

Analytical Perspective on the Importance of Coordination in Implementing Vertical and Horizontal Organizational Designs

Robert T. Dauphin, PhD

Associate Professor of Public Administration

Albany State University

504 College Drive Albany

Georgia

Abstract

Organizational design represents a control mechanism that affects employees' work outcomes, it ensures that employees perform required tasks effectively and efficiently and assists the attainment of organizational goals and objectives (Katsikea et al, 2011). Organizational design dictates the internal characteristics of organizations (Daft, 1995). The impetus of this analytical perspective are to analyze and highlight the significance of coordination during the establishment and implementation of "vertical" organizational design, and "horizontal" organizational design. Coordination represents an all-encompassing, master organizational design concept in which every other organizational design concept is accomplished (Mooney and Reiley, 1931). Coordination promotes: task specialization and division of labor; unity of functions; equalizes disparities and reestablishes teamwork; harmonizes employees and organizations goals; helps with task differentiation and integration; decreases employee conflicts and eradicates rivalries; helps with task interdependence; enhances employee and employer relations; enhances employees' competence; and promotes effective networking during the implementation of vertical and horizontal organizational work operations.

Keywords: Coordination, Organizational, Design, Employees, Vertical, Horizontal, Hierarchical, Flat,

Introduction

Organizations use organizational design as a control mechanism to affect employees work outcomes, to ensure employees perform required tasks effectively and efficiently, and to assist the attainment of organizational goals and objectives (Katsikea et al, 2011). Organizational design dictates the internal characteristics of organizations (Daft, 1995). These internal characteristics receive attention since they are vital to organizations success or failure (Zheng et al, 2010; Auh and Menguc, 2007), and these organizational designs include; "vertical" (hierarchical) and "horizontal" (flat) designs. Vertical organizational design involves a clearly defined chain of command from the top of organizations to the bottom; individuals at the top make all vital decisions, which they then transmit down through subordinate administrators and managers (Weber, 1922, Snafritz, 2001). Horizontal organizational design on the other hand involves low level of complexity, flat in nature with few layers of authority, low degree of formalization and centralization (Burns and Stalker, 1994). Thus, organizational design enables organizations to establish formal authority responsibility, and accountability, it enables organizations to clarify and communicate clear lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability (Tompkins, 2005). Organizational design involves "the establishment of authority relationships with the establishment of coordination between them, both vertically and horizontally within organizational designs" (Koontz, 1994). Contemporary organizational design draws on ideas from various disciplines to make organizational functioning more effective, dynamic, by blending individual and organizational solutions together into a cohesive whole. Thus, contemporary organizational designs focus on adaptability; they mostly rely on employee participation, distribute authority based on skill and have less rules and restrictions, resulting in a more organic design. Generally, organizations establish goals, and accomplish these goals by combining concepts, efforts and resources. Concepts such as division of work and specialization, which usually involves the assignment of specific tasks that organizational members to take advantage of specialized skills and abilities; authority and responsibility, usually establishes responsibility, both formal and personal responsibility (Tompkins, 2005). The impetus of this analytical perspective is to analyze and highlight the significance of coordination during the establishment and implementation of "vertical" organizational design and "horizontal" organizational design. The need for this analysis originates from the fundamental transformation occurring within the various sectors (public and private) of organizations. The inherent organizational need for effective and efficient service, and productivity and profit required action.

This transformation should not come at the expense of abandoning any organizational design; organizations should identify innovative operational concepts that can enhance the implementation or practice of a specific organizational design. How can organizations effectively and efficiently implement or practice “vertical” or “horizontal” organizational designs and how can organizations eradicate the operational limitations that exist within the designs? Organizational operations have become more complex and technical; the ideal approach remains effective implementation of “coordinative concept,” the all-encompassing, principal concept, through which all other concepts achieve coordination within organizations (Tompkins, 2005).

