

A Study of the Perception of Indian Employees on Organizational Structure

Akanksha Vashisth¹; Lavina Sharma^{2*}

¹Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India.

^{2*}Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune, Maharashtra, India.

^{2*}lavina.sharma@sibm.edu.in

Abstract

This paper examines the perception of Indian employees on the role of organizational structure; it also aims to assess the impact of culture on the views of Indian employees regarding their choice of work environment and the feasibility of self-management practices in India. Despite widespread acknowledgment of the challenges presented by flat structures and hierarchical structures, little is known about today's Indian workforce's think and needs. The relationships between various factors on the employees' orientation of the preferred organizational structure and its effect on their motivation are studied in this paper. The results reveal no great disparity in the views and choices of the employees who have an experience of flat structure and those who do not. However, it does indicate various other relationships between the factors that impact the organizational structure like Control and Capability, Reward-Systems and Organizational Levels, Culture and Reward Systems, Tendency to Explore and Reward Systems, Organizational levels and Motivation and lastly, Organizational Level and Culture. The results also suggest that Indian employees do want to have autonomy and responsibility in their work. However, they do believe that the different organizational levels have their role in managing the organization.

Key-words: Organizational Structure, Employee Perception, National Culture, Job Satisfaction, Control, and Capability.

1. Introduction

The concept of flat structures is not new and has been talked about for ages. The main purpose of these structures is to provide enough autonomy and responsibility with employees to enhance their productivity and commitment to the organization due to direct involvement in the decision-making processes [1]. Indian history has been deeply rooted in hierarchy, right from the "caste system" to the culture of sycophancy. In the dimensions of cultures defined by Hofstede, India has a rating of 77 in

the Power distance factor, which substantiates that Indians have a high acceptance rate for the unequal distribution in power [2]. As every country is different in its culture and values, there is a difference in the approval of flat structures. Some might find this unsettling as more flexibility is given to self-managed employees or teams and might find it disrespectful to leaders [3].

Each country might require different planning and decision-making regarding management related to organizational structure to reduce the friction brought about by different perceptions of fairness [4]. There has been a plethora of research on the pros and cons of both the structures, but little is known on the perception of the Indian employees on their choice of work environment and the factors related to organizational structure that led to their dissatisfaction at the workplace [5].

2. Literature Review

There have been various studies in the past related to the field of organizational structure. Among the first studies was of Worthy (1950), where it was observed that the flatter or decentralized structures create potential better employee attitudes, more effective supervision, and autonomy, thereby creating a greater sense of responsibility, self-development, and creativity among employees, which is a requisite to the personal contentment of employees and is a vital component for the democratic way of life [6]. It also suggested that one of the major causes of the strained manager-employee relationships in today's times is the overly complex nature of the organizational structure. Worthy's findings intrigued everyone about the idea of equality and autonomy [7].

Different organizational structures (tall, medium, and flat) were considered. 295 trade sales representatives were monitored. It was observed that employees in the flat arrangement were more satisfied due to their freedom and perceived lesser amounts of anxiety and distress. They also performed more effectively than the employees of medium and tall organizations [8].

Another important factor that comes into play when discussing organizational structure is decision time. The decision time of both (hierarchical and flat) was not affected due to the difference in organizational structures of the two organizations. However, it had a considerable effect on the performance which was judged by profits made [9]. Teams working in the hierarchical design performed considerably better than those working in a flat design. The reasoning defined this outcome: the taller firm had an orderly decision-making process due to its narrow structure. More levels facilitated team members to analyze the decisions regularly [10].

It cannot be denied that flat structures have the upper hand over hierarchical arrangements in terms of freedom and flexibility, but few things can be considered. In relatively flat structures, as

there are fewer levels, the opportunities to grow are also less [11], which was because advancement to a higher grade acts as one of the drivers for motivation in a tall structure. In contrast, the work culture in a flat arrangement plays a major function in the gratification of the employees [12].

Empirical endings strengthen the hypothesis that in a tall structure with more reporting levels, employees tend to interpret more opportunities for promotion. What attracts them in a flat structure is the satisfaction due to the work environment [13]. The perception of promotional opportunities had a positive correlation with the employees' dedication and satisfaction. The way an organization is structured and the reward systems are decided can have a considerable impact on employee commitment. It can be liked with their perception of institutional fairness [14].

