



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

Module Title: Visions for the Future - Theoretical Perspectives on Management
Module Code: LCDB7008_LON

Technology advances - specifically in the areas of e-Commerce and e-Business have rendered traditional models of organisational structure and theories of management roles obsolete in the light of the changing nature of 21st century corporations.

Submitted By: Anil Poudyal
Student ID: 2429341
Email: 2429341@student.uwtsd.ac.uk
Submitted To: Prof Amare Desta
Submitted Date: 29 Dec 2025

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Aim	2
Research Questions.....	2
Conceptual and Theoretical Foundations.....	2
Key Concepts: Technology, Organisation, and Management.....	2
Traditional Models of Organisational Structure	2
Hierarchical and Bureaucratic Structures	2
Contingency and Information Processing Perspectives.....	3
Conceptual Lenses for Evaluating Digital Transformation.....	3
Literature Review.....	3
Digital Transformation and Fintech	3
e-Commerce and e-Business Models	4
Organisational Structure in Digital Firms	5
Management Roles in Digital Contexts.....	6
Control, Risk, and Data Governance	7
3.6 Reassessing the Obsolescence of Traditional Management	8
Critical Evaluation: Structural Realities in the Fintech Ecosystem	8
The Regulatory Paradox.....	9
The Hybrid Reality: Agile Delivery, Traditional Governance	10
Visions for the Future of Management	10
The Era of Agentic AI	10
The 'Zero Operations' Model.....	10
The Liquid Workforce and Ethical Leadership.....	11
Implications of Structural Obsolescence	11
Conclusion and Strategic Evaluation	12
References	14

Introduction

The growth of digital technology has become defining force in evolution of contemporary organisations (Vial, 2019, pp. 118–144). Last two decades have become the prominent decades of evolution of e-commerce and e-business and this evolution has transformed how firms create value; coordinate activities and engage with customers and partners (Iman, 2020, p. 1725309). These transformations extend beyond operational efficiency and increasingly shape organisational structures and management roles (Warner and Wäger, 2019, pp. 326–349). Businesses are now trying to switch from old-fashioned model to digital first models where data does the major job to help organisation leaders make decisions. As the information is now available to everyone a person's job title matters less than what data shows. This is pushing today's leaders to rethink the old rule that a "manager" must be the one in total control for every decision. And this has prompted renewed academic debate regarding the continued relevance of traditional management theories in the context of 21st century corporations.

Withing this debate a strong claim have been emerged what advancement in technology particularly in e-commerce and e-business have rendered traditional organisational structures and theories of management roles obsolete (Verhoef *et al.*, 2021, pp. 889–901). This assertion reflects that there is a deep-rooted critique of management models rooted in industrial era with broader assumption of stability linear workflows and clearly bounded organisational roles. There is an argument between scholars on how digital technologies fundamentally undermine hierarchical control and standardised managerial functions, and some contend that traditional models persist in modified or hybrid forms. Rather than disappearing entirely, management structures and roles may be rethought to accommodate new technological and institutional realities.

One of the most transformed industries through technology is finance, and this sector provides a particularly compelling context which to examine this claim (Siddiqui and Rivera, 2022, pp. 63–73). Cloud computing, application programming interfaces, big data and automation are common advanced digital technologies that fintech businesses use in their day-to-day operations. And fintech firms are often characterised by platform-based operating models, agile and cross-functional team and rapid innovation cycles (Arner, Barberis and Buckley, 2019; Vives, 2019, pp. 243–272). Such rapid feature deployment and decision making is often challenged by conventional organisational hierarchies and redefine managerial authority, shifting emphasis from command-and-control practices towards coordination, facilitation, and technological literacy. But at the same time fintech firms remain subject to significant regulatory intervention. While they practise modern style of management are somehow forced to be under old management style in a way. This tension makes fintech an analytically rich setting for evaluating claims of managerial and structural obsolescence.

The use of fintech as the focal sector for this study is theoretically justified as this sector represents an extreme case of digital transformation. Another critical point in fintech is that it represents an extreme case of digital transformation, where technological intensity is very high and organisational experimentation is common (Calderon-Monge and Ribeiro-Soriano, 2024, pp. 449–491). Yet this sector is also the sector of intervention and is embedded within institutional frameworks that demand accountability, compliance and risk mitigation (Haddad and Hornuf, 2016, no. 6131). Due to this fintech organisations expose the limits of technological determinism and allow for a more nuanced assessment of how far traditional management models have been displaced, adapted or retained. Exploring fintech enables this

report to critically test whether claims of obsolescence hold when digital innovation collides with organisational and regulatory constraints.

Aim

The aim of this study is to examine whether advances in e-commerce and e-business within the fintech sector have rendered traditional organisational structures and theories of management roles obsolete. The study seeks to evaluate extent to which technological change has displaced, transformed or reconfigured established management models.

