IMPACT OF ADAPTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

OMOFOWA Mary Shadrach, AGIREN Tuoyo Eresanara & OBAKPOLOR Kingsley
Department of Human Resource Management,
Faculty of Management Sciences,
University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State
Corresponding Author's Email: mary.omofowa@uniben.edu

ABSTRACT

The study examined impact of adaptive organizational design on organizational performance**.** Strategic flexibility and Organizational ambidexterity theories provided a framework for this study, the review utilized a comprehensive literature review and analyzed empirical work investigating Adaptive Organizational Design and Organizational Performance, the studies found out a meaningful correlation between organic structures promoting dispersed decision-making and strengthened innovation outputs leading to profitability boosts. This lends empirical support to principles of flexible design espoused in strategic flexibility theory. The study concluded that, it is evident through perplexing empirical work and busting explorations of literature that adaptive designs play a pivotal role in thriving amid industry turbulations. The study therefore recommended that Organizational leaders should implement structural changes to distribute accountability across multi-disciplinary teams and cultivate cross-pollination of diverse ideas

Keywords: Adaptive Organisational design, Organisational performance and Strategic flexibility theory

INTRODUCTION

Organizational performance encompasses diverse metrics that evaluate how efficiently and effectively an organization achieves its goals and objectives (Sugiarti, 2022). An organization's ability to evolve and adapt internal structures and processes maximizes performance during disruptive marketplace changes. Continuous learning and the promotion of cross-functional collaboration enhance the flexibility necessary to adjust effectively to new challenges and opportunities (Haris, 2023). Key elements of measuring performance include financial indicators like profitability and growth, operational metrics like productivity and quality, and assessments of customer satisfaction (Mello, 2021) Examples of organizational design attributes that can be adapted are decision-making structures, team compositions. (PalimĄka, 2021). Ensuring high organizational performance presents ongoing challenges, as organizations

operate in increasingly volatile environments where the only constant is change (Sugiarti, 2022). To keep pace with shifting market demands and sustain competitive advantage, organizations require an adaptive capacity to modify their structures, processes, and strategies (Al-Murad, 2022). This links to the concept of adaptive organizational design.

As posited by (Zhang, 2021), Adaptive organizational design refers to the capacity of an organization to modify its internal structures, processes, and strategies in response to environmental changes. When an organization can rapidly adjust its design attributes as conditions evolve, it gains the flexibility needed to maximize opportunities and minimize threats posed by uncertainty (Kasberger, 2023) However, such dynamism also brings challenges related to maintaining internal coordination and control as changes occur (Bailey, 2021). If navigated skillfully, adaptive organizational design allows optimization of current performance by leveraging available resources suited to emerging realities. In this way, the ability to evolve organizational form enhances long-term viability in unpredictable conditions (Livenko, 2021).

Adaptive organizational design plays a crucial role in bolstering organizational performance through periods of turbulence and transformation (van Bree, 2021). When an organization can dynamically reconfigure its structural, processual, and strategic dimensions to better fit emerging realities, it gains the nimbleness needed to capitalize quickly on opportunities or counter potential threats in a changing landscape (Paul, 2012). This enhances both short-term and long-term viability by keeping the organization's design parameters attuned to the constantly fluctuating demands of its task environment (Higo, 2021). The flexibility to renew one's organizational form as required empowers continuous optimization of how available resources are deployed and directed towards the realization of an organization's goals (Choi & Yang, 2023).

