

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



What is the Right Organization Design?

N. ANAND

RICHARD L. DAFT

INTRODUCTION

A start-up company in Florida, called World Response Group (WRG), developed an unusual woven mat for the horticulture industry that was made from all-natural fibers. Horticulture growers in the U.S. produce hundreds of millions of potted plants each year. The product, called SmartGrow, dramatically reduced weed growth in potted plants and simultaneously provided important nutrients – all with no chemicals. SmartGrow raw materials and manufacturing expertise were available in China and India. As the company grew, the managers and board members talked frequently about organization structure. Two schools of thought emerged. One group wanted to import raw materials into the U.S. for manufacturing by WRG and thereby have direct control over manufacturing, marketing, and sales. These functions would be departments within WRG. The second group wanted to import already manufactured and packaged products from overseas, outsource marketing to an agency, and hire a horticulture distribution company to handle sales. The second group pushed the concept that no one within the company would ever touch the product. Nor would there be functional departments for manufacturing, marketing, and sales.

That discussion of structure within WRG would not have occurred 30 years ago when Robert Duncan published his seminal article, "What is the Right Organization Structure?" in *Organization Dynamics* in 1979. At that time, organizations were thought to be self-contained, and structure defined the reporting relationships among internal functional

departments. Duncan's article provided important insights about the conditions under which different internal arrangements would achieve a company's mission. His insights are still referenced in management textbooks today.

The purpose of this article is to present key developments in organization structure and design that have occurred since Duncan's article and describe when each can be used for greatest effect. We will briefly review the important structural designs from 30 years ago and then describe key developments since that time. The concepts are organized into three eras, which reflect substantive changes in management thinking from vertical organization to horizontal organizing to open boundaries via outsourcing and partnering.

ERA 1: SELF-CONTAINED ORGANIZATION DESIGNS

The first era of organizational design probably took hold in the mid-1800s, and was dominant until the late 1970s. In Era 1, the ideal organization was self-contained. It had clear boundaries between it and suppliers, customers or competitors. Inputs arrived at the organization's gate, and after a transformation process, left as a completed product or service. Almost everything that was required during the transformation process was supplied internally. Design philosophies from this era emphasized the need to adapt to different environmental and internal contingencies and the ability to control the different parts of the organization

through reporting relationships in a vertical chain of command.

The structure of self-contained organizations can be thought of as: (1) the grouping of people into functions or departments; (2) the reporting relationships among people and departments; and (3) the systems to ensure coordination and integration of activities both horizontally and vertically. The structures of this era, including functional, division, and matrix designs, rely largely on the vertical hierarchy and chain of command to define departmental groupings and reporting relationships.

Functional

In a functional structure, activities are grouped together by common function from the bottom to the top of the organization. Each functional activity – accounting, engineering, human resources, manufacturing, etc. – is grouped into a specific department. Most small companies use this structure, as do many large government organizations and divisions of large companies.

Divisional

The divisional structure occurs when departments are grouped together based on organizational outputs. The divisional structure is sometimes called a product structure or profit center. Most large companies have separate divisions that use different technologies or serve different customers. People within each division have more product focus, accountability, and flexibility than would be the case if they were part of a huge functional structure. For example, United Technologies Corporation (UTC), which is among the 50 largest U.S. industrial firms, has product divisions for air-conditioning and heating (Carrier), elevators and escalators (Otis), aircraft engines (Pratt & Whitney), helicopters (Sikorsky), and aerospace (Hamilton Sundstrand), among others. Each division acts like a stand-alone company, doing its own product development, marketing, and finance.

Horizontal Overlays and Matrix

Few organizations can be successful today with a pure functional structure, because the resulting functional or divisional silos inhibit the amount of coordination needed in a changing competitive environment. Organizations break down silos by using a variety of horizontal linkage mechanisms to improve communication among departments and divisions. These coordination relationships are often drawn on organization charts as dotted lines. Many organizations use full-time product managers, project managers, or brand managers, to coordinate the work of several departments. The brand manager for Planters Peanuts, for example, serves as an integrator by coordinating the sales, advertising, and distribution for that product. General Motors Corp. has brand managers who are integrators responsible for marketing and sales strategies for each of GM's new models.

Organizations that need even stronger horizontal coordination may evolve to a matrix structure. The matrix combines a vertical structure with an equally strong horizontal overlay. While the vertical structure provides traditional control within functional departments, the horizontal overlay provides coordination across departments to achieve profit goals. This structure has lines of formal authority along two dimensions, such as functional and product or product and region. Some employees report to two bosses simultaneously. For example, after a regional marketing promotion went \$10 million over budget, Nike Inc. managers engineered a matrix structure that assigned dual responsibility by product and region to manage the introduction of new products each year. Headquarters establishes which product to push. Then product managers determine how to do it, but regional managers have authority to modify plans for their regions. Nike's matrix provides a counterbalance between product manager and regional manager ambitions.

ERA 2: HORIZONTAL ORGANIZATION DESIGN WITH TEAM- AND PROCESS-BASED EMPHASIS

The second era of organizational design started in the 1980s. As the world grew increasingly complex, organizations of Era 2 experienced the limits of traditional designs. Coordination between departmental silos within the organization became more difficult, and vertical authority-based reporting systems often were not effective in creating value for customers. At the same time, information processing capacity of organizations improved greatly, due to the availability of personal computers and networks. Design philosophies of this era emphasize the need to reshape the internal boundaries of the organization in order to improve coordination and communication.

