COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES IN SOME EU COUNTRIES

Ioana Raluca Goldbach
ioanagolbach@yahoo.com
Valahia University of Târgoviște

The comparative analysis of organizational structures highlights similarities and differences between different factors influencing a company in its way of operation with the internal and/or external environment. The paper analyzes the organizational structures of some top companies from England, France and Romania that influence/determine the cultural organizational values and the norms elaborated and implemented, which, in time, become moral values and norms that acquire a social meaning, which means that they have been accepted by all the members of the organization.

Keywords: organizational structure, organizational behaviour, comparative analysis.

JEL Code: M14; O57

Introduction

Compared management also contains comparative analyses from different cultures or nations, comparisons between different organizations helping the managers identify similarities and differences between them, to increase the organizations' functionality, effectiveness and efficiency. To increase the performances of a company, be it on the micro or macro level, the development of its organizational structure is necessary. Before analyzing the organizational structure in the companies of the EU countries and of Romania, it is necessary to understand its definition and contents. We need to emphasize the fact that these countries differ from one another by their economic development and cultural level.

Another important activity concerning the organizational structure is the analysis of the company's objectives, followed by the definition of the necessary activity and the determination of their content, of the divisions, of the organizational structure and, finally the overall assessment. The organizational structure is also affected by the determining factors and by its elaboration principles.
With a relatively well-built organizational structure, a society may not be successful, but with an improper organizational structure, no company of the developing countries can survive for long on the market.

1. The organizational structure of the British companies

The government principles rely on tradition, convention and previous facts. The society is heterogeneous, multi-cultural, and multinational largely due to the collapse of the colonial empire. The British society is conservative, observing tradition in the operation of its institutions, maintaining the monarchic tradition and promoting a respectful attitude towards the achievements of the colonial history. The social structure is divided into the middle class and the working class. At present, the British capitalism is a combination between government control and liberalism, having a mixed ownership structure: public and private.

The business environment relies on a corporate economy managed by a technocrat elite - a moderate intervention of the government, legislatively supervised by the parliamentary democracy system is accepted.

British companies are managed by a managing board constituting the main decisional unit of a company and the source of power in an organization. A public limited company (PIC) has to have a managing board made up of at least two managers appointed by shareholders. One of them is the chairman, who may be the general manager of the company, as well. Or else, the general manager shall often be appointed administrative manager. Beside the chairman, there will be a secretary of the company, responsible for the observance of the law and for administration. The other members of the board are not subjected to restrictions. In general, there is a financial manager and other managers representing the main operational units of the company. A holding whose structure reunites several

companies shall have several such boards, usually under the same chairman. They may be named local boards and are made up of local managers.

A private limited company (Ltd) must have only one manager, appointed by its owners. Big companies may have non-executives whose theoretical role is to oversee the activity from objective positions while their practical role is to ensure contact with the government and with the establishment. Most of the time, these jobs are held by aristocrats, politicians and retired public servants. The board shall then appoint an executive committee made up of executive managers and a managing director to run the company. Under the board level, the organizational nature becomes less clear. The traditional British concept of organization is a vertical stratified pyramid, based on a vertical management chain.

Its main goal is to transmit down the hierarchy the orders from the top. The organizational charts do not reflect a scheme of the company, but an image of the social hierarchy. The British companies' management requests and requires certain qualities and skills from the managers. The most appreciated quality is the capacity to efficiently preside over the meetings and to establish good relations with employees.

1.1. Specifics of the organizational structure of the British companies

The great British companies are organized as holdings, having deeply decentralized structures. Within the headquarters there is a small number of hierarchic levels and of managers having coordination and control (particularly financial control) responsibilities. The branches are, in general, structured on product or groups of products and enjoy decisional autonomy for the manufacture and sales activities.