Research Questions

Following are the research questions to achieve the aim of the study.

- RQ1: How have organisational structures within fintech firms evolved in response to advances in e-commerce and e-business?
- RQ2: In what ways have management roles and responsibilities changed within fintech organisations operating in highly digitalised environments?
- RQ3: To what extent does existing empirical and theoretical literature support claims that traditional organisational structures and management roles have become obsolete, as opposed to hybrid or adapted forms persisting?

Conceptual and Theoretical Foundations

Key Concepts: Technology, Organisation, and Management

(Verhoef *et al.*, 2021, pp. 889–901), advances in e-commerce and e-business are understood as manifestations of broader digital transformation processes that reshape organisations operate and generate value not just transactional capabilities. Digital transformation involves embedding digital technologies into core organisational processes, models and governance arrangements. This is done by altering established organisational logics rather than merely digitising existing practices.

Organisational structures are conceptualised as the formal and informal arrangements. In traditional management theory this is done such that tasks are divided, authority is well allocated and there is good coordination within organisation. This is done to reduce uncertainty and enabling control through control through hierarchical authority, defined roles and formal reporting relationships (Mintzberg, 1979).

Management roles are strategically set and are understood as cluster of responsibilities through which managers plan, coordinate and monitor organisational activities (Fayol, Storrs and Urwick, 1949). And these roles position managers as intermediaries between strategic intent and operational execution relying on hierarchical authority and information control to achieve organisational objectives (Mintzberg, 1979).

Traditional Models of Organisational Structure

Hierarchical and Bureaucratic Structures

Traditional models are mostly rooted in hierarchical and bureaucratic principles. Here the authority flows vertically, and decision making is centralised to higher organisational levels (Weber and Parsons, 1947). And these structures rely on clearly defined job descriptions, formal

rules and standardized procedures to ensure coordination and control across organisational activities. Major underpinnings of these models are predictability and efficiency.

Contingency and Information Processing Perspectives

There is some level of dynamism in traditional organisational theory with introduction of contingency theory, and it argues that organisational structures must align with environmental conditions including uncertainty, complexity, and information requirements (Donaldson, 2001). This perspective indicates that there is no single optimal structure, instead organisational effectiveness depend on the fit between structure, environment and task characteristics.

Information processing perspectives further suggest that organisational structures evolve to manage information flow efficiently (Verhoef *et al.*, 2021, pp. 889–901). Organisation's adaptations to technology becomes necessary as it alters how information is generated, processed and shared. This implies that traditional theory already anticipates structural change in response to technological developments, challenging simplistic claims of outright obsolescence (Plekhanov, Franke and Netland, 2023, pp. 821–844).

Conceptual Lenses for Evaluating Digital Transformation

This study adopts a view of digital transformation as a process of organisational reconfiguration rather than tech technological substitution. Digital technologies produce hybrid organisational forms rather than uniform outcomes, this happens with reshaping structures, governance mechanisms and managerial responsibilities in uneven and context-specific ways.

Fintech organisations frequently operate through platform-based models, this combines elements of hierarchy, market coordination, and digital governance. These organisations work by building rules directly into their technology and they use data to coordinate how different participants interact (Möhlmann *et al.*, 2021, pp. 1999–2022). The relationship between partners, user and developers are more important so they do not completely rely on hierarchies or strict organisational boundaries.

Literature Review

There has been good level of expansion of literature in recent years in the field of digital transformation, this shows rapid transformation in reshaping organisations, business models, and management practices (Verhoef *et al.*, 2021, pp. 889–901). In this broader stream, fintech has emerged as a distinct area of inquiry, examining the application of e-commerce and e-business models withing financial services and their implications of organisational design and governance (Iman, 2020, p. 1725309). The recognition of digital transformation in fintech among scholars is increasing and this is extended beyond technology adoption to include changes in organisational structures, coordination, mechanisms and managerial roles (Vial, 2019, pp. 118–144). However, the perspectives are competing, some studies emphasise the disruptive nature of digital technologies and suggest that traditional organisational structures and management roles are becoming obsolete in digitally intensive firms (Verhoef *et al.*, 2021, pp. 889–901).

Digital Transformation and Fintech

Digital transformation in financial services is understood as a fundamental shift in how financial services are run and the governance of it through integration of digital technologies, in a way it is not just incremental technological upgrade (Verhoef *et al.*, 2021, pp. 889–901). This shift has become prominent and easily seeable to all in recent decades. This shift has also

introduced alterations in organisational logics by reshaping value creation, coordination mechanism and decision-making structures (Vial, 2019, pp. 118–144).