Literature Review

The review of the literature on vertical and horizontal organizational designs revealed that most of the literature originated from classical theorists such as Max Weber, Frederick Taylor, Henry Fayol, Luther Gulick, and structural theorists such as, Tom Burns and G. M. Stalker, and Peter Blau and W. Richard Scott to name a few. The literature review explores perspectives on the characteristics of tall and flat organizational designs, hierarchy of authority, fixed official duties, systems of rules, technical expertise, written document, contributive nature of work, and the all-encompassing role that coordination plays in enhancing organizations overall operations. Few analyzes have focused on coordination as a component that enhances both vertical and horizontal organizational designs for maximum benefit and advantage. This analysis intended to analyze and synthesize vertical and horizontal organizational designs in conjunction with the concept of coordination and eventually endeavor to come up with components that can assist the concept of coordination to enhance the implementation of both vertical and horizontal organizational designs.

Characteristics of Vertical Organizational Design:

The characteristics of “vertical” organizational design involve: specialized variation of employees work that are broken-down within organizations; each organizational tasks are abstract and implemented procedurally and different from other tasks; tasks connected among the different operational levels within the chain of command that oversee various organizational tasks; detailed characterization of employees rights and responsibilities and procedural techniques attached to each operational task; the organization converts rights and responsibilities and procedures into the duties of operational positions; vertical structure of control, authority and communication; a fortification of the vertical structure by the positioning of actual knowledge entirely at the top of the organization where organizational decisions are made; operational interaction among members tend to occur vertically between superiors and subordinates; operations and working conditions are controlled by directives and decisions of superiors; insistence to loyalty to the organization and obedience to superiors as a rule in organizations; and places significance and respect to internal knowledge, skills, and abilities (Sharitz and Ott, 2005).

Characteristics of Horizontal Organizational Design:

The characteristics of “horizontal” organizational design involve: the participative nature of employees specialized knowledge and experience; organizational tasks are usually realistic based on organizations’ operations; employees engage in constant interaction and redefinition of tasks during organizational operations; it is almost impossible to shift responsibility of operational task to another employee in any direction (upwards, downwards, or sideways); operational commitment spread across professional disciplines and function levels; it involves a network structure of control, authority, and communication, thus, accountability rest on employees conduct during their operational role, as those operation link with other operations within these organizations; managers within the organizational structure are not perceived as having monopoly on tasks and operational knowledge, operational and task knowledge disburse across the organization, making it an ad hoc center of control authority and communication; operational communication tend to flow laterally, resembling consultation rather than command; operational communication involve more of information and suggestions, instead of instruction and command; this structure values loyalty and obedience, and the commitment to organizational tasks and technological and administrative ethos; and it places significance and respect on the qualification and expertise within a specific work discipline (Sharitz and Ott, 2005).

Hierarchy of Authority:

Hierarchy of authority involves the hierarchical arrangement of managerial positions according to levels of authority, with each subordinate office under the control and supervision of a superior office, and the lower office account to the higher office through a clear chain of command (Tompkins, 2005). Organizations establish hierarchy of authority for organizations and employees ‘advantage, hierarchy of authority enhances organizations with competent managers and administrators that establishes career guidance for employees, managerial integrity, competence, and sustained

organizational success (Root III, 2019). Tompkins suggested that such an arrangement provides employees the possibility of appealing decisions of their supervisors to a higher authority, in a structured fashion.

In Tompkins perspective, the complete establishment of a hierarchical structure brings about a monocratic structure. In Tomkins view, public and private organizations regardless of complexity practice the principle of hierarchy of authority. According to Tomkins, when organizations fully establish the concept of jurisdictional capability, hierarchical subordination, especially in public organizations, does not imply that supervisors must dictate official duties to subordinates. Tomkins said that the reverse is true, that subsequent to the establishment of organizational tasks, the duties and responsibilities of those tasks remain the employees who perform those tasks. The disparaging of vertical organizational designs has become trendy for long time, detractors suggest that hierarchies are too controlled, individualized, and rigid; nonetheless, they establish stability in organizations (Bradt, 2019). In Bradt's view, regardless of the overarching strategy of organizations, organizations required stability, results and authority. Under these conditions, vertical organizations with regimented managers that possess command and control attitudes, and with a drive to succeed, doing things right, the right way, every time, succeed. Bradt argued that, this attitude combined with a compulsive focus on stable, consistent results, and with employees respecting authority, and responding well in a command and control environment, organizations would experience success. According to Bradt, organizations choice of organizational design reflects organizations move from strategy to operations, and strategies are just academic pursuits, until organizations implement those strategies, managers must focus on getting things done. Bradt explained that organizations options bring strategies to existence, and vertical organizational design ensures that organizations run smoothly, with employees performing their duties and responsibilities as planned, and thereby ensures smooth organizational functions.