Another important aspect is innovation. The decentralization was linked with more innovative behavior among employees as compared to centralization [15]. In centralization, employees need their superior's approval which inhibits the creative and exploratory behaviors. It could give employees the feeling that their ideas are not being appreciated. Formalization also resulted in reduced innovation [16]. When rules and guidelines take the front seat in an organization and employees have little control over decision-making, they are less likely to explore new ideas, methods, and techniques [17].

When supervised defined fix work practices, employees had fewer prospects for trial and error. The way supervisors practice control and flexibility given to employees to explore important factors which are impacted due to the difference in nature of the organizational structures. Leadership plays a central role in organizational structure [18]. The emergence of new job roles makes it important to recognize how an organizational design can hinder or enable the supervisory decisions related to the current job roles [19].

The program's configuration of decentralization and semi-structured formalization provided the most encouraging circumstances for supervisors to use their decision to take groundbreaking sustainability initiatives [20]. The conclusions talk about the idea of "shaping and being shaped" as organizational arrangements and management decisions are interrelated and co-evolve over time [21]. The organizational arrangement affects the project reporting levels, and therefore, it is essential to balance the different units of an organization. Organizational discords arising in the project setting can be prevented by the right selection of the organizational structure. For example, the role and authority level should be established to prevent conflicts between functional managers and project managers [22].

There are two kinds of behaviors exhibited in transformational leadership, Organizational Behaviors (OB) and Personal Behaviors (PB). Centralization weakened the permitting process of

personal behaviors. Formalization supported to allow the processes of organizational behaviors and weakened that of Personal Behaviors [23]. Both the behaviors (Organizational Behavior and Personal behaviors) increase employee satisfaction and commitment towards the organization.

A firm is considered a network of employees where informal conversations have a deep impact on employee behaviors. These collective behaviors then form the organizational culture. Social interactions between staff portray the level of satisfaction of employees and influence their productivity [24]. Formal meetings are accompanied by casual, less structured views and discussions in which parties involved are often able to and mutual understanding and create shared intentions. The way the organizational structure is designed has an impact on how they collaborate. The management can plan strategically while designing the firm's structure and set a culture that leverages workers' informal interactions to increase organizational performance. Digital transformation changes the way of operations in an organization that sometimes cannot be completely anticipated [25]. Therefore, leaders should establish an organizational structure that encourages autonomy, agility, transparency, and innovation.

Later, the concept of Self-Managed Work Teams (SMWTs) also came into the picture. These are the relatively autonomous teams that have their roles and decision-making responsibilities without any management above them. SMWTs become more complex in their implementation in the different cultures because the national culture can form a different notion of organizational fairness. What appears right in one culture may not be considered justifiable in other [26].

Holacracy was first introduced in 2007. It is a practice of governance that has self-managing teams rather than a traditional hierarchy in the organizational structure. It is built on the concept of integrative decision-making. There are predefined rules in the holacracy framework, and it applies to everyone in the same way. In holacracy, the jobs are defined as 'roles [27]. The teams are surrounded by 'circles' where each circle administers itself by finding the roles required to reach the objectives of the circle and assigning circle members to fill them. This practice provides agility to organizational practices and a sense of ownership and autonomy to the employees. However, at the same time, scaling up such a model comes as a huge challenge [28].

Effectiveness in organizational processes can be achieved by a 360° agile organizational structure, an amalgamation of the matrix organizational structure overlaid with cross-functional teams (CFTs). This structure does not form any hierarchy. The only player to report will be of the founders/management [29]. The holacracy structure was found 'chaotic' due to the inner circles reporting to outer circles, but there is no reporting individual outside the matrix in the proposed model. They report to each other and in the absence of any one of them, the other takes over [30].

Once they are contented with the output, they deliver it to the management. Another hindrance in the holacracy model is the scalability model. However, this model introduces the concept of 'scaled agility,' which will help to expand the anticipated structure to a sizeable extent. It will also lead to fast decision-making [31]. The self-esteem component of personalities can be gratified by providing more autonomy and equal opportunities. A clear definition of roles will fill communication gaps and enhance collaboration and transparency [32].