With wider perspective, fintech has evolved as prominent sector of digital transformation and is characterised by the synthesis of financial services with platform technologies, data analytics/big data, cloud infrastructure and advanced APIs (Iman, 2020, p. 1725309). From the day on fintech firms are built for the internet challenging traditional banking systems and their operation patterns, this has compelled existing banking organisations to bring services to match digital first companies (Haddad and Hornuf, 2016, no. 6131). And this has led to frame fintech as disruptive, making a narration that these firms are built to break from traditional organisational and managerial arrangements.

However, this disruption-focused narrative has been increasingly questioned. Research also shows that even though Fintech companies use new technology and innovative business models, they face limits and cannot just change however they want (Barroso and Laborda, 2022, p. 100028). This is particularly due to regulatory requirements related to risk management, consumer protection and data security impose structural constraints that limit the extent to which fintech organisations can abandon formal hierarchy and managerial oversight (Zetzsche *et al.*, 2018, pp. 31–103).

Recent literature further indicates that digital transformation in fintech often produces hybrid organisational forms rather than the wholesale replacement of traditional structures (Barroso and Laborda, 2022, p. 100028). And this proves the narrative that digital transformation reconfigures organisational boundaries and authority rather than eliminating them. Moreover, some studies highlight significant variation between fintech start-ups and digitally transforming financial institutions like banks, cooperatives and investment firms. Most of the startups initially exhibit flatter structures and decentralised decision-making, growth and regulatory integration often lead to re-introduction of managerial layers and formal governance mechanisms (Vives, 2019, pp. 243–272). And this leads to the challenged narrative of digital transformation that claims that it inevitably leads to the obsolescence of traditional management models.

The literature suggests that digital transformation in financial technology should be understood as context-dependent process shaped by technological possibilities, strategic choices, and institutional constraints. Digital transformation does not disregard traditional management roles and organisational structures but reconfigures them to become more advanced, strategically placed and curated with the need of customer, organisation and overall market changes. This creates a more enhanced and flexible governance practice enabled by the power of data.

e-Commerce and e-Business Models

The literature frequently distinguishes between e-commerce and e-business, although the boundary between the two is not always applied consistently. E-commerce is typically understood as the external part of the business where goods and services are sold to businesses and normal consumers. And E-business on the other hand is broader domain that covers using digital tools to run every part of the business, including internal teamwork and managing relationships with partners (Verhoef *et al.*, 2021, pp. 889–901).

In the context of financial technology firm, this distinction is particularly important. Many fintech firms grow through e-commerce innovations including but limited to payments, peer-to-peer lending platforms or mobile banking interfaces, which primarily enhances customer

experience and transaction speed (Iman, 2020, p. 1725309). Research increasingly suggests that the more companies are aligned with tech to sell products/services to consumers, but when companies do use those technologies for their internal process and governance the impact of it on business is higher (Plekhanov, Franke and Netland, 2023, pp. 821–844).

Several studies argue e-business models in fintech challenge traditional organisational structures. It enables real-time data sharing, automation, and cross-functional collaboration. This reduces reliance on sequential workflows and multi layered managerial approval (Vial, 2019, pp. 118–144). This perspective narrates that e-business models are often associated with flatter structures and is more decentralised decision-making. This is particularly in product development and customer-facing functions.

Nevertheless, empirical evidence presents a more nuanced picture. While e-business models usually decentralise certain operational decisions, they frequently centralise other, particularly those related to data governance, cybersecurity, and regulatory compliance (Haddad and Hornuf, 2016, no. 6131). As a result, e-business adoption does not uniformly dismantle hierarchical control but redistributes authority across different organisational units making decision cycle swift.

And like other frameworks and models e-business models also evolve over time. Early-stage firms rely no loosely structured teams and informal coordination, but growth, scaling and regulatory scrutiny tend to introduce formal processes and managerial oversight (Vives, 2019, pp. 243–272). This challenges claims that e-business inherently renders traditional management models obsolete.

Overall, the literature suggests that e-commerce and e-business models act as enabling mechanisms for organisational change. These models alter how work is coordinated, and decisions are made. But the organisational impact is shaped by strategic choices, regulatory environments, and governance requirements. This builds narrative of building hybrid governance and operational models rather than eradication of traditional model.

Organisational Structure in Digital Firms

Recent studies show that digital organisations challenge the ability of traditional hierarchical structures for managing complex, fast-moving and digitally mediated work. Some scholars argue that increased task interdependence, rapid information flows, and continuous innovation place pressure on vertically layered structures that rely on sequential decision-making (Hanelt *et al.*, 2021, pp. 1159–1197).

Recent research increasingly documents a shift towards flatter, networked, and team-based organisational arrangements in digitally intensive firms. There are empirical evidence suggesting that digital firms' reliance on cross-functional teams, modern structures and flexible role boundaries to enable rapid experimentation and responsiveness (Fan, 2025, p. 104578). This perspective confirms that digitalisation is associated with decentralised coordination and reduced reliance on formal hierarchy. This model is often called “Spotify Model”, it organises employees not by function by their cross functional abilities (Azonuche and Enyejo, 2024, pp. 57–69). This structure renders the traditional role structurally redundant; there is no single "Head of Marketing" directing daily tasks because marketing logic is embedded directly into the product deployment cycle of the squad (Tkalic, Klotins and Moe, 2025).