Fixed Official Duties:

Fixed official duties involves the arrangement of organizations tasks systematically so that employees have clearly distinct responsibilities, and authority delegated to ensure decisions are made within specific specialized settings (Tompkins, 2005). Shafritz and Ott (2001) said that the organizations fixed official duties form the core of organizations operations, which usually required the effective and efficient performance of organizations work with the same effort, with employees following similar path, managers with similar issues, acquiring knowledge, confidence, and accuracy to enhance organizational operations. In Shafritz and Ott's view, fixed official duties encourages reduction in the number of tasks that require employees' attention and effort, and researchers have identified fixed official duties has as the ideal means of individuals or group of individuals. Shafritz and Ott argued that the concept of fixed official duties does not only apply to technical operations, but without exception to every operation that involves considerable number of individuals and require capabilities of various types, and it results in specialization of functions and separation of authority. Though difficult to implement at times, nevertheless, it enables employees to identify their formal roles and responsibilities, and the behaviors and methods required to perform organizations work; ensures task completion; employees tend to work together better; and limit wasted energy (Blazek, 2016).

In Blazek's view, regardless of employees' roles and responsibilities within organizations, fixed official duties ensures that managers at every level effectively manage their sphere of responsibilities. In Capozzi (2019) perspective, assigned responsibilities enhances efficiency. Capozzi explained that a clear understanding of employees' duties allows managers to establish timelines, such as chart lists of employees assigned to specific tasks and the projected completion time. Capozzi said that in the absence of assigned responsibilities, outcome of organizational work becomes uncertain, ambiguous, and usually incomplete and that assigned responsibilities enable employees to understand their duties and responsibilities, and managers can easily monitor employees as they implement or execute organizations work. Capozzi suggested that program implementation and production improve when organizations assign employees specific duties. In Capozzi's view, employees establish a sense of ownership; they become invested in the process outcome, thereby enhancing their efforts to produce quality products and services. Capozzi's further asserted that the absence of assigned responsibilities, employees grow disinterested, detached and sometimes become territorial.

Systems of Rules:

Organizations establish system of rules to curtail the scope of official authority and restrict managers' personal behaviors; whereas, technical rules establish how employees at every level must execute work and decisions made (Tompkins, 2005). Rules play a significant role in organizations, as it serves several functions such as; to impose order, serves as coordinating mechanism among employees and between organizational units (Van de Ven, Delbecq, & Koenig, 1976). According to Okhuysen and Bechky (2009), rules provide coordinating function as it define employees' functional responsibilities, allocate resources, and establish coordination among organizational managers. Rules as forms of control can sometimes cause drawbacks (Okhuysen and Bechky, 2009), and sole reliance on rules can lead to failure, as not all possible circumstances organizations can anticipate and put into a controlling system.

Thus, even in highly structured environments, employees' decision-making and ingenuity is vital (Dekker, 2003; Woods & Shattuck, 2000). Complex organizational systems can be a hindrance to ingenuity and change (Rousseau, 1978), and studies have revealed that formalization can have a negative effect on job satisfaction (Arches, 1991) and can lead to feelings of ineffectiveness and self-estrangement (Kakabadse, 1986). In order to address these disadvantages of rules as systems of control, organizations can react either by abolishing rules and reducing the overall rules density or by implementing more rules to counteract the shortcomings of the existing rules. Classical bureaucratic theory (e.g., Weber, 1978) argued that formalization has a self-promoting tendency to create more rules, but Schulz (1998) found that rules do not substantially "breed" additional rules; instead, the establishment of new rules slows down, as added rules are already in existence. Walsh and Dewar (1987) suggested that formalization has a more positive effect at the start of organizational life as it enhances efficiency, but later, negative effects take over, because, "as formalization fosters the development of administrative power and influence, it may ultimately contribute to organizational ineffectiveness and decline" (Walsh & Dewar, 1987:221).

