

# **STUDY OF CORRELATION BETWEEN TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE IN MINTZBERG'S VISION AND CHANGE MANAGEMENT METHODS**

**Prof. Mihai Vărzaru Ph. D**  
**Lect. Radu Ogarcă Ph. D**  
**University of Craiova**  
**Faculty of Economics and Business Administration**  
**Craiova, Romania**

**Abstract:** The process of organizational change has become a daily process in the new economy, in which the dynamics of the environment involves a rapid reconfiguration and organizational management of economic and social entity. The multiplication of these processes requires adequate studies to identify common and repetitive elements, allowing a minimum of formalization of organizational change actions and a rapid transfer of knowledge at the level of each specialist involved in such actions.

Our paper proposes a sneak peek into Mintzberg's synthesis on organizational theory and its subsequent developments, in conjunction with the development of logistics entity-level social and economic. Investigation methodology includes general and specific approaches concerning the concepts of structure and organizational change and their correlation with organizational performance, analysis instruments and methods which have proven viability of the corresponding usage approach these economic-managerial categories to increase effectiveness in the long term, in the spirit of sustainable development.

Study of the characteristics of the methods developed so far and used in organizational change and their correlation with the specific characteristics of the types of structures that are highlighted by Mintzberg allow demonstration of compatibility which can be successfully used in the management and administration of this difficult process.

**JEL classification: M12, M14, M21**

**Key words: organizational change, structure, organizational theory, structuring forces**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Hellriegel et al (2008) provides an overview of methods for change and states that none of these can be considered as the best in all conditions. He argues that a process managed in an organization can achieve the same results in another organization, thereby placing change in a contingency perspective. One of the main objectives of the work concerns the continuation and deepening of global studies already undertaken and highlight the influence that organizational context influences the choice of instruments of change. The methodology used in this paper is based on exploring the theory and hybrid knowledge about structural configurations and methods of change and identify the characteristics that allow to establish causal links between the two concepts under study.

Analysis undertaken on the basis of features / criteria of change methods allow the easily verifiable issue about compatibility of their use in certain structural configurations.

### 1. STRUCTURAL CONFIGURATIONS AND THEIR BEHAVIOR TOWARDS CHANGE

When presenting his ideas on organizational structure, Mintzberg (1982) believes that academic research efforts to date have tended to limit their explanatory power, favoring more analysis than synthesis. These efforts aimed ways of combining individual variables together along linear axes and less attachment to position where the different sets of parameters can be different groups that can be considered configurations archetypes and images. These configurations are systems where it is important to consider network link and not a single variable that try to explain the others.

Coordination mechanisms are considered the most appropriate means of organizing work, the fundamental elements supporting structure. Their presentation in order mutual accommodation, direct supervision, standardization of work procedures, standardization of results, standardization of skills and knowledge, standardization of procedures is performed also depending on work supported by the increasing complexity of organization (Charron, Separi, 2004) .

At present the main types of Mintzberg's optical structures, de Person (2001) notes that to work, the company must reconcile the different coordination mechanisms and that this choice results from an equilibrium between four basic structural forces, namely entrepreneurial, mechanistic, professional and adhocratic. He suggests that such organization is subject, depending on the specific contingency factors and their parameters, these forces, one of which is stronger and has to impose structure. Structural configurations and their main characteristics, as it is favorable context, are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1**

**The main features of structural configurations Mintzberg's view**

<b>Structural configuration</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Advantages/ inconveniences</b>
Simple structure	-Simple, informal, flexible -Logistic support and hierarchical line less developed	-Simple and dynamic environment -Strog leadership, sometimes charismatic or autocritic -Small organizations or new	-Often visionary process, in large part deliberately, but emergent and flexible to detail -Ductile organization, after leader positions	-Rapid response, mission sense -vulnerable, limited -danger of imbalance because of strategy or performance of operations
Mechanistic bureaucracy	-Bureaucracy centralized -Procedures formalized, work specialized division of labor, regrouping functional tasks,	-Environment simple and stable -organizations large and older - rationalization work, rationalization of technical system	-Strategic Programming -resistance to strategic changes and, in order to overcome them they must take form of	-Effective, safe and accurate, the consistency - obsession with control can lead to:

	<p>ranking importance</p> <p>-Tehnostructure is the key organization, separate from hierarchical line-</p>	<p>-external control becomes instrument</p> <p>-internal control can provide form of closed system</p> <p>-common structure in the production of the goods and services,</p> <p>administation, the organizations of the control and security</p>	<p>organization innovative or venture in the case of the recovery</p> <p>-Change depends on the modes of action</p> <p>-long periods of stability, interrupted by violent revolution</p> <p>strategic crisis</p>	<p>-human problems in operational center, leading to:</p> <p>- problems of coordination to administrative center, leading to: - problems adapting to the level of strategic leadership.</p>
<p>Profesional bureaucracy</p>	<p>-Bureaucracy relatively decentralized, dependent on the superior training of the operators' professional</p> <p>-operation requires the creation of operational systems professional inside which specialists can work stand-alone and, as subjects of control of the profession</p> <p>- Tehnostructure and hierachical level minimum average, which shows a field of control of the work of extra-wide professional, logistics support, as they like mecanist configurations, to support the specialists</p>	<p>-Complex and stable environment</p> <p>- Simple technical system</p> <p>- Often, but not necessarily sector of services</p>	<p>-More strategies widely fragmented, but required a certain cohesion</p> <p>- most are adopted from the professional perspective and by collective choice, others, by administrative authorisation</p> <p>- the overall strategy is very stable, but in detail it is revealed continuously changing</p>	<p>- Benefits by democracy and specific autonomy</p> <p>-problems of coordination between various systems operational professional, improper use of professional availability, the reject innovation</p> <p>-public answers to failures, often inappropriate and of mechanist origin</p> <p>-exacerbated syndication of these problems</p>
<p>Divisional structure</p>	<p>-Divisions based on the markets, coupled slim under the control of the organization's administrative center</p> <p>-Autonomous Divisions in coordinating their activities (limited decentralization) but subject to the control of performance, which trains standardization</p>	<p>-Markets diversified, especially in terms of products and services (as opposed to customers and regions), by-products and intermediates encourage diversification</p> <p>conglomerate is the purest form of this configuration</p> <p>- Typical structure</p>	<p>-Headquarters defines the group strategy as a portfolio management</p> <p>business divisions defining their own strategies</p>	<p>-Solution to some problems of functional structures integrated mechanistic model, such distributed risk, mobilize capital, add or reduce activities</p> <p>- diversification</p>

	<p>results on the creation of structures in mechanist divisions, as a tool of the head office, but tendencies of assembly of closed system</p>	<p>typical of large organizations and older, very popular in the business world, but in development and administration or other public services</p>		<p>conglomerate discourages innovation; an improvement in the functioning of the market capital and boards of management can be done as an alternative independent firms to be more profitable than divisions -system for monitoring the performance is likely to lead the organization to an insensitive or irresponsible social behavior -with all a tendency to of development in public services, danger is even greater because of impossibility of measuring the number of objectives social</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Adhocratic structure</p>	<p>-Structure of innovative organizations, fluid, organic, with limited decentralization -functional experts assigned to multidisciplinary teams of experts for the implementation of innovative projects -coordination through mutual adaptation with staff, integrator managers and structure matrix</p>	<p>-Complex and dynamic environment, which includes high technology, frequent changes of products because of the competition, projects very large -usually young, because of bureaucratic pressures that occur with age -Frequency in young industries -There are two forms: operational adocracy to work under contract and administrative adocracy to work on their own projects, along with automated operational center</p>	<p>-Essentially based on experience or learning -Usually emerging, evolving through a variety of processes that start from bottom and is formalized by the management at this level -Cycles of convergence and divergence characteristics on strategic objectives</p>	<p>-Combines more democracy with less bureaucracy and thus a structure of fashion -Very effective for innovation -Efficiency can be achieved by the inefficiency -Human problems arising from ambiguity and danger of inadequate transition to another configuration</p>
-----------------------------	--	---	---	--

## 2. CHARACTERIZATION METHODS AT ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Organization must continuously ask which changes are necessary and how to achieve them, and this is the essence of change management. Moreover, strategy and organizational change are inseparable and, consequently, management of change is a desirable skill for any manager (Todnem, 2005).