However, this view has been sometimes challenged for overstating the decline of hierarchy. Comparative research across various industries suggests that hierarchy remains central in coordinating complex organisations even for digital contexts, though its form and function may change (Fan, 2025, p. 104578). Rather than disappearing, hierarchy is often selectively retained in areas requiring stability, accountability, and risk control.

This argument is very evident in studies of digitally regulated sectors in particular financial organisations. Research on such financial and platform-based organisations indicates that majority of the organisation use modern and digitally enabled models for operations and adopt flexible and decentralised structures, but governance intensive functions such as compliance, risk management, and audit often remain highly formalised and governed by traditional hierarchical based models of control and management (Hillebrand, Raisch and Schad, 2025, pp. 343–375).

With the acknowledgement of advantages and disadvantages of both the hierarchical and network model of decision flow, recent work conceptualises these arrangements as hybrid organisational forms, blending the best of both models. Recent studies show that this approach of hybridisation leads platform based fintech organisation to balance innovation and control, rather than forcing a trade-off between flexibility and hierarchy (GOMBER *et al.*, 2018, pp. 220–265).

Taken together, the literature indicates that digitalisation does not eliminate organisational hierarchy but reshapes and advances its role within broader structural configurations. Digital firms' organisational structures increasingly reflect layered hybridity, here authority, coordination and control are distributed unevenly across various functions and also various cross functional departments. This challenges claims that digital transformation renders traditional organisational structures obsolete and instead points towards reconfiguration and selective persistence. It is kind of looking for good part of traditional model and integrate with digitally governed model to have netter outcome as whole.

Management Roles in Digital Contexts

Digital transformation often changes what managers do, it does tools change the tools they use (Henderikx and Stoffers, 2023, p. 1147002). And then there is a somewhat misconception stating that many argue that digital systems eliminate the need of managers, the reality is far more complex because technology often shifts the managerial focus from routine task supervision toward strategic leadership and human-centric mentorship (Stark and Vanden Broeck, 2024, no. 2).

With narrative of reducing managers as whole still existing, some recent studies show that the middle managers still matter during digital change. Because they serve as the essential link that turns complex company goals into real-world results while helping their teams stay calm and focused through the stress of major technical changes (Kusmaryanto and Santoso, 2025, no. 1). Further evidence also suggests that middle managers need new skills to build digital confidence and also social and emotional judgement in this era of digitisation (Henderikx and Stoffers, 2023, p. 1147002). Digital leadership is the practical requirement it is not a buzzword, and the studies link it to higher engagement and empowerment among staff (Kusmaryanto and Santoso, 2025, no. 1). So now the role of managers has shifted from direct supervision to enabling fast coordination, managers now focus on removing blockers and shaping team conditions. But in

contrast this can increase managerial pressure as work becomes faster and expectations rise, and potentially clarity of role may fall.

Another perspective of research focuses on algorithmic management where systems allocate tasks, track performance and trigger interventions, this changes how authority works (Stark and Vanden Broeck, 2024, no. 2). Some scholars argue that algorithmic management can replace parts of human management while some consider that it is just a reshaping catalyst. The better view that it creates a new mix of substitution and complementarity (Cui, Tan and Shi, 2024, p. 101838). This matters for fintech companies as governance demands are high and manager has to balance innovation but with control which in return protects some aspects of traditional management responsibilities. Recent fintech work shows that leadership composition is shaped by risk and governance needs, this supports the argument that management does not disappear in fintech (Siddiqui and Rivera, 2025, p. 236).

The major argument in current literature is that there is no possible collapse of managerial role but change in role's structure and role's working ways. Management roles are being redefined around coordination, digital literacy and governance. This is more consistent with hybridisation than obsolescence.

Control, Risk, and Data Governance

Digital transformation increases the importance of control and governance in organisations, due to flexible structures and uneven authority, and this is especially true in financial services (Plekhanov, Franke and Netland, 2023, pp. 821–844). The heavy reliance on data like for credit scoring, fraud detection and customer profile raise new governance practices (Eling and Lehmann, 2018, pp. 359–396). And this reduces the need of traditional supervisory roles that historically mediated the risk and ensured compliance through human oversight. The process is more standardised and system-based rather than relational leading to highly secure and leading towards of systemically enabled idealism.

Regarding new governance practices, the literature further supports the argument that managerial authority is increasingly displaced by formalised digital rules. With the enablement of role-based access, object-based permissions in digital systems a governance framework can be developed where one can decide who can access data, how it can be used and how decisions are audited (Khatri and Brown, 2010, p. 148). This leaves limited scope for discretionary managerial intervention. And in this context, managers are required to comply with system-defined constraints rather than actively exercising control over processes and outcomes.