Technical Expertise:

Authors such as Meredith and Mantel (1986) wrote that some of the prevailing factors leading to successful organizations include technical reliability and the ability to use organizations approach for implementing and executing tasks that met performance standards on time and within planned schedule. They claimed that procedural organizations were ideal for technical ventures based on their training, experience, and educational background. Therefore, the focus of project-management training has been on the technical, tactical and specialized skills deemed essential to perform organizational tasks (Zielinski, 2005).

Written Document:

Well-maintained original written documents establish the crux of organizations effective management and existence (Weber, 1946; Shafritz and Ott, 2001). Weber, Shafritz and Ott suggested that organizations sometimes separate central offices from decentralized offices, and generally, public organizations separate employees' official activities from their personal life. They stated that organizations separate public revenues and equipment from officials' personal assets and this concept has long existed, and currently, both public and private organizations implement this principle. Weber, Shafritz and Ott argued that in principle, separation exists between managers managerial and professional lives from their private lives, their official correspondence from personal and official assets from personal assets.

Centralization:

Centralization fit every forms of organizational operations, directives converge towards the center of authority, and from the center, directives or order sent out set every organizational department moving (Fayol, 1949; Sharitz and Ott, 2005). According to Fayol, Sharitz and Ott, centralization is not a positive or negative managerial system. In Fayol, Sharitz and Ott perspective, organizations can institute centralization whenever they decide to do so; nonetheless, every organization practices some aspect of centralization. They argue that the question of centralization and decentralization depends on the extent to which organizations want to implement the concept. Fayol, Sharitz and Ott explained that there exists an absolute centralization in organizations where managerial directives go directly to workers; in large organizations, where lengthy scalar chain interjects between managers and workers, directives and counter-information go through series of intermediaries, and each intermediary purposefully or inadvertently assert additional information into the delivery of the directive. Fayol, Sharitz and Ott argued that in that instance, employees do not operate as a cog within an organizational machine, and any aspect of ingenuity left to intermediaries depend on the character of the supervisors' trust in their intermediaries and the organizational environment. Fayol, Sharitz and Ott suggested that the magnitude of centralization should depend on organizational operation, but the goal should involve the optimal use of every employee in the organization. In Fayol, Sharitz and Ott view, if managers moral worth, strength, intellect, experience, and nimbleness of thought permit to have a vast span of activities, managers would implement centralization extensively and minimize dependency on their deputy managers. Conversely, if managers prefer to have prefer to depend on the experience, opinions, and counsel of deputy managers while personally reserving the privilege to offer general directives, that manager inadvertently practicing decentralization. Fayol, Sharitz and Ott concluded that since managers and employees' organizational interaction seems dynamic, the magnitude of centralization and decentralization may itself differ continuously. They said that organizations must solve this problem based on situations, to the best of the need of organizations. They went on to say that, this problem does no limit itself to higher authorities, but also to superiors at every level, and can spread or stay with employees' creativities. They found that organizations could address the issue of centralization and decentralization by focusing on one dynamic; and all that enhances employees' role produces decentralization, and all that lessens employees' role brings about centralization.