The results of a study carried out on British companies shows that, the holding, as a juridical entity and a management instrument, has the following features:

- it has a stable headquarters, where a lower number of people work, coordinating several branches of which many are the property of the mother company;
- each branch has its own Managing board made up of employees of the branch and of the mother company; each branch produces and sells, under its own brand, and few exchanges take place between branches.

The holding, as an organizational entity, has a marked flexibility, materialized in: elaboration of criteria and indicators of economic efficiency, method of distribution of material, financial, human and informational resources towards branches and components, distribution of branches within divisions, analysis of economic-financial results.

The cultural organizational values and norms are elaborated and gradually adopted and, similarly, implemented in the organization, as well, in time, until it comes to run its activity according to moral values and norms, finally acquiring a social meaning, by which we understand that they have been accepted by all the organization members. But, any action initiated by the manager is limited by the proper responsibility, and we can speak here of an aware and permanent self-control, favoring self-organization/ self-discipline and self-control, which, due to the managerial ability, are passed on easily from the manager to the individuals of the organization.

This makes it possible for social and moral discipline to appear and grow, which, at a certain moment, becomes the second nature for any Englishman. But all these rely on a large experience acquired and stored in time. They accept and impose a liberal attitude permanently giving credit to the freedom of the creative spirit.

In Great Britain, within the organizational structures, we can note a decentralization trend and a low managerial apparatus taking care prevalently of the elaboration of overall strategies and, eventually, of the financial control exercise.

The largest part of the companies are holdings having, as a rule, product-specialized branches. Among them, sometimes there occur communication problems, due to the lack of functionality in subdivisions (branches), which are little integrated into the general system.

Within this organizational structure, means of communication and coordination are efficient on all levels and for each existing branch, a Managing Board and a general manager are appointed, who are to implement all decisions and global strategies, established on the central level.

Within each branch under the control of the general manager, there are four managers, at least, specialized in manufacture, marketing, human resources and financial-accounting activities.

Within the divisionary holding, compared to the simple one, for different activity fields or for different products, there are organized divisions within which there are branches – a process of diversification of activities. In headquarters, there are a low number of employees. Within each branch, there is a

Managing Board which shall include a member from the central level as well. Specialists appreciate that this structure is flexible: the top management grants funds to branches, establishes the performance objectives, monitors their achievement degree, requires performance in sales, sometimes regrouping the branches in a division. A disadvantage of such a structure is that the branches' managers exchange few ideas, which determine a decrease of the synergy effects.

Next, we shall present the organizational structure of **"Kettleby Foods"**, a company which is a part of the Samworth Brothers Group holding, which produce traditional food like countryside pie, roast beef etc.

Samworth Brothers is a private limited company. Its object is the production of food and take-out. It is quite curious that this company does not own its own brand seeing that it produces for other distributors, who demand that products should bear their names or slogan.

"Kettleby Foods" has an organizational structure similar to that of the other divisions of the group. As an autonomous business, the company has four managers: a Managing Director, a Finance Manager, a Manufacture Manager and a Commercial Manager. The business has five senior managers namely: HR Manager, Technical Manager, Engineering Manager, Production Development Manager and Supply Manager.

The organizational structure of Kettleby Foods has divisions on products. In this structure, each division contains the main operational resources it needs to be able to pursue its objectives without interacting with other individuals.

In the organizational structure of the British company, information travels from one level to the next, both horizontally and vertically, which determines a consultative (participative) management.

The managers' responsibilities are delegated from the medium to the lower management levels, as the latter are directly in touch with the employees and may control and motivate them more easily. Here, the control has a low centralization degree, seeing that planning and financial control go to the top managers. For the other elements, the control is decentralized. This divisional structure per product is flexible.

2. Organizational structure in the French companies

The French state centralism is the political answer to the dimension and diversity of France and involves the idea of stability which transcends and absorbs the regionalisms and excludes any concept based on federalism or delegation of power. Centralized, well-ordered and legalist, the political structure is a model for the business environment. Administration on vertical, net divisions, well-ordered hierarchies, centralized planning are features of the companies, and of the State, as well.

