertilised across projects or products, 2) Resources are scarce and 3) Abilities to process information and to make decisions need to be improved.

Top Management			
Manufacturing	**Sales**	**Finance**	**Personnel**
Manufacturing Unit	Sales Unit	Finance Unit	Personnel Unit
Manufacturing Unit	Sales Unit	Finance Unit	Personnel Unit
Manufacturing Unit	Sales Unit	Finance Unit	Personnel Unit
Manufacturing Unit	Sales Unit	Finance Unit	Personnel Unit

Figure: Matrix Structure

Changing organizational design

Old Organizational Design	New Organizational Design
♦　One large corporation	♦　Mini-business units and cooperative relationships
♦　Vertical communication	♦　Horizontal communication
♦　Centralised top-down decision making	♦　Decentralised participative decision making
♦　Vertical integration	♦　Outsourcing & virtual organizations
♦　Work/quality teams	♦　Autonomous work teams
♦　Functional work teams	♦　Cross-functional work teams
♦　Minimal training	♦　Extensive training
♦　Specialised job design focused on individual	♦　Value-chain team-focused job design

For development of matrix structure Davis and Lawrence, have proposed three distinct phases:

1.　**Cross-functional task forces**: Temporary cross-functional task forces are initially used when a new product line is being introduced. A project manager is in charge as the key horizontal link.

2.　**Product/brand management**: If the cross-functional task forces become more permanent, the project manager becomes a product or brand manager and a second phase begins. In this arrangement, function is still the primary organizational structure, but product or brand managers act as the integrators of semi permanent products or brands.

3.　**Mature matrix**: The third and final phase of matrix development involves a true dual-authority structure. Both the functional and product structures are permanent. All employees are connected to both a vertical functional superior and a horizontal product manager. Functional and product managers have equal authority and must work well together to resolve disagreements over resources and priorities.

　　However, the matrix structure is not very popular because of difficulties in implementation and trouble in managing.

7.2.7 Network Structure

A radical organizational design, the network structure is an example of what could be termed a "non-structure" by its virtual elimination of in house business functions. Many activities are outsourced. A corporation organized in this manner is often called a virtual

organization because it is composed of a series of project groups or collaborations linked by constantly changing non-hierarchical, cobweb-like networks. The network structure becomes most useful when the environment of a firm is unstable and is expected to remain so. Under such conditions, there is usually a strong need for innovation and quick response. Instead of having salaried employees, it may contract with people for a specific project or length of time. Long-term contracts with suppliers and distributors replace services that the company could provide for itself through vertical integration. Electronic markets and sophisticated information systems reduce the transaction costs of the marketplace, thus justifying a "buy" over a "make" decision. Rather than being located in a single building or area, an organization's business functions are scattered at different geographical locations. The organization is, in effect, only a shell, with a small headquarters acting as a "broker", electronically connected to some completely owned divisions, partially owned subsidiaries, and other independent organisation. In its ultimate form, the network organization is a series of independent firms or business units linked together by a common system that designs, produces, and markets a product or service.

Companies like Airtel use the network structure in their operations function by subcontracting manufacturing to other companies in low-cost.

The network organization structure provides an organization with increased flexibility and adaptability to cope with rapid technological change and shifting patterns of international trade and competition. It allows a company to concentrate on its distinctive competencies, while gathering efficiencies from other firms who are concentrating their efforts in their areas of expertise. The network does, however, have disadvantages. The availability of numerous potential partners can be a source of trouble. Contracting out functions to separate suppliers/distributors may keep the firm from discovering any synergies by combining activities. If a particular firm overspecialises on only a few functions, it runs the risk of choosing the wrong functions and thus becoming non-competitive.

The new structural arrangements that are evolving typically are in response to social and technological advances. While they may enable the effective management of dispersed organizations, there are some serious implications, The learning organization that is a part of new organizational forms requires that each worker become a self motivated, continuous learner. Employees may lack the level of confidence necessary to participate actively in organization-sponsored learning experiences. The flatter organizational structures that accompany contemporary structures can seem intrusive as a result of their demand for more intense and personal interactions with internal and external stakeholders. Combined, the conditions above may create stress for many employees.

7.2.8 Hourglass Structure

In the recent year's information technology and communications have significantly altered the functioning of organizations. The role played by middle management is diminishing as the tasks performed by them are increasingly being replaced by the technological tools. Hourglass organization structure consists of three layers with constricted middle layer. The structure has a short and narrow middle-management level. Information technology links the top and bottom levels in the organization taking away many tasks that are performed by the middle level managers. A shrunken middle layer coordinates diverse lower level activities. Contrary to traditional middle level managers who are often specialist, the managers in the hourglass structure are generalists and perform wide variety of tasks. They would be handling cross-functional issues emanating such as those from marketing, finance or production.