Prior studies such as (Halpern & Owen, 2021: Fiala, 2023: Khusniyah Indrawati & Muljaningsih, 2022) have established adaptive capacity as a key success factor for organizational endurance and prosperity during times of uncertainty (Harker & During, 2022). Prior studies (Bailey, 2021: van Bree, 2021: Paul, 2012) have established adaptive capacity as a key success factor for organizational endurance and prosperity during times of uncertainty (Bailey, 2021). Prior studies (Henry, 2021: Fiala, 2023) have established adaptive capacity as a key success factor for organizational endurance and prosperity during times of uncertainty. However, scant research exists exploring the precise relationship between adaptive organizational design attributes and quantitative indicators of organizational performance (Khusniyah Indrawati & Muljaningsih, 2022). Given the persisting volatility afflicting industries and national economies worldwide, investigating the impact that environmental dynamism has on the design-performance linkage assumes growing practical salience (Fiala, 2023). Moreover, little is known about this relationship's manifestation within diverse organizational contexts and sectors. The proposed study intends to determine the influence of adaptive organizational design on key indicators of organizational performance within the current contextual conditions. Findings seek to fill gaps in understanding how design attributes enhance or hinder a firm's ability to achieve its goals through efficiency and effectiveness

gains, thereby expanding theoretical knowledge on management strategies for thriving in today's VUCA business environment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Performance - Defining the Construct and its Dimensions

Organizational performance encompasses a multidimensional construct evaluated through diverse indicators. Traditionally, researchers define organizational performance according to financial measures such as profitability, sales growth, and return on investment (Higo, 2021). However, a narrow focus on financial metrics provides an incomplete picture of organizational effectiveness by overlooking non-financial aspects (PalimĄka, 2021) argues operational, market, and employee-related factors combine to determine organizational performance in a more holistic sense.

Sugiarti, (2022) opine that categorize key performance dimensions into financial, customer, internal business process, learning and growth, and employee-related perspectives. Financial performance concerns traditional accounting-based and market-based metrics reflecting profitability, liquidity, and shareholder return (Haris, 2023). The customer dimension examines how well an organization meets customer needs through outcomes like satisfaction, loyalty, and retention (Haris, 2023). Internal business processes center around operational efficiencies and quality standards evident in production capabilities, cycle time reduction, and productivity (PalimĄka, 2021). Learning and growth emphasize organizational innovation through intangible assets, employee competencies, and information systems that sustain competitive advantage over time (Khusniyah & Muljaningsih, 2022) Lastly, employee-related factors cover work attitudes, job satisfaction, and the work environment for motivating staff toward goal achievement.

Taken together, these diverse components capture a multidimensional view of organizational performance aligned with modern business priorities around customers, processes, human capital, and innovation in addition to traditional financial targets (Richard et al., 2009; van Bree, 2021). By considering multiple perspectives, researchers gain a more comprehensive evaluation of organizational effectiveness beyond isolated metrics (Paul, 2012). This multidimensional conceptualization of organizational performance thus provides an appropriate framework for the current study.

Organizational Design

Organizational design refers to the structural configurations within an organization that dictate how it functions, from the arrangement of work activities to the allocation of power and tasks (van Bree, 2021). Core elements of design include departmentalization based on product, function, geography and customer groups; mechanistic versus organic structuring; vertical hierarchy versus horizontal team structures; and centralization versus decentralization of authority (Al-Murad, 2022). Effective organizational designs align these structures strategically with environmental demands (Bailey, 2021).

Adaptive designs emphasize flexibility through reconfigurable, modular systems that enable continuous transformation in response to changing circumstances (Haris, 2023). Organizations using adaptability as a design principle emphasize horizontal participation, team-based work over vertical hierarchies, fluid job definitions and roles, decentralization, information-rich lateral ties across divisions rather than top-down control to foster distributed learning (PalimĄka, 2021). Adhocracy designs draw from principles of organic systems to imbue companies with qualities like readiness, resilience and receptiveness. In contrast, mechanistic designs prioritize stability suitable for static conditions through strict division of labour, centralized control and standardization (van Bree, 2021). The appropriate design profile depends on an organization's strategic objectives and the industrial environment it operates within (Haris, 2023).

Adaptive Organizational Design - Principles and framework

Adaptive organizational design involves structuring organizations with dynamism and flexibility as core principles to effectively respond to environmental changes (Van Bree, 2021). A key framework for adaptability includes modular and reconfigurable systems that facilitate continuous renewal through rearrangement of existing structures, avoidance of structural inertia, and distribution of power to enable experimentation across organizational units (Haris, 2023).