2.1. Organization of companies in the Grandes Ecoles tradition

Limited companies may be joint-stock companies – Societe Anonyme (SA) or private companies, Société à responsabilité limitée (SRL).

A joint-stock company management may take two forms:

- a managing board made up of elected shareholders (conseil d'administration), whose chairman is appointed by the board and has total managerial responsibility. The board may appoint one or more general managers to support the chairman
- a dual management system, consisting in a surveillance board (conseil de surveillance) and a managing board (conseil directoire) made up of between two and seven managers. They are appointed by the surveillance board and manage the company under the board's control. The managing board votes according to the majority principle.

Limited companies are, in general, small, with maximum 50 shareholders, who appoint one or several managers. Irrespective of their dimensions, the French institutions are well-centralized. Behind an omnipotent general manager (president directeur general - PDG), there is a strict hierarchy of executive managers, organized according to the company's operational axes, with rigid management links. Usually, there are much more intermediate management levels than in a German or a Dutch company. All the communication and authority lines lead, vertically, to the PDG. The matrix-type management has met a glorious age in the business environments of several cultures, but it has not been quite successful in France.

The connections between departments are hard to establish and the result is that they pass, whenever possible, through the centre. The hierarchic structures, promoted in the French management, stimulate the inequality of chances to get to power. These structures are highly bureaucratic – the system creates career difficulties, by the promotion at job according to restrictive,

hereditary, professional cast and richness criteria. The institutions assuring the exclusive training of the management staff - Grandes Ecoles – have a restrictive character, since the places in these schools are reserved for the rich, who have benefited from a special educational system.

Admission in Grandes Ecoles is highly demanding and conditioned by the graduation from university courses. Only 5% of the university graduates obtain diplomas from these schools of future leaders. The PDG (The Manager General Chairman) must be an authoritative person, with high technical skills, paying more attention to details than his peers from other countries. He/she behaves naturally, in a way that in other countries would be considered as dictatorial.

Delegation of authority is low – the job description is a detailed list of responsibilities and sequences of reports. The accent falls more on supervision than on control. As for the collaboration of the employees in a team, this is little used.

The team concept is reduced to a group of specialists in a certain field, under the leadership of an incontestable leader. The professional relations between colleagues are based more on rivalry than on collaboration – as a consequence and extension of the extremely competitive system, promoted by schools.

As for the company meetings, they have a pre-established structure, with a detailed agenda. Their goal is, mainly to inform and coordinate; they are not a debate or decision forum. A meeting or any other <public> circumstance is, firstly, an opportunity for the manager to assert his/her authority. Consensus is not a major goal. The main goal is to obtain clarification and consent.

Communication in the company is achieved by studies and reports, which present significant elements in the decisional process. Oral presentations and discussions meant to disseminate information or collect necessary data are seldom used. It is the circulation of reports that is important, which must be comprehensive, clear, well-structured, well-written and well-presented.

Promotion is generally done according to experience criteria, corroborated with professional education and competence. In the organizations based on vertical hierarchies and specialization, it seldom happens for somebody to be promoted directly from a department to the other, if they have not been especially trained to reach the top.

Qualification in the company is little developed, compared to other countries and has in view technical qualification rather than the general management. There is a marked loyalty to the company. Even though French people like individualism and autonomy, at the same time they need to feel included in a protective social unit.

The French management style is authoritarian - friendly, which requires the consulting of a close circle of counselors to scientifically substantiate decisions and adoption them individually. A feature of the French managerial style is its centralized authoritarianism. The terms *management* and *manager*, of Anglo-Saxon origin, have not been assimilated by the French organizational culture.