Wide at the top

Narrow at the middle

Widest at the bottom

Figure: Hourglass Organisation Structure

Hourglass structure has obvious benefit of reduced costs. It also helps in enhancing responsiveness by simplifying decision making. Decision making authority is shifted close to the source of information so that it is faster. However, with the reduced size of middle management the promotion opportunities for the lower levels diminish significantly. Continuity at same level may bring monotony and lack of interest and it becomes difficult to keep the motivation levels high. Organisations try to overcome these problems by assigning challenging tasks, transferring laterally and having a system of proper rewards for performance.

7.3 Strategic Leadership

Weak leadership can wreck the soundest strategy; forceful execution of even a poor plan can often bring victory.

– Sun Zi

A leader lives in the field with his troops.

– H. Ross Perot

Strategic leadership sets the firms direction by developing and communicating vision of future, formulate strategies in the light of internal and external environment, brings about changes required to implement strategies and inspire the staff to contribute to strategy execution. A manager as a strategic leader has to play many leadership roles to play: visionary, chief entrepreneur and strategist, chief administrator, culture builder, resource acquirer and allocator, capabilities builder, process integrator, crisis manager, spokesperson, negotiator, motivator, arbitrator, policy maker, policy enforcer, and head cheerleader. Sometimes it is useful to be authoritarian; sometimes it is better to be a perceptive listener and a compromising decision maker; sometimes a strongly participative, and sometimes being a coach and adviser is the proper role.

A strategic leader is a change agent to initiates strategic changes in the organisations and ensure that the changes successfully implemented. For the most part, major change efforts have to be top-down and vision-driven. Leading change has to start with diagnosing the situation and then deciding which of several ways to handle it. Managers have five leadership roles to play in pushing for good strategy execution:

1. Staying on top of what is happening, closely monitoring progress, solving out issues, and learning what obstacles lie in the path of good execution.

2. Promoting a culture of *esprit de corps* that mobilizes and energizes organizational members to execute strategy in a competent fashion and perform at a high level.

3. Keeping the organization responsive to changing conditions, alert for new opportunities, bubbling with innovative ideas, and ahead of rivals in developing competitively valuable competencies and capabilities.

4. Exercising ethical leadership and insisting that the company conduct its affairs like a model corporate citizen.

5. Pushing corrective actions to improve strategy execution and overall strategic performance.

For example: N. R. Narayan Murthy, is known as a celebrated business leader because of the values he had institutionalised over his tenure as CEO of Infosys. One of the great legacy he left with Infosys is a strong management development program that builds management talent and strategic leader with ethical values.

Dhirubhai Ambani, pioneer of Reliance Group, was an icon in himself because of his ability to conceptualise and create sweeping strategies, to reach corporate goals, and proficiency in implementing his strategic vision. Dhirubhai Ambani had the ability to provide clear direction for the company and had strong interpersonal skills that inspired the employees to contribute their best for the accomplishment of strategic vision. These qualities made him an excellent strategic leader in the corporate world.

Leadership role in implementation: The strategic leaders must be able to use the strategic management process effectively by guiding the company in ways that result

in the formation of strategic intent and strategic mission, facilitating the development and implementation of appropriate strategic plans and providing guidance to the employees for achieving strategic goals.

Figure: Strategy Design and Implementation: Interrelationship of Elements

Strategic leadership entails the ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, and empower others to create strategic change as necessitated by external environment. In other words, strategic leadership represents a complex form of leadership in companies. A manager with strategic leadership skills exhibits the ability to guide the company through the new competitive landscape by influencing the behaviour, thoughts, and feelings of co-workers, managing through others and successfully processing or making sense of complex, ambiguous information by successfully dealing with change and uncertainty.

Figure: Effective Strategic Leadership

In the today's competitive landscape, strategic leaders are challenged to adapt their frames of reference so that they can deal with rapid, complex changes. A managerial frame of reference is the set of assumptions, premises, and accepted wisdom that bounds a manager's understanding of the company, the industry in which it competes, and the core competencies that it exploits in the pursuit of strategic competitiveness (and above-average returns). In other words, a manager's frame of reference is the foundation on which a manager's mindset is built.

The importance of a manager's frame of reference can be seen if we perceive that competitive battles are not between companies or products but between mindsets or managerial frames. This implies that effective strategic leaders must be able to deal with the diverse and cognitively complex competitive situations that are characteristic of today's competitive landscape.