Algorithmic management represents a more advanced stage of this transformation. Algorithms have become centre for routine tasks like allocating tasks, evaluating performance and now can trigger corrective actions with very minimal human involvement. The work of some middle management is also eased with works like monitoring, coordination and evaluation. As these algorithms become more reliable, explainable and more tested in various context, the justification of retaining traditional layers of managerial control weakens further (Stark and Vanden Broeck, 2024, no. 2).

Recent synthesis argue that digital transformation leads to a redistribution of control from stakeholders to technological systems. Human managers are key part of the governance and may remain formally accountable, their practical influence, indulgence, and interferences over day-to-day is necessary but the workload is often eased as decision-making is delegated to digital architectures. This shift supports claims that traditional management roles, particularly

those centred on monitoring and control, are becoming structurally obsolete in digitally intensive sectors such as fintech.

3.6 Reassessing the Obsolescence of Traditional Management

Most of the recent existing literature converges on the view that digital transformation does not drastically modify existing organisational arrangements but progressively undermines the foundations to which traditional management is built. Studies argue that the growing reliance on data analytics, automation and platform infrastructures reduces the structural need for traditional management roles, particularly for those who are focused on monitoring and coordination roles. And when information flow is instant and transparent the managerial overload becomes less and this shift weakens the rationale for layered managerial hierarchies that were designed to manage information scarcity rather than abundance (Hanelt *et al.*, 2021, pp. 1159–1197).

This narrative is further supported by recent literatures for platform-based organisations, these businesses rely heavily on rules embedded in technology, standardised protocols, and automated enforcement mechanisms. These arrangements make traditional models obsolete with codified control, making organisational coordination less dependent on managerial authority. And as platforms scale, the control increasingly reside in system architecture rather than in formal structures (Gawer, 2022, pp. 110–124).

The algorithmic management explicitly frames this transformation as displacement rather than a complement to traditional management. Managerial roles and workloads as discussed earlier have been fewer due to allocation of algorithms to work on performance evaluation, contingency detection and also suggestive features of algorithms for easier decision making. This strongly supports the argument that traditional management roles are becoming structurally obsolete, even if managerial titles persist (Stark and Vanden Broeck, 2024, no. 2).

Synthesis of various scholarships increasingly conclude that digital transformation leads to a redistribution of power from organisational entities to technological systems making decision making and day to day activities efficient, fast, consistent and reliable. Rather than adapting traditional management models to a new context, digital organisations integrate management functions to infrastructures and algorithms to bypass the need of human mediation. From this perspective, the obsolescence of traditional management is not sudden and abrupt but cumulative. It is progressive replacement of human control with automated governance. Overall, the literature provides substantial support for the claim that advances in e-commerce and e-business contribute to the obsolescence of traditional organisational structures and management roles. In the context of financial technology firms, the digital intensity and regulatory automation are particularly high. Management increasingly operates through systems rather than people. This nature of progress challenges the continued relevance of classical management theories and reinforces the need to reconceptualise management for digitally mediated organisations.

Critical Evaluation: Structural Realities in the Fintech Ecosystem

The literature discussed in the previous section provides strong support for the argument that digital transformation undermines the foundations of traditional organisational structures and

management roles. Traditional management models and theories assume that coordination, control and decision-making depend on authority, supervision and gatekeeping of information. In digitally transforming and transformed environments, particularly in fintech these assumptions do not hold much longer. Digital systems perform routine functions and analytics that aid decision making directly, reducing the structural relevance of traditional managerial roles.

The most concrete evidence for obsolescence of traditional hierarchical structures is found in the operational designs of Neobanks for example, Monzo, Revolut and Chime. These financial institutions have totally different style of operation compared to traditional banks and their hierarchical structures. These kinds of institutions have made fundamental shift towards “Agile Scaling Frameworks”; working in networks for faster decision making and for operational flexibility (Azonuche and Enyejo, 2024, pp. 57–69).

One of the most significant changes concerns the role of information. Classical management relies on managers as intermediaries who collect, interpret and distribute information across organisational levels. And this results to flatter and more automated organisational arrangements. And with the flow of information and power of instantaneous information flow has led to change in control mechanisms. Rather than relying on supervision and approval, organisations integrate control with algorithms, dynamically defined rules, workflows and compliance systems.

In the context of fintech regulatory technologies automate monitoring and reporting, leaving little room for discretionary managerial intervention. The role of managers remains accountable, but it increasingly becomes symbolic or supervisory rather than operational. Decision-making authority has similarly migrated from individuals to systems. And the integration of algorithms assess risk, allocate resource and trigger functions faster and more consistently than human managers. This reduces need of managerial judgement and can rely on produced information. And over the period this process erodes the rationale for management layers whose primary function was decision validation rather than value creation.