The horizontal organization emphasizes reengineering along workflow processes that link organizational capabilities to customers and suppliers. While traditional self-contained organizations of Era 1 embodied the need for hierarchical control and separate functional specializations, the horizontal organization advocated the dispensing of internal boundaries that are an impediment to effective business performance. If the traditional structure can be likened to a pyramid, the metaphor that best applies to the horizontal organization is a pizza – flat, but packed with all the necessary ingredients.

Examples


New product development is one context in which the horizontal organization design is most appropriate. Take the example of Ford Motor Co.'s Escape gas-electric hybrid sport utility vehicle (SUV), conceived in response to consumer demand and competition from rivals such as Toyota Motor Corp. and Nissan Motor Co. Ford adopted the horizontal organization design, which involved creation of a cross-functional team to handle the entire workflow for develop-

ing and launching a new automobile model. The team included highly accomplished individuals from research and product engineering – two groups that are traditionally in separate silos in Ford. There were two team leaders, one with experience in product development and another with expertise in launching vehicles in the market on time. In the development phase, the team invested a considerable amount of time learning about customer requirements firsthand, by talking to potential owners in addition to relying on market research reports. The research scientists and engineers shared a common office space, discussed emerging issues over group lunches, and improved product design through hallway chats. The team was sheltered from the rest of the organization and provided with resources rapidly as and when required. For example, when discussions with the Japanese battery supplier were stalling because of language difficulty, the Ford corporate office dispatched an engineer fluent in Japanese to help the team out. Once the prototype vehicle was developed, the team shifted into launch mode in order to get it ready for production. The team started working more intensively with outside suppliers that provided critical parts for the new vehicle and were always around to solve manufacturing problems. The Escape Hybrid SUV was launched on time and is regarded by industry experts as a successful product for Ford.

Other firms that have used the horizontal organization for new product development include Xerox Corp., Lexmark Printers, and Eastman Kodak Co. Another domain in which this design works effectively is in back-office tasks of financial services firms that involve handoffs to multiple departments. Barclays Bank in the U.K. uses the horizontal design for its mortgage services, incorporating legal and relocation services in addition to traditional tasks such as loan sanctioning and credit assessment.

The design features of the horizontal organization are summarized in [Table 1](#).

TABLE 1 DESIGN FEATURES OF THE HORIZONTAL ORGANIZATION

FEATURES	HORIZONTAL ORGANIZATION
Figure	
What is it?	Breaking down internal boundaries and vertical silos to make subunits work together <i>horizontally</i>
Design principles	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Organize around complete workflow processes rather than tasks. (2) Flatten hierarchy and use teams to manage everything. (3) Appoint process team leaders to manage internal team processes. (4) Let supplier and customer contact drive performance. (5) Provide required expertise from outside the team as required.
Advantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Rapid communication and reduction in cycle time of work done. (2) Individuals working together on teams develop broader perspective, more flexible and empowered roles. (3) Rapid organizational learning is facilitated. (4) Improved customer responsiveness.
Disadvantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Separation of business activities into processes and non-process functions may be problematic. (2) Cinderella problem: non-process bits of the organization could feel neglected. (3) Teamwork could get in the way of functional specialization. (4) Traditional departments may instigate turf battles.
When to use	When the organization can create better value by improving internal coordination to enable greater flexibility and tailored responses to fit customer needs.

Design Principles

Five principles govern the design of a horizontal organization. First, organize around complete workflow processes rather than departments. The key is to move away from a traditional department-centered mindset of breaking things down by functions. Instead, think about how different pieces of work are holistically accomplished in the organization. For example, at Progressive Casualty Insurance Company, adjusters and claims personnel are organized into teams that handle the entire claims process from beginning to end. Departmental boundaries are eliminated, and the claims response takes a few hours rather than a week. Second, diminish hierarchical differences and use teams to carry out the work, which is what Progressive does. The use of team structure

empowers employees, decentralizes decision-making, and allows for greater learning across the organization. Third, appoint team leaders to manage the internal process in addition to coordinating the work. It is important to realize that monitoring the team's processes is as important as taking care of expected outputs. In the Escape Hybrid team, one individual took the lead role during development and adopted a relaxed and exploratory mindset, while another individual took on a more task-oriented and deadline-driven role during the launch phase. Fourth, allow team members to interact with customers and suppliers directly, so as to adapt and respond quickly if required. Direct contact allows members to keep abreast of changes in the environment more quickly. Finally, provide required expertise from the outside as and when

requested by the team. A good team realizes that it does not have all the answers, and therefore it should not be shy about asking for help when needed.

Advantages

There is rapid communication among team members with different functional backgrounds, resulting in reduction in the time for getting workflows completed. Members of a team develop a broader perspective and become adept at solving problems that have the potential to hinder the effectiveness of the entire organization. Employees become more flexible in terms of skill and competence by being aware of the roles of others, and thus feel more empowered to make decisions. Being part of the team also guarantees some recognition and social support. Overall, the level of learning within the horizontal organization increases tremendously compared with the traditional pyramid structure, because of close contact with both customers and suppliers at either end of the workflow. For example, Ford executives used the horizontal approach to customer service for the Escape SUV. Several horizontally aligned groups were responsible for core processes such as parts supply and logistics, vehicle service programs, and technical support. As the processes took hold, learning and responsiveness increased sharply.