A Strategic leader has several responsibilities, including the following:

◆   Making strategic decisions.

◆   Formulating policies and action plans to implement strategic decision.

◆   Ensuring effective communication in the organisation.

◆   Managing human capital (perhaps the most critical of the strategic leader's skills).

◆   Managing change in the organisation.

◆   Creating and sustaining strong corporate culture.

◆   Sustaining high performance over time.

Thus, the strategic leadership skills of a company's managers represent resources that affect company performance. And these resources must be developed for the company's future benefit.

Strategic leadership sets the firm's direction by developing and communicating a vision of future and inspire organization members to move in that direction. Unlike strategic leadership, managerial leadership is generally concerned with the short-term, day-to-day activities. Two basic approaches to leadership can be transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style.

Transformational leadership style uses charisma and enthusiasm to inspire people to exert them for the good of the organization. Transformational leadership style may be appropriate in turbulent environments, in industries at the very start or end of their life-cycles, in poorly performing organizations when there is a need to inspire a company to embrace major changes. Transformational leaders offer excitement, vision, intellectual stimulation and personal satisfaction. They inspire involvement in a mission, giving followers a 'dream' or 'vision' of a higher calling so as to elicit more dramatic changes in organizational performance. Such a leadership motivates followers to do

more than originally affected to do by stretching their abilities and increasing their self-confidence, and also promote innovation throughout the organization.

Transactional leadership style focuses more on designing systems and controlling the organization's activities and are more likely to be associated with improving the current situation. Transactional leaders try to build on the existing culture and enhance current practices. Transactional leadership style uses the authority of its office to exchange rewards, such as pay and status. They prefer a more formalized approach to motivation, setting clear goals with explicit rewards or penalties for achievement or non-achievement.

Transactional leadership style may be appropriate in static environment, in mature industries, and in organizations that are performing well. The style is better suited in persuading people to work efficiently and run operations smoothly.

7.4. Strategy Supportive Culture

Every organisation has a unique organizational culture. It has its own philosophy and principles, its own history, values, and rituals, its own ways of approaching problems and making decisions, its own work climate. It has its own embedded patterns of how to do things. Its own ingrained beliefs and thought patterns, and practices that define its corporate culture.

> **Corporate culture refers to a company's values, beliefs, business principles, traditions, ways of operating, and internal work environment.**

Where Does Corporate Culture Come From?

A company's culture is manifested in the values and business principles that management preaches and practices, in its ethical standards and official policies, in its stakeholder relationships (especially its dealings with employees, unions, stockholders, vendors, and the communities in which it operates), in the traditions the organization maintains, in its supervisory practices, in employees' attitudes and behaviour, in the legends people repeat about happenings in the organization, in the peer pressures that exist, in the organization's politics that permeate the work environment. All these sociological forces, some of which operate quite subtly, combine to define an organization's culture, beliefs and practices that become embedded in a company's culture can originate anywhere: from one influential individual, work group, department, or division, from the bottom of the organizational hierarchy or the top

Frequently, a significant part of a company's culture emerges from the stories that get told over and over again to illustrate to newcomers the importance of certain values and beliefs and ways of operating.

Culture: ally or obstacle to strategy execution?

An organization's culture is either an important contributor or an obstacle to successful

strategy execution. The beliefs, vision, objectives, and business approaches and practices underpinning a company's strategy mayor may not be compatible with its culture. When they are compatible, the culture becomes a valuable ally in strategy implementation and execution. When the culture is in conflict with some aspect of the company's direction, performance targets or strategy, the culture becomes a stumbling block that impedes successful strategy implementation and execution.

Role of culture in strategy execution

Strong culture promotes good strategy execution when there's fit and impedes execution when there's negligible fit. A culture grounded in values, practices, and behavioural norms that match what is needed for good strategy execution helps energize people throughout the company to do their jobs in a strategy-supportive manner, adding significantly to the power and effectiveness of strategy execution. For example, a culture where frugality and thrift are values strongly shared by organizational members is very conducive to successful execution of a low-cost leadership strategy. A culture where creativity, embracing change, and challenging the status quo are pervasive themes is very conducive to successful execution of a product innovation and technological leadership strategy. A culture built around such business principles as listening to customers, encouraging employees to take pride in their work, and giving employees a high degree of decision-making authority is very conducive to successful execution of a strategy of delivering superior customer value.

A work environment where the culture matches the conditions for good strategy execution provides a system of informal rules and peer pressure regarding how to conduct business internally and how to go about doing one's job. Strategy-supportive cultures shape the mood, temperament, and motivation the workforce, positively affecting organizational energy, work habits and operating practices, the degree to which organizational units cooperate, and how customers are treated.