Other frameworks emphasize the need for alignment between structural configuration and organizational processes on one hand, and market dynamics on the other (Khusniyah Indrawati & Muljaningsih, 2022). Adaptability also stems from horizontal participation over vertical control, decentralization, interdependent lateral relationships tied by trust and cooperation rather than hierarchy, the presence of multiple leaders rather than a single authority, and learning reinforced through information availability rather than top-down mandates (Kasberger, 2023). Flexibility allows organizational leaders to rapidly adjust strategies through temporary structures that enable swift alteration of organizational properties to suit shifting industry forces and competitive terrains better than bureaucracies locked into path dependencies. Such design principles provide avenues for continual strategic change and performance enhancement, (Bailey, 2021).

Types and Attributes of Adaptive Organizational Design

Research on adaptive organizational design has identified key types and attributes that enable dynamism and reformability in structures (Kosasih & Nugroho, 2021). Adhocractic structures promote adaptation through self-controlled semi-autonomous units with fluid, flexible connections (Yang, 2020). Another type is modular forms comprising reconfigurable subsystems that facilitate novel system recombination through loose yet interdependent couplings (Paul, 2012).

Additionally, attributes like low intra- and high inter-unit interactions allow partial independence yet whole-entity transformations (Higo, 2021). Non-routine work assignments cross-trained employees promote learning through exposure to diverse tasks. Distributed decision-making permits localized autonomy with unified direction via shared vision and

values rather than tight rules (Halpern & Owen, 2021). Extensive lateral ties based on trust rather than authority stimulate knowledge flows supporting continuous reinvention. Highly connected network designs maintain flexibility through decentralized control and access to diverse perspectives (Kim, 2022). Temporary organizational structures also emerge around pressing strategic issues enabling fast, focused endeavors (Henry, 2021). Such fluid yet aligned types and elements underpin an organization's capacity for strategic renewal in changing contexts (Paterson-Roberts, 2023).

Influence of Adaptive Organizational Design on Organizational Performance

"The adaptability inherent in the design of adaptable organizations has the potential to influence organizational performance over time (Al-Murad, 2022). Regular structural changes that delegate decision-making authority among interconnected units are believed to boost learning through trial and error with reduced risks (Larsen, 2022). Exchanging diverse perspectives fosters innovation, which is essential for surpassing competitors stuck in traditional setups.

Research evidence supports these assertions, linking flexible organic structures with more robust pipelines for new products and improved service quality that is crucial for customers (T.P.P, 2020).". Modularity promoting component recumbence empowers rapid product or business model reconstitution following market research, linked to sales increases (Higo, 2021). Loose yet aligned interdependencies keep options open without commitment to suboptimal choices, lowering long-run costs from resource reallocation mishaps (Fiala, 2023).

Further, adaptable structures trigger positive network externalities via knowledge spillovers that compound individual efforts into compounding returns at the collective level (Atkin 2022). However, skeptics argue fluid structures jeopardize efficiency by undermining standard routines and coordinate actions. More research remains necessary to delineate fully the contingencies governing when and how responsive designs optimize indicators of organizational effectiveness.

Challenges of Adaptive Organizational Design and it effect on Organizational Performance

While adaptive organizational design aids strategic dynamism, its implementation harbors challenges that could negatively impact organizational performance if not mitigated (Powell and Lim, 2021). Fluid configurations create ambiguity in roles and power structures that breed uncertainty and tensions if change is poorly communicated or resisted by rigid elements (Yang, 2020) Distributed decision-making slows coordination when collaborators operate with diverse interests.