To conclude, the French management style appears as an authoritarian, centralized, individualistic, bureaucratic and still viable one. To try to suggest a possible opening of this management style and a shift of its accent from the manager's supreme authority on a participative organizational culture and an intuitive management, we shall synthesize some aspects approached by the French author, Meryem le Saget in *Intuitive Management.* For a company, it is vitally important to anticipate the changes of the market, to prepare timely, efficient answers to these modifications.

Meryem le Saget emphasizes the importance that the "company-market" couple acquires under these circumstances: "the speed at which the company must react in front of the market and in front of the increasing demand for diversity are the origin of the current organization-market relation". Thus, a transition is recorded concerning the hierarchic and organizational structure of the organization, from the pyramid to the network.

The network relies on the flexible structures which it uses. This trend towards flexibility is participative, not by the abandon of power, but by another way of regarding authority. Organization as a network or as a matrix combines the traditional structures on functions with the horizontal ones, which put resources in common. The project teams within the network have unity through their capacity of self-organization and by a clear vision on the mission to accomplish. Nevertheless, in France the matrix-like organization has not grown roots, since "in France, if you speak to people about mentality change, they get blocked."

The network cannot find a fertile ground in the excessively centralized organizational structures, as it relies on the delegation of authority and responsibilization, as well as on collective creativity, being closely connected to the principles of reality, to the company's external and internal environment, made up of market, clients, competition, manufacture, team operation, cohesion,

information circulation. Both in matters of transmission of the manager's vision and in information circulation, natural communication has a determining role.

Communication, as Socrates once said, is the art of getting focused on the interlocutor, to ask him/her questions wisely, so that he himself/she herself may answer the questions.

Communication requires a thorough listening through empathy, which consists in entering the other's universe, to understand him/her and, thus, to perceive the facts from his/her perspective, as well. It is important to have in mind that each member of an organization does not communicate anything else except what the other has been able to understand. Any successful communication shall be a consensus on a hypothesis, a consensus built on stages, in a protective climate, of respect for the others' ideas.

Communication means the transmission of information and meaning, by respecting the communication principles: integrity – the simple and truthful speaking, the acceptance of each one's sensitivity and emotion, the real wish of having a communication with the audience. Communication does not mean only a rigid exchange of instructions and information; it means being with the others.

The real motivation of the personnel comes from self-motivation, from the result of efforts and social group cohesion. One desideratum towards which we must tend is to push the total quality up to quality of relations between people. The best manager will always be the one who can find a reward in what he accomplishes with his/her team and who can create communities of membership and meaning.

Above, we have tried to give a cultural-cognitive approach of the managerial phenomenon and of the interactions it involves, which, though at first sight might seem perfectionist, with idealizing accents hard to achieve, is still the only one that can assure success in an atomic and strongly competitive economic environment.

2.2. Structural organization of the French companies

The structural organization is closely connected to the French managers' perception regarding the superiority of intellectual work, to the attention paid by them to their social positions, to their tendency towards giving orders. Therefore, in French companies the organizational structures are specific of a "command" management, since they have their origins in the educational system.

The organizational structures of French companies have the most hierarchic levels, and differences between salaries are significant but, because they also show strong tendencies of autonomy of the individual, reconciliation between such tendencies makes the French companies' organizational structures very complex.

In France, they pay importance to specialization, the delegation of authority is not really practiced, and there are too many top managers. The Manager General – chairman has a higher authority than his peers from other countries, since in most cases, he is also a shareholder of that company. Even if there is a Managing board, he claims its right of adopting by himself certain decisions. We appreciate that the French management has not been able to identify a performance-yielding management style, in relation to the great economic powers. France is well-known for an insufficiency of its organization model, in spite of all the actions taken in this respect, which does not allow the French companies to reach competitive performance levels.

In France, we may note a trend towards bureaucracy, towards the autocratic style which determines: the organization as hierarchic pyramids, power and authority centralization, hierarchic control, centralization of decisions and pronounced specialization, the use of some complex organizational structures, such as: divisions with a operational and of general quarters character, inter-division teams and groups etc; existence of several hierarchic levels which determines the appearance of some communication issues, isolation of employees from the lower level, feeling sometimes hostility towards superiors, isolation of the individual, in general, as a result of the lack of cooperation, communication, consulting etc.

