

CORE CHALLENGE OF THE TRIBE MODEL – BALANCING AUTONOMY AND STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

Tomasz Migduła^{1*}

Abstract: The Tribe Model is an Agile organizational architecture with the innate goals of accelerating innovation and achieving deep customer centricity. Its core challenge, however, is managing a fundamental paradox: the inherent tension between the high degree of team autonomy required for rapid innovation and the high degree of strategic alignment needed for a cohesive customer experience. The main aim of this paper is to deconstruct the model to analyze how this central paradox shapes an organization's ability to achieve its dual strategic goals. This study employs a systematic literature review, involving a meta-synthesis of academic articles, practitioner works, and expert analysis. The results confirm that while autonomous Squads effectively dismantle functional silos, they can also fragment the customer journey without robust strategic alignment mechanisms. The paper concludes that the model's success is not guaranteed by its structure alone, but is contingent on actively managing this inherent paradox through a conducive organizational culture, the right leadership approach, and the use of appropriate tools, such as OKR.

Keywords: Agile organizational design, customer centricity, innovation, organizational agility, Tribe Model

JEL Classification: L22, M10, M15, O31

Introduction

Organizations today confront the dual imperative of achieving deep customer centricity while sustaining continuous innovation. The former demands the holistic alignment of functions to deliver value, whereas the latter requires transforming concepts into market-ready solutions. However, these objectives are often impeded by the inertia of traditional, siloed structures. Such hierarchies, characterized by

¹ Tomasz Migduła, MSc, t.migdula@gmail.com,  <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8164-2453>

* Corresponding author: Tomasz Migduła, t.migdula@gmail.com

self-contained departments that prioritize vertical coordination over horizontal collaboration, tend to fragment the customer experience (Scott & Gong, 2021). This structural rigidity fosters a “silo mentality”, where insular departments prioritize narrow functional goals over broader organizational objectives, stifling the cross-disciplinary cooperation essential for innovation. This insularity leads to resource duplication, delayed decision-making, and a failure to address cross-cutting challenges effectively (Scott & Gong, 2021). Consequently, the organization's ability to innovate and respond cohesively to customer needs is severely undermined.

In response to the limitations of these hierarchical structures, Agile methodologies emerged, initially within the software development sector, to promote flexibility, speed, and adaptability. The core principles of Agile, such as iterative development, continuous feedback, and empowered, cross-functional teams, were designed to help organizations respond more effectively to market changes. While its origins are in technology, the success of this mindset has led to the adoption of Agile principles in various business functions beyond IT as companies seek to increase responsiveness and break down operational silos across the entire enterprise.

A prominent manifestation of scaling these principles is the Tribe Model, an organizational architecture that structures work into small, autonomous teams known as Squads. These Squads, containing all the skills needed to execute their mission, are designed to operate like independent startups and are grouped into larger, mission-aligned Tribes. The model's primary intention is to dismantle traditional hierarchies and apply Agile ways of working to broader business challenges, not just software delivery. Nevertheless, despite its conceptual appeal and celebrated success stories, such as that of the Dutch bank ING which credits the model for improved time-to-market and employee engagement (Jacobs & Schlatmann, 2017), its practical implementation has yielded mixed results. The transformation journey is often a long, non-linear process fraught with challenges, as documented in a decade-long case study of a large IT services firm (Berkani & Causse, 2019). Many organizations struggle to balance the high degree of team autonomy central to the model with the strategic alignment necessary for coherent value delivery.

This paper addresses this gap by deconstructing the Tribe Model not merely as a catalyst, but as an organizational architecture defined by a core challenge: the inherent tension between team autonomy and strategic alignment. The analysis will demonstrate that the model's architectural principles constitute a powerful framework, but one whose success is ultimately contingent on an organization's ability to navigate this central paradox. Consequently, this study posits the following research hypothesis: The active management of the paradox between Squad autonomy and strategic alignment is a critical success factor in the implementation of the Tribe Model. The contribution of this work is therefore to move beyond prescriptive descriptions of the model and offer a nuanced analytical framework for understanding its implementation challenges and critical success factors.

Literature review

The imperative of customer centricity

Transitioning to a customer-centric strategy entails fundamental reorientation, placing the customer at the core of the organizational ecosystem (Burritt & Kilara, 2016). This paradigm is defined as a strategy that aligns an organization's architecture and processes to deliver a unique and valuable customer experience, thereby creating a strategic and managerial advantage (Al Sayed et al., 2022; Burritt & Kilara, 2016). Research indicates that while customer centricity drives innovativeness, its effect on business growth is largely indirect, mediated by this enhanced innovative capacity (Tuominen et al., 2023). This approach moves beyond traditional market orientation to a more profound integration of customer needs into the very fabric of the organization.

The success of a customer-centric model depends on several key factors, including a deep commitment to understanding customer needs and promoting an internal marketing culture that prioritizes customer satisfaction (Al Sayed et al., 2022). The case of Amazon exemplifies this, where a relentless focus on the customer experience has become a cornerstone of its competitive advantage (Baboolal-Frank, 2021). This strategic choice reflects a deeper philosophical shift, where the concept of the customer is reinterpreted in a way that challenges traditional business logic, allowing a more dynamic and responsive organizational posture (Mehramolan, 2016).

Consequently, success requires an ecosystem where every component supports the customer journey (Burritt & Kilara, 2016). This strategic choice is not merely tactical but also structural, yielding proven returns in loyalty and innovation (Tuominen et al., 2023). This inherent dependence of a customer-centric strategy on its structural foundation means that its successful implementation is, fundamentally, a matter of organizational design. Hence, understanding how specific organizational architectures can overcome the fragmentation of traditional, siloed structures is critical to translating the vision of customer centricity into a tangible reality.

The role of organizational design in fostering innovation

Organizational design is a key lever for competitive advantage, directly shaping innovation capacity (Sengul, 2019). This is vital for business model innovation, which necessitates asset reconfiguration (Leih et al., 2015). Conversely, innovation acts as a catalyst for structural change; as firms encounter limitations during projects, they often redesign organizational components to better support experimentation (Brix & Peters, 2015). This iterative relationship underscores that organizational design is not a static blueprint but an evolving framework that both shapes and is shaped by a firm's innovative activities. The role of design in this context is measurable, with clear impacts on the growth and success of innovation within an enterprise (Galindo-Rueda & Millot, 2015).

The journey toward an Agile organization is a deliberate design choice aimed at enhancing responsiveness and innovation. This is especially critical for high-tech startups, where initial organizational design choices can significantly impact long-term

innovation outcomes and the ability to scale effectively (Grimpe, Murmann & Sofka, 2019). By viewing organizational design as a strategic choice, firms can proactively structure themselves to foster the collaboration, flexibility, and learning required to thrive in dynamic and competitive environments (Sengul, 2019).

The Tribe Model as an Agile organizational architecture

Kniberg and Ivarsson (2012) detailed the Tribe Model as an architecture designed to scale operations while preserving innovation. Its foundation is the autonomous “Squad”, a cross-functional unit responsible for specific features, grouped into larger, mission-aligned “Tribes”. This modularity is supported by knowledge-sharing structures: “Chapters” unite specialists for skill development under a Chapter Lead (De Smet, 2018), while voluntary “Guilds” facilitate the cross-pollination of ideas to balance autonomy with strategic coherence (Trzaskowska-Dmoch et al., 2025).

Table 1. Architectural components of Tribe Model

Component	Composition & scale	Core purpose & focus	Key principle
Squad	A small, self-organizing, cross-functional team, typically comprising 5-8 members.	To take end-to-end responsibility for a specific feature area or mission. The Squad is designed to operate with minimal dependencies and handoffs, covering everything from design and development to deployment and maintenance of its designated area.	Autonomy. Functions like a “mini-startup”, empowered to decide how to best achieve its long-term mission.
Tribe	A collection of Squads working in a related business area, typically scaled to maintain close personal connections.	To provide strategic alignment and a supportive ecosystem for its Squads. The Tribe Lead ensures that the work of all the constituent Squads contributes to a broader, shared business objective and fosters an environment of collaboration and innovation.	Alignment. Acts as a “lightweight matrix” or an incubator, providing context and a shared mission without imposing rigid, top-down control.
Chapters	A group of specialists with the same competence (e.g. all UX designers, all database administrators) from the various Squads within a single Tribe.	To maintain and develop functional excellence within a specific discipline. It serves as a “home” for specialists to share knowledge, establish best practices, and engage in skill development. The Chapter Lead is typically the line manager for the members.	Competence. Functions as a formal “community of practice” that ensures high standards and prevents knowledge from becoming siloed within individual Squads.

Component	Composition & scale	Core purpose & focus	Key principle
Guild	A voluntary, organization-wide community of people who share a common interest. A Guild can span across multiple Tribes.	To facilitate the cross-pollination of ideas, knowledge, and practices across the entire organization. Guilds are formed organically around topics of interest, which can range from specific technologies (e.g. a programming language) to broader subjects (e.g. web performance).	Community of Interest. Acts as the “organic glue” of the organization, connecting people across formal boundaries and breaking down potential Tribe-level silos.

Source: Own elaboration based on Kniberg & Ivarsson (2012)

This model embodies several key trademarks of Agile organizations, including a networked structure that replaces traditional hierarchy and a focus on empowering teams to make decisions quickly. The effectiveness of such Agile teams is a subject of ongoing research, which seeks to understand how different architectural arrangements contribute to their success (Steeh et al., 2025). The core principle is to create an environment where small, focused teams have the autonomy and resources to deliver value iteratively, a practice that many large corporations are now seeking to implement in order to enhance their own agility.

The Tribe Model, therefore, should be understood not as a rigid framework to be copied, but as a case study in applying Agile principles to organizational design at scale. It provides a practical example of how to structure an organization to foster collaboration, empower employees, and accelerate innovation cycles (Kniberg & Ivarsson, 2012).

Despite its widespread discussion and adoption, however, much of the existing literature treats the model as a set of best practices rather than a complex system with inherent paradoxes. There remains a significant gap in research that deconstructs the model to analyze the fundamental tensions between its core tenets, such as high team autonomy, and the strategic alignment required for true customer centricity.

The successful implementation of such a model requires not only a deep commitment to Agile values (Trzaskowska-Dmoch et al., 2025), but also a nuanced understanding of these internal conflicts, which this paper aims to provide.

Research methodology

This study employed a systematic literature review and qualitative synthesis. Since the Tribe Model is an evolving construct rather than a static framework, a systematic review was selected to integrate fragmented knowledge from diverse sources, offering a more comprehensive perspective than a single case study. The objective was to construct a holistic understanding of the model by analyzing its conceptual foundations, practical applications, and documented outcomes.

The research process was initiated with a structured search of academic and professional literature. To ensure a comprehensive scope, the search strategy utilized a range of keywords, including “Spotify Model”, “Tribe Model”, “agile scaling”, “organizational agility”, “squads, chapters, guilds”, and “customer centricity”. The analysis was intentionally grounded in a multi-source corpus designed to capture a variety of perspectives. This corpus included:

- Peer-reviewed academic articles from the fields of management, organizational design, and innovation, identified through scholarly search engines including Google Scholar, used to establish the theoretical context and review empirical findings concerning Agile organizational structures.
- Seminal practitioner-authored works, particularly the foundational whitepaper by Kniberg and Ivarsson (2012), analyzed to understand the model's original intent and core architectural principles.
- Expert critiques and implementation analyses from credible industry practitioners and consultants (e.g. Lee, 2020) provided critical, real-world insights into implementation challenges and deviations from the original concept.

The final stage of the research involved a thematic analysis of the selected material. This qualitative technique was used to systematically code the content and identify recurring concepts, arguments, and reported experiences. The process focused not merely on summarizing individual sources, but also on synthesizing disparate findings into a coherent conceptual framework. This synthesis enabled identification of the underlying mechanisms, inherent tensions, benefits, and critical failure points associated with the implementation of the model, which are presented in the Results section.

Results: analyzing the core challenge of the Tribe Model

Dismantling silos, creating micro-silos: the paradox of the squad structure

Analysis indicates that the Squad, the foundational unit of the Tribe Model, embodies a central paradox. Although designed to dismantle functional silos and accelerate value delivery (Kniberg & Ivarsson, 2012), its inherent autonomy can inadvertently foster “micro-silos”. While the cross-functional structure addresses the fragmentation typical of departmental divisions (Trkman et al., 2015), by embedding all the necessary skills within a single, mission-oriented unit, the model aims to eliminate the delays and communication overhead typical of siloed organizations, thereby accelerating value delivery (Trzaskowska-Dmoch et al., 2025). The inherent design of the Squad, as a self-contained “mini-startup”, directly addresses the structural impediments that prevent a holistic view of the customer journey.

Nonetheless, practitioner critiques reveal a counter-theme: highly autonomous Squads can inadvertently create “micro-silos”. When teams focus exclusively on their mission, they may fail to share knowledge, leading to duplicated work and a fragmented understanding of the broader product ecosystem (Segars, 2019). Empirical research confirms that organizations do not simply replicate the generic

Spotify template but actively adapt it to their needs. A multi-case study found that a common adaptation to mitigate these micro-silos is the creation of shared cross-product tribes (e.g. for security or infrastructure) that provide specialized services across multiple Squads, ensuring both efficiency and standardization (Gerster et al., 2020). This observation aligns with broader research on cross-functional teams. While such teams are designed to dismantle knowledge barriers, their potential can be undermined if they foster internal conflicts or a sense of isolation from the rest of the organization, a risk that effective management must mitigate (Blindenbach-Driessen, 2015).

The model's horizontal structures, Chapters and Guilds, are presented as the intended solution to this problem of secondary fragmentation. Chapters, that is groups of specialists of the same discipline across different Squads within a Tribe, are designed to maintain technical excellence and facilitate knowledge sharing within a specific competency (Kniberg & Ivarsson, 2012). They function as formal structures for competence development that prevent knowledge from becoming isolated within individual teams, a role complemented by Guilds, which the same research identifies as informal "communities of practice" (Trzaskowska-Dmoch et al., 2025). Guilds, as voluntary, cross-Tribe communities of interest, are meant to create even broader networks for cross-pollinating ideas and practices across the entire organization, acting as the "glue" that prevents knowledge fragmentation (Kniberg & Ivarsson, 2012). However, the successful implementation of such informal structures is not guaranteed; at ING for instance, Guilds failed to gain significant traction, demonstrating that even well-intentioned knowledge-sharing mechanisms can struggle to thrive within a specific corporate context (Kerr et al., 2018).

The contingent effect of autonomy on innovation

Analysis confirms a strong thematic link between team autonomy and innovation capacity (Trzaskowska-Dmoch et al., 2025; Segars, 2019). The freedom to experiment is consistently identified as a key driver of creativity. This aligns with research demonstrating a significant negative relationship between high centralization and employee innovative behavior (Dedahanov et al., 2017). Furthermore, the model's cultural emphasis on treating failure as a learning opportunity creates the psychological safety necessary for radical innovation (Bäcklander, 2019). This decentralized approach is found to have a positive impact on both operational efficiency and employee engagement, which are precursors to sustained innovation (Trzaskowska-Dmoch et al., 2025).

Nevertheless, the synthesis of critical analyses reveals that autonomy alone is insufficient and can even be detrimental to organization-wide innovation. An overemphasis on autonomy without effective knowledge-sharing mechanisms leads to duplicated efforts and fragmented learning as different teams independently "reinvent the wheel" to solve similar problems (Lee, 2020). Both structural differentiation (autonomy) and integration (knowledge sharing) are necessary to execute complex innovation streams. The effectiveness of Chapters and Guilds is thus identified as a critical moderating factor. When these horizontal networks function well, they

amplify innovation by disseminating best practices and new ideas. When they are weak or ineffective, the innovative potential of autonomous teams remains localized and fails to scale.

This brings the model's core challenge directly into focus within the realm of innovation. The relationship between autonomous Squads and the horizontal structures of Chapters and Guilds is not merely supportive. It is the very manifestation of the tension between creative freedom and strategic coherence. While high autonomy is essential for fostering localized, bottom-up experimentation, scaling these individual innovations into a cohesive organizational capability requires the deliberate alignment that these knowledge-sharing networks are designed to provide. Therefore, the model's success in creating a truly innovative ecosystem hinges on actively managing this paradox by empowering teams to diverge in their explorations while ensuring their discoveries ultimately converge into collective, strategic progress. This tension demonstrates that the path to enterprise-wide innovation is defined by the delicate balance between enabling freedom and maintaining focus.

The central trade-off: reconciling autonomy with a cohesive customer experience

The analysis reveals that the model's core challenge becomes most apparent when pursuing a truly customer-centric strategy. This goal requires managing a central trade-off: the inherent conflict between the high level of team autonomy granted for speed and the high level of strategic alignment necessary for a cohesive customer experience across all touchpoints. Academic research confirms that a truly customer-centric strategy requires a consistent and seamless journey across all product touchpoints, which is difficult to achieve when dozens of teams operate independently (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016). While Squads are empowered to respond quickly to customer needs within their specific domain, this can lead to a fragmented user experience if not guided by a unified vision (Lee, 2020). This tension represents a classic organizational paradox, where leaders must manage the competing demands of freedom and control to foster innovation.

The literature, particularly critiques of the model, indicates that overemphasis on autonomy without robust alignment mechanisms leads to divergence from strategic business goals. The success of the model in fostering customer centricity is therefore contingent on the effectiveness of its alignment mechanisms. These are identified as the leadership roles of the Tribe Lead and the Trio (a leadership group of product, design, and tech leads), who are responsible for communicating a clear strategic vision and ensuring that the work of all Squads contributes to that shared mission. In practice, this strategic alignment is often operationalized through frameworks such as objectives and key results (OKRs), which provide a structured methodology for setting clear, ambitious goals and formulating measurable action steps to achieve them (Wulff et al., 2024). Such tools allow the organization to cascade strategic intent without resorting to the top-down control that the model aims to replace, thereby connecting high-level business outcomes with the autonomous work of the Squads

(Wulff et al., 2024). This aligns with broader research on customer-centric transformations, which emphasizes the critical role of leadership in embedding a customer-first mindset across all functions.

Synthesis of critical failure points and success factors

The meta-synthesis of practitioner critiques and implementation analyses (e.g. Carroll et al., 2023; Lee, 2020) reveals several recurring failure points. The most prominent is the attempt to copy the model's structure without adopting its underlying culture of trust and autonomy. This approach, often referred to as "Cargo Cult Agile", is the ritualistic imitation of Agile practices without a full understanding of the underlying principles or the reasons behind them (Havstorm et al., 2025), which leads to superficial transformations where organizations simply relabel existing structures, for instance, calling departments "Tribes", without granting teams the genuine autonomy required for success (Lee, 2020; Carroll et al., 2023).

Another critical failure point is the flawed implementation of the matrix structure, particularly the role of the Chapter Lead. Critiques from former employees highlight that when Chapter Leads act as traditional line managers responsible only for career development but not for delivery, it creates a vacuum of accountability and leaves the Product Owner without a single, accountable engineering counterpart (Lee, 2020). Finally, a consistent theme is the underestimation of the need to enable leadership. The model requires a fundamental shift from "command and control" management to a servant leadership style, a difficult transition that is often a major source of resistance (Bäcklander, 2019). From these failure points, a clear set of success factors emerges, as summarized in Table 2. This is further supported by the work of Carroll (2023), whose research on large-scale Agile transformations highlights that a focus on initial adoption without a strategy for long-term "normalization" is a primary reason for failure.

Table 2. Synthesis of architectural principles and documented implementation challenges

Architectural element	Intended purpose (catalyst)	Documented challenges (barrier)
Squads	Break down functional silos and accelerate value delivery through cross-functional autonomy (Kniberg & Ivarsson, 2012).	Can create "micro-silos", leading to knowledge fragmentation and duplicated work if not properly connected to the wider organization (Segars, 2019).
Chapters	Maintain technical excellence, ensure engineering standards, and foster skill development across Squads (Trzaskowska-Dmoch et al., 2025).	The Chapter Lead role can create a flawed matrix structure with unclear accountability for delivery, hindering decision-making (Lee, 2020).
Guilds	Promote cross-organizational knowledge sharing and innovation through voluntary communities of interest (Kniberg & Ivarsson, 2012).	Can lack focus and lose momentum without clear goals or active coordination, becoming ineffective discussion forums.

Architectural element	Intended purpose (catalyst)	Documented challenges (barrier)
Tribes	Provide strategic alignment and a shared mission for a collection of Squads, acting as an “incubator” for broader business objectives.	Susceptible to “cargo cult” implementation, where a department is simply renamed a “Tribe” without fundamentally changing its hierarchical structure or processes. It can also evolve into a new, larger “Tribe-level silo,” hindering cross-organizational collaboration.
Tribe Leadership (Tribe Lead, Trio)	Provide clear strategic direction and ensure that autonomous Squads remain aligned with the broader customer journey and business goals.	Risk of reverting to “command and control” management styles or creating role ambiguity regarding accountability relative to the Product Owner.
Autonomy-Alignment Principle	Empower teams to innovate quickly (autonomy) while ensuring they contribute to a unified strategic direction (alignment).	Over-fixation on autonomy without strong alignment mechanisms leads to strategic drift and inconsistent customer experiences (Carroll et al., 2023).

Source: Own elaboration

Taken together, the findings synthesized in Table 2 reveal a fundamental duality within the architectural elements of the Tribe Model, where each intended catalyst presents a corresponding implementation challenge. Each component, designed as a catalyst for agility, presents a corresponding barrier if implemented without addressing its inherent complexities. The autonomy that empowers Squads can lead to fragmentation, while the matrix structure of Chapters intended to ensure quality can create accountability conflicts. This synthesis reveals that the model is not a static blueprint but a dynamic system of managing organizational tensions. These results provide the foundation for a subsequent discussion on the broader implications for theory and practice.

Conclusions

The findings of this meta-synthesis demonstrate that the Tribe Model is best understood not as a prescriptive framework to be replicated, but as a set of architectural principles designed to manage the inherent tensions between autonomy and alignment. Analysis confirms that core components, such as autonomous Squads, are effective in breaking down traditional functional silos, while the matrixed structures of Chapters and Guilds are intended to foster the knowledge sharing crucial for innovation. Nonetheless, this research reveals that these architectural elements present a fundamental paradox. The very autonomy that fuels speed and creativity can lead to strategic fragmentation and inconsistent customer experiences if not carefully balanced by robust alignment mechanisms. The model's catalytic potential,

therefore, is not an automatic outcome of its structure, but is contingent upon an organization's ability to actively navigate these persistent organizational paradoxes.

The primary contribution of this study is the deconstruction of the Tribe Model into a set of underlying principles and tensions, offering a more nuanced perspective than is typically found in practitioner-focused literature. For theory, this paper bridges the gap between organizational design literature and Agile scaling methodologies, framing the model as a socio-technical system for managing the paradoxes of innovation. For practice, the findings serve as a critical caution against cargo cult adoption. The key implication for managers is that a successful transformation requires a shift in focus from merely copying structural artifacts to fundamentally rewiring the organizational backbone, its core processes of budgeting, performance management, and talent development (Brosseau et al., 2019). The journey is rarely linear. It can be a “step-wise” process of gradual implementation or an “all-in” transformation, but in every case, it demands cultivation of the cultural prerequisites. As one of the architects of the ING transformation stated, leaders must be willing to “give up fundamental parts of [their] current way of working,” including traditional hierarchy and input steering, in exchange for empowered teams and “output steering” (Jacobs & Schlatmann, 2017). This underscores the final point: success hinges on fostering organizational trust and a deep commitment to enabling leadership. Without these foundational elements, the architectural principles of the model fail to function as intended and may even introduce new dysfunctions.

Finally, the limitations of this study, rooted in its reliance on a meta-synthesis of publicly available data, open several avenues for future research. While this approach allowed a broad synthesis of diverse perspectives, it lacks the depth of direct empirical investigation. Future research should therefore employ longitudinal, in-depth case studies within organizations that have implemented these principles. Such studies could provide richer data on the evolution of these structures over time and the specific leadership behaviors required to manage the identified tensions effectively. Furthermore, quantitative research is needed to measure the precise impact of specific architectural elements. Future studies could, for instance, examine the correlation between Guild strength (measured by meeting frequency and cross-Tribe project participation) and the reduction of duplicated work among Squads, offering tangible metrics beyond general innovation scores. Ultimately, as organizations continue to seek greater agility, understanding the deep interplay between architectural design, organizational culture, and strategic outcomes will remain a critical area of inquiry.

References

- Al Sayed, F., Hejase, H., Hamdar, B., Hatoum, A., & Hejase, A. (2022). An assessment of customer-centricity success factors: Context of the Lebanese market. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 22(2), 1-29.
- Baboolal-Frank, R. (2021). Analysis of Amazon: Customer centric approach. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2), 1-16.
- Bäcklander, G. (2019). Doing complexity leadership theory: How agile coaches at Spotify practise enabling leadership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 28(1), 42-59. DOI: 10.1111/caim.12303

- Berkani, A., & Causse, D. (2019, June). *Explaining the agile transformation through management innovation adoption*. EURAM 2019.
- Blindenbach-Driessen, F. (2015). The (in)effectiveness of cross-functional innovation teams: The moderating role of organizational context. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 62(1), 29-38. DOI: 10.1109/TEM.2014.2361623
- Brix, J., & Peters, L. S. (2015). Exploring an innovation project as a source of change in organization design. *Journal of Organization Design*, 4(1), 29-43. DOI: 10.7146/jod.17574
- Brosseau, D., Ebrahim, S., Handscomb, C., & Thaker, S. (2019). *The journey to an agile organization*. McKinsey & Company.
- Burritt, K., & Kilara, T. (2016). *Learning from customer centricity in other industries a primer*. CGAP.
- Carroll, N., Conboy, K., & Wang, X. (2023). From transformation to normalisation: An exploratory study of a large-scale agile transformation. *Journal of Information Technology*, 38(3), 267-303. DOI: 10.1177/02683962231164428
- De Smet, A. (2018). The agile manager. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 3, 76-81. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/the-agile-manager>
- Dedahanov, A. T., Rhee, C., & Yoon, J. (2017). Organizational structure and innovation performance: Is employee innovative behavior a missing link?. *Career Development International*, 22(4), 334-350. DOI: 10.1108/CDI-12-2016-0234
- Galindo-Rueda, F., & Millot, V. (2015). *Measuring Design and its Role in Innovation*. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers 2015/1, OECD Publishing. DOI: 10.1787/5js7p6lj6zq6-en
- Gerster, D., Dremel, C., Brenner, W., & Kelker, P. (2020). How enterprises adopt agile structures: A multiple – Case study. *ACM SIGMIS Database: the DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 51(1), 84-103. DOI: 10.1145/3380799.3380807
- Grimpe, C., Murmann, M., & Sofka, W. (2019). Organizational design choices of high-tech startups: How middle management drives innovation performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 13(3), 359-378. DOI: 10.1002/sej.1330
- Havstorm, T. E., Karlsson, F., & Gao, S. (2025). Agile software development method cargo cult – Devising an analytical tool. *Information and Software Technology*, 187, 107851. DOI: 10.1016/j.infsof.2025.107851
- Jacobs, P., & Schlatmann, B. (2017). *ING's agile transformation*. McKinsey Quarterly.
- Kerr, W. R., Gabrieli, F., & Moloney, E. (2018). *Transformation at ING (A): Agile*. Harvard Business School Case 818-077.
- Kniberg, H., & Ivarsson, A. (2012). *Scaling Agile @ Spotify with tribes, squads, chapters & guilds*. Retrieved September, 2025 from <https://blog.crisp.se/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/SpotifyScaling.pdf>
- Lee, J. (2020, April 19). *Failed #SquadGoals*. <https://www.jeremiahlee.com/posts/failed-squad-goals/>
- Leih, S., Linden, G., & Teece, D. J. (2015). Business model innovation and organizational design. In *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation Management*. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198701873.003.0002
- Lemon, K. N., & Verhoef, P. C. (2016). Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69-96. DOI: 10.1509/jm.15.0420
- Mehramolan, A. (2016). Postmodernism and customer centricity. *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Behaviour in Emerging Markets*, 1(3), 34-41. DOI: 10.7172/2449-6634.jmcbem.2016.1.3
- Scott, D., & Gong, T. (2021). Coordinating government silos: Challenges and opportunities. *Policy Design and Practice*, 4(3), 358-372. DOI: 10.1080/25741292.2021.1943997
- Segars, A. H. (2019). Creating a tribal approach for innovation in organizations. *Business Horizons*, 62(3), 409-418. DOI: 10.1016/j.bushor.2019.01.007
- Sengul, M. (2019). Organization design as a competitive choice: An application to the study of innovation. *Journal of Organization Design*, 8(22), 1-9. DOI: 10.1186/s41469-019-0063-8
- Steegh, R., Van De Voorde, K., & Paauwe, J. (2025). Understanding how agile teams reach effectiveness: A systematic literature review to take stock and look forward. *Human Resource Management Review*, 35(1), 101056. DOI: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2024.101056

- Trkman, P., Mertens, W., Viaene, S., & Gemmel, P. (2015). From business process management to customer process management. *Business Process Management Journal*, 21(2), 250-262. DOI: 10.1108/BPMJ-02-2014-0010
- Trzaskowska-Dmoch, A., Kocot, M., Gontarek, I., Rodowicki, S., Oleksiejuk, J., & Stasiak, J. (2025). A management model in an Agile organization based on the example of a company Spotify. *European Research Studies Journal*, 28(2), 51-70. DOI: 10.35808/ersj/3964
- Tuominen, S., Reijonen, H., Nagy, G., Buratti, A., & Laukkanen, T. (2023). Customer-centric strategy driving innovativeness and business growth in international markets. *International Marketing Review*, 40(3), 479-496. DOI: 10.1108/IMR-09-2020-0215
- Wulff, J., Sörgel, P., & Kataeva, N. (2024). *Unleashing the power of OKRs to improve performance*. Boston Consulting Group. Retrieved September 29, 2025, from <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2024/unleashing-the-power-of-okrs>

Authors' Contribution: Tomasz Migduła – 100%.

Acknowledgements and Financial Disclosure: The lack of funding.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest.

Ethics Declaration: No declaration required.

AI Declaration: Gen AI was used to verify and identify linguistic errors, which were then manually eliminated on a point-by-point basis.

GLÓWNE WYZWANIE MODELU TRIBES – RÓWNOWAŻENIE AUTONOMII I STRATEGICZNEGO DOPASOWANIA

Streszczenie: Model Tribes to zwinna architektura organizacyjna, której wrodzonymi celami są przyspieszenie innowacji i osiągnięcie głębokiej klientocentryczności. Jego kluczowym wyzwaniem jest jednak zarządzanie fundamentalnym paradoksem: nieodłącznym napięciem między wysoką autonomią zespołów, niezbędną dla szybkich innowacji, a wysokim stopniem strategicznego dopasowania, koniecznym do zapewnienia spójnego doświadczenia klienta. Głównym celem tego artykułu jest dekonstrukcja modelu w celu analizy, w jaki sposób ten centralny paradoks kształtuje zdolność organizacji do osiągania jej podwójnych celów strategicznych. W badaniu zastosowano systematyczny przegląd literatury, obejmujący metasyntezę artykułów naukowych, prac praktyków oraz analiz eksperckich. Wyniki potwierdzają, że choć autonomiczne składy skutecznie likwidują siłosy funkcjonalne, mogą one również fragmentaryzować ścieżkę klienta bez solidnych mechanizmów strategicznego dopasowania. W artykule dokonano konkluzji, że sukces modelu nie jest gwarantowany przez samą jego strukturę, lecz zależy od aktywnego zarządzania tym nieodłącznym paradoksem poprzez sprzyjającą kulturę organizacyjną, odpowiednie podejście przywódcze i wykorzystanie odpowiednich narzędzi, takich jak OKR.

Słowa kluczowe: zwinne projektowanie organizacyjne, klientocentryczność, innowacje, zwinność organizacyjna, Model Tribes

Articles published in the journal are made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International Public License. Certain rights reserved for the Czestochowa University of Technology.

