

Innovations in organisational structure

Tiernan, Siobhan . Tiernan, Siobhan.

[ProQuest document link](#)

ABSTRACT

Organizational structure has been changing fast in recent years and it seems likely that this trend will continue. The main impetus has come from changes in the business environment, which has moved from being a relatively stable and static one to one characterized by complexity, uncertainty, dynamism, and competition. Changes in the business environment have occurred in 4 main areas - political, economic, technological, and social. Trends in organizational structure are downsizing, changes in job design, team mechanisms, and increased responsibility and decision making. The cluster structure is a radical and innovative form of organizational structure consisting of collections of workers undifferentiated by rank or job title who operate together on a semi-permanent basis with no direct reporting relationships and only a residual hierarchy. Cluster-like structures, while exhibiting similar characteristics to the cluster, offer a step-by-step route to organizational restructuring. Cases of the cluster and cluster-like structures in British Petroleum Engineering and TEAM Aer Lingus are presented.

FULL TEXT

INTRODUCTION

Organisational structure has been changing fast in recent years and it seems likely that this trend will continue. The main impetus has come from changes in the business environment, which has moved from being a relatively stable and static one to one characterised by complexity, uncertainty, dynamism and competition (Handy 1989, Grinyer et al 1988, Wilson and Rosenfeld 1990 and Pettigrew and Whipp 1991). In light of all this, researchers are increasingly recognising that traditional hierarchical and bureaucratic structures can no longer adequately respond to--or anticipate--future developments in the business world (Moss Kanter 1983, Kilmann 1984 and 1989, Walton 1985, Kanter and Buck 1985, Handy 1989, Bartlett and Ghoshal 1990, Charan 1991, Quinn Mills 1991, Franz 1991, Drucker 1992 and Clegg, 1992).

A CHANGING BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

Changes in the business environment have occurred in four main areas: political, economic, technological and social; and in the last decade the intensity of such change has been exceptionally rapid (Kilmann 1984, Moss Kanter 1989 and Scott Morton 1991). Political and economic developments such as deregulation, liberalisation, privatisation and the emergence of the Single European Market have accelerated the trend towards increased competition, both nationally and internationally. Economic globalisation and internationalisation and the resulting new interdependencies have increased competitive pressures still further. Indeed, because changes occur so quickly and so often, Pettigrew and Whipp (1991) argue that organisations need to be prepared to manage change on a continual basis.

The most important social change is related to worker attitudes. A larger proportion of the workforce is educated, and is thus possessed of a different set of work values--in terms of their ideas and expectations about work and its place in society than previous generations. This change has been reinforced by a shift away from manual and clerical work towards knowledge-based occupations (Drucker 1992). The consequence is that younger workers demand more opportunity and more enjoyment from what they do; they are less willing to accept traditional authority; and they are increasingly demanding more autonomy and more say in the decisions which affect both themselves and the business.

The technological change which has altered the world of work and the way business is conducted most profoundly has been the information technology explosion. Those companies which are prime movers in this field have also enjoyed significant competitive advantage, and organisations seeking to keep ahead are required to maintain a constant watch on

information technology developments appropriate to their own industries.

TRENDS IN ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

According to Drucker(1992), there have been two major evolutions in organisational structure to date. The first occurred in the early 1900s, and involved a recognition of the independent roles and functions of management and company ownership. The second evolution took place some twenty years later, and introduced the command/control organisation with which we are so familiar today--with its classically bureaucratic emphasis on central service staffs, personnel management, budgets and controls. Now organisations are coming to terms with a third evolutionary period. The shift this time is from bureaucratic, hierarchical forms of structure to more adaptable cluster forms--or in Clegg's (1992) terminology, from modernist to post-modernist forms.

The old model, with its extended hierarchy, narrowly segmented job design, rule-bound procedures and lack of individual autonomy and responsibility is no longer appropriate for effective organisation in the current business environment. The structures and systems associated with such organisational forms do not adapt readily to change, and are not flexible enough to anticipate change.