The French have organizational structures and with notable differences between salaries. Anyway, during the last years, there has been noted a tendency of practicing a participative management, the continuous adaptation to the EU socio-economic context, application of a modern system of adopting the strategic and practical decisions.

Following some studies carried out within some companies from England and France, it has been noted that, in France, specialization is preferred; coordination is scarce, and top managers are numerous. In the French companies, the company's chairman (who has a much higher decisional power than those in companies from other countries) has a very important role, as he concentrates a great part of the decisional authority. Even when there is a Managing board, he is the one who, actually,

makes decisions in the company. Such authority concentration on the chairman's level is explainable, since, in most cases, the chairman is the major capital owner in the company which he manages.

M. Crozier characterizes this structure of the French companies' activities by the "isolation of the individual and a lack of constructive cooperation activities, on the one hand, and the isolation of the personnel from the lower levels and the lack of communication between the individuals from different levels, on the other hand". These might be the reasons for hostility to superiors - which leads to the use of some rather sophisticated reconciliation mechanisms, because authority is found between the official rules and unofficial social pressures. On each hierarchic level, the officially-established rules by the structural organization defend the individual prerogatives from the arbitrary interferences from the higher levels, providing a high autonomy degree. At the same time, there are pushed pressures with tendencies of power abuse, by which they intend to extend some rights and prerogatives on other hierarchic levels, as well. We may appreciate that, under the conditions in which the high-level managers own great power, such power is limited by the lower-level personnel's resistance.

2.3. Analysis of the organizational structure of the Charles Faraud S.A.S. society, whose headquarters are in Avenue de Gladenbach, B.P. 33-Z.A. LA TAPY – 84170 Monteux, France. The juridical form of the society is "anonymous society" with a completely private social capital. The activity field of the company is represented by the manufacture of vegetable and fruit products.

The organizational structure of this kind of company is one of compartment-per-product type, having only one product manager, who has authority on several divisions.

The organizational structure of the French company is made up of a high number of hierarchic levels, which determines a bureaucratic management. This extended organizational structure is favored by the fact that office people and specialists are called for to elaborate decisions.

The vertical centering of the information, communication and authority channels allows a high degree of centralization of decisions and the manager's (chairman's) wish to have total control on decisions. Information starts from the lower levels of the hierarchic structure, and after that decisions are elaborated on top.

Given that the work division horizontally and vertically is deepened, there is a risk that all difficulties be transmitted towards the top of the pyramid. On each hierarchic level, the rules established officially through the structural organization defend the individual prerogatives from arbitrary interferences of the upper levels. The result is a high autonomy degree.

3. The organizational structure of the Romanian companies

An important role in the changes imposed by the transition to the market economy goes to the economic organizations' management which must direct their attention towards:

- identification of changes that need to be carried out in companies, preliminary to the successive states that must be reached and to the factors influencing such changes;
- knowing and applying the managerial mechanisms by which these changes can be promoted and controlled

In this context, we have to emphasize the fact that the current managerial education is largely focused on maintaining a company in a state of equilibrium and on the prevention of the causes that might determine the loss of this state. Less attention is paid to the study of the disequilibrium states occurred, of the causes of such states, as well as to the possibilities of projecting and controlling the change processes necessary to get over of such states.

The features of the development of the Romanian reform are:

1. The sudden demolition of the old economic structures, without replacing them with something efficient for the society. It has generated chaos in the national economy. The rather alarming decrease of the industrial and agricultural manufacture has meant the loss of a number of foreign markets, the domestic market turning into a market for the foreign products. This situation has generated chronic unemployment, a continuous degradation of the national fixed capital, an aggressive inflation and the shocking fall of the national currency, a stunning increase of the prices of consumer goods and services, except for the price for manpower.