Change actions may aim to improve further, involving only a succession of minor developments within the organization, or may mean a radical evolution of the structure. This study is focused on analysis methods/instruments within the second category, of major changes that require the support of a formalized process and led to the managerial level and have remained at the center of recent efforts to improve, as benchmarking (Maire, 2002) or Six Sigma (Pillet, 2003).

According to the makers of change these methods/instruments were included in three larger groups such as top-down, bottom-up and transfunctional involving specially constituted teams.

### 2.1. Top-down methods

*Reengineering (BPR)*. Is the fundamental rethinking and radical ways the management processes are organized to result in significant improvements in the measurement of performance such as cost, quality, service and speed. Among the seven key factors of reengineering, Brilman (2006) cites the commitment of management in a clear strategy, process customer-oriented approach, the formation of multidisciplinary teams with the best employees, ensuring conditions for the expression of freest creativity and computer scientists involved early in the approach.

Reengineering marks a break in the traditional organization, meaning that the organization will be designed primarily as a set of business processes supported by activities or functions supports. Reengineering approach requires the development of two phases, the first one of study and reconception, and the second, of implantation of team formation, which is crucial when a set of changes appear. Hammer points out the consequences of its application "complex processes are simplified, but the tasks become more complex, employees are more autonomous and more decision makers, staff changes. Gradually occur professional rather than workers and managers, the structure evolves from pyramid shaped towards the network team, gives the function for the process, measure results, not activities, managers changes from controllers to coaches (coach), senior evolves from joined position arbitrators to the leader ... (Brilman, 2006) ".

The radicalism promoted by the BPR method cannot be successful outside observance of fundamental conditions during its unfolding. On the one hand, there must be assurance that such a project officer has charisma necessary to impose a radical change to processes whose operating rules are soaked in culture. On the other hand, surely there must be a team players with the ability to propose and integrate new ways of working different from today. Another limitation of the method is related to the difficulties facing the team reengineering access to all information about the operation involved in the change process.

*Benchlearning.* The method was designed by Karlof and Ostblom (1997) and means learning the best practices identified by an internal or external benchmarking (outside the organization). The approach is based on the principle of assimilating knowledge about effective routines that other organizations have experienced (without having to own experimentation) and draw the necessary lessons about negative experiences that others have lived and they have experienced (and not be repeated).

For putting it into practice is necessary to have a set of specific assembly of mechanisms and crossing their knowledge from the individual to the collective level. Thus, benchlearning enables an organization to obtain and use another experience and expertise through knowledge transfer encoded. A process of benchmarking consists in changing a company by imitating and adapting successful practices from outside, while benchlearning represents a last stage of this process, because it aims to change the organization and making it understand and assimilate knowledge associated with these practices. Knowledge management can represent the wider of application of benchlearning.

Relatively new method and unrun, benchlearning encounters more difficulties in its application. Maire (2004) made a list of traps which have to face an organization that adopts this method of change. He mentioned difficulties in finding partners that provide the best examples in a field in which operates change that is needed. Another aspect to be noted is an absence of a simple and concrete methodological support to achieve benchlearning, specific situation of new instruments that have not yet consolidated in businesses practices. As benchlearning requests, by definition, finding the best practices to improve a particular process can actually be identified good practice, because such an analysis is difficult and sometimes impossible to put into practice. The practice often taken as an example is very good and it does not matter that she is not considered to be the best one.