Disadvantages

As with any design option, the horizontal organization has its fair share of drawbacks. First, the identification of complete and self-contained work processes within an organization can be problematic. It may be difficult to separate workflows from departmental tasks in a straightforward manner. Strong departments within a firm might fight hard because they might perceive a loss of "turf." Even where the identification is done well and in a politically astute manner, there can be a short-run increase in costs while transitional arrangements are perfected and as

employees adjust to the lack of traditional and direction. Second, there is the Cinderella problem: employees belonging to parts of the organization that have not been earmarked as horizontal might feel relatively neglected. The emphasis on cross-disciplinary teamwork and immediate customer gratification could stand in the way of deeper technical specialization that can result in innovative products. Finally, managers in entrenched departments may feel a loss of turf and may act politically to stymie attempts at effective horizontal collaboration.

When to Use

The horizontal design is best when the organization can create better customer value by improving internal coordination so as to be flexible and responsive to customers' needs. By creating key workflow processes and defining support tasks, there is a better line of sight to customers. This design should be used when the organization is able to move to the mindset of a team-based structure without great difficulty, and also when it is able to trade off the short-term losses incurred in making the new structure work against the gains that eventually accrue from it.

ERA 3: ORGANIZATIONAL BOUNDARIES OPEN UP

The third era of organizational design came into its own in the mid-1990s, with rapid improvements in communication technology in the form of the Internet and mobile phones. Era 3 also coincides with the rise of emerging economies such as China and India, where there is a great pooled of skilled expertise in performing very specific tasks such as low-cost manufacturing and software development. The external and internal boundaries of the organization opened up as never before. Managers became increasingly comfortable with the idea that their organization could not efficiently perform all of the tasks required to make a product or service.

In the early years of the era, large and bloated organizations shed a lot of tasks that were completed internally, and this led to a difficult period of adjustment. Later on, start-up organizations were designed at the outset to be more lightweight by having a number of tasks performed externally.

HOLLOW ORGANIZATION

The biggest trend in the design of organizations in Era 3 has been, without doubt, the outsourcing of various pieces of work done internally to outside partners. The phenomenon became most noticeable in the shifting of the manufacturing function from the U.S. to cheaper areas of production in Asia. In 1986, a *Business Week* article noted that a number of industries – including auto, steel, machine tools, consumer electronics, and semiconductor chips – were shifting their production elsewhere, and hence could be characterized, in contrast to traditional manufacturers, as “hollow corporations.” More than 20 years later, business commentators recognize that adopting the hollow organization design form has led to more value creation, because U.S. firms now focus on honing profit-making functions such as design and marketing.


Examples

There are now few industries that remain untouched by the hollow organization design option. Take the case of the U.S. military. Faced with contradictory demands – for greater troop deployment to fight terrorism around the world and pressure to cap the number of active personnel and reservists who are called up – the military has turned towards ever increasing use of private military company (PMC) contractors to provide all services except the core one of fighting battles and securing defensive positions. For instance, Kellogg Brown & Root, a subsidiary of the Haliburton Corporation, builds and maintains military bases that have been deployed in Iraq and also provides for all

catering and cleaning requirements and its employees (comprising engineers, architects, logistics experts, cooks, and cleaners) live and work alongside servicemen and women in many active theatres around the world. Much of the sophisticated weaponry used by the military – such as the F-117 fighters, the Patriot missile, and the Global Hawk drone – is maintained on site by PMCs. A study of the use of PMCs by the military in Bosnia showed that outsourcing had reduced troop numbers by 24% and cut operational costs by 27%. As this illustration shows, the hollow design form allows for more flexibility, better use of specialist external technology, and greater efficiency.

More conventional examples of the hollow design abound. Sneaker companies Nike and Reebok Ltd. pioneered outsourcing of manufacturing to Southeast Asian contractors more than 20 years ago, and showed how profitability could be improved by adopting a hollow design. More recently, much of the mundane work of the financial services industry – such as processing insurance claims, approving mortgage loans, and analyzing financial statements of companies – has been accomplished by outsourcing partners located more than halfway across the globe. Another area is customer service work, from simple tasks such as confirming bank or credit card balances to sophisticated ones such as providing technical support for computer users. Rapid developments in communication technologies have allowed work that would have previously been kept in-house to migrate abroad. This trend has affected large and small companies alike. For example, Fluor Corp., a medium-sized California-based architectural services company, outsourced much of the work of generating blueprints and specifications for a multi-billion dollar Saudi Arabian petrochemical complex to a team of 200 Filipino architects employed by partner firm in Manila. Likewise, solo architects working in the U.S. can make use of freelance architectural contractors based in Hungary (where there is an abundance of trained architects) to render plans into three-dimensional specifications.