Taken together, these changes suggest that digital transformation does not simply modify classical management but gradually replaces their core functions. And while the titles of the management people remain similar but the role in coordination, control and decision-making reduces over time. With this narrative traditional management becomes structurally obsolete rather than formally eliminated.

However, theoretical obsolescence does not always equate to practical elimination. For actual operational reality one must look beyond academic model to test whether these structures are truly disappearing or merely evolving. This sector provides a unique but ideal testing ground because it contains digital first Neobanks and digitally transforming financial institutions attempting to retrofit these new techniques, structures and approaches. The critical evaluation of these two structural differences between these two groups leads us to determine if the traditional hierarchy is truly obsolete or simply wrapped around by the code

The Regulatory Paradox

The previous sections challenged traditional structures to become obsolete. However, a critical evaluation must consider the legal reality. Financial institutions do not operate in a vacuum. These firms operate in one of the most heavily regulated industries in the world. This regulatory

environment acts as a “counterforce”, and this prevents the complete removal of traditional management hierarchy. Fintech firms might want flat and agile structure where authority is decentralised, and team decides. But the regulators demand an accountable representative across hierarchy. And with this fintech firms are forced to re-introduce hierarchy as they grow. Therefore, the traditional structure is not obsolete due to legal requirement, and it is required for survival.

The Hybrid Reality: Agile Delivery, Traditional Governance

The legal and regulatory challenges and agile forms of firms have tension between them and has introduced a new organisational form. In this form of organisation, the executing body i.e. software developers are kept away from the hierarchical model and only the upper management face the hierarchy and regulatory challenges. And this way the new organisational form is hybrid and will complete legal requirements and maintain organisational agility.

Visions for the Future of Management

The evolution thus far has narrowed on the present tension between traditional models and digital agility. The management structures of 2030 will look very different from today. It is necessary to look forward to technologies such as agentic AI and decentralised autonomous organisations. These technologies further suggest that we are not just witnessing a change in management style but a fundamental re-definition of the corporation itself.

The Era of Agentic AI

Current use of Generative AI tools like ChatGPT, Microsoft Co-Pilot, Claude is passive and waits for a human to give it a command. They are smart assistants and augment user's tasks. But the next phase of technology is “Agentic AI”, and this can be major shift for management structure. Agentic AI is self-sustained and does not need for instructions. The agent is given a broad goal, and it achieves the goal it on its own. This way the stakeholder's workload is decreased they can focus on other organisational goals.

This development creates a challenge for the traditional manager, the previous managers' job was to approve these small decisions and were the gatekeeper but due to introduction of agentic Ai, it removes the need for this gatekeeper. With this introduction human is no longer the player, human is the referee now. With this the operational role of the manager is becoming obsolete.

The 'Zero Operations' Model

Another major vision for the future is the concept of “Zero Operations” or “Zero-Ops”. This is becoming popular in recent days in banking sectors. Banks have huge back offices with hundreds of people, they process papers, check customer details and verify transitions. This structure requires many layers of management to organise the staff.

The Zero-Ops model aims to eliminate this entire structure. In this progress when a customer applies for a loan on their phone the entire process is digital and automated including identity check, risk assessment and money transfer. Which makes the entire process complete with no human being ever touching the transaction.

The Liquid Workforce and Ethical Leadership

When machine does the operational work, the human structure must also change. While traditional model relies on permanent employees with fixed job titles, fixed operational and fixed departments. This is solid structure but with digitation the future of vision is liquid workforce with cross-functional teams and agile leadership.

In liquid organisation teams are not permanent, they are designed for specific goal and when goal is achieved it dissolved and is reassigned, restructured for another goal. This is similar to how film crew works; a group of experts come together to complete a move and move on to another project once done with first one. In the domain of financial technology this allows companies to become very fast and agile, they can bring cyber-security expert for certain timeline to accomplish and swap them for another goal later reducing organisational overhead and also increasing efficiency.

Implications of Structural Obsolescence

The above analysis has largely focused on the operational and economic efficiencies introduced by digital transformation. However, with the change in structure and working pattern there comes major societal and ethical consequences. The fundamental restructuring of the organisational hierarchy also brings reduced social contract between corporation, customers and the workforce.

The lower and middle management tier served as primary engine for socioeconomic mobility; it provided a clear pathway for individuals as career advancement. The transition towards Zero-Ops and agentic AI models as observed in fintech sectors threatens to dismantle this economic pattern. The bifurcation of the workforce in current labour market trend is often described as barbell structure where at one end there is demand of highly specialised technical architects such as data scientists and algorithm engineers who design automated system and at the other end there is retained need for lower-paid service roles (Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2020, pp. 2188–2244; Susskind, 2020).