A strong strategy-supportive culture nurtures and motivates people to do their jobs in ways conducive to effective strategy execution; it provides structure, standards, and a value system in which to operate; and it promotes strong employee identification with the company's vision, performance targets, and strategy. All this makes employees feel genuinely better about their jobs and work environment and the merits of what the company is trying to accomplish. Employees are stimulated to take on the challenge of realizing the company's vision, do their jobs competently and with enthusiasm, and collaborate with others as needed to bring the strategy to fruition.

Perils of Strategy-Culture Conflict: When a company's culture is out of sync with what is needed for strategic success, the culture has to be changed as rapidly as can be managed – this, of course, presumes that it is one or more aspects of the culture that are out of whack rather than the strategy. While correcting a strategy-culture conflict can occasionally mean revamping strategy to produce cultural fit, more usually

it means revamping the mismatched cultural features to produce strategy fit. The more entrenched the mismatched aspects of the culture, the greater the difficulty of implementing new or different strategies until better strategy-culture alignment emerges. A sizable and prolonged strategy-culture conflict weakens and may even defeat managerial efforts to make the strategy work.

Creating a strong fit between strategy and culture: It is the strategy maker's responsibility to select a strategy compatible with the "sacred" or unchangeable parts of prevailing corporate culture. It is the strategy implementer's task, once strategy is chosen, to change whatever facets of the corporate culture hinder effective execution.

Changing a problem culture: Changing a company's culture to align it with strategy is among the toughest management tasks--easier to talk about than do. Changing a problem culture is very difficult because of the heavy anchor of deeply held values and habits-people cling emotionally to the old and familiar. It takes concerted management action over a period of time to replace an unhealthy culture with a healthy culture or to root out certain unwanted cultural obstacles and instil ones that are more strategy-supportive.

The first step is to diagnose which facets of the present culture are strategy supportive and which are not. Then, managers have to talk openly and forthrightly to all concerned about those aspects of the culture that have to be changed. The talk has to be followed swiftly by visible, aggressive actions to modify the culture-actions that everyone will understand are intended to establish a new culture more in tune with the strategy. The menu of culture-changing actions includes revising policies and procedures in ways that will help drive cultural change, altering incentive compensation (to reward the desired cultural behaviour), visibly praising and recognizing people who display the new cultural traits, recruiting and hiring new managers and employees who have the desired cultural values and can serve as role models for the desired cultural behaviour, replacing key executives who are strongly associated with the old culture, and taking every opportunity to communicate to employees the basis for cultural change and its benefits to all concerned.

Implanting the needed culture-building values and behaviour depends on a sincere, sustained commitment by the chief executive coupled with extraordinary persistence in reinforcing the culture at every opportunity through both words and deed. Neither charisma nor personal magnetism is essential. However, personally talking to many departmental groups about the reasons for change is essential; organizational changes are seldom accomplished successfully from an office. Moreover, creating and sustaining a strategy-supportive culture is a job for the whole management team. Major cultural change requires many initiatives from many people. Senior managers, department heads, and middle managers have to reiterate values and translate the organization's philosophy into everyday practice. In addition, for the culture-building effort to be successful, strategy implementers must enlist the support of first line

supervisors and employee opinion leaders, convincing them of the merits of practicing and enforcing cultural norms at the lowest levels in the organization. Until a big majority of employees join the new culture and share an emotional commitment to its basic values and behavioural norms, there's considerably more work to be done in both instilling the culture and tightening the culture strategy fit.

The task of making culture supportive of strategy is not a short-term exercise. It takes time for a new culture to emerge and prevail; it's unrealistic to expect an overnight transformation. The bigger the organization and the greater the cultural shift needed to produce a culture-strategy fit, the longer it takes. In large companies, changing the corporate culture in significant ways can take two to five years. In fact, it is usually tougher to reshape a deeply ingrained culture that is not strategy-supportive than it is to instill a strategy-supportive culture from scratch in a brand-new organization.

7.5. Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship

7.5.1 Concept of Entrepreneur

Entrepreneurship is the attempt to create value through recognition of business opportunity, the management of risk taking appropriate to the opportunity and through management skills to mobilize financial, human and material resources necessary to create an enterprise. Entrepreneurship involves creation of a business idea and the fusion of capital, technology and human talent to give practical shape to the idea. The person who perceives the business idea and take steps to implement the idea is known as an entrepreneur.