TABLE 2 DESIGN FEATURES OF THE HOLLOW ORGANIZATION

FEATURES		HOLLOW ORGANIZATION
Figure		
What is it?		Outsourcing internal organization <i>processes</i> that support an organization's mission
Design principles		(1) Determine non-core processes – those that are <i>not</i> (a) critical to business performance, (b) creating current or potential business advantage, (c) likely to drive growth or rejuvenation. (2) Harness market forces to get non-core processes done efficiently. (3) Create an effective and flexible interface through a contract that aligns incentives.
Advantages		(1) Cost savings due to less capital expenditure and overhead. (2) Tapping into best sources of specialization and technology. (3) Market discipline that leads to supplier competition and innovation. (4) Flexibility in using lower cost and higher quality inputs.
Disadvantages		(1) Loss of in-house skills. (2) Possible decrease in internal innovation capacity. (3) Costs of transitioning to hollow state. (4) Higher monitoring to align incentives. (5) Reduced control over supply. (6) Competitive threat of being supplanted by suppliers.
When to use		When there is heavy price competition with pressure to cut costs and there is enough of a market outside the organization to perform required processes.

The design features of the horizontal organization are summarized in Table 2.

Design Principles

There are three principles governing the design of the hollow organization. First, determine core and non-core business processes in the organization. Typically, core processes share these characteristics: they are critical to business performance, they create current or potential business advantage, and they are likely to drive future growth and rejuvenation. All other processes can be deemed non-core and are likely candidates for being outsourced. For example, in building the Cayenne SUV, Porsche retained critical processes such as engine production, transmission manufacturing, and final assembly – contributing to just about 10% of the finished automobile as core – and

outsourced everything else. Second, harness market forces to outsource non-core processes. With increasing globalization and installation of high-touch informational technology systems, it is possible to offshore work to places that are not only cheaper, but also of higher quality. Big tax and audit firms, for example, routinely outsource the filing of individual and corporate tax returns to India-based firms such as MphasiS where highly qualified local accountants complete the task at a fraction of the price that an equivalent U.S. employee would cost. Third, write an effective and flexible contract to align incentives between the firm and the outsourcing provider. One sensitivity issue in using PMCs in war zones is that such firms are ultimately accountable to shareholders rather than the U.S. military, and therefore incentives have to be put in place to ensure continued cooperation.

Advantages

The main advantage of the hollow organization is in the cost savings that comes from utilizing a lesser amount of capital expenditure and in carrying a less administrative overhead. This design also provides greater organizational flexibility by allowing the use of higher quality inputs at less cost. Firms can focus on what they do best, while tapping into the best sources of specialization and technology that outsourcers can bring with them. The growing market for outsourced services, in turn, makes providers more competitive and innovative, thereby adding more to the bottom line of the hollow organization.

Disadvantages

There are several downsides to using the hollow design option. There is a loss of in-house skills, and with that possibly the reduced capacity to innovate. The costs of transitioning to a hollow state are high, and include intangibles such as reduced employee morale. Also, if the supplier is distant both geographically and culturally, then there may be additional costs in terms of increased monitoring or switching to another supplier. Hollow organizations have less control over the supply of their products because of dependence on outsourcing partners, and there is even a threat of being supplanted by suppliers. To illustrate, Motorola Inc. hired BenQ, a Taiwanese manufacturer, to design and develop handsets for its American markets; BenQ then used the expertise gained to create a market for itself in mainland China.

When to Use

The hollow design is usually considered when an organization faces heavy price competition, and consequently, pressure to cut costs. This prompts managers to see what processes can be done cheaper outside the organization. In order to avoid being held hostage to a single supplier, there has to be enough of a market to stimulate efficiency in the performance of outsourced processes.

MODULAR ORGANIZATION


The modular organization was another design that was popularized in the early 1990s. The image that it presents of the organization is one of a collection of Lego bricks that can snap together or be hived off as necessary. The design is similar to the hollow organization in its use of outsourcing. Crucially, however, what is different and distinctive about this form is that outsourcing conforms to pieces of the product rather than outsourcing organizational *processes* (e.g., human resources, warehousing, and logistics) in the hollow form. The assembly of decomposable product chunks provided by internal and external subcontractors is the defining feature of modular organization design.

Examples

The making of Bombardier's Continental business jet shows how flexible modular organizations can be. The jet can fly eight passengers comfortably from coast to coast in the U.S. without stopping to refuel. Bombardier has broken up the design of the aircraft into 12 large chunks provided by internal divisions and external contractors. The cockpit, center, and forward fuselage are produced in-house, but other major parts are supplied by manufacturers spread around the globe: tailcone (Hawker de Havilland, Australia), stabilizers and rear fuselage (Aerospace Industrial Development, Taiwan), engines (General Electric Co., U.S.A.), wing (Mitsubishi, Japan), fairings to improve aerodynamics (Fischer, Austria), landing gear (Messier-Dowty, Canada), and avionics (Rockwell Collins, U.S.A.). It takes just four days for employees in Bombardier's factory in Wichita, Kansas to snap the parts together. There were a number of upsides for Bombardier in using the modular design. The firm was able to share development costs with its partners, slash the cycle time required to launch a new product, and enter the market at a price point that was about \$3 million less than its nearest competitor.

Other industries in which modular organizations tend to be prevalent include automo-

TABLE 3 DESIGN FEATURES OF THE MODULAR ORGANIZATION

FEATURES	MODULAR ORGANIZATION
Figure	
What is it?	Assembling decomposable <i>product chunks (modules)</i> provided by internal and external subcontractors
Design principles	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Break products into manageable modules. (2) Design interfaces that allow different chunks to work together. (3) Outsource product chunks that are produced more efficiently by others. (4) Design the organization to focus on assembling and distributing chunks created in-house and outside.
Advantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Cost savings and speed of responsiveness. (2) Take advantage of competence beyond one's boundary. (3) Scope to experiment with different suppliers that focus on improving their own part. (4) Increased ability to innovate through recombination of modules in different ways.
Disadvantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Not all products may be amenable to chunking into modules. (2) Poorly specified interfaces that hinder modules from work can hamper assembly. (3) Laggards can hold up innovation that occurs concurrently across a chain of collaborators.
When to use	When it is possible to specify the nature of product modules and to design interfaces that allow them to join up and function.

bile manufacture, bicycle production, consumer electronics, household appliances, power tools, computing products, and software.