2. The lack of a concrete coherent programme, correlated and coordinated, to create a really modern and efficient economy from an economic, social and ecological perspective. Often, the macro-economic actions were in contradiction with the real needs of development of the micro-economy, leading not only to an artificial financial block, but also to the hindering of the national production, and importing more expensive similar products, for whose payment heavy loans were contracted outside the country.

3. The third feature consisted in the promotion – unlike the behavior of some developed countries – of an excessive liberalism, and of some behaviors getting the country back to the interwar economic-social past. It affected a high number of companies in industry and agriculture, and also in tourism, scientific research, education, culture, health, as well as the population who had been the beneficiary of their activities.

4. On the whole, a transition is developing, which has at its heart a system of primitive capital accumulation, seeing that a great part of it crosses the border. Here, we can largely find the economic cause of the moral crisis and of the increasingly alarming proportions of corruption which has been ceaselessly eroding the economic bases of our state, contributing, at the same time, to the so well-known depression and disgust of the great majority of the population.

3.1. Specifics of the organizational structures of the Romanian companies

Under the current circumstances, most Romanian companies are characterized by a lack of adaptation of organization and management in relation to the changes of environment, the latter determining a somber perspective regarding the future. In this case, a real restructuration process is necessary.

As for the comparison between the Romanian companies' situation and that of foreign companies, it intends to gradually reduce the difference between the autochthonous managerial capacity, compared to the one that should allow us to reach a level similar to that of the competitive industrial systems of the European Union. Though, at a close look, we may note that different market economy models are singled out almost exclusively by some aspects of the macroeconomic leadership. The companies' founders exert influence over the manifestations of the organizational culture, beginning with the name and logo of the company and continuing with the behavioral formal symbols and norms (established by organization rules, where applicable). In very many small companies, owners are also managers, they have established the company's culture without being restricted by habits, since the impression left depends on their age, education, experience, personality, or the activity's specifics.

Small and medium-size companies (SMC) have recorded a spectacular development during the recent years, being considered as having a key role in the current economic context, considering their specifics - mobility, crisis-resistance capacity, dynamism, innovating potential, adaptation to the signals coming from the market.

In Romania, there operate:

a) joint stock companies have on top the Shareholders' General Meeting among whom the shares are shared and having the right of making decisions depending on the quota they own. As a rule, the one who owns the majority package of shares also has the position of chairman (manager general) of the Managing Board and is wholly responsible for management.

b) limited trade companies, managed by a surveillance board and a managing board made up of a number of managers between five and seven and appointed by the surveillance board under whose control they manage the company.

The centralization degree is high, there is a single centre for decision elaboration or confirmation, a high distance from power, the hierarchic levels are pretty many in number and far positioned from this decisional centre.

The decisional process in made up of two steps. One expansion step, when the opinions of the group authorized for counseling are gathered and the second step - of concentration - of condensation into a unique concrete form of the decision.

There is a continuous process of reassertion and re-demonstration of one's managerial abilities. These precepts shape a single vision, making us draw the following conclusions:

-the leader, beside the formal investiture, needs managerial knowledge, as well;

-the system is organized in a rigid hierarchic structure, of an unwritten law nature, which combines with a technocrat structure.

-it operates predominantly with strategies including the individual in the system and stimulating his loyalty to it;

-organization is accomplished with the observance of the principle of concordance between the operators' personal features and particulars of responsibilities to accomplish;

- the formal leader-leader dualism is visible;

-there is postulated the necessity of selection of personnel on categories of specific activities and responsibilities, the need to train and guide the personnel.