This inclines with the argument that while traditional structures may become obsolete for capital efficiency, but the removal poses a significant risk to social stability. Fintech companies have evolved into highly efficient in profit generation with the employment of a fraction of human workforce compared to their traditional predecessors. Now this has created a paradox where the technological advancement of the firm may correlate with the economic regression of the wider community. Therefore the future researchers must investigate the responsibility of the lean digital corporation in a society where the traditional mechanism of wealth distribution has been engineered out of existence.

A further critical implication concerns the reduction of human discretion and empathy in decision-making. In traditional models the human manager served as a vital function as a moral circuit breaker. Human manager had the option to deviate from protocols in exceptional circumstances, for example they could grant a loan to a long-term customer with a temporary cash flow issue. But in fully automated structural model, this discretionary capacity is often removed. All the algorithms operate on strict coded logics and do not possess any empathy or context awareness beyond their training data (Davenport, 2019). If an applicant fails a credit score threshold by a fraction, the system rejects them without recourse. This phenomenon is

often termed as automated rigidity. While the obsolescence of human management roles may lead to organisations that are operationally flawless but can be brittle ethically.

Conclusion and Strategic Evaluation

The major objective of this research was to critically evaluate the assertion that technological advances in e-commerce and e-business have rendered traditional organisational structures and management theories obsolete. This report also addresses the societal implications of these shifts. Furthermore, it addresses the significant societal implications of these shifts and offers strategic recommendations for practitioners navigating this transition in the 21st-century business landscape.

After a critical examination of the fintech sector, the evidence suggests that this claim is substantially justified regarding the mechanics of coordination. The hierarchy existed primarily to flow information from bottom of the pyramid to the top, however with the introduction of digital technology, APIs and cloud-based architecture has effectively automated this coordination function. In modern fintech firms the organisational chart is no longer a map of human reporting but increasing a map of software permissions. The vertical integration that defined 20th century banking where a lending department was physically and operationally separate from a payments department are now structurally incompatible. Those traditional models cannot withstand the speed of today's digital transactions. And with this the witness of replacement of functional hierarchy with networked ecosystem is general now. Here the value is created horizontally across cross-functional teams rather than vertically down commanded chains (Azonuche and Enyejo, 2024, pp. 57–69). With this transition the structure has become invisible but not disappeared, the invisibility is caused as it is encoded into the digital platform itself rather than enforced by human managers. Therefore, while the need for control remains, the traditional structural model for achieving it is indeed obsolete.

Regarding the obsolescence of management roles, the evolutions direct to the fundamental bifurcation of the manager's function. The classical theories of management by Fayol and Tylor focused heavily on scientific management tasks such as scheduling, monitoring productivity, and quality control. Algorithmic Management and Agentic AI has captured the duties of supervisory team members marking managerial hierarchical roles and duties obsolete. But is it crucial to differentiate between obsolescence of tasks and obsolescence of the role.

While machine has taken over the science of management, strategy and ethics, it lacks empathy which has become more valuable in this day and age. The future manager has to be able to maintain psychological safety and resolve conflicts within human teams rather than being able to allocate work which is done by the system. This way the traditional command and control manager is obsolete and new form of management “Coach and Architect” should be in hand who serve a function that AI cannot yet replicate.

The research confirms that the 21st century corporation is undergoing a metamorphosis from the machine bureaucracy of industrial age to digital organism of information age. Stability, vertical control and human-mediated information flow are some of the major characteristics of traditional models but in current environment of ubiquitous data and automated agency these models are no longer fit for purpose and are structurally obsolete. However, the transformation does not have direct indication for complete eradication of manager but evolution of managers to integrate technology and technology led decisions in their decisive powers. The age of technology has been moving towards a future where the structure of the firm is defined not by

who reports to whom, but by how human intelligence interfaces with artificial intelligence and other advance technology. The hierarchy of future management will be invisible but will have been integrated in the software system itself and the managers of the future will be guardians of culture rather than supervisors of tasks. The adaption of these new models is not option anymore it has become fundamental prerequisite for survival in a digital-first world, and this applies to all companies and businesses.