Another relevant aspect to look at while designing Organizational structure can be culture. It can be a valid argument that some of the differences in the feasibility and success of organizational structure can be attributed to cultural factors because every country has its history and beliefs [33]. The way we are raised in our families has a significant impact on our personalities and thoughts. Hofstede (1994) concluded that the culture of a nation plays a major role in operating an organization. There were many differences found based on dimensions which included concepts like finding the degree to which the people in a society within a country hope for and agrees to the unequal distribution of power, the extent of interdependence the community maintains among its members, and whether the real motivation comes from enjoying what you do *or being the best* [34].

3. Methodology

3.1. Hypothesis Development

The organizational structure's important factors were identified from the review of literature and interviews conducted and embedded in the questionnaire.

It aims to determine the perception of employees on these eleven key aspects of the organizational structure: (1) Experience (2) Supervision (3) Communication Gap (4) Collaboration (5) Reward System (6) Tendency to explore (7) Motivation (8) Culture (9) Organizational levels (10) Capability (11) Effectiveness of SMWT (Self-Managed Work Teams).

3.1.1. Experience: This factor segregates the people who have any experience working in a flat structure from those who do not have any experience, which will be useful in determining whether employee perceptions differ due to their experience and whether it has any relationship with other factors [35].

3.1.2. Supervision: This factor was used to assess whether they have experienced or observed that the constant monitoring of their supervisors harms employee productivity. It would assess whether the quality of work is getting impacted due to the supervision.

3.1.3. Communication: This factor has a huge impact on assessing whether an employee is being heard or not, impacting their satisfaction levels. An organization with a hierarchy of multiple levels is more likely to have communication gaps than a flat organization having fewer levels where people can engage with everyone.

3.1.4. Collaboration: The need for promotion in a hierarchy can come in the way of collaboration between employees. It can resist sharing of ideas and relationship building. It can foster jealousy among co-workers due to the need to secure a higher position and status.

3.1.5. Reward System: It shows if the employee believes in the concept of promotions, levels and therefore, wants to get rewarded in the form of higher status and position in an organization or prefers an equal status with an increase in compensation and benefits [36].

3.1.6. Tendency to explore: The choice between becoming an expert and exploring different roles/fields can explain an organization's innovative capability. It also determines the Tendency of subservience related to one's work.

3.1.7. Motivation: The respondents were asked to choose what will motivate them: autonomy and flexibility at the workplace where they were in charge of everything from choosing the project to working on it or a boss who guides them well or working with Self-Managed Work Teams (SMWT's).

3.1.8. Culture: Their views on whether our culture & history (of hierarchies and putting people in levels) will impact India's feasibility of self-management practices.

3.1.9. Organizational levels: Their views on whether they would like to have no leadership titles and believe that everyone should work at the same level because excellence can occur at any level. So, why have those levels? Alternatively, every level plays a different role in guiding, structuring, and balancing the organization. Does hierarchy balance an organization better or giving power to individuals' will?

3.1.10. Capability: Respondents were asked whether they think that not everyone is equally capable of self-management and that the uncertainty will create more confusion and decline performance. If you start assigning responsibility to employees, they will feel empowered. They might make mistakes (which bosses also do sometimes), but eventually, they will learn and grow.

3.1.11. Effectiveness of SMTWs: Respondents were asked whether they think Self-Managed Work Teams with no bosses to guide can be effective in India. These eleven aspects were then studied and analyzed, and then the following hypotheses were created:

H1: There is no relationship between Supervision and Capability.

The hypothesis is formulated to test whether there exists a relationship between the micro-management of the supervisor and the difference in capabilities of the employees.

H2: There is no relationship between Organizational levels and Reward System

The hypothesis is framed to verify whether there exists a relationship between their choice of organizational structure and the reward that motivates them.

H3: There is no relationship between Reward System and Culture

The hypothesis is formulated to establish whether there exists a relationship between the impact of culture and the choice of rewards.

