

# Structural configurations for organizations

[Business](#), [Management](#)



Structural Configurations of Organizations Henry Mintzberg's explanation of structural configurations is based on the process of clustering various organizational functions into groups and displaying their relative size. This includes clout and is in response to different objectives and external challenges. However, other authors have also established different concepts of organizational structures (Csaszar & Felipe, 2012).

Sally Helgesen's approach to organization structure is based on the fact that the web serves as a tool that enables constant organization and reorganization of enterprises. From the management point of view, this approach is credible. For instance, it is not possible for an organization to achieve optimum flexibility and specialization without continuous evolution of its structure. Web inclusion as a concept initiates new connections and link people thus exposing them to new organization methods. Consequently, continuous improvements on the existing organization structures can be initiated (Helgesen, 2005).

Additional approach to structural configurations remained formulated by four authors including Veld, Schaap, Termeer and Twist in their book, "Autopoiesis and Configuration Theory". Based on their approach, organizations operate within diverse environments and each has its individual way of integrating into the surrounding in terms of technological and structural configuration (Veld et al, 1991). The key point in this case is the fact that managers should view organizations as structural entities and avoid unnecessary fragmentation that would otherwise jeopardize the effectiveness of organizational activities.

The pros of Helgesen's approach over Mintzberg are the initiation of

continuous improvement in organization structure, improved flexibility and specialization. However, process of continuously transiting into a new organizational structure may be complex and consequently disadvantageous. Similarly, advantage of the second approach is that the effectiveness of the organization is improved by centralization of its activities because they are viewed as a whole entity and not irrelevantly fragmented.

#### References

- Csaszar, Felipe A. 2012. " Organizational structure as a determinant of performance: Evidence from mutual funds." *Strategic Management Journal* 33, no. 6: 611-632. Business Source Complete, EBSCOhost (accessed July 2, 2015).
- Helgesen, S. (2005). *The web of inclusion: Architecture for building great organizations*. Washington, D. C: Beard Books.
- Veld, R. J., Schaap, L., Termeer, C. J. A. M., & Twist, M. J. W. (1991). *Autopoiesis and Configuration Theory: New Approaches to Societal Steering*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.