The flexibility demanded also triggers high costs associated with ongoing structural realignment that diverts funds from core operations (Paul, 2012). Transitioning to new designs requires the disruption of path dependencies held by incumbent power groups defending the status quo (Eke and Onuoha, 2020). Further, the enhanced experimentation spreads risk across domains compared to specialized functional silos yet demands greater vigilance to recognize and scale emergent successes promptly (Higo, 2021).

Striking a balance between stability and fluidity emerges as a paradox, and overemphasis on either quality risks undermining performance goals (Halpern & Owen, 2021). However, with proactive leadership addressing these challenges through clear vision and open communication, adaptive designs hold promise to boost organizational effectiveness through improved alignment with shifting strategic imperatives (Henry, 2021).

Theoretical Review

Organizational Ambidexterity Theory

Organizational ambidexterity theory was first proposed by March in 1991 to reconcile the competing demands of exploration and exploitation activities for firms. March argued that organizational survival relies on both explorative innovation to discover novel opportunities and exploitative improvements to existing competencies. Duncan in 1976 also expounded this paradoxical need for organizations to balance competing dynamics of stability and change for long-term viability (Larsen, 2022).

Ambid theory suggests that organizational design features that facilitate the simultaneous pursuit of exploration and (Larsen, 202). The essential components encompass the chronological ordering of these procedures facilitated by consecutive specialized units or distinct subunits. Regarding the structure, there exist two parallel chains of authority and distinct entities allocated for both exploration and exploitation placed adjacent to each other. This arrangement incorporates cultural standards and incentives that merge conformity with variations as complementary functions when appropriately harmonized. Subsequent scholars have expanded their viewpoints to encompass cultural, leadership, and process-oriented mechanisms to achieve duality.

"The concept of ambidexterity theory presents a thought-provoking perspective on aligning an organizational structure effectively with environmental demands and maintaining organizational adaptability. This theory serves as a valuable framework to understand how a harmonious blend of characteristics within flexible organizational structures can encourage both innovative exploration and necessary exploitative improvements crucial for long-term organizational efficiency in unpredictable environments.".

Strategic Flexibility Theory

The academic sphere introduced the concept of strategic flexibility as an alternative viewpoint to elucidate how companies can develop adaptable strategic mindsets. According to this theoretical framework, organizations operating in volatile markets must include adaptability into their technological and managerial capabilities. By using modular and loosely coupled frameworks, it becomes possible to interchange pieces as required in order to effectively respond to evolving situations....

"One essential aspect of the strategic adaptation theory underscores the significance of deliberately ambiguous or adaptable structural arrangements in generating possibilities to efficiently address unanticipated circumstances (Chanphati & Thosuwanchot, 2023). Rather of rigorously sticking to predetermined frameworks, proponents of flexibility argue that

effectively handling uncertainty requires making flexible judgments rather than making rigid promises. The decentralization of power is achieved by the elimination of borders between units and functions, therefore facilitating the convergence of varied perspectives and resources".

The relationship between an organization's adaptable structure's flexibility-promoting elements and its performance results has been the subject of recent studies.

Theoretical framework

Ambidexterity Theory acknowledges the importance for organizations to understand and balance exploitation of existing capabilities while also exploring fresh and new opportunities through innovation. As posited by Chanphati and Thosuwanchot, (2023) use and application of this theoretical framework explains how adaptive designs can aid and strengthen the performance effects of strategic alignment, more better than any other theorical model. Therefore, Ambidexterity Theoretical framework is the best and most fitting lens for the current study

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After thorough review analysis of several empirical studies and also conducting extensive literature reviews, it has become apparent that the use and implementation of adaptable designs is very crucial in effectively and efficiently addressing issues and challenges across different industries. As seen Flexible frameworks may potentially increase and enhance the performance of any industry, even despite the presence of un-certainties that require effective management. New perspectives in the organization have the ability to motivate and encourage innovation and knowledge. Organizational vitality may adopt on a dynamic and also modernized shape with competent leadership that encourage and cultivates clarity despite shifting dynamics. Adaptable frameworks that can adapt to shifting trends seem to be the difference between success and failure in a volatile, unpredictable, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) landscape.