*Management by constraints (MPC).* The MPC method is shown in the actions of planning, organization, evaluation and operation of complex systems, as regards the system as a set of interrelated elements that must be addressed and integrated globally. Representing a synthesis of the methods "Just in Time" (the Japanese) and MRP (Material

Requirements Planning), reply to western, the MRC method proposes a change that a whole system approach, focusing mainly on reducing stocks and cycles of production.

The constraints which are the subject method can be of different nature, but generally it focuses on some "bottle-necks" or "narrow places" in relation to the production capacity of some jobs.. MPC method is based on the assumption that capacity imbalance is inevitable and sometimes it is desirable. The basic idea is that the organization must be changed on the basis of imbalance, and that should be invested and managed to maintain a "imbalance" (Marris, 1994). Therefore change must focus on the most restrictive resources of the organization, and optimizing exploitation of these narrow places constitute the core method.

Regarding the limits applying MPC method, the first refers to its exclusive use to manage changes in production systems and the impossibility of generalization to other organizational components. Another weakness is that the method is not interested in the impact of changes in production system have on human factor which is considers secondary, but in reality they have important consequences on the functionality of the organization.

*Hoshin management.* Known by many names or simply Hoshin, the method is considered a form of strategic management which allows an enterprise to mobilize all resources to focus on a few key points that are its objectives of progress. Used particularly in the strategic direction of breakthroughs (in the sense of technical or technological breakthrough) or pilot actions to improve closer to practice, the method allows the management of profound changes. These changes will seek to determine the appearance of break-ups and the challenge of some breakthroughs (new directions) in the proposed developments.

Hoshin management uses principles of management by objectives, but focus on improving processes and has the particularity to act at all levels of the enterprise. Its tasks are multiple. The first is the key communication objectives to all company employees, preferably by using clear quantification. The second mission is to focus all jobs and tasks related to achieving clear objectives of the company, so that it is possible to make the breakthroughs by concentrating efforts and better coordination of resources. These two tasks are closely related to the third, which requires effective adaptation of the objectives and activities of the enterprise for a more rapid adaptation to frequencies changes of the environment..

Hoshin management key to success depends on the ability to use certain standard instruments for strategic planning (such as SWOT analysis, competitive analysis, Force Field Analysis etc.), quality (Duret, 2002), but also certain notions of semantics. These conditionings highlights and limits its application. In addition, the success of the method requires the existence of a developed cultural context in which management instruments and methods to be well established and used.

## **2.2. Bottom-up methods**

The specificity of these methods lies in the fact that the authors and presenters are situated at the level of a change of operational or manager in an organization. They have proved to be effective methods of coordination of sustainable change, because developments obtained on the bearings may determine deep problems, and in the end radical changes of the organization.

*Toyota Production System (TPS)*. The TPS goes way beyond the simple model subsystem of production, such as JIT (Just in Time), or that of a technique, such as Kanban (Ohno, 1992), positioning itself as a system rather management and structure induced coordination change in the organization in a way similar to the methods discussed above (Hoshin and MPC).

The main idea of the model is to eliminate waste, and it is materialized by applying two basic principles. The first principle is "just in time", which means disposing the stocks. The second principle of "autonomy" which has evolved to that of "autoactivation", had the main objective of achieving an uncontrolled avoidance of products faulty in the case of a production of mass distribution and the possibility of operator at several cars (reorganisation work and posts general advisers).

Principles and rules change oriented model on those elements which lead to development of staff, an increase in autonomy of operators at their posts, the identification and exploitation individual talents, multiplication of training activities, etc. Any resource is considered by TPS a rare resource, which should be exploited optimally. Use of the model TPS in the management of change that its main disadvantage long duration of the implementation, and this has led some simplifications of principles and adaptations that were published afterwards, such as Lean Production System, the use of which has gone beyond the borders of the car sector.