Order: According to Fayol, Sharitz and Ott, a formula exists for material things; they describe this formula as “A place for everything and everything in its place.” The same for human order, “A place for everyone and everyone in his place.” **Material Order:** Fayol, Sharitz and Ott, stated that the object of order should involve avoiding loss of material, and for organizations to avoid loss of material things must be suitably arranged and the environment pre-chosen to facilitate organizations operations. They said that the fulfillment of the last condition could give the appearance of order, disguising disorder. They argued that the appearance of disorder may be order, and perfect order presumes a carefully selected area and the appearance of order is simply an unreal depiction of actual order. **Social Order:** In Fayol, Sharitz and Ott view, for social order to exist, there must “be an appointed place for every employee and every employee present in their appointed place,” and perfect order demands that the place be suitable for employees and employees for the place. They said that social order presumes the successful implementation of two difficult managerial functions: “good organization and good selection,” and the fulfillment of these functions bring about social order “A place for each one and each one in place.” Fayol, Sharitz, and Ott went on to say that, social order requires specific knowledge of every employee requirements and resources in organizations, and a continuous balance between requirements and resources. They suggested that this balance tend to be difficult in large organizations, and when this situation has been interrupted, and resulted to employees’ neglect of organizations goals, and when motivation, nepotism, favoritism, or simply lack of knowledge, permeate organizations no amount of talent and strength will sweep away abuses and restore order.

Esprit De Corp: Unity is strength, organizational leaders that take this proverb to heart would perform well (Sharitz and Ott, 2005). In Sharitz and Ott perspective, harmony and peace among employees within organizations, results is a form of strength, and the concept that organizations should observe to maintain harmony is unity of command; and the pitfalls to avoid are; erroneous understanding of the saying “divide and rule,” and the abuse of written communications. Fayol, Sharitz and Ott warned that organizational managers must not “divide to rule” their own teams, because it does significant damage to organizations. They said that this ill-advised idea to management is a result of lack of managerial competence, or flawed understanding of things, or from selfishness, which substitute employees’ interests with personal goal. They said that, there is no value in managers spreading discord among employees; and that managers require real abilities to synchronize effort, inspire enthusiasm, utilize each employee’s talents, and compensate employees of work well down, instead of arousing potential jealousy and upsetting pleasant interactions. Fayol, Sharitz and Ott advised that verbal communication tends to be simpler and faster than written communication, because it tends to prevent misunderstanding, and it benefits involve promptness, clarity, and synchronicity. Fayol, Sharitz and Ott advised that, organizations should regard concepts that have proven true; because it is on these concepts, organizations would build their core foundations and beliefs.

Line-Staff Principle: In Luther Gullick view, organization designs should involve line-staff principle. Gullick said that staff agencies advise and support line agencies and are to give orders. Gullick says that the distinction seems vital relative to planning departments because it emphasizes the significance of declining to insert any component of administrative authority and control into professional and technical departments and agencies. However, Gullick argued that although organizations would consider certain employees’ as staffs, according to the strict interpretation of the line and staff principle whenever organizations designate administrative responsibility and authority to any staff, that duty instantly and entirely becomes a line duty.

Coordination a Core Component of Organizational Design : Coordination represents an all-encompassing, master organizational design concept in which every other organizational design concept is accomplished (Mooney and Reiley, 1931). In Mooney and Reiley’s view, coordination embodies an essential aspect of organizations’ operations; division of labor necessitates coordination, to accomplish complicated organizational tasks. They explain that to accomplish multifaceted organizational goals, organizations must practice coordination regardless of the size of the organization. In Mooney and Reiley’ perspective, coordination guarantees that employee or group of employees are responsible for aspects of organizations overall tasks and permit organizations to take advantage of task specialization. Hence, coordination promotes: task specialization and division of labor, unity of functions, equalizes disparities and reestablishes teamwork, harmonizes employees and organizations goals, helps with task differentiation and integration, decreases employee conflicts and eradicates rivalries, helps with task interdependence, enhances employee and employer relations, enhances employees’ competence, and promotes effective networking during the implementation of vertical and horizontal organizational work operations. Thus, Kadu (2019), explains these features as: **Enhances task specialization and division of labor:** The concepts of division of labor and specialization necessitate separation of organization into different functional sections. However, all these functional sections work towards accomplishing a common organizational goal or goals. Integration of these separated sections within organizations require coordination, which makes coordination the nucleus of organizational work and job specialization.

Promotes unity of function: Coordination provides unity of functions of varied resources, skills, activities and perspectives. Acknowledging the importance of diversity in organizations is essential because of differences in employees' attributes and characteristics. Coordination minimizes some of the strains that diversity of employee attributes and characteristics sometimes produce and restores unity of function to accomplish intended organizational goals.