3.2. Study of organization within S.C. "Dorna Brânzeturi" S.A.

The economic company analyzed is S.C. "DORNA BRÂNZETURI" S.A., a "joint stock company", with mixed, wholly private capital. The company was established in 1999 and is the third of the five companies of DORNA group. The company's activity field is represented by the product manufacture.
The organizational structure of this company includes: The managing board – the supreme management body of the company, made up of three administrators who are shareholders. It provides the company's current management and accomplishes the managing board's decisions within the company's activity limits. A division of the management work and a productive spirit are required according to the organizational structure, as well, which relies on a managerial initiative, just for the promotion of the new, of cooperating simply, efficiently, going beyond some rigid compartment division and proving maximum responsibility towards the company.

Information and communication are vertically-centered, hence a technocratic management. The hierarchic levels are many in number, control is intense, which determines a high centralization degree. The organizational structure is not a flexible one.

Information and communication are vertically-centered, hence a technocratic management. Hierarchic levels are many, control is intense, which determines a high centralization degree. The organizational structure is not a flexible one.

Conclusions

The organization function (F.O.) is a management function within which one can delimit two main subdivisions: the whole organization of the company, materialized in the setting of the organizational structure and of the informational system. By means of these two components of the management system, the organization structure - subordinated to the achievement of the company's fundamental objectives - is ensured, and is exerted by the organization's top management and sensibly conditions the efficiency of the management process as a whole.

The second major category is the organization of the organizational functions; it is preponderantly qualitative, being achieved mainly on the medium and lower management level.

We should have in mind the double character of the organization – a function of the management and the field itself – which are not mutually exclusive, on the contrary, they are complementary, naturally subordinated to the organization's fundamental objectives.

The evolution of a company is determined by two major factors - competitiveness and profitability – which, in their turn, depend on the organization's structure. F.O. has a pronounced creative, dynamic and flexible character, so that it facilitates, to a maximum extent, the operation of some performance-achieving activities (O.Nicolescu, I. Verboncu, M.Profiroiu, 2010, p.183).

In our vision, the flexible management determines the intense and quasi-continuous modification of the constructive and operational parameters of the organization's management, which confers dynamism to its activities and results. At present, there is the so-called flexibility paradox, which consists of the fact that flexibility is valueless, if not combined with the stability which maintains the company's identity and continuity.

In Great Britain the companies' organizational structure is flexible, while in France and Romania it is characterized by rigidity, a feature present in all the companies analyzed, from where it results the need of flexibility for organizations. Total flexibility makes the organization impossible, generating chaos. For the implementation of this mutation, several action plans are recommended (L.M. Constantinescu, 2006, p. 149):

- the change of the value system, giving up the traditionally approached stability. Managers must aim at the achievement of an equilibrated dynamism or of a dynamic equilibrium;

The relative diminution of the managerial apparatus, compared to the amplification of the organization's size and, not seldom, even absolute diminution. The few management apparatuses present - regarding the organization's flexibility and dynamism - multiple advantages: easier observation of the new elements and their operative distribution on the level of the whole management apparatus; easier change of the content itself and of the achievement of the management activity, for the implementation of changes on this level; easier obtaining of acceptance and promotion of new ideas, given the low number of people involved.

- the development within the organizational structures of divisions with an operational and general headquarters character, with an increased accent on those divisions contributing directly to the projection and implementation of exchanges in the organization. On the background of proliferation of informatics, there takes place the development of some powerful divisions of planning, marketing, organization, methods and techniques which, in

essence, assure – by the elaborated decisional variants, by the fundamental changes in the management system, by the conception and the executers' works – exactly the flexibility and dynamism features, which are necessary to a competitive company;

- the quick modification of the management system parameters in their whole, or/and on the subsystem level – organizational structure, informational system, decisional and methodological system.

The comparative analysis of the organizational structures in England, France and Romania has highlighted the fact that, in England we can find a consultative management, where all the hierarchic levels are consulted in making decisions; in France, a bureaucratic management, where the communication channels are vertically-centered, and decisions are made on top of the pyramid, while in Romania companies are characterized by a bureaucratic management and by decisions made only on the hierarchy's top levels. The number of hierarchic levels of the Romanian companies is high, the centralization degree of private companies is low, while it is rather high in state companies.