H4: There is no relationship between Tendency to explore and Reward System

The hypothesis is formulated to identify whether there is a relationship between their innovative capability and the choice of rewards.

H5: There is no relationship between Organizational levels and motivation

The hypothesis is formulated to test whether there exists a relationship between their source of motivation and choice of organizational structure

H6: There is no relationship between Organizational levels and culture

The hypothesis is formulated to test whether there exists a relationship between their choice of organizational structure and the impact of culture on this perception.

3.2. Sample and Data Collection

The survey was based on a self-administered questionnaire. A total of 182 responses were considered for the analysis. A Chi-square test was applied to identify the relationships between the different factors mentioned above.

The sample is majorly comprised of employees working in private organizations. The questions covered their perception based on experience or observation and their general perception about the feasibility and effectiveness of the flat structures in India. In other words, this questionnaire had a simple and clear purpose of finding out whether they would like to work in a hierarchy or a flat structure, their views and reason of inclination, as well as dissatisfaction towards an organization due to its structure of the Indian workforce concerning the Organizational structure in today's times.

4. Results and Findings

It is to be noted that all the findings were based on the results analyzed from respondents' perception. In this study, 48.9% of respondents have worked in a flat structure before, and 51.1% have not. Therefore, an almost equal distribution on both sides will give us a better picture. The sample is taken from all the parts of the country. The demographic distribution of the respondents is 64.7 % Males and 35.3% Females. The Highest Education Qualification of the respondents is a Master's degree with 62.1%, Bachelor's degree with 37.4%, and 0.5% with Diploma.

4.1. Hypothesis 1: There is No Relationship between Supervision and Capability

The null hypothesis suggests that there is no relationship between the perceptions of the constant monitoring of the supervisor and the difference incapability of a person for self-management practices. Out of 182 respondents Table 1, 133 (73.1%) employees believe that they have experienced /observed that the monitoring declines the productivity of the employee, and out of those, 106 (58.2%) believed that if you start assigning responsibility to employees, they will learn better. The χ^2 value for this comparison is 12.752, and the p-value 0.000, which is less than 0.05. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis. It proves that there exists a statistically significant relationship between the perceptions of Supervision and Capability.

Table 1 - Cross-tabulation between Supervision and Capability

			Capability		Total
			Not everyone is equally capable of self-management and the uncertainty will create confusion and decline performance.	If you start assigning responsibility to employees they will feel empowered and they will learn and grow.	
Supervision	Yes	Count	27	106	133
		Expected Count	36.5	96.5	133.0
		% of Total	14.8%	58.2%	73.1%
	No	Count	23	26	49
		Expected Count	13.5	35.5	49.0
		% of Total	12.6%	14.3%	26.9%
Total	Count	50	132	182	
	Expected Count	50.0	132.0	182.0	
	% of Total	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%	

4.2. Hypothesis 2: There is no Relationship between Organizational Levels and Reward Systems

The null hypothesis suggests no relationship between the perceptions of the importance of organizational levels and the choice of reward system an individual chooses. Out of 182 respondents Table 2, 148 (81.3%) employees believe that every level of an organization plays a significant role, and out of those, 101 (55.5%) want to work in a company where they will be promoted to higher levels. It signifies that many people in India still give importance to hierarchy and prefer being promoted rather than working in a flat structure and getting pay and promotions according to the delivered results.

The χ^2 value for this comparison is 17.523, and the p-value of 0.000 is less than 0.05. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis. It proves that there exists a statistically significant relationship between Organizational Levels and Reward Systems.

Table 2 - Cross-tabulation between Organizational Levels and Reward Systems

Organizational_Levels * Reward_System Crosstabulation

			Reward_System		Total
			A company where high performers are promoted to a higher level.	A company where everyone has equal status but there is a difference in compensation and benefits.	
Organizational_Levels	There should be no leadership titles & everyone should work at the same level because Excellence can occur at any level	Count	10	24	34
		Expected Count	20.7	13.3	34.0
		% of Total	5.5%	13.2%	18.7%
	Every level plays a different role in guiding, structuring and balancing the organisation.	Count	101	47	148
		Expected Count	90.3	57.7	148.0
		% of Total	55.5%	25.8%	81.3%
Total	Count	111	71	182	
	Expected Count	111.0	71.0	182.0	
	% of Total	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%	

4.3. Hypothesis 3: There is no Relationship between Reward System and Culture

The null hypothesis suggests no relationship between the perceptions of choice of the reward system and the importance of culture at organizational levels. Out of 182 respondents Table 3, 148 (81.3%) employees believe that Indian culture and history impact the feasibility of self-managed practices in India. Out of those, 83(45.6%) believe that they want to work in a company where high performers are promoted.