Bureaucratic, hierarchical structures thrive on stability and certainty--a state which characterised previous environments, but not the one in which most organisations now operate. It is becoming widely recognised, therefore, that an alternative is needed (Moss Kanter 1983, Kilmann 1984, Walton 1985, Handy 1989, Bartlett and Ghoshal 1990, Charan 1991, Quinn Mills 1991, Franz 1991, Drucker 1992 and Clegg 1992).

Many of the recent changes in organisational structure have been in direct response to changes in the business environment. One such development is the trend towards 'flatter' structures. Reducing the layers in the hierarchy is designed to reduce costs, free up information flows, speed up communications, and allow more innovative ideas to flourish and to filter through the structure--rather than be blocked by communication bottlenecks. Drucker (1992) argues that whole layers of management serve only as relays for the unfocused signals that pass for communication, and play no active role in decision making or leadership.

An important point to note is that many researchers (Moss Kanter 1983, Walton 1985, Charan 1991 and Dumaine 1991) envisage a role for a 'downsized' hierarchy alongside innovations in structure. Critics such as Jaques (1990) appear to believe that the trend is towards the elimination of hierarchy, when it has rather been to reduce it and make it function more effectively. Extensive hierarchy clearly hampers effective management and stifles innovation and leadership. But to eliminate hierarchy altogether would be both impractical and in contravention of all the time-tested laws of management and leadership.

In face of demands for increased adaptability and flexibility organisations have responded by widening job design. Previously individuals were boxed into segmented isolated work tasks, with little knowledge or training in other areas. Due to the peak and trough nature of demand in many industries and the need to be more flexible, many organisations have now widened job categories and trained workers to be multiskilled (Franz 1991).

Changing attitudes among the workforce have led to the the creation of new structures which allow individuals more responsibility and authority over their work, and a larger role in decision making. In order to meet these demands, organisations have pushed responsibility downwards; for example, workers have been allowed to inspect work where previously they were only allowed to manufacture products. Workers have also been given a greater role in decision making--or what Handy (1989) describes as 'Subsidiarity' in his 'Federal Organisation'.

The final trend has been to move away from segmented and isolated work to team-based operations. Organisations are experimenting with task forces for short-term problem solving exercises, and with cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams to achieve longer-term objectives and specific projects of an on-going nature. Moss Kanter (1983) argues that such team mechanisms promote the circulation of resources, information and support. Charan (1991) argues that networks and teams are extremely important in the current volatile climate and that no traditional corporate structure, irrespective of how de-layered it is, can produce the flexibility and focus that success demands.

Charan also believes that success can only be achieved by the use of networks or teams drawn from across the company--both from business units and from different hierarchical levels. These networks or teams are not necessarily permanent in nature but can be called into action when needed. Drucker (1992) argues that it is task-focused teams which will perform

the basic work of the organisation, with the traditional bureaucratic departments serving as guardians of standards, and as centres for training and the assignment of specialists.

The trend, therefore, has been away from segmented and isolated structures with little communication and interaction between areas and different levels, to a situation where interaction and integration are seen as being essential to operations. No longer do functional areas concentrate only on their own tasks. Now they are made aware of the work of other areas and how they can be of assistance to them. Interaction through teams and networks ensures that the wider picture of the organisation is understood. Team-based work ensures a more flexible and adaptable approach to work, makes possible the wider exercise of autonomy and responsibility, gives rise to increased interaction, communication and information flows, and makes work more enjoyable for those involved. These trends are summarised in Figure 1.

FIGURE 1: STRUCTURAL TRENDS; A SUMMARY

FACTORS FORCING CHANGE

Political Developments

Economic Developments

Technological Developments

Social Developments

STRUCTURAL TRENDS

Downsizing

Changes in Job Design

Team Mechanisms

Increased Responsibility and Decision Making

While the trends in organisational structure are clear, nobody has offered a complete blueprint for implementing such changes--the precise nature, form and content of the structural form has not been clearly articulated. Of course no new means of managing an organisation arrives full-blown and ready to be implemented, but generally evolves as a result of actions taken by innovative organisations. In this respect two different forms of structural approach demand our attention: 'clusters' and 'cluster-like' structures.