As for the organizational structure of the Romanian companies is concerned, we may note that a mutation has occurred from the mechanistic type structure, characterized by a strongly formalized compartment-division, a hierarchic exacerbation, a predilection for written information, a stress laid on formal documents of organization etc. to the organic-type structure, which is less formalized, concomitantly centralized and decentralized where cooperation, consultation, creativity and communications are of primordial importance, and the main organizational subdivisions are modifying almost continuously their dimensions and components to cope with the continuously changing situations.

In British companies, the number of hierarchic steps and the control degree are low, hence a decentralization tendency results, while in French companies the number of hierarchic levels is high and control is intense, which leads to a strong centralization. The centralization degree of the Romanian private companies is low, while within the state companies, it is high.

In England, information travels both vertically and horizontally, in France it travels from the bottom to top, and in Romania, information travels from the low hierarchic levels towards the upper ones of the pyramid. In the British companies, the organizational structure is flexible, and in France and Romania it is rigid inside - a common feature, present in all the companies, under analysis - and there is a need for a high integration degree and for good relations between departments.

In the managerial practice, organizations are not limited to a single type of organizational structure. The best organizational structure is the one making the organization able to interact with the environment by channeling, the effective and efficient guiding of its people and resources, for them to be able to answer the consumers'/clients' needs.

A flexible and dynamic management generates multiple positive effects for an organization (*Purdea, D, Hadi, J., Manole, I. 2004, p. 152)*:

- It assures concordance between the dynamics of the organizational management features and the demands coming from the organization's marketing environment;
- It impresses a marked dynamism and adaptability to the organization's activities, which influences the obtaining of high economic, social and ecological performances for the organization;
- It favors the accomplishment of an organizational architecture of a holonic type, characterized by the division of organization into modules (holons) with a pronounced operational autonomy and the development of operational relations, both between groups of subdivisions, and on the organization level.

The use of motivational elements of a participative nature, complementing the traditional modalities of individual motivation of the company's employees and the promotion of a participative management style, of a participative leadership and culture, are elements of major importance for the intensification of collaboration, of consulting and of involvement of employees in the managerial processes and relations, which allow the achievement of equilibrium between the participative and the imperative elements, which in the modern companies favor the obtaining of a high performance, the development of an organizational culture, fostering the concentration on the achievement of the company's objectives, of good human relations and employees' cohesion, which diminishes the potential and open conflicts and/or confers a constructive character for their settlement.

The organizational structure determines the organization's capacity to answer to change and, more often than not, one can admit that an organic organization does not own a well-defined organizational chart, so that its operations are permanently being redefined (T. Burns, G.M. Stalker, 1995, p. 45).

In the *"organizational behavior congruence"* model, the basic hypothesis is the fact that each organization has a maximum effectiveness when its main components are congruent with one another, and the effectiveness problems are caused by the managerial / organizational factors, due to the lack of congruence between the organizational components.

The relation between the four components of this model – organizational task/activity; people who must fulfill the organizational responsibilities; formal organizational mechanisms, including different structures, processes, systems, etc. – projected to stimulate /facilitate the organizational responsibilities' fulfillment as well as the non-formal organizational mechanisms, including the templates of communication, of power and influence, the values and norms characterizing the effective operation of one company and, by analyzing the activity type that must be run and the employees who run the respective activity, we can determine their congruence level.

References

1. *Burduș, E. (1997), Management comparat (Compared Management). Editura Economică, București*
2. *Burns, T., Stalker, G.M. (1995), Structural Inertia and Organizational Change, Institute Tavistock of London*
3. *Constantinescu, L., M., (2006), Managementul calității totale (Total Quality Management), Editura Bibliotheca, Targoviste, p.149*
4. *Former, R. (1986) Advances in International Comparative Management, London, Vol.l*