*Kaizen method*. Introduced in the early 1990s as a result of efforts by Imai (1992), Kaizen means "change in better", and involves a gradual improvement, orderly and continue to the problems, involving all actors within the enterprise. Among principles on which they follow and which enable it to be efficient is to remember removing the paradigms, on ideas courage even when some of the things appear obvious, improve processes, and not only of the results, evolving in a global framework, by ensuring the coherence of the objectives of the individual actors, mutual respect for the stakeholders, etc. These four principles claim application of others, which refers to the orientation towards customers or the rules of the remedial of the situations identified.

Initiation method can be done in several ways. The most used is the focus of change on the operational activities, to make work more productive, in the conditions of a improvement of the conditions in which this is carried out. It is used and in the case of production equipment efficiency improvement by proposing new implants. Application of the method is carried out by groups of improvement in both formats specialists, and especially from the staff concerned, which is involved in the process of change. It is also based on use of a system for collecting suggestions which enables all workers to submit their comments and to propose possible improvement. After validation within the group, retained the suggestions are implemented without requiring management approval.

The adoption of such a method is not unconditionally ensure success. One of its limitations refers to perennial change, keep spirit, which depends on the consistent involvement of increased remuneration. The spirit method involves a lack of structures, and an active presence of systems and procedures to ensure continuity of improvement. Gathering suggestions from staff involved in change is favorable to increase motivation, but may act in the opposite direction when the number of proposals and improvements is very high and the question of selection can be subjective.

### **2.3. Methods of management through transformational team**



The specifics of these methods lies in the fact that changes are made by a specially appointed team composed of functional experts seconded from their posts, and are widespread in large structures or matrix organizations.

*Management by projects.* The content of this method is closely related to the concept of the project which allows an organization to evolve and which it shall take the form of a combination of repetitive resources to design and implement a change. The main objective for this type of methods of change does not relate to the identification of targets on which to focus change, but consists rather in use of appropriate methodology project that introduced the desired changes in an organization.

Regarding the problems that can occur in practicing this method, importance should be given first to the choice of team members, whose quality depends on the achievement of project objectives. Equally important are also the relationships which are established between team members of the project and between them and the employees involved in the change process, because the risk of rejection endangers the most insignificant goals.

*Total Quality Management.* This tool is important for the organization since the 1980s, following the research of Deming and Juran. It aims, in particular, the participation of all members of the organization to improve processes, products and culture. By its innovation, total quality is a revolution of management and a social innovation organization, highlighting the importance of cross relations. Brillman (2006) defines total quality as a method that "refers to long-term success through customer satisfaction by all members of an entity to improve processes, products, services and culture of the organization ... TQM is an innovation of social organization".

It is important to note also that TQM is a new vision of quality and customer relations, based on detailed analysis of the manufacturing process (Igalens, 2003). This latter process should take into account the communication between different functions, in order to ensure the integrity of the manufacturing process. TQM is perceived as a process of social integration, which focuses on teamwork, on training and on benchmarking. In conclusion, it can be said that TQM involves the use of a certain number of management principles focused on the quality, ie the simultaneous achievement of the objectives of the seven components of any organization functioning, i.e. management, planning, results, employees, processes, knowledge requirements of the customers and their satisfaction

*Six Sigma.* In any enterprise, manufacturing of inconsistent parts is the source of additional costs, with a direct impact on performance. Except for customer dissatisfaction, which remains a difficult factor to be measured, more elements, such as physical faults of fabrication, assembly errors, rejections and corrections are quantifiable and, therefore, measurable. Six Sigma is a methodology which is based on the concept of measurement and statistical analysis of the processes, being used to measure, analyze, eliminate defects, losses or other measurable quality problem which can occur in manufacture. It has become a real management approach applied to all enterprise functions, as well as used in administrative processes and logistics.

Six Sigma method starts with basic principles mentioned above and shall be based on two other principles, namely optimization of results and performance through management process and reduce the variability of these processes in order to diminish non-conformities and the effects may cause. Thus, for this method all processes register a variation caused by a small number of major causes (ie 20% cases-80% effects). Identifying these causes offers the possibility to control and improve the situation quickly

and important, by removing their variation. In terms of change, the method is characterized by a strategy of rupture, relying on a coherent structure directed towards customers and established statistical instruments. Targeted change is considered strategic for the enterprise, producing a new competitive advantage.