The design features of the horizontal organization are summarized in Table 3.

Design Principles

Four principles govern the design of modular organization. First, break products up into separable modules that can be made on a stand-alone basis. Second, design interfaces that allow different modules to work with each other. If this aspect is poorly done, then it can cause tremendous headaches down the line. Bombardier learned this principle from tough experience while outsourcing modules for aircraft that it developed before the Continental jet. Third, outsource product chunks

that can be made more efficiently by external contractors. PalmOne Inc., the manufacturer of personal digital assistants, uses modularity in the product to focus on developing the software while outsourcing various hardware modules to subcontractors such as HTC of Taiwan. Finally, enable the organization to focus on assembling the different chunks of the product created in-house and outside.

Advantages

The prime advantage of the modular structure is its efficiency and speed of response. Nissan operates the most efficient automobile plants in the U.S., thanks to its modular organizational design. Parts such as the frame, dashboard, and seats are built by contractors and shipped to the assembly line. Modular

design also allows firms to take advantage of competence beyond their own boundaries. By partnering with HTC, PalmOne was able to reduce defects by 50%. Firms can experiment with the use of different suppliers that focus on being the best in their class. Another advantage for modular firms is the increased ability to innovate through the recombination of modules in different ways. Nissan, for example, can use its assembly line to build many more different models of autos than rivals, thanks to its greater modularity.

Disadvantages

One key issue that limits applicability of the modular organization design is the fact that not all products or production processes are amenable to chunking into modules. Second, poorly designed interfaces can hinder modules from working with each other and lead to costly rework. DaimlerChrysler adopted a highly modular design for its two-seater Smart Car, but the launch was beset with a number of problems because various parts of the car would not snap into place as planned and required extensive debugging. Finally, firms have to manage partner firms as if they were part of one large coalition – and this is where the modular design differs significantly from hollow. Innovation has to occur concurrently across a chain of partner firms in order to create a new generation of products, and laggards can hold up the entire development cycle.

When to Use

The modular design is used when it is possible to break up the organization's product into self-contained modules, and where interfaces can be specified such that the modules work when they are joined together.

VIRTUAL ORGANIZATION

Few of today's companies can go it alone under a constant onslaught of international

competitors, changing technology, and new regulations. Organizations around the world are embedded in complex networks of relationships: competing fiercely in some markets while collaborating in others. Collaboration or joint ventures with competitors usually takes the form of a virtual organization – a company outside a company created specifically to respond to an exceptional market opportunity that is often temporary. The metaphor for this design comes from virtual memory in a computer, which makes it act as if there were more storage capacity than actually present.

Examples

When Marks & Spencer (M&S), the venerable British retail chain, suffered dramatically declining sales in its core product of women's clothing, it turned to a one-time rival for help. George Davies is a serial entrepreneur who has previously set up two companies that have competed successfully with M&S. Together they created a virtual organization called Per Una, with the objective of getting younger women interested in a range of fashionable but reasonably priced clothing. The arrangement was unusual for M&S, which is famously insular and likes to keep all its branding and merchandising in-house. In launching Per Una, M&S provided only retail shelf space and marketing support. Davies contributed everything else, including apparel and accessories, logistics, and sales training. M&S benefited from increased traffic into its stores, while Davis retained a major share of the profits. Per Una proved to be a big hit and helped revive M&S' business fortunes, and was later absorbed completely into M&S. This example illustrates the key features of the virtual organization – willingness to collaborate with unlikely partners, capitalizing on market opportunity, and dissolving the virtual entity when it has served its purpose.

Virtual organization design is very prevalent in the high-technology industry where concurrent competition and cooperation is rife. For example, Symbian Ltd., a software

developer for mobile phones, is a virtual organization set up by a consortium of competitors for handsets, including Nokia AB oyj, Sony Ericsson, Samsung Electronics Co., Panasonic, and Siemens AG. Large and mature companies also use virtual organization design to respond swiftly to a commercial opportunity. For example, rivals P&G and Clorox have recently collaborated with each other to create a new generation of plastic wrap, Glad Press 'n Seal, to compete with market leader Saran.

The design features of the horizontal organization are summarized in Table 4.

Design Principles


There are four principles governing the design of the virtual organization. First, create boundaries around a temporary organization with external partners. The organization may look like a separate entity as in a joint venture. Second, use technology to link people, assets, and ideas. Often the virtual organization is not tangible in terms of separate

offices, facilities, and other types of infrastructure. It exists in people's minds. What makes it coherent is the sense of purpose and resources that are dedicated to achieving goals. For example, Billable Hour, a small business specialty wristwatch and greeting card retailer, relies on a far-flung network of partnerships, linked by technology, to produce its goods. Third, each partner brings its domain of excellence to bear. Fourth, disband or absorb once the opportunity evaporates. For example, at the height of the dot-com boom, Procter & Gamble Co. used technology partners to create a virtual organization called Reflect.com, with the aim of selling cosmetics online. After the boom faded away, P&G disbanded the organization and absorbed the learning from the experience into a more traditional cosmetics division.