The χ^2 value for this comparison is 8.021, and the p-value of 0.005 is less than 0.05. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis. It proves that there is a significant relationship between the perception of the Reward System and culture.

Table 3 - Cross-tabulation between Reward System and Culture

			Culture		Total
			Yes	No	
Reward_System	A company where high performers are promoted to a higher level.	Count	83	28	111
		Expected Count	90.3	20.7	111.0
		% of Total	45.6%	15.4%	61.0%
	A company where everyone has equal status but there is a difference in compensation and benefits.	Count	65	6	71
		Expected Count	57.7	13.3	71.0
		% of Total	35.7%	3.3%	39.0%
Total	Count	148	34	182	
	Expected Count	148.0	34.0	182.0	
	% of Total	81.3%	18.7%	100.0%	

4.4. Hypothesis 4: There is no Relationship between Tendency to Explore and Reward Systems

The null hypothesis suggests no relationship between the perceptions of the importance of organizational levels and the choice of reward system an individual chooses. Out of 182 respondents Table 4, 120 (65.9%) employees have a higher tendency to explore and want to work in different roles and projects, while 62 (34.1%) want to work only in their field of roles and projects.

The χ^2 value for this comparison is 6.891 and with a p-value of 0.009, which is less than 0.05. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis. It shows that there exists a statistically significant relationship between Tendency to explore Organizational Levels and Reward System.

Table 4 - Cross-tabulation between Tendency to Explore and Reward Systems

			Tendency_to_Explore		Total
			Projects related to your area/field to gain expertise.	Projects in different areas other than your own that interests you and help you learn and grow.	
Reward_System	A company where high performers are promoted to a higher level.	Count	46	65	111
		Expected Count	37.8	73.2	111.0
		% of Total	25.3%	35.7%	61.0%
	A company where everyone has equal status but there is a difference in compensation and benefits.	Count	16	55	71
		Expected Count	24.2	46.8	71.0
		% of Total	8.8%	30.2%	39.0%
Total	Count	62	120	182	
	Expected Count	62.0	120.0	182.0	
	% of Total	34.1%	65.9%	100.0%	

4.5. Hypothesis 5: There is no Relationship between Organizational Levels and Motivation

The null hypothesis suggests no relationship between the perceptions of the importance of organizational levels and the source of motivation. Out of 182 employees Table 5, 82 (45.1%) chooses autonomy and flexibility at the workplace as their motivation. In contrast, 56 (30.8%) believe they will be motivated by a boss who guides them well, and 44 (24.2%) believe that working in Self-Managed Work teams will motivate them better. 61(33.5%) believe that every level plays a guiding role while they still want to have autonomy in their work.

The χ^2 value for this comparison is 6.105 and with a p-value of 0.047, which is less than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. It verifies that there exists a statistically significant relationship between their choice of Organizational Levels and Motivation.

Table 5 - Cross-tabulation between Organizational Levels and Motivation
Organizational_Levels * Motivation Crosstabulation

			Motivation			Total
			Autonomy and Flexibility where you are in charge of everything from choosing the project to working on it.	A boss who guides you well.	Working with Self-Managed Work Teams.	
Organizational_Levels	There should be no leadership titles & everyone should work at the same level because Excellence can occur at any level	Count	21	5	8	34
		Expected Count	15.3	10.5	8.2	34.0
		% of Total	11.5%	2.7%	4.4%	18.7%
	Every level plays a different role in guiding, structuring and balancing the organisation.	Count	61	51	36	148
		Expected Count	66.7	45.5	35.8	148.0
		% of Total	33.5%	28.0%	19.8%	81.3%
Total		Count	82	56	44	182
		Expected Count	82.0	56.0	44.0	182.0
		% of Total	45.1%	30.8%	24.2%	100.0%