The main advantage of the Six Sigma is that defines the tasks and responsibilities of personnel involved in management of change. The approach and the organization of its implementation is heavy and are hard to adapt to SMEs. Another disadvantage which makes it difficult to apply are related to the need in the enterprise to whether there are any other methods and instruments regarding the quality, since its methodology integrates in a coherent manner this assembly.

### **3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF METHODS CHANGE. CORRELATION WITH THEIR STRUCTURAL CONFIGURATIONS**

Methods that were discussed above are numerous and their specific features are inducing different ways and approaches in the implementation of change. As a whole, these methods emphasizes how to perform the change and actions to be taken, but details the transitional phase, in which it will operate progressive change. Or enterprises cannot afford to change their processes and to change the organization by interrupting, even temporary, their daily activities today.

From this point of view, an assessment appears opportune to position each method depending on which companies experiencing difficulty in completing this transitional phase of change.

Methods in which the transient phase is considered easy to go can be considered Kaizen, TPS, MPC, TQM and Hoshin. Thus, in the case of method Kaizen transitional phase shall be conducted in the best conditions, whereas actors who are involved in change propose only measures to evolve the organization. There are all of the conditions that these shares are the most indicated, to have the team that can change very good context and take decisions informed on the matter. Another argument that advocates for this conclusion is therefore that the method makes use of policy "small steps", which can facilitate the implementation of change.

TPS method also ensure a smooth transition of the transitional phase of change due to simplicity message or, that the need for reducing waste. Autonomy given to players increase their involvement in achieving change. However, the method is based on a principle which may not be always be easily followed, that of a new strong bond and shared by all the partners involved in carrying out these actions.

The method MPC has a very pragmatic approach of change, by solving problems which may prove acute for the organization and by more attention to those occurring during its use. Employees who enter such a project better support change, considering that it solved their own problems. That's why the transitional phase of change is greatly facilitated. The objective quality-client, pursued by TQM method, is that on which it initiates and builds change, and it is one that facilitates transitional phase for change. Actors of change, and themselves customers from outside the enterprise, are much more careful with the notion of fault and more receptive to the change in which they undertake. Hoshin management structures transitional phase change around achieving common goals. This mutuality of the objectives shall contribute to a better acceptance of the changes by the different actors of the company, which he considers it a successive series of actions which are directly linked to achieve their own objectives.

Another category of methods is that the transitional phase is considered by a medium difficulty, and includes benchlearning and management by projects. Benchlearning has two tendencies contrary to the transition to change. The advantage to take over and integrate a process which has made its sample valentel on the other hand, which do not require successive phases of experiments, making the transition to change easier. On the other hand, take over of a process in totally new, which often require adaptations and reshuffle, and acquisition by employees within a short time can prove to be difficult from this point of view. Management by projects structures the change around a project and enjoys the resources and expertise to a wide variety to be found within his team. More risks may arise in respect of communication within the framework of this team, which may affect transitional phase for change.

Group of methods for which transitional phase change is difficult include Six Sigma and BPR methods. Six Sigma method is recognized as a method mainly reserved for specialists who can master well statistical instruments. Involvement of all employees included in the procedure of change in the application of instrumentation is often difficult to ensure in the implementation of the actions necessary and extend for undefined periods the transition to the desired situation. The second method, BPR, put the actors of change in difficult situations. They must quickly adapt to a process decided by management, which is new and under the conditions in which they must be able to maintain their results, although all landmarks and the support are changed.

Methods in the analysis of characteristics of change and their association to the descriptions of types of structural configurations identified by Mintzberg may be some compatibility which may be necessary in organizational improvement of the management. Thus, six Sigma methods and Hoshin seem best adapted to support a change in the structures and divizional adhocratic, but are not indicated in the case of type bureaucratic (mechanist and vocational) and simple. In the latter case there is a problem difficult admitting only, such as the communication between experts and operational employees, which is difficult, but also the difficulty their implementation in practice.