CLUSTER STRUCTURES

The cluster structure is a radical and innovative form of organisational structure consisting of collections of workers undifferentiated by rank or job title who operate together on a semi-permanent basis with no direct reporting relationships and only a residual hierarchy. They function as clusters of autonomous units with decision making delegated to cluster members. It is also the cluster members, rather than those at higher levels in the organisation, who have direct contact with the customer. And members are accountable to the cluster as a whole for group performance and quality. Clusters themselves are linked by contacts between members who interface with the organisation through the residual hierarchy. Proponents of the cluster structure, such as Quinn Mills (1991) and Drucker (1992), argue that this is what organisations in the future will adopt for effective functioning. However, concrete examples of clusters are extremely difficult to find. Only one organisation can be clearly identified within the current academic literature which comes near to corresponding with the characteristics of the cluster structure.

THE CASE OF BRITISH PETROLEUM ENGINEERING

The case of British Petroleum Engineering (BPE) has been documented by Quinn Mills (1991). The organisation consists of more than 1000 professional engineers and support staff who provide technical support, engineering, procurement and contractual services to BP, its partners and to outside organisations. Before experimenting with cluster structures, BPE experienced extremely high costs and found that its engineering specialists did not communicate adequately with the project team members from client organisations.

To begin with, BPE reduced its engineering staff by 10%--through resignation and redundancy. It then initiated an internal restructuring programme. To provide customers with a better service it was decided to reduce specialisation within particular engineering disciplines. Six broad engineering resource groups were created, each having limited sub-divisions based on discipline and functional specialisms. The six broad resource groups produced 16 clusters of engineers, ranging from 30 to 60 members. The organisation is now structured around the 16 clusters, supported by three functional areas:

Business Services, Engineering Resources and Technology Development. Each of the clusters has one senior consultant whose responsibilities include coordination and integration between functional areas and cluster members. There are however, no direct reporting relationships within the clusters and the senior consultant acts as a facilitator rather than a controller. Engineers are therefore expected to be self-managing, on the basis of their skills and experience. The residual hierarchy consists of the Managing Director, General Managers and Staff Managers, and is viewed not as a centre of authority and direction but one of support. Each of the three functional areas assigns individuals to service the 16 clusters. The Engineering Resources function contains resource managers who review assignments and career progress for the 30 to 60 members of a cluster; Business Services provides people to handle contracts and to solicit business on behalf of clients; and Technology Development assigns people to handle technology issues for clients.

THE THEORETICAL ADVANTAGES OF CLUSTER STRUCTURES

Theoretically there are several potential advantages associated with the cluster structure. It results in lower administrative overheads, by significantly reducing the hierarchy and operating with no direct reporting relationships--operating with fewer levels translates into savings for the organisation. More entrepreneurial behaviour becomes possible within cluster structures, where individual workers operating relatively independently now have the autonomy to take action in relation to work and to make important decisions for themselves. The lack of reporting relationships and residual hierarchy means that the individual is freer to use his/her own skills and abilities, and can therefore be more creative.

The lack of bureaucracy and 'red tape' means that the organisation has greater flexibility and adaptability in responding to external developments. No longer hindered by burdensome rules and procedures, the organisation can change and adapt with ease. Cluster structures are also more open to new technology; since the structure consists of knowledge-based professionals acting as consultants directly with customers, they are in a position to take advantage of new technology and the opportunities that it offers.

The informality of the cluster structure allows tasks to be challenging and exciting, as individuals are no longer boxed into job descriptions; the resulting greater autonomy and discretion ensure improved retention of workers. Promotion within the cluster structure is no longer based on advancement up the traditional hierarchy. There is, therefore, much less risk of placing the wrong person in the wrong job. And because clusters operate on a semi-permanent basis, individuals have greater opportunities to identify their particular strengths and weaknesses in specific assignments.

LIMITATIONS OF THE CLUSTER STRUCTURE

There are, however, potential limitations and disadvantages. Clusters are extremely dependent on the quality of leadership available. Within clusters different people will assume a leadership role, depending on the particular assignment. The person most competent in relation to the assignment will become the leader of the cluster, but only for the duration of the assignment. Effective operation of the cluster is thus very dependent on leadership skills, which may not be available.