4.6. Hypothesis 6: There is no Relationship between Organizational Levels and Culture

The null hypothesis suggests no relationship between the perceptions of the importance of organizational levels and culture. Out of the total 182 Table 6, 148 (81.3%) believes that Indian culture does play a role in the feasibility of self-managed practices in India, and out of that, a whopping 116 (63.7%) believes that every level in an organization plays a significant role in balancing and managing an organization. Hence, it points toward that majority has a perception that different levels will manage an organization better than a flat organization with no levels. The χ^2

value for this comparison is 17.523, and the p-value of 0.000 is less than 0.05. So, we reject the null hypothesis. It suggests that there exists a significant relationship between Organizational Levels and Reward Systems.

Table 6 - Cross-tabulation between Organizational Levels and Culture
Culture * Organizational_Levels Crosstabulation

			Organizational_Levels		Total
			There should be no leadership titles & everyone should work at the same level because Excellence can occur at any level	Every level plays a different role in guiding, structuring and balancing the organisation.	
Culture	Yes	Count	32	116	148
		Expected Count	27.6	120.4	148.0
		% of Total	17.6%	63.7%	81.3%
	No	Count	2	32	34
		Expected Count	6.4	27.6	34.0
		% of Total	1.1%	17.6%	18.7%
Total	Count	34	148	182	
	Expected Count	34.0	148.0	182.0	
	% of Total	18.7%	81.3%	100.0%	

5. Discussion

The results provide support for the fact that constant monitoring of bosses does impact the efficiency of employees. 73.1% of the workforce in the sample feels that there exists micro-management, which declines their productivity. The supervisors should provide some autonomy in work given to the employees. 72.5% of them believe that if you start assigning responsibility to employees, they will learn in a better way. Learning is a choice, and in order for this decision to come naturally to them, they should not be monitored all the time. Giving them some control will lead to better results. For the same reason, researches have shown that employees feel more satisfied in flat organizations as more control is given to them.

Out of the total, 45.1% people in our research feel that they will be motivated to work in a place with full autonomy where they are in charge of the work they do while 30.8% wants to work under a boss who guides them well and 24.2% wants to work in Self-Managed Work teams. It clearly shows that most people want to control what they do, which is provided by flat organizations. However, at the same time, 81.3% of the people believe that every level of an organization plays a significant role in guiding and structuring an organization which is a characteristic of a hierarchy.

Also, not every individual is equally capable of working independently. Many of us might require someone to guide us through the process. It completely depends on the nature of the job and the ownership taken by the employees in a company.

The promotion comes as another important factor. 61% want to work where high performers are promoted, whereas 39% want to work where everyone is at the same level, but high performers are paid high in terms of compensation and rewards. It clearly shows that people are not just satisfied with the higher recognition in terms of rewards but still care about their status or the level they are put in. Another issue related to promotion in a flat organization is that people are at the same level with the same designation for years as there is no hierarchy. If they want to change jobs and move to a hierarchical company, they have to justify their designation. Also, some people with 15-20 years of experience do not feel comfortable working with an employee having 2-3 years of work experience with the same designation. These are a few challenges faced in a decentralized organization.

Talking about innovative capability, 65.9% of employees tend to explore and want to work in different roles and projects, while 34.1% want to work only in their roles and projects. As culture was assumed to be an aspect to consider for the success of self-management practices in the country, 81.3% of employees believe that Indian culture and history impact the feasibility of self-managed practices in India.

All these factors are interrelated and impact our perception, which then shapes our satisfaction levels.

6. Conclusion

Perception is the first step towards action. In order to find out where we are heading, it is pertinent to understand the perception of employees of an organization in particular and a nation in general. This study was envisioned to capture a general perception of the Millennials who are current or to-be employees in India. Results indicate that there is not much difference in perception of flat structure and those who do not. However, it does indicate various other relationships between the factors that impact the organizational structure like Control and Capability, Reward-System and Organizational Levels, Culture and Reward Systems, Tendency to Explore and Reward Systems, Organizational level, and motivation and lastly, Organizational Level with culture.