Advantages

The virtual organization provides firms with the ability to move nimbly to exploit a favorable market opportunity. Virtual design

TABLE 4 DESIGN FEATURES OF THE VIRTUAL ORGANIZATION

FEATURES	VIRTUAL ORGANIZATION
Figure	
What is it?	Creating a <i>company-outside-a-company</i> to respond to an exceptional (often temporary) opportunity
Design principles	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Create boundaries around a temporary organization with external partners. (2) Use technology to link people, assets, and ideas. (3) Each partner brings its domain of excellence. (4) Disband or absorb once the opportunity evaporates.
Advantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Ability to move nimbly to respond to market opportunity. (2) Allows a firm to provide product extension or one-stop-shop service. (3) Leverage organizational assets distributed across partners forming the virtual firm. (4) No commitment to keeping the organization going after initial opportunity vanishes.
Disadvantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Increase in the load of communication to ensure there is no duplication or redundancy. (2) Lack of trust could break down communication and coordination. (3) Employees in the virtual entity may have partisan or weak organizational identification.
When to use	When it is possible to explore a fleeting market opportunity by partnering with other organizations.

also allows a firm to provide a product extension that would have been impossible otherwise, and also to jointly leverage organizational assets that are distributed across partnering firms. In the Glad joint venture, for example, the wrap was invented in P&G labs but marketed under Clorox's well-established Glad brand name. Since then, the two companies have continued the collaboration with the introduction of Glad Force Flex trash bags, which make use of a stretchable plastic also invented in P&G labs. Finally, another advantage of the virtual form is that it can be easily disbanded or absorbed once the opportunity for collaboration goes away, or it can be made into a stand-alone entity if the opportunity becomes larger.

Disadvantages

The major downside of virtual organization design is that it requires a tremendous amount of communication and understanding to keep it going. Partners need to talk to each other to avoid duplication and redundancy. One recurring problem with the Per Una organization was that some of its apparel was strikingly similar to what M&S had designed. Another problem is that lack of trust or misalignment of incentives could break down communication and coordination. In the Per Una case this problem manifested itself in terms of M&S's indefinite return policy – customers can bring in goods that they are dissatisfied with any time; George Davies, on the other hand, wanted a time limit on when customers could come back in to claim a refund or exchange, so as to protect the profitability of the operation and also its reputation for fair commercial exchange. A final drawback is that employees in the virtual entity may have partisan or weak organizational identification, and this, in turn, may reduce their commitment.

When to Use

The virtual design is used when it is possible to explore a fleeting market opportunity by partnering with complementary

organizations. In such situations, typically one organization does not have the necessary capability to respond, and it is necessary to look around to see what other organizations (including competitors) can offer. The design works best when there is clear understanding among partnering organizations as to their rights and obligations.

NEW DEMANDS ON MANAGERS AND ORGANIZATIONS

The shifting emphasis from vertical designs to horizontal designs to partnership designs has reshaped the roles of managers. The biggest change has been from having direct control over resources required for performance toward dependence on others over whom there is no direct control. Even with more dependence and less control under newer structural designs, managers are still responsible for performance outcomes. For a manager who is used to a traditional top-down approach, it is hard to let go of control. The late business guru Peter Drucker once noted that the problem with large company managers is that they are used to giving orders and not to working with a partner – a totally different proposition.

A nice example is provided by the transition of Strida, a U.K.-based company that sells lightweight foldable bicycles, from a functional design, vertically integrated manufacturer to a completely hollow form. In 2001, Strida received a large order from an Italian customer, willing to buy at a price that was below the cost of producing the bicycles in the U.K. The CEO of the company, Steedman Bass, immediately began investigating ways of making the organization more efficient. First, he decided to shut down the in-house production plant and identified a manufacturing partner in the Far East who could make the bike at lower cost. He used expert contractors to continue developing new bicycle models, to design the owner's manual, to design the company's Web site. He used various Web-based software ser-

vices to ensure smooth communication between the designers and the manufacturer, to manage accounts, materials and documents. He then turned to a long-time vendor to take over the back-end operation of the company – including warehouse management, order fulfillment, inventory control, customer service, inbound container management, and accounts generation. The company has low overhead and is now structured to ramp up and down quickly in response to market fluctuations. Bass focuses almost exclusively on managing the various relationships that make up the business. Bass had loved making his own bikes, and therefore the biggest barrier in making the transition was in his willingness to find, trust, and hand over that responsibility to someone else that could do it more efficiently.

A study of the fit between executive style and executive roles by the Hay Group distinguished between *operations roles* and *collaborative roles*. Operations roles have traditional line authority and are accountable for business results, typically through direct control over people and resources. Successful operations managers set goals, establish analyses, take risks, and are intensely focused on results. Collaborative roles, however, lack direct authority over horizontal colleagues or partners, and are nonetheless accountable for key business results. Successful managers in collaborative roles are extremely flexible and proactive, achieve outcomes through personal communication and influence tailored to people and situations, and assertively seek out needed information.