Key Findings and Recommendations for the study

- Adopting flexible organizational decision making frameworks that facilitate decentralized decision making across departments may greatly increase innovation outputs and promote profitability, according to the study's consequential finding. To divide duties across cross-functional teams and encourage the exchange of different perspectives, it is recommended that leaders inside undertake structural changes. The derivation of insights from errors and the investigation of novel strategies will be facilitated by this strategy...
- The capability of businesses to successfully adapt by changing their design features in response to the changing demands of the corporate landscape was a significant discovery.. This leads to an enhancement in resource allocation, benefiting both short-term and long-term sustainability. Managers are advised to stay vigilant of market shifts, granting strategic business units the autonomy necessary to promptly readjust. Additionally, creating temporary organizational structures can facilitate agile responses to urgent challenges..
- The research unearthed that while fluidity in design brings challenges to coordinate, the opportunities for renewed perspectives to spur innovation could elevate enterprise

performance substantially. Deft leadership and clear communication are paramount to navigating changes. It is advised that top management should clearly articulate the organizational vision during fluid transitions and promote psychologically-safe environments where employees are not averse to experimenting with new ideas. Open communication channels can also mitigate uncertainties arising from ambiguity.

References

Al-Murad, Dr. N. Y. M. (2022). Apply green marketing strategies to improve market performance by competitive advantage as mediating: An analytical study of some small organizations in Iraq. *Webology*, *19*(1), 1266–1281. https://doi.org/10.14704/web/v19i1/web19085

Atkin, D., Chen, M. K., & Popov, A. (2022). *The returns to face-to-face interactions: Knowledge spillovers in Silicon Valley*. National Bureau of Economic Research. http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w30147

Bailey, J. A. (2021). Capacity as organizational conditions. In *building learning capacity in an age of uncertainty* (pp. 48–72). Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781003144847-4

Bhat, A., & Katagi, N. N. (2021). Magnetohydrodynamic flow of viscous fluid and heat transfer analysis between permeable discs: Keller-box solution. *Case Studies in Thermal Engineering*, *28*, 101526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2021.101526

Carmody-Bubb, M. (2023). The challenge of uncertainty in complex adaptive systems research. *In cognition and decision making in complex adaptive systems* (pp. 47–51). Springer International Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-31929-7_7

Chanphati, J., & Thosuwanchot, N. (2023). Strategic flexibility. In *responding to uncertain conditions: New research on strategic adaptation* (pp. 1–15). Emerald Publishing Limited. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80455-964-220231001

Choi, M., & Yang, J.-S. (2023). *How allocation of resources and attention aids in pursuing multiple organizational goals*. *Computational and mathematical organization theory*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10588-023-09377-4

Dai, M., Jiang, Z., & Wang, N. (2022). *Strategic investment under uncertainty with first- and second-mover advantages*. National Bureau of Economic Research. http://dx.doi.org/10.3386/w30150

Eke, O., & Onuoha, C. (2020). Innovation strategies and organizational performance of water packaging firms in Lagos State. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 70–88. https://doi.org/10.46654/ij.24889849.b61117

Fiala, N., Rose, J., Ankel-Peters, J., & Aryemo, F. (2023). *The (very) long-run impacts of cash grants during a crisis*. Center for Open Science. http://dx.doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/rdjn9

Halpern, J., & Owen, A. (2021). Scaffolding autonomy. In *the ethics of shared decision making* (pp. 49–67). Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/med/9780197598573.003.0005

Haris, A. (2023). The effect of web quality, customer retention and switching barrier on customer loyalty through customer satisfaction. *Interdiciplinary Journal and Hummanity (INJURITY)*, *2*(12), 992–1005. https://doi.org/10.58631/injurity.v2i12.153

Harker, C., & During, J. (2022). Money advice and education: In *financing prosperity by dealing with debt* (pp. 115–130). UCL Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv28m3h1h.14