> *Entrepreneurship is an attitude of mind to seek opportunities, take calculated risk and drive benefits by starting and running a venture. It comprises of numerous activities involved in the conception, creation and running an enterprise.*
>
> *An entrepreneur is a person who searched for business opportunity and starts a new enterprise to make use of that opportunity.*

An entrepreneur is an individual who conceives the idea of starting a new venture, takes all types of risks, not only to put the product or service into reality but also to make it an extremely demanding one. An entrepreneur is one who:

➢ Initiates and innovates a new concept.

➢ Recognises and utilises opportunity.

➢ Arranges and coordinates resources such as man, material, machine and capital.

➢ Faces risks and uncertainties.

➢ Establishes a startup company.

➢ Adds value to the product or service.

➢   Takes decisions to make the product or service a profitable one.

➢   Is responsible for the profits or losses of the company.

7.5.2 Concept of Intrapreneur

The terms Entrepreneur and Intrapreneur are frequently used in the business world. Many people use these terms interchangeably because they think that they both contain the same elements. However, the fact is that there exists a fine line amidst, these two terms. While the former refers to a person who starts his own business with a new idea or concept, the latter represents an employee who promotes innovation within the limits of the organisation.

An intrapreneur is nothing but an entrepreneur who operates within the boundaries of an organisation. He is an employee of a large organisation, who is vested with authority of initiating creativity and innovation in the company's products, services and projects, redesigning the processes, workflows and systems.

The intrapreneurs believe in change and do not fear failure. They discover new ideas, look for such opportunities that can benefit the whole organisation and take risks, promote innovation to improve the performance and profitability of the organisation. The job of an intrapreneur is extremely challenging. They get recognition and reward for the success achieved by them.

It has now become a trend that large corporations appoint intrapreneur within the organisation, to bring operational excellence and gain competitive edge in the market.

🔁 SUMMARY

The chapter considers the relationship between strategy and structure. Often, organization structure is redesigned to make it support strategy implementing and control though in some cases strategy is redesigned in tune with the organization structure. According to Chandler thesis, structure follows strategy. Several types of structure are used by different firms for strategy implementation under different situations. These includes simple structure, functional structure, divisional structure, multiple structure, strategic business units (SBUs), matrix structure, network structure and hourglass structure. We have discussed SBUs as grouping of related businesses, which is amenable to separate and composite strategic treatment.

Later, strategic leadership is discussed. Strategic leadership is the ability of influencing others to voluntarily make decisions that enhance prospects for the organization's long-term success while maintaining short-term financial stability. The chapter covers the leadership role in strategic implementation and also explains the two basic approaches of leadership styles, viz., transformational leadership and transactional leadership style. It also covers the concept of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship.

▭▷•·· TEST YOUR KNOWLEDGE

Very Short Answer Type Questions

Question 1

Explain the following concepts:

(a)   Strategic Business Unit

(b)   Network structure.

Answer

(a)   A Strategic Business Unit (SBU) is a unit of the company that has a separate mission and objectives which can be planned independently from other company businesses. SBU can be a company division, a product line within a division or even a single product/brand, specific group of customers or geographical location. The SBU is given the authority to make its own strategic decisions within corporate guidelines as long as it meets corporate objectives.

(b)   Network structure is a more radical organizational design. The network structure could be termed as 'non-structure' as it virtually eliminates in-house business functions and outsource many of them. A corporation organized in this manner is a virtual organization because it is composed of a series of project groups or collaborations linked by constantly changing non-hierarchical, cobweb-like networks.

Short Answer Type Questions

Question 2

State with reasons which of the following statements is correct / incorrect:

(a)   Strategies may require changes in organizational structure.

(b)   SBU concept facilitates multi-business operations.

(c)   Culture promotes better strategy execution.

(d)   An organisation's culture is always an obstacle to successful strategy implementation.

(e)   Corporate culture is always identical in all the organisations.

Answer

(a)   Correct: Strategies may require changes in structure as the structure dictates how resources will be allocated. Structure should be designed to facilitate the strategic pursuit of a firm and, therefore, should follow strategy. Without a strategy or reasons for being, companies find it difficult to design an effective structure.

(b) Correct: Organizing business along SBU lines and creating strategic business units has become a common practice for multi-product/service and global organizations. It is a convenient and intelligent grouping of activities along distinct businesses and has replaced the conventional groupings. SBU facilitates strategic planning, gaining product-related/market-related specialization, gaining cost-economies and more rational organizational structure.

(c) Correct: Strong culture in an organisation promotes good strategy execution when there's fit and hurt execution when there's negligible fit. A culture grounded in values, practices, and behavioural norms that match what is needed for good strategy execution helps energize people throughout the company to do their jobs in a strategy-supportive manner, adding significantly to the power and effectiveness of strategy execution.