Motivation can also be a problem; in the absence of reporting relationships, clusters require self-motivated members, and can experience periods of high motivation at certain times and poor motivation at others.

Loss of managerial control too can be a source of difficulty. Managers accustomed to traditional control and command can feel out of depth in a structure where no direct reporting relationships exist. Organisational loyalty and commitment can come under stress as well: commitment may move away from the organisation to the cluster. Sectional interests may thus become more important than wider organisational goals. To work effectively, clusters also demand teamwork, cooperation and good interpersonal skills. Moreover, a cluster structure does not suit all work situations. High volume, low variance activities are poorly suited to clusters, since the work simply cannot be made more challenging and interesting. In such situations there is little scope for increasing responsibility and discretion.

CLUSTER-LIKE STRUCTURES

It is perhaps because of the radical, near revolutionary nature and content of the cluster structure that few organisations have adopted it; instead many of them have been experimenting with more incremental approaches to change. Cluster-like structures, while exhibiting similar characteristics to the cluster, offer a step-by-step route to organisational restructuring. The principle characteristics of cluster-like structures are outlined in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF CLUSTER LIKE STRUCTURES

Flatter Hierarchies

Wider Spans of Control

Wider Job Design

Cross Functional and Cross Hierarchical Teams

Reduced Formalisation

As will be clear, a cluster-like structure incorporates many of the new components designed to increase the ability of the organisation to meet and anticipate changes in the environment: downsizing of the hierarchy, widened spans of control, wider job design, the freeing-up of information and communication flows, the use of cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams, and a general reduction in formalisation. Reducing formalisation is most important; it minimises the degree of bureaucracy inherent in traditional structures; it allows new ideas to flourish, and lets people use their own judgement rather than relying on pre-programmed responses. Everyone has an input into decision making, diverse views are aired and taken into account, producing thereby a decision that has taken account of a range of options.

As compared to the introduction of cluster structures, no radical changes are made to the organisation. Reporting relationships are maintained in a downsized hierarchy--thus maintaining accountability. Responsibility and autonomy are increased, therefore, but at a slower pace than with cluster structures, and the structure evolves and adjusts to changing situations. Not surprisingly, examples of this more incremental approach to structure are more numerous than for clusters. In the United States various companies have experimented with cluster-like structure, most notably Rank Xerox, Du Pont, General Electric and Becton Dickinson.

THE CASE OF TEAM AER LINGUS

An interesting example of a cluster-like structure can be found in Ireland in TEAM, the maintenance and overhaul subsidiary of Aer Lingus. TEAM was officially launched as a separate company in 1991, having previously been the Maintenance and Engineering Department of the national airline. Until the new cluster-like structure was established in 1990 the Department had operated in an extremely hierarchical and bureaucratic way. Increased competition in the market for maintenance and overhaul contracts spurred the company into introducing a new form of structure which would improve its competitive advantage. TEAM was restructured into five business units, based on the products and services provided by the organisation.

The new structure reduced the number of levels in the hierarchy. Previously there had been ten levels, but the figure now stands at seven, with the main reductions occurring in the area of middle management. Correspondingly, spans of control have been widened with a new average between 6 and 7:1--twice that found in the old structure. Job design has also been widened. Previously eleven different trades existed, each with its own inner hierarchy and demarcation lines, protected by the various trades, and the resultant inflexibility hampered functional efficiency. A Trade Integration Agreement of 1988 sought to alleviate the problem by abolishing the strict division of labour, and by integrating the eleven trades into just two, namely 'avionic' and 'mechanical' tradesmen.