Henry, A. E. (2021). Organizational structures and strategic change. In *understanding strategic management*. Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/hebz/9780198859833.003.0013

Higo, E., Soga, S., & Miura, H. (2021). *Inter-unit common cause failure analysis based on data from intra-unit cases*. ASME International. http://dx.doi.org/10.1115/1.0000449v

Kasberger, B. (2023). When can auctions maximize post-auction welfare? *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, *89*, 102972. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2023.102972

Khusniyah Indrawati, N., & Muljaningsih, S. (2022). Achieving competitive advantage through spiritual capital, innovation work behavior, and organizational learning. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *20*(2), 426–437. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(2).2022.35

Kim, K. (2022). Supervisor leadership and subordinates' innovative work behaviors: Creating a relational context for organizational sustainability. *Sustainability*, *14*(6), 3230. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14063230

Kosasih, K., & Nugroho, A. W. (2021). Perception of millennial workforce upon ICT and organizational learning and innovative performance: The mediating role of ambidexterity. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, *6*(2), 153–161. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.2.823

Larsen, O. P. (2022). Learning from physical models: Design through experimentation. In *Conceptual Structural Design* (pp. 73–90). ICE Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1680/csd.65987.073

Livenko, A. (2021). Economic and organizational aspects of educational resources in the current conditions of Ukraine. *Ekonomika Ta Derzhava*, *3*, 94. https://doi.org/10.32702/2306-6806.2021.3.94

Mello, D. (2021). Experiencing remote teaching and supervising undergraduate and graduate students in two public Brazilian universities: Challenges and possibilities. *Proceedings of the 2021 AERA Annual Meeting*. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/1685723

PalimĄka, K. (2021). Financial and non-financial aspects of entrepreneurship - The Polish perspective. *Financial Internet Quarterly*, *17*(4), 105–119. https://doi.org/10.2478/fiqf-2021-0030

Paterson-Roberts, A., Yamin, R., Mortensen, M., & Reyes, D. L. (2023). Handling rejection within the workplace: Four evidence-based approaches. *Organizational Dynamics*, *52*(3), 100993. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2023.100993

Paul, R., Saha, S., Pal, C., & Sau, S. (2012, March). Novel architecture of modular exponent on reconfigurable system. *2012 Students Conference on Engineering and Systems*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/sces.2012.6199123

Powell, K. S., & Lim, E. (2021). The concept of "spatial knowledge" used by top-management-teams and CEOs in internationalization. *Multinational Business Review*, *30*(2), 173–191. https://doi.org/10.1108/mbr-07-2020-0144

Qureshi, S., & Kratzer, J. (2011). An investigation of antecedents and outcomes of marketing capabilities in entrepreneurial firms: An empirical study of small technology-based firms in Germany. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *24*(1), 49–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2011.10593525

Rösler, J., Söll, T., Hancock, L., & Friedli, T. (2021). Value co-creation between public service organizations and the private sector: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Administrative Sciences*, *11*(2), 55. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11020055

Sugiarti, R., Indupurnahayu, I., & Nurhayati, I. (2022). Performance analysis of private higher education by financial, customer, internal process and growth perspectives. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, *34*(2), 59. https://doi.org/10.52155/ijpsat.v34.2.4579

T.P.P, R. (2020). An empirical study on the service quality satisfaction of customers of online shopping with special reference to Kannur district of Kerala. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, *24*(4), 5989–5994. https://doi.org/10.37200/ijpr/v24i4/pr2020408

Van Bree, J. (2021). *How to group the tasks of an organization. In organization design* (pp. 109–136). Springer International Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78679-3_7

Yang, H. (2020). Performance analysis of semi-rigid connections in prefabricated high-rise steel structures. *Structures*, *28*, 837–846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2020.09.036

Zhang, F. (2021). Evaluating public organization performance under extreme weather events: Does organizational adaptive capacity matter? *Journal of Environmental Management*, *296*, 113388. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113388