Equalizes disparities and reestablishes teamwork: Coordination equalizes inequalities and reestablishes teamwork. Employee differences sometimes create imbalances, making it problematic to achieve organizations goals. Coordination enforces teamwork in organizations, and teamwork equalizes unequal aspects during the accomplishment of organizational goals.

It harmonizes employees and organizations goals: Employees' needs influence their goals. Individual employee goals may be different from group goals and organizational goals. Conflict between these goals may deter expected organizational outcomes. Coordination can assist in harmonizing and integrating employees' goals with organizational goals.

It helps with differentiation and integration: Coordination establishes collaboration in differentiated work units and establishes clear line of authority to accomplish integrated work effects. Differentiated work units and authority centers are unavoidable in organizations for obvious reasons of division of labor and specialization. Coordination enables organizations to promote collaboration to enhance the integration of differentiated work.

It decreases employee conflicts and eradicates rivalry: The differences in employee characteristics sometimes creates personality conflicts. Such conflicts sometimes establish personal rivalries and group rivalries. Coordination helps to eradicate such conflicts and rivalries by establishing sociable and cooperative personal and work relationship. Conflicts and rivalries are counterproductive to organizations work. Coordination helps minimize their effects and, in some instance, eliminate them within organizations.

It helps with task interdependence: Though organizations separate work activities into different functional areas, interdependence of each function eventually helps in accomplishing organizations objectives. In the absence of coordination, organizations cannot achieve interdependence. Equally, interdependence also promotes mutuality in organizations. Mutuality involves relating and interacting with fellow employees positively. Coordination fosters a culture where everyone strives to win for themselves, their teams, and their organizations.

Enhances employee and employer relationship: Positive employer and employee relations promotes positive work environment in organizations balance of power. Responsibility, initiative, loyalty and commitment are the values that organizations aspire to achieve and try to inculcate in their workforce. Positive employer and employee relations minimizes power imbalance within organizations and establishes organizational cultural values that enable employees to take responsibilities, develop loyalty, initiative and ultimately align organizations goals with individual employee goals by establishing shared vision.

Enhances employees' competence: Coordination establishes self-managing teams and enables management to connect organizations strategy with individual employee knowledge by establishing knowledge pools. Knowledge pools enable organizations to enhance the competency of employees and ultimately enables organizations to respond to the competitive internal and external environments.

Promotes effective networking in organizations: Coordination helps growing organizations by developing an effective network of large number of employees working in an organization. These abovementioned factors illustrate that coordination represent a vital prerequisite for success of organizations operations. In the absence of coordination, organizations would have trouble to accomplish their desired goals. Therefore, Chester Barnard said that the quality of coordination represents a crucial factor in the survival of organizations.

Analysis and Discussion: The multidimensional aspects of organizational design offer a framework that allows for rich understanding of the dynamics and outcomes for seamless organizational operations, regardless of the organizational design of organizations. The writer suggests that the framework focuses on "coordination," which represents the principal method of synchronization to avoid disruption of organizational operations and to guarantee harmonization of functions among individuals and groups, which together would assist organizations to archive their operational goals. Coordination must involve three features: division of labor, interdependence of departments, and assimilation of individuals within organizations. Conversely, we can view these coordination features as productivity stimulators, enhances specializations, and vital to advance diverse individual motives despite the organizational design. Researchers and scholars have written extensively about the "red tape" or "bureaucratic nature" of mechanistic or hierarchical organizational designs, nonetheless, an effective coordination of mechanistic or hierarchical organizations can negate these negative effects of this organizational design. Perspectives that can enhance the implementation of coordinative concept in both mechanistic and organic organizational designs involve:

- The establishment of clear and attainable goals, organizations should have a coherent plan of how to proceed by establishing interdepartmental relations.
- Organizations should analyze the proposed interdepartmental relations in terms of the organizational, technical, managerial, and employee advantages and disadvantages. Only after considering both the advantages and disadvantages can organizations determine whether the advantages are worth the inevitable risks that a specific type of coordination presents.
- Once organizations decide to implement a certain type of coordinative operational function, organizations have to establish a strategy to ensure departmental success. Organizations should anticipate and take into account the size of departments and the organization, which type of knowledge, skills, and abilities employees should possess to represent various departments or organizations, and what external organization or organizations that best fit to cooperate with operationally. Organizations should research best practices from other organizations to learn from similar experiences. Organizations should prepare to highlight their goals, to justify the establishment of the organization to both internal and external observers.
- Organizations should establish a relation of trust between departments and employees, establishing a notion of partnership, and establish organizational credibility through honesty and training. Time pressure a critical factor, organizations need to establish credibility earlier during the implementation phase of departmental coordination and partnership with employees. The appointment and selection of departmental heads also would play a vital role in establishing a relationship of trust. These department heads should have enough stature in organizations to legitimize the department and demonstrate to external actors the commitment of the organization to succeed. Once the organization has established its credibility, it can establish trust through good will and clear communication.
- Organizations should practice flexibility, because situations can change, other individuals or employees could have varied perspectives from those of top-level members of organizations. Organizations should respond constructively to those perspectives. Failure to do so can create conflict and mistrust.

Conclusion

The era of conforming to a specific organizational design has ended. Managerial and administrative framework has experienced continuous transformation over the years, as traditional designs has proven insufficient in dealing with new operational realities. Traditional theories and practices are insufficient to provide the necessary guidance and support for organizations in a constantly changing world in which complexity and uncertainty abound. This analysis tends to spur towards innovative thoughts and ideas, in terms of which managerial concept or concepts can stabilize organizational functions and radically redefine organizational designs. If organizations are to prosper and want to be innovators of managerial and administrative change, organizations will need to embrace concepts and ideas that stabilize, enhance and accelerate work operations. Thus, regardless of the types of organizational design organizations practice, they must ensure that a strong but flexible coordination process become the nucleus of their operations. Researchers and writers have discussed some of the weaknesses of vertical or hierarchical organizational design, favoring horizontal or flat organizational design because of its perceived flexibility. This writer submits that both organizational designs are important and serve specific purposes depend on the type, purpose, and function of organizations. Vertical or hierarchical organizational design only needs some level of flexibility built into its coordinative operational processes to enable free flow of organizational operations, to eliminate “red tapes” and other inefficiencies.

References

- Allen, P.M (2001), A complex systems Approach to Learning in adaptive Networks, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol.5, No.2, pp.149-180.
- Apgar, M. (1998), The Alternative Workplace: Changing Where and How People Work. *Harvard Business Review*, May/June, 76(3): 121-130.
- Auh, S, & Menguc, B. (2007). Performance implications of the direct and moderating effects of centralization and formalization on customer orientation, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36, 1022–1034
- Blazek, K. (2016). The Importance of Defining Roles and Responsibilities. *TruScore*. Retrieved from <https://www.truscore.com/360-feedback-resources/the-importance-of-defining-roles-and-responsibilities/>
- Beatty, R.W., & Ulrich, D.O. (1991), Re-Energizing the Mature Organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, *American Management Association*, 16-30.
- Borkar, R. (2010), *Flat Organizational Structure*.
- Berreby, D. (1998), Complexity Theory: Fact-free Science or Business Tool? *Journal of Strategy and Business*, [Online], First Quarter, Available: <http://www.strategybusiness.com/strategy/98104/page1.html>.