Formalisation affecting TEAM derives from two main sources: trade union negotiated rules; and safety, legal and engineering standards. The latter are externally imposed and will not, therefore, change to any great extent. In recent years, however, there has been a reduction in the amount of formalisation associated with union agreements, since the Trade Integration Agreement of 1988 also eliminated the rules and procedures associated with strong lines of demarcation. TEAM has also experimented with the use of cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams--overlaid on a downsized hierarchy. Examples of such teams in operation have arisen from the programme designed to improve productivity and quality. A Quality Management Steering Committee, chaired by the Chief Executive, meets monthly and is updated on progress and performance. The Committee is responsible for overall direction and policy making in relation to quality. Horizontal to this structure are Quality Improvement Teams (QITs) which are cross-functional and cross-hierarchical. Two such teams exist in TEAM, under the direction of an Executive Director. Sub-divisions of these teams, called Sub-Quality Improvement Teams (Sub-QITs), are formed in each business unit to further promote quality.

TEAM has moved towards structuring tasks on a workgroup/team basis as well. The approach has been to place emphasis on focused responsibility at all levels, and to foster team spirit within each business and support unit. For example, in the Aircraft Overhaul business unit, four teams have been created: 'widebody overhaul', 'narrow body new technology overhaul', 'narrow body mature overhaul' and 'cabin interiors'. Every attempt has been made to push decision making

down to the business unit, and each unit manager is totally responsible for the results of the unit concerned. The cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams represent a further effort to push decision making downwards, and they also act as forums for the discussion of new ideas. For example, QITs and Sub-QITs allow those on the shopfloor to have at least some influence over decisions, and a major effort has been made to decentralise decision making as far as possible. Strategic decisions are still taken at the top, but all of the business unit managers have a role to play in this, and the cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams ensure that wide and varied perspectives are brought to bear.

There has also been a strong attempt to widen the scope of individual responsibility for many workers. The business unit structure ensures that responsibility is pushed down from the top to the business unit managers; the process of delegating responsibility still further down is achieved by the wider spans of control and reductions in the unit hierarchy. These reductions allow tasks which were formerly supervised by two levels to be supervised now by one; middle management consequently spends more time facilitating work completion rather than controlling in the traditional sense. TEAM Aer Lingus is, therefore, a prime example of an organisation which has moved from a bureaucratic hierarchical form of structure to one which is more cluster-like in nature.

ADVANTAGES OF CLUSTER-LIKE STRUCTURES

Several advantages can be identified in the operation of cluster-like structures. In the first place, they result in increased flexibility. Changes in job design ensure that workers are trained across a complete range of tasks; so when demand for one particular task increases, the organisation is flexible enough to adapt to such environmental shifts. Reductions in formalisation further enhance flexibility. A more effective utilisation of labour during peaks and troughs becomes possible, and increased scope for responsibility and decision making also ensures that labour, the key resource, is utilised most effectively. Cluster-like structures lead to reductions in costs as well; in addition to the kind of savings already discussed, fewer grade levels should result in fewer of the kind of claims based on the maintenance of pay relativity between grades so frequently witnessed with tall hierarchies.

Individuals benefit from the introduction of cluster-like structures. Reductions in the hierarchy and widened spans of control result in more freedom and discretion for the individual worker. Supervisors now facilitate rather than control operations, and people no longer have someone watching over their shoulder--and consequently feel more trusted. Moreover, wider job design translates into greater opportunities within the organisation. It opens up chances for career advances not just in one area but across the whole organisation. And the use of cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams facilitates a more participative and equitable approach to decision making. This means that decisions are more likely to be acceptable to people, since they will have played a role in their formation. Increased creativity too becomes possible with cluster-like structures. Individuals are freer to be more innovative, and ideas are less likely to be blocked by overloaded managers.

Increased productivity is another potential outcome for a cluster-like structure. Widened job design and the use of cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams ought to improve output significantly, since skills can be used more effectively during peaks and troughs in demand. They also reduce the number of minor disputes caused by demarcation, which can cause major disruptions for organisations. Finally, cluster-like structures increase vertical and horizontal communications and information flows. The use of cross-functional and cross-hierarchical teams means more interaction and integration. Communication and information flow takes place not only vertically, as in the past, but also horizontally--which facilitates a wider understanding of the whole organisation rather than producing a segmented and isolated view. Increases in the flow of communication and information means that decisions can be taken more quickly and innovative ideas can flourish.