The old way of managing was to defend the unit's boundaries and oversee its performance by emphasizing operations roles. However, collaborative roles are more common in new organizational structures. The key manager demands for succeeding with newer structural designs are as follows.

Get the Right Partner on the Bus

In a hollow or modular design this means spending time to get to know a potential partner's strengths, weaknesses, and goals.

For routine, commodity-type sourcing, due diligence is less important. But for a significant partnership, trust in the partner is essential. Check for gaps in skills and competency to assess whether the partner can deliver what your business needs. It is good to investigate prospective partners by talking to other companies they've partnered with and to develop a sense of how well suited their culture and priorities are to your own. For hollow and modular designs, it is good to understand the process being outsourced and what to expect from the partner. When the partner takes it over, your control will be gone. The partner will get most of the benefit from improvements, innovation, and efficiencies.

Select People With Lateral Organizing Skills

Lateral organizing skills refers to the ability to work with people across organizations, including those with whom lines of responsibility and accountability are a little fuzzy. People who are part of a horizontal team or who work with outside partners must have excellent coordination, personal influence, and negotiation skills. Soft skills dominate hard skills in the newer organization designs. A process owner or a partner cannot simply order a change. It's about influence, influence, and influence to adjust the relationship to serve new demands. Managers with lateral organizing skills may also act as evangelists, convincing people to give up their own needs for the greater good of collaboration for customer satisfaction.

Seek Clarity, Not Control

As relationships move from vertical to horizontal and from work that can be observed to work performed elsewhere, much time has to be devoted to the front end of the relationship—setting expectations and creating structure. Every conceivable issue must be discussed and probably written down in contracts with outside partners. Memos of understanding are effective for process teams. The respective goals, incen-

tives, and desired outcomes should be defined in advance. During the relationship, problems surely will arise and changes will be made, but clarity in the beginning is essential. Steedman Bass of Strida says that careful negotiation beforehand is critical. "Good contracts are important. They may be time-consuming, but taking the time to write and negotiate good contracts that work for both parties is essential. You're placing a lot of reliance on people, and it has to work. We did our homework up front, thinking of how we wanted the relationships to work, and that has probably eliminated 98% of the potential misunderstandings on either our part or theirs." Bass also emphasized, "I had never used contracts to sue or punish partners; I used them to mutually establish the playing field and rules of the game."

Design Coordination Mechanisms


Some amount of mutual control with partners can be asserted through explicit collaboration mechanisms. For an outside partner, example mechanisms might include a Leadership Governance Board of senior executives that meets quarterly, or monthly meetings of team leaders, or periodic visits to each others' sites to see the work, build relationships, and discuss results. Scheduled periodic discussions of metrics, performance results, and written reports should also be part of the coordination process with internal or external partners.

CONCLUSION

After much debate, the managers at WRG, the start-up horticulture supply company referred to at the beginning of this article, decided to adopt a hollow rather than a functional organization design. It was a learning process for managers and board members because the team's experience had been in traditional structures. A manager and board member made trips to India and China to meet and build personal relationships with

suppliers. The product had to be supplied in bulk for horticulture nurseries, and in appealing individual packages for retail sales. The time and travel overseas was only a fraction of the cost of buying machines and building a small manufacturing plant. Building strong relationships with sales distributors and a marketing agency was more challenging. These businesses were focused on their own needs more than on a partnership. Moreover, the board member who worked with distributors had something of an autocratic temperament, which made it hard to connect with the prospective partners. The CEO, however, had a knack for building horizontal relationships with growers and university researchers for testing product efficacy. The science supporting the superior efficiency of SmartGrow was thereby accomplished at minimal cost. After some trial and error, the hollow organization form proved a boon to WRG.

The movement from Era 1 to Era 3 has vastly expanded the array of organization design choices available to managers. The new designs – particularly variations of the horizontal and hollow forms – that have evolved in the past three decades offer a number of advantages, but as we have noted, each has particular challenges as well. The shift from vertical to horizontal thinking and behavior can be difficult. The implementation of a horizontal or sourcing design has its own challenges. Realigning a large company along horizontal processes can require a wrenching change in people and culture. Adopting a hollow form may require less change in culture, but a new manager paradigm will be needed, with special focus on finding suitable external partners and building relationships that serve both partners. Maintaining external collaboration requires its own expertise. With increasing global competition, managers have to be astute and realistic about the organization design that provides them with competitive advantage and their customers with greatest value.

 To order reprints of this article, please call +1(212)633-3813 or e-mail reprints@elsevier.com



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Robert Duncan's original article titled "What Is the Right Organization Structure? Decision Tree Analysis Provides the Answer," *Organizational Dynamics*, 1979 (winter), 59–80, provides a brief overview of functional, divisional, and matrix structures. Stewart A. Clegg's book *Modern Organizations* (Sage, 1990) traces the evolution from traditional to contemporary organization designs. The classic reference on divisional structures is *Strategy and Structure* (MIT Press, 1962) by Alfred Chandler. *Matrix* (Addison-Wesley, 1979) by Stanley Lawrence and Paul Davis is the definitive introduction to the topic. Jay Galbraith's *Designing Complex Organizations* (Addison-Wesley, 1973) provides a brief yet comprehensive description of Era 1 designs.