- Bradt, G. (2019). In Praise Of Hierarchical Organizations (Sometimes). Leadership Strategies. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/georgebradt/2018/10/02/in-praise-of-hierarchical-organizations-sometimes/#386194ae357f>
- Burns, T. And Stalkee, G.M.(1961), *The Management of Innovation*, Tavistock.
- Capozzi, C. (2019). What Is the Importance of Establishing & Assigning Responsibilities for Project Team Members? Chron. Retrieved from <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/importance-establishing-assigning-responsibilities-project-team-members-18128.html>
- Chirantan Basu, Weakness of Hierarchical Organizational Structures, *Demand Media*, <http://smallbusiness.chron.com>.
- Daft, R. (1995). *Organization Theory & Design*, (5th ed.), New York, West Publishing Company.
- D'Aveni, R.A. (1994), *Hyper-competition: Managing the Dynamics of Strategic Manoeuvring*. New York: The Free Press.
- David Ingram, The Advantages of Flat Organizational Structure, *Demand Media*, <http://smallbusiness.chron.com>.
- Dekker, S. 2003. Failure to adapt or adaptations that fail: contrasting models on procedures and safety. *Applied Ergonomics*, 34(3): 233-238.
- Drucker, P.F. (1992), *Managing for the Future: The 1990s and Beyond*. New York: Truman.
- Frizzelle, G. & Richards, H. (2002), "Considering organization structure and design from a Complexity Paradigm Perspective" in (eds.) *Tackling industrial complexity: the ideas that make a difference*. Mcmillan, E, Institute of Manufacturing, University of Cambridge.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management*. Pittsman and Sons. London
- Gulick, L. (Unknown). Notes on the Theory of Organization. *Gulick and Urwick*.
- Kadu, D. (2019). What is the Importance of Coordination in an Organization? Retrieved from <http://www.shareyouressays.com/knowledge/what-is-the-importance-of-coordination-in-an-organization-explained/116971>.
- Kakabadse, A. 1986. Organizational Alienation and Job Climate: A Comparative Study of Structural Conditions and Psychological Adjustment. *Small Group Research*, 17(4): 458-471.
- Katsikea, E, Theodosiou, M, Perdakis, N, & Kehagias, J. (2011). The effects of organizational structure and job characteristics on export sales managers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment, *Journal of World Business*, 46, 221–233
- Kondalkar, V.G. (2006) *Organizational Behavior, New Age International Edition*.
- Koontz, H (1994), *Management, Mc Graw Hills International Edition*.
- Leigh Richards, The Difference Between Tall & Flat Organizational Structure, *Demand Media* <http://smallbusiness.chron.com>.
- Meredith, J. R. & Mantel, S. J. (1986). *Project Management: A Managerial Approach*. John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Mooney, J. D. & Reiley, A. C. (1931), *Onward Industries!*
- The Principles of Organization and their significance to Modern Industries*. Harper Collins. New York
- Natasha Gilani (2004), Bureaucratic Vs. Flat Organizational Structure, *Demand Media*, <http://smallbusiness.chron.com>.
- Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. 2009. Coordination in Organizations: An Integrative Perspective. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3: 463-502.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998), *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, Applications*. 8th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Root III, G. N. (2019). Why Is the Hierarchy of Authority Important in an Organization? Chron. <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/hierarchy-authority-important-organization-11899.html>
- Rousseau, D. M. 1978. Characteristics of Departments, Positions, and Individuals: Contexts for Attitudes and Behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(4): 521-540.
- Shafritz, J. M. & Ott, J. S. (2001). *Classics of Organizational Theory*. Wadsworth: Thompson Learning, United States
- Strinfellow, A. (2010), *About Flat Organization Structure*.
- Tompkins, R. J. (2005), *Organizational Theory and Public Management*. Cengage Learning. United States
- Van de Ven, A. H., Delbecq, A. L., & Koenig, R. 1976. Determinants of Coordination Modes within Organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 41(2): 322-338.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social Economic Organization*. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons: Oxford Press.
- New York Woods, D. D., & Shattuck, L. G. 2000. Distant Supervision – Local Action Given the Potential for Surprise. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 2(4): 242-245.
- Zielke, A. & Pohl, M. (1996). Virtual Vertical Integration: The Key to Success. *The mckinsey Quarterly*, 3: 160-163.
- Zielinski, R. (2005). The Performance Pyramid: Building Blocks for a Successful Choral Performance. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnoxob3Bzb25tdXNpY2VkcG9ydGZvbGlvfGd4OmU2YzQxNDg3OGMzYTM3Mg>