References

- Acemoglu, D. and Restrepo, P. (2020) "Robots and Jobs: Evidence from US Labor Markets," 128(6), pp. 2188–2244. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1086/705716>.
- Arner, D.W., Barberis, J.N. and Buckley, R.P. (2019) "The Evolution of Fintech: A New Post-Crisis Paradigm?" Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2676553>.
- Azonuche, T.I. and Enyejo, J.O. (2024) "Evaluating the Impact of Agile Scaling Frameworks on Productivity and Quality in Large-Scale Fintech Software Development," pp. 57–69. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijsrmt.v3i6.449>.
- Barroso, M. and Laborda, J. (2022) "Digital transformation and the emergence of the Fintech sector: Systematic literature review," 2(2), p. 100028. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.digbus.2022.100028>.
- Calderon-Monge, E. and Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2024) "The role of digitalization in business and management: a systematic literature review," 18(2), pp. 449–491. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00647-8>.
- Cui, T., Tan, B. and Shi, Y. (2024) "Fostering humanistic algorithmic management: A process of enacting human-algorithm complementarity," 33(2), p. 101838. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2024.101838>.
- Davenport, T.H. (2019) *The AI advantage : how to put the artificial intelligence revolution to work*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. Available at: <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130850071517539340>.
- Donaldson, L. (2001) *The contingency theory of organizations*. 1st ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications (Foundations for Organizational Science). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452229249>.
- Eling, M. and Lehmann, M. (2018) "The Impact of Digitalization on the Insurance Value Chain and the Insurability of Risks," 43(3), pp. 359–396. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41288-017-0073-0>.
- Fan, Y. (2025) "The innovation effect of digital business model transformation orientation: Evidence from corporate cross-boundary innovation," 103, p. 104578. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.104578>.
- Fayol, H., Storrs, C. and Urwick, L. (Lyndall) (1949) *General and industrial management*. London: Pitman. Available at: <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130000794706599552>.
- Felin, T. and Powell, T.C. (2016) "Designing Organizations for Dynamic Capabilities," 58(4), pp. 78–96. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.78>.
- Gawer, A. (2022) "Digital platforms and ecosystems: remarks on the dominant organizational forms of the digital age," 24(1), pp. 110–124. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2021.1965888>.

GOMBER, P. et al. (2018) “On the Fintech Revolution: Interpreting the Forces of Innovation, Disruption, and Transformation in Financial Services,” 35(1), pp. 220–265. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2018.1440766>.

Haddad, C. and Hornuf, L. (2016) “The Emergence of the Global Fintech Market: Economic and Technological Determinants,” (6131). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2830124>.

Hanelt, A. et al. (2021) “A Systematic Review of the Literature on Digital Transformation: Insights and Implications for Strategy and Organizational Change,” 58(5), pp. 1159–1197. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639>.

Henderikx, M. and Stoffers, J. (2023) “Digital transformation and middle managers’ leadership skills and behavior: a group concept mapping approach,” 14, p. 1147002. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1147002>.

Hillebrand, L., Raisch, S. and Schad, J. (2025) “Managing with Artificial Intelligence: An Integrative Framework,” 19(1), pp. 343–375. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2022.0072>.

Iman, N. (2020) “The rise and rise of financial technology: The good, the bad, and the verdict.” Edited by A.W.K. Tan, 7(1), p. 1725309. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1725309>.

Khatri, V. and Brown, C.V. (2010) “Designing data governance.” Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) (Communications of the ACM, 53). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1629175.1629210>.

Kusmaryanto, S. and Santoso, C.B. (2025) “A scoping review of middle managers in the digital transformation era in public sector organizations: are they still needed?,” 12(1). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2461734>.

Mintzberg, H. (1979) *The Structuring of Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Möhlmann, M. et al. (2021) “Algorithmic Management,” 45(4), pp. 1999–2022. Available at: <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-022-00764-w>.

Plekhanov, D., Franke, H. and Netland, T.H. (2023) “Digital transformation: A review and research agenda,” 41(6), pp. 821–844. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2022.09.007>.

Siddiqui, Z. and Rivera, C.A. (2022) “FinTech and FinTech ecosystem: A review of literature,” 12(1), pp. 63–73. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22495/rgcv12i1p5>.

Siddiqui, Z. and Rivera, C.A. (2025) “Insights into FinTech leadership composition for risk governance,” 15(3, special issue), p. 236. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22495/rgcv15i3sip6>.

Stark, D. and Vanden Broeck, P. (2024) “Principles of Algorithmic Management,” 5(2). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/26317877241257213>.

Susskind, D. (2020) *A world without work : technology, automation, and how we should respond*. London: Allen Lane. Available at: <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130848328679084800>.

Tkalich, A., Klotins, E. and Moe, N.B. (2025) "Identifying Critical Dependencies in Large-Scale Continuous Software Engineering." Available at:
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2504.21437>.

Verhoef, P.C. et al. (2021) "Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda," 122, pp. 889–901. Available at:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>.

Vial, G. (2019) "Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda," 28(2), pp. 118–144. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>.

Vives, X. (2019) "Digital Disruption in Banking," 11(1), pp. 243–272. Available at:
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-financial-100719-120854>.

Warner, K.S.R. and Wäger, M. (2019) "Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal," 52(3), pp. 326–349. Available at:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2018.12.001>.

Weber, M. and Parsons, T. (1947) The theory of social and economic organization. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Zetzsche, D.A. et al. (2018) "REGULATING A REVOLUTION: FROM REGULATORY SANDBOXES TO SMART REGULATION," 23(1), pp. 31–103. Available at:
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/2023375464>.