(d) Incorrect: A company's culture is manifested in the values and business principles that management preaches and practices. The beliefs, vision, objectives and business approaches and practices underpinning a company's strategy may be compatible with its culture or may not. When they are compatible the culture becomes a valuable ally in strategy implementation and execution.

(e) Incorrect: Every company has its own organisational culture. Each has its own business philosophy and principles, its own ways of approaching to the problems and making decisions, its own work climate, work ethics, etc. Therefore, corporate culture need not be identical in all organisations. However, every organisation over a period of time inherits and percolates down its own specific work ethos and approaches.

Question 3

Briefly answer the following questions:

(a) How can a corporate culture be both strength and weakness of an organisation?

(b) Write a short note on the advantages of SBU structure.

(c) Write a short note on importance of corporate culture.

(d) Explain briefly the role of culture in promoting better strategy execution.

(e) 'A network structure is suited to unstable environment.' Elaborate.

(f) Briefly describe the impact of corporate culture on an organization.

(g) Write short notes on the characteristics of strategic business unit (SBU)

(h) What steps would you suggest to change a company's problem culture?

(i) What is an 'hour glass structure'? How can this structure benefit an organization?

(j) 'To coordinate more complex organizational functions, companies should abandon the simple structure in favour of the functional structure' Discuss.

(k)   Distinguish between Transformational Leadership Style and Transactional Leadership Style.

(l)   What are the different responsibilities of a strategic leader?

Answer

(a)   The most important phenomenon which often distinguishes one organisation with another is its corporate culture. Corporate culture refers to a company's values, beliefs, business principles, traditions, and ways of operating and internal work environment. Every corporation has a culture that exerts powerful influences on the behaviour of managers.

   (i)   **As a strength**: Culture can facilitate communication, decision making and control and instil cooperation and commitment. An organization's culture could be strong and cohesive when it conducts its business according to clear and explicit set of principles and values, which the management devotes considerable time to communicating to employees and which values are shared widely across the organisation.

   (ii)   **As a weakness**: Culture, as a weakness can obstruct the smooth implementation of strategy by creating resistance to change. An organization's culture could be characterised as weak when many sub-cultures exists, few values and behavioural norms are shared and traditions are rare. In such organizations, employees do not have a sense of commitment, loyalty and sense of identity.

(b)   SBU is any part of a business organization which is treated separately for strategic management purposes. The concept of SBU is helpful in creating an SBU organizational structure. It is discrete element of the business serving product markets with readily identifiable competitors and for which strategic planning can be concluded. It is created by adding another level of management in a divisional structure after the divisions have been grouped under a divisional top management authority based on the common strategic interests.

   Its advantages are:

   ◆   Establishing coordination between divisions having common strategic interests.

   ◆   Facilitates strategic management and control on large and diverse organizations.

   ◆   Fixes accountabilities at the level of distinct business units.

   ◆   Allows strategic planning to be done at the most relevant level within the total enterprise.

- ◆ Makes the task of strategic review by top executives more objective and more effective.

- ◆ Helps allocate corporate resources to areas with greatest growth opportunities.

(c) A culture where creativity, embracing change, and challenging the status quo are pervasive is very conducive to successful execution of a product innovation and technological leadership strategy. A culture built around such business principles as listening to customers, encouraging employees to take pride in their work, and giving employees a high degree of decision-making responsibility is very conducive to successful execution of a strategy of delivering superior customer service.

A strong strategy-supportive culture nurtures and motivates people to do their jobs in ways conducive to effective strategy execution; it provides structure, standards, and a value system in which to operate; and it promotes strong employee identification with the company's vision, performance targets, and strategy. All this makes employees feel genuinely better about their jobs and work environment and the merits of what the company is trying to accomplish. Employees are stimulated to take on the challenge of realizing the company's vision, do their jobs competently and with enthusiasm, and collaborate with others as needed to bring the strategy to success.

(d) Strong culture promotes good strategy execution when there's fit and impels execution when there's negligible fit. A culture grounded in values, practices, and behavioral norms that match what is needed for good strategy execution helps energize people throughout the organization to do their jobs in a strategy-supportive manner. A culture built around such business principles as listening to customers, encouraging employees to take pride in their work, and giving employees a high degree of decision-making responsibility. This is very conducive to successful execution of a strategy of delivering superior customer service.

A strong strategy-supportive culture makes employees feel genuinely better about their jobs and work environment and the merits of what the company is trying to accomplish. Employees are stimulated to take on the challenge of realizing the organizational vision, do their jobs competently and with enthusiasm, and collaborate with others.