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED WITH CLUSTER-LIKE STRUCTURES

Before cluster-like structures can be introduced, several issues need to be addressed. Costs are a particularly important consideration. The biggest expense in introducing such structures is the change in job design and the resultant training costs. Organisations must undertake a careful cost/benefit analysis of such a move, to ensure that long-term paybacks justify initial expenditure; in most cases, however, long-term benefits would be expected to outweigh short-term costs. The question of promotions becomes a contentious issue once the hierarchy has been reduced, since individuals will perceive their career opportunities to be about to be diminished. However, the situation can be managed by the promotion of people horizontally rather than purely vertically within their own area. This will require a change of focus among the

workforce and a clear understanding of the benefits of such a move.

When increasing individual responsibility it is important to reward this. The reality is that while responsibility is gratefully received, compensation has to be forthcoming--monetary or otherwise. When introducing elements of the cluster-like structure a change of organisational culture may also be needed. For example, there is little point in introducing new participative decision making structures when the culture dictates that all decisions be taken at the top. If the culture of the organisation emphasises 'do as little as possible to get by', then widening job design will have little impact. Any organisation considering introducing elements of the cluster-like structure should examine its culture in order to discover whether it is in conflict with any of the elements of a new structure. If there is a conflict then management must either seek to change the culture--or perhaps modify the proposed structure to accommodate what cannot be changed.

THE FUTURE: CLUSTER OR CLUSTER-LIKE STRUCTURES

Both these forms of structure, then, have potential advantages and disadvantages, and present both opportunities as well as limitations. A key question is, which form of structure is most likely to be introduced by organisations in the near future. Taking the cluster structure first, it is a great pity that only one example can be found in the literature. The lack of practical examples poses problems for organisations seeking to replicate the cluster structure, since it is plainly very difficult for them to ascertain whether it would be suitable for their circumstances.

Factors peculiar to the BPE would suggest difficulties for organisations not possessing the same characteristics. The first major block on general transferability is that the BPE example covers mainly professional engineers rather than the blue collar, craft or white collar workers found in most organisations. One could plausibly argue that the nature of the BPE workforce has had a large bearing on the success of the structure, and that clusters may only work in organisations which employ professional workers. It is true, on the other hand, that the increase in the numbers of knowledge-based workers means that many more organisations may begin to fit the mould in the fairly near future.

The nature and style of management is another important area to consider. In a situation where managers have to cope with the loss of traditional control and authority, a more participative managerial style is clearly demanded. Yet if managers perceive the status quo to be satisfactory, why would they give up their status, power and job titles to move to a cluster structure with no reporting relationships? Another practical problem with cluster structures is their effect on salary structure. If so many members of the organisation have the same job title, should they not also all receive the same remuneration? If workers are presently in two or three different grades it would clearly be impossible to introduce the same wage for all of them immediately.

It appears, therefore, that practical difficulties, unresolved issues and the radical nature of the cluster structure will result in few organisations introducing it in the near future. Organisations will probably find the more incremental, experimental cluster-like structure a more compelling alternative. There are a number of important areas where the cluster-like structure is more appropriate than the cluster. Firstly, the cluster-like structure involves a step-by-step approach, and is thus neither as radical nor as risky as the cluster structure. Organisations can sample aspects of the cluster-like structure, and if they feel it suits their needs can experiment further. Introducing cluster-like structures does not represent an 'all or nothing' programme, and for organisations which are unsure of what changes they require, the cluster-like structure seems an excellent starting point.

For while clusters appear suitable only for professionals, cluster-like structures are obviously suitable across a more varied occupational range--as shown by the list of companies that have experimented with them. The other main problem associated with cluster structures relates to the role of culture; the more radical cluster structure demands an equally radical change in organisational culture--something which takes much time and effort. The cluster-like structure evolves over time, however, as will any cultural change associated with it. The immediate future, therefore, seems to lie with cluster-like rather than with cluster structures. While clusters may represent what organisations will eventually strive for, most will feel it premature to move in so radical a direction.