In their book *Reengineering the Corporation* (HarperBusiness, 1993) Michael Hammer and James Champy discuss how reengineering horizontal processes can cut costs and improve customer value. John A. Bryne's "The Horizontal Corporation," *Business Week*, 20 December 1993, 76–81, provides a number of original illustrations of companies that have adopted the horizontal design. The principles of team-oriented organization design are succinctly articulated by Albert Cherns in "The Principles of Sociotechnical Designs," *Human Relations*, 1976, 29, 783–792. The Ford Escape SUV example used in the article is adapted from Chuck Salter's article "Ford's Escape Route," *FastCompany*, October 2004, 106–110. Frank Ostroff's book *The Horizontal Organization* (Oxford University Press, 1999) is a comprehensive exposition of that design option. A wonderful firsthand report of an organization moving from predominantly Era 1 vertical lines of command to Era 2 horizontal processes can be found in Mary Walton's *Car* (W.W. Norton, 1999).

Norman Jonas's 1986 article "The Hollow Corporation," *Business Week*, 3 March, 57–59, attracted widespread attention to the growing trend in outsourcing. The key principles of the hollow form are summarized by Simon Domberger in *The Contracting Organization* (Oxford University Press, 1998). Examples of the hollow form can be found in the following articles: Anthony Bianco and Stephanie Anderson Forest, "Outsourcing War," *Business Week*, 15 September 2003, 42–49; Pete Engardio, Aaron Berstein, and Manjeet Kripalani, "The New Global Job Shift," *Business Week*, 3 February 2003, 36–48; and Pete Engardio and Bruce Einhorn, "Outsourcing Innovation," *Business Week*, 21 March 2005, 86–94. More generally, John Hagel III and Marc Singer discuss the Era 3 philosophy of design in their aptly titled article "Unbundling the Corporation," *Harvard Business Review*, March–April 1999, 133–141.

The article titled "The Modular Corporation" by Shawn Tully and Tricia Welsh, *Fortune*, 8 February 1993, 106–115, helped spread awareness of this Era 3 option to a wide business audience. A comprehensive discussion of the modular form can be found in Carliss Y. Baldwin and Kim B. Clark, *Design Rules: The Power of Modularity v.1* (MIT Press, 2000). Academic articles discussing the key features of the modular form include the following: Ron Sanchez and Joseph T. Mahoney, "Modularity, Flexibility, and Knowledge Management in Product and Organizational Design," *Strategic Management Journal*, 1996, 17, 63–76; and Melissa A. Schilling and Kevin T. Steensma, "The Use of Modular Organizational Forms: An Industry Level Analysis," *Academy of Management Journal*, 2001, 44, 1149–1168. Exam-

ples of the modular form can be found in Philip Siekman's "The Snap-Together Business Jet," *Fortune*, 21 January 2002, 104A–104H; and David Welch's "How Nissan Laps Detroit," *Business Week*, 22 December 2003, 60–62.

William Davidow and Michael Malone's book *The Virtual Corporation* (HarperCollins, 2003) provides a good introduction to the opportunities and challenges of the virtual form. A framework that considers when the virtual form should be favored is provided by Henry Chesbrough and David Teece in their article "When is Virtual Virtuous? Organizing for Innovation," *Harvard Business Review*, January–February 1996, 65–73. Shona Brown and Kathleen Eisenhardt theorize the virtues of temporary organizations in their book *Competing on the Edge* (Harvard

Business School Press, 1998). The P&G-Clorox virtual organization example was drawn from Patrica Seller's article "Teaching an Old Dog New Tricks," *Fortune*, 31 May 2004, 166–180.

Transitioning from a traditional organization design to a more contemporary option can be challenging. A number of books provide guidance on how the redesign challenge can be met, including Bruce Pasternack and Albert Viscio's *The Centreless Corporation* (Simon & Schuster, 1998); David Nadler and Michael Tushman's *Competing by Design* (Oxford, 1997); Henk Volbreda's *Building the Flexible Firm* (Oxford, 1998); Jay Galbraith's *Designing Organizations* (Jossey-Bass, 2002); and Michael Goold and Andrew Campbell's *Designing Effective Organizations* (Jossey-Bass, 2002).

N. Anand is a professor of organizational behavior at IMD, Lausanne. He has also taught at London Business School, Tanaka Business School (Imperial College, London), the Indian School of Management, and the Owen Graduate School of Management (Vanderbilt University). Anand's current research examines new forms of organization design, knowledge-based innovation in professional service firms, and social networking in organizations. His work appears in journals such as *Academy of Management Journal*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, *Organizational Dynamics*, *Organization Science*, and *Personnel Psychology*. He consults as a management educator for a global list of corporations including HSBC, Credit Suisse Financial Corporation, and Mc-Graw Hill (e-mail: anandnar@gmail.com).

Richard L. Daft holds the Brownlee O. Currey, Jr. Chair in the Owen Graduate School of Management, Vanderbilt University, where he studies and teaches leadership, high-performance cultures, and change management. Daft has authored 12 books, including his best selling textbook, *Organization Theory and Design*, 9th ed. (Thomson, 2007). Daft also co-authored *Fusion Leadership: Unlocking the Forces that Change People and Organizations* (Berrett-Koehler, 2000), and has published dozens of scholarly articles. He has been involved in management development and change consulting for many organizations, including Bridgestone/Firestone, the National Academy of Science, American Banking Association, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Allstate Insurance, Pratt & Whitney, and State Farm Insurance (email: dick.daft@owen.vanderbilt.edu).