The results also suggest that Indian employees do want to have autonomy and responsibility in their work. However, they also believe that the different organizational levels have their role in managing the organization. The majority of them agreed that Indian culture and history of hierarchy

and levels would impact India's feasibility and acceptance of self-management practices. The majority of them have experienced/observed that the constant monitoring of the boss decreases employee productivity and they have experienced/observed that there is a communication gap between frontline employees and the top leadership. Also, most of them believe that promotion between employees comes in sharing ideas and relationship building. In a country of so much diversity and complexities, we can first try to implement the self-management practices in parts of an organization and then expand based on the organizational requirements. Using self-management practices to design an entire organization is wise, but only if the level of adaptability is high and the company functions in a fast-changing and highly competitive environment. The paybacks of making rapid changes far outweigh the costs, and the wrong decisions will not be that disastrous.

Since the present study is based on perception, the results must be treated cautiously. The appropriateness of the structure differs depending on the industry as well as the job roles. Some roles might require supervision and guidance, while others need to be autonomous to perform better. However, it is true that if we allow people to start taking charge, they will eventually learn, but it is highly based on the context of the organization. The upcoming generation of self-managing teams desires a new generation of leaders to see the difference and decide when it is best to put aside the hierarchy for a different way of operating and be bold enough to defend hierarchy where it serves the organization's fundamental goals.

7. Limitations and Future Research

Even though the purpose of the present study was effectively accomplished, limitations addressed in future studies should be illustrated. First, this study was purely intended to capture a general perception of the Millennials who are current or to-be employees in India.

As every organization is different concerning its nature and employees, some results may not hold. Thus, future research should elucidate the precise cause-and-effect relationship between the different perception factors in a particular organization and then capture its results by designing and executing a longitudinal survey. The insights derived could be used to formulate policies related to organizational structure.

Second, to generalize the outcomes to other countries, upcoming studies are needed to test the conceptual framework of this study in other countries and then equate the results with the conclusions of this study. Also, the framework can be used, but the study results might change in different time frames due to the ever-evolving nature of the world.

Given the circumstantial dependency of the framework, other factors could also be added if found relevant. Lastly, future research can also be carried to compare the perception and dynamics of organizational structure in smaller and larger organizations.

References

- Worthy, J. C. (1950). Organizational structure and employee morale. *American Sociological Review*, 15(2), 169-179.
- Carzo Jr, R., & Yanouzas, J. N. (1969). Effects of flat and tall organization structure. *Administrative science quarterly*, 178-191.
- Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment, and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology*, 6(1), 1-22.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly Jr, J. H. (1975). Relation of organizational structure to job satisfaction, anxiety stress, and performance. *Administrative science quarterly*, 272-280.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1977). The relationship between organizational structure and organizational control. *Administrative science quarterly*, 95-113.
- Fredrickson, J. W. (1986). The strategic decision process and organizational structure. *Academy of management review*, 11(2), 280-297.
- Singh, J. P. (1990). Managerial culture and work-related values in India. *Organization Studies*, 11(1), 075-101.
- Pollard, G. (1995). Job satisfaction among news workers: The influence of professionalism, perceptions of organizational structure, and social attributes. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 72(3), 682-697.
- Finlay, W., Martin, J. K., Roman, P. M., & Blum, T. C. (1995). Organizational structure and job satisfaction: Do bureaucratic organizations produce more satisfied employees? *Administration & Society*, 27(3), 427-450.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (1997). The impact of cultural values on employee resistance to teams: Toward a globalized self-managing work team effectiveness model. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(3), 730-757.
- Campbell, S. L., Fowles, E. R., & Weber, B. J. (2004). Organizational structure and job satisfaction in public health nursing. *Public Health Nursing*, 21(6), 564-571.
- Robertson, B. J. (2007). Organization at the leading edge: Introducing Holacracy™. *Integral Leadership Review*, 7(3), 1-13.
- Øgaard, T., Marnburg, E., & Larsen, S. (2008). Perceptions of organizational structure in the hospitality industry: Consequences for commitment, job satisfaction, and perceived performance. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 661-671.
- Katsikea, E., Theodosiou, M., Perdikis, 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(2), 221-233.