REFERENCES

- Bartlett C. & Ghoshal S. 1990, 'Matrix Management: Not a Structure but a Frame of Mind', Harvard Business Review, Volume 68, No 4, 138-145.
- Beckard R. & Harris R. 1987, Organisations Transitions: Managing Complex Change, Addison-Wesely, Reading, Mass.

Charan R. 1991, 'Networks Reshape Organisations for Results', Harvard Business Review, Volume 69, No 5. 104-115.

Clegg R. 1992, 'Modernist and Post Modernist Organisations', in Human Resource Strategies, edited by G. Salaman, Sage Publications, London.

Drucker P. 1992, 'The Coming of the New Organisation', in Human Resource Strategies, edited by G. Salaman, Sage Publications, London.

Dumaine B. 1991, 'The Bureaucracy Busters', Fortune Magazine, June 17, 27-36.

Franz H. 1991, 'Quality Strategies and Workforce Strategies in the European Iron and Steel Industry', in A Flexible Future? Prospects for Employment and Organisation, edited by P. Blyton and J. Morris, De Gruyter, New York.

Grinyer P. et al 1988, Sharpbenders: The Secrets of Unleashing Corporate Potential, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Handy C. 1989, The Age of Unreason, London, Hutchinson.

Jaques E. 1990, 'In Praise of Hierarchy', Harvard Business Review, Volume 68, No 1, 127-133.

Kilmann R. 1984, Beyond the Quick Fix, California, Jossey Bass.

Kilmann R. 1989, 'A Completely Integrated Programme for Creating and Maintaining Organisational Success', Organisational Dynamics, Summer 1989, Volume 18, No. 1, 4-19.

Moss Kanter R. 1983, The Change Masters: Corporate Entrepreneurs at Work, Unwin, London.

Moss Kanter, R. 1989, When Giants Learn to Dance, Boston, Unwin.

Naisbitt M. 1982, Mega Trends: Ten New Directions Shaping Our Lives, Warner, New York.

Pettigrew A. & Whipp R. 1991, Managing Change for Competitive Success, Blackwell, Cambridge, Mass.

Quinn Mills D. 1992, The Rebirth of the Corporation, Wiley, New York.

Scott Morton, M. 1991, The Corporation of the 1990s: Information Technology and Organisational Transformation, Oxford University Press, New York.

Walton R. 1995, 'From Control to Commitment in the Workplace', Harvard Business Review, Volume 64, No. 2, 76-84.

Wilson D. & Rosenfeld R. 1990, Managing Organisations: Text, Readings and Cases, McGraw Hill, London.

Siobhan, *Lecturer, Department of Management, University of Limerick. The author wishes to acknowledge the financial support of TEAM Aer Lingus and the Irish American Partnership, and the helpful comments of Patrick Flood. This article was completed before recent developments concerning the future of Aer Lingus.

DETAILS

Subject:	Trends; Innovations; Clusters; Changes; Advantages; Workers; Competitive advantage; Job design; Organizational structure; Technological change; Teams; Communication; Decision making; Modernism; Information technology
Business indexing term:	Subject: Workers Competitive advantage Job design Organizational structure
Company / organization:	Name: British Petroleum Co PLC; Ticker: BP; DUNS: 21-004-2669
Classification:	5400: Research & development; 2320: Organizational structure
Publication title:	IBAR; Dublin
Volume:	14
Issue:	2
Pages:	57
Number of pages:	12

Publication year:	1993
Publication date:	1993
Publisher:	De Gruyter Brill Sp. z o.o., Paradigm Publishing Services
Place of publication:	Dublin
Country of publication:	Poland
Publication subject:	Business And Economics
ISSN:	03321118
Source type:	Scholarly Journal
Language of publication:	English
Document type:	Journal Article
Accession number:	00802219
ProQuest document ID:	207630242
Document URL:	https://may.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/innovations-organisational-structure/docview/207630242/se-2?accountid=12309
Copyright:	Copyright Irish Business and Administrative Research 1993
Last updated:	2024-11-29
Database:	ProQuest One Academic

LINKS

[Search for full text at Maynooth University](#), [Search for full-text at Maynooth University](#)

Database copyright © 2026 ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved.

[Terms and Conditions](#) [Contact ProQuest](#)