(e) Network structure is a more radical organizational design. The network structure could be termed a "non-structure" as it virtually eliminates in-house business functions and outsource many of them. An organisation organized in this manner is often called a virtual organization because it is composed of a series of project groups or collaborations linked by constantly changing non-hierarchical,

cobweb-like networks. The network structure becomes most useful when the environment of a firm is unstable and is expected to remain so. Under such conditions, there is usually a strong need for innovation and quick response. Instead of having salaried employees, it may contract with people for a specific project or length of time. Long-term contracts with suppliers and distributors replace services that the company could provide for itself.

(f) Corporate culture refers to values, beliefs, business principles, traditions, ways of operating, and internal work environment. An organization's culture is either an important contributor or an obstacle to successful strategy execution. The beliefs, vision, objectives, business approaches and practices underpinning a company's strategy may be compatible with its culture or not. When they are, the culture becomes a valuable ally in strategy implementation and execution. When the culture is in conflict with some aspect of the company's direction, performance targets or strategy, the culture becomes a stumbling block that impedes successful strategy implementation and execution.

A culture grounded in values, practices, and behavioural norms that match what is needed for good strategy execution helps energize people throughout the company to do their jobs in a strategy-supportive manner, adding significantly to the power and effectiveness of strategy execution.

(g) **Strategic Business Unit (SBU)** is a unit of the company that has a separate mission and objectives and which can be planned independently from other businesses of the orgnanisation. The three most important characteristics of SBU are:

- It is a single business or a collection of related businesses which offer scope for independent planning and which might feasibly stand alone from the rest of the organization.

- It has its own set of competitors.

- It has a manager who has responsibility for strategic planning and profit performance. He has control of profit-influencing factors.

(h) Changing problem cultures is very difficult because of deeply held values and habits. It takes concerted management action over a period of time to replace an unhealthy culture with a healthy culture or to root out certain unwanted cultural obstacles and instil ones that are more strategy-supportive.

- The first step is to diagnose which facets of the present culture are strategy supportive and which are not.

- Then, managers have to talk openly and forthrightly to all concerned about those aspects of the culture that have to be changed.

- The talk has to be followed swiftly by visible, aggressive actions to modify

the culture-actions that everyone will understand are intended to establish a new culture more in tune with the strategy.

The menu of culture-changing actions includes revising policies and procedures, altering incentive compensation, recruiting and hiring new managers and employees, replacing key executives, communication on need and benefit to employees and so on.

(i) In the recent years information technology and communications have significantly altered the functioning of organizations. The role played by middle management is diminishing as the tasks performed by them are increasingly being replaced by the technological tools. Hourglass organization structure consists of three layers in an organisation structure with constricted middle layer. The structure has a short and narrow middle management level.

Information technology links the top and bottom levels in the organization taking away many tasks that are performed by the middle level managers. A shrunken middle layer coordinates diverse lower level activities.

Wide at the top

Narrow at the middle

Widest at the bottom

Hourglass Organization Structure

Hourglass structure has obvious benefit of reduced costs. It also helps in enhancing responsiveness by simplifying decision making. Decision making authority is shifted close to the source of information so that it is faster. However, with the reduced size of middle management, the promotion opportunities for the lower levels diminish significantly.

(j) Simple organizational structure is most appropriate usually in those small organisations that follow single business strategy and offer a line of products in a single geographic market. When a small organisation grows, its complexities also tend to grow which necessitates the companies to abandon the simple organisation structure which it has been adopting hitherto and move towards structures like functional organisational structure. A typical simple organization structure is often owner driven with small number of employees.

Functional structure groups tasks and activities by business function, such as production, marketing, finance, research and development and is generally headed by Chief Executive Officer or Managing Director. Besides being simple and inexpensive, a functional structure also promotes specialization, encourages efficiency, minimizes the need for an elaborate control system, and allows rapid decision making. At the same time with the passage of time and overall growth much more complex organisational structures exist in business world. However, dividing organization according to functional lines is invariably found at some level or the other.

(k) Difference between transformational and transactional leadership

1. Transformational leadership style uses charisma and enthusiasm to inspire people to exert them for the good of organization. Transactional leadership style uses the authority of its office to exchange rewards such as pay, status symbols etc.

2. Transformational leadership style may be appropriate in turbulent environment, in industries at the very start or end of their cycles, poorly performing organisations, when there is a need to inspire a company to embrace major changes. Transactional leadership style can be appropriate in static environment, in growing or mature industries and in organisations that are performing well.

3. Transformational leaders inspire employees by offering excitement, vision, intellectual stimulation and personal satisfaction. Transactional leaders prefer a more formalized approach to motivation, setting clear goals with explicit rewards or penalties for achievement and non-achievement. Transactional leaders focus mainly to build on existing culture and enhance current practices.

(l) A Strategic leader has several responsibilities, including the following:

◆ Making strategic decisions.

◆ Formulating policies and action plans to implement strategic decision.

◆ Ensuring effective communication in the organisation.

◆ Managing human capital (perhaps the most critical of the strategic leader's skills).

◆ Managing change in the organisation.

◆ Creating and sustaining strong corporate culture.

◆ Sustaining high performance over time.

Questions with Descriptive Answers

Question 3

What do you mean by strategic leadership? What are two approaches to leadership style?

Answer

Strategic leadership is the ability of influencing others to voluntarily make decisions that enhance prospects for the organisation's long-term success while maintaining short-term financial stability. It includes determining the firm's strategic direction, aligning the firm's strategy with its culture, modelling and communicating high ethical standards, and initiating changes in the firm's strategy, when necessary. Strategic leadership sets the firm's direction by developing and communicating a vision of future and inspire organization members to move in that direction. Unlike strategic leadership, managerial leadership is generally concerned with the short-term, day-to-day activities.

Two basic approaches to leadership can be transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style.

Transformational leadership style use charisma and enthusiasm to inspire people to exert them for the good of the organization. Transformational leadership style may be appropriate in turbulent environments, in industries at the very start or end of their life-cycles, in poorly performing organizations when there is a need to inspire a company to embrace major changes. Transformational leaders offer excitement, vision, intellectual stimulation and personal satisfaction. They inspire involvement in a mission, giving followers a 'dream' or 'vision' of a higher calling so as to elicit more dramatic changes in organizational performance. Such a leadership motivates followers to do more than originally affected to do by stretching their abilities and increasing their self-confidence, and also promote innovation throughout the organization.

Transactional leadership style focuses more on designing systems and controlling the organization's activities and are more likely to be associated with improving the current situation. Transactional leaders try to build on the existing culture and enhance current practices. Transactional leadership style uses the authority of its office to exchange rewards, such as pay and status. They prefer a more formalized approach to motivation, setting clear goals with explicit rewards or penalties for achievement or non-achievement.

Transactional leadership style may be appropriate in static environment, in growing or mature industries, and in organizations that are performing well. The style is better suited in persuading people to work efficiently and run operations smoothly.

Question 4

Discuss the leadership role played by the managers in pushing for good strategy execution.

Answer

A strategy manager has many different leadership roles to play: visionary, chief entrepreneur and strategist, chief administrator, culture builder, resource acquirer and allocator, capabilities builder, process integrator, crisis solver, spokesperson, negotiator, motivator, arbitrator, policy maker, policy enforcer, and head cheerleader. Managers have five leadership roles to play in pushing for good strategy execution:

1. Staying on top of what is happening, closely monitoring progress, working through issues and obstacles.

2. Promoting a culture that mobilizes and energizes organizational members to execute strategy and perform at a high level.

3. Keeping the organization responsive to changing conditions, alert for new opportunities and remain ahead of rivals in developing competitively valuable competencies and capabilities.

4. Ethical leadership and insisting that the organization conduct its affairs like a model corporate citizen.

5. Pushing corrective actions to improve strategy execution and overall strategic performance.

Question 5

Define corporate culture. Also, elucidate the statement "Culture is a strength that can also be a weakness".

Answer

The phenomenon which often distinguishes good organizations from bad ones could be summed up as 'corporate culture'. Corporate culture refers to a company's values, beliefs, business principles, traditions, ways of operating and internal work environment. Every corporation has a culture that exerts powerful influences on the behaviour of managers. Culture affects not only the way managers behave within an organization but also the decisions they make about the organization's relationships with its environment and its strategy.

"Culture is a strength that can also be a weakness". This statement can be explained by splitting it in to two parts.

Culture as a strength: As a strength, culture can facilitate communication, decision-making & control and create cooperation & commitment. An organization's culture could be strong and cohesive when it conducts its business according to a clear and explicit set of principles and values, which the management devotes considerable time to communicating to employees and which values are shared widely across the organization.

Culture as a weakness: As a weakness, culture may obstruct the smooth implementation of strategy by creating resistance to change. An organization's culture could be characterized as weak when many subcultures exist, few values and behavioral norms are shared and traditions are rare. In such organizations, employees do not have a sense of commitment and loyalty with the organisation.