- Kline, T. J., & Boyd, J. E. (1991). Organizational structure, context, and climate: Their relationships to job satisfaction at three managerial levels. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 118(4), 305-316.
- Wu, W. W., Hao, Q., Kasper, H., & Muehlbacher, J. (2012). How does organizational structure influence performance through learning and innovation in Austria and China. *Chinese Management Studies*.
- Foss, L., Woll, K., & Moilanen, M. (2013). Creativity and implementations of new ideas: Do organizational structure, work environment, and gender matter? *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 5(3), 298-322.
- Wickramasinghe, V. (2016). Effects of reporting levels on team workers in new business sectors. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 28(4), 91-106.
- Ahmady, G. A., Mehrpour, M., & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). Organizational structure. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 455-462.
- Velinov, E., & Denisov, I. (2017). The relationship between contemporary holacratic models of management and company performance: Evidence from global corporations in the world. *Global Journal of Business & Social Science Review*, 5(2), 10-15.
- Dedahanov, A. T., Rhee, C., & Yoon, J. (2017). Organizational structure and innovation performance. *Career Development International*.
- Auchter, A. M., Mejia, M. H., Heyser, C. J., Shilling, P. D., Jernigan, T. L., Brown, S. A., & Dowling, G. J. (2018). A description of the ABCD organizational structure and communication framework. *Developmental cognitive neuroscience*, 32, 8-15.
- Holck, L. (2018). Unequal by structure: Exploring the structural embeddedness of organizational diversity. *Organization*, 25(2), 242-259.
- Jermisittiparsert, K., Sriyakul, T., & Sangperm, N. (2019). The Influence of Customer and Technology Supply Chain Integration on Social Sustainable Performance with Moderating Role of Organizational Structure. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 8(3), 71-82.
- Mirković, V., Lukić, J., Lazarević, S., & Vojinović, Ž. (2019). Key characteristics of the organizational structure that supports digital transformation. *XXIV International Scientific Conference SM 2019, Strategic Management and Decision Support Systems in Strategic Management*, 255, 261.
- Newton, J., Wait, A., & Angus, S. D. (2019). Watercooler chat, organizational structure, and corporate culture. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 118, 354-365.
- Sandhu, S., & Kulik, C. T. (2019). Shaping and being shaped: How organizational structure and managerial discretion co-evolve in new managerial roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(3), 619-658.
- Alexiou, A., Khanagha, S., & Schippers, M. C. (2019). Productive organizational energy mediates the impact of organizational structure on absorptive capacity. *Long Range Planning*, 52(2), 155-172.
- Kim, S., & Shin, M. (2019). Transformational leadership behaviors, the empowering process, and organizational commitment: investigating the moderating role of organizational structure in Korea. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(2), 251-275.
- Soderstrom, S. B., & Weber, K. (2020). Organizational structure from interaction: Evidence from corporate sustainability efforts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1), 226-271.

George, C. (2020). How Organizational Structures Affect Project Outcomes. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* ISSN: 2319, 7064, 1553-1557.

Iranmanesh, M., Kumar, K. M., Foroughi, B., Mavi, R. K., & Min, N. H. (2020). The impacts of organizational structure on operational performance through innovation capability: innovative culture as moderator. *Review of Managerial Science*, 1-27.

Kiruba Nagini, R., Devi, S. U., & Mohamed, S. (2020). A Proposal on Developing a 360° Agile Organizational Structure by Superimposing Matrix Organizational Structure with Cross-functional Teams. *Management and Labor Studies*, 45(3), 270-294.

Joseph, J., & Gaba, V. (2020). Organizational structure, information processing, and decision-making: A retrospective and road map for research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 267-302.

Jafari Songhori, M., & Nasiry, J. (2020). Organizational Structure, Subsystem Interaction Pattern, and Misalignments in Complex NPD Projects. *Production and operations management*, 29(1), 214-1.

Kleinknecht, R., Haq, H. U., Muller, A. R., & Kraan, K. O. (2020). An attention-based view of short-termism: The effects of organizational structure. *European Management Journal*, 38(2), 244-254.