Management by projects and other similar variants require more human resources in the various specialties. For these reasons, this method finds sufficient resources in the configurations that are of type mechanistic bureaucracy, divisional or adhocratic. Methods Kaizen, TQM et TPS, of japanese origin, based on the principle that any change managed by a difficult and distant structure can only have negative effects on acceptance and implementation of change. Therefore they are accessible to organizations which are directly involved in the effort of change, with a slight structure, within the meaning of its permeability, or a strong chain of command. Such a characteristic is specific to simple structures, divisional or professional bureaucracies

BPR method is specific to a strategy of rupture, making it adaptable to simple configuration or the type of professional bureaucracy, in which management has a role important enough to promote and sustain the approach of change. Its use within the busiest structures is difficult because of difficulties that arise in managing conflicts of interests in the intermediate levels of management. Regarding the benchlearning method, the conditions of its use requires a vigorous coordination from management and a strong involvement of human resources at operational level. Either these goals satisfy the simple structures, professional bureaucracies and adhocracies and not favor its application in divisional configuration and bureaucracies of mechanistic type because of the multiplication of intermediate levels of management.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

Use of methods of change may prove incompatible with organizational structures within which this must be done. This can completely compromise the chances of success of change, as it affects the structure of the enterprise whenever changes become a necessity. This situation may compromise the whole's chances of success of the changes because they affect the business whenever the change becomes a necessity. To overcome this situation, the method Six Sigma proposes, for example, the setting up of a new structure, which has the establishment and coordination of change, solution less effective in the case of SMEs or organizations that use Kaizen methods or TPS. In fact companies have significant difficulties when it is to be carried to adopt multiple new structures for several types of change which must be carried out. The best solution on the way to a procedure to change is that the organization must not create difficulties or confuse its organizational structure by creating a parallel structures, where there is a need of the choice of a method which to respond to this requirement. The procedure for determining the compatibilities of the structural patterns set by Mintzberg and the methods of change the most well known in practice comes to bring interesting items in this respect.

## 5. REFERENCES

1. Brillman J. Les meilleurs pratiques du management. Au coeur de la performance, Les Editions d'Organisation, Paris, 2006
2. Duret et al. Qualité en production: de l'ISO 9000 à Six sigma, Les Editions d'organisation, Paris, 2002
3. Hellriegel, D., Organizational Behavior. South Western Educational Publishing, Slocum, J.W.Jr. 1992
4. Igalens J. La qualite, Encyclopedie des ressources humaines, Edition Vuibert, Paris, 2003
5. Imai M. Kaizen : la clé de la compétitivité japonaise, Eyrolles Universites, Paris,1992
6. Karlöf B., Le Benchmarking : Un indicateur d'excellence en maîtrise de qualité et de productivité , Travail et Méthodes, Vol. 48, 1997
7. Maire J.-L. A model of characterization of the performance for a process of benchmarking, Benchmarking : An International Journal, Vol. 9, No. 5, 2002.
8. Maire J.L.s.a Le benchmarking, comment identifier et caractériser les bonnes pratiques, Gestion dynamique des connaissances industrielles (Traité IC2), Vol. 2, Eds. IC2, Hermès Science, 2004.
9. Marris P. Le management par les contraintes, Ed. d'Organisation, Paris, 1994.
10. Mintzberg H. Structure et dynamique des organisations, Les édition d'Organisation, Paris, 1982
11. Mintzberg H. Mintzberg on Management. Inside Our Strange World of Organizations , The Free Press, New York, 1982
12. Ohno T., s.a Présent et avenir du Toyotisme, Masson, Paris 1992.
13. de Person J. Organon. L'outil systemique du manager, Edition Celse, Paris, 2001
14. Pillet M. Six Sigma : comment l'appliquer, Editions d'Organisation, Paris, 2003.
15. Todnem R. Organizational change management: A critical review, Journal of Change Management, vol.5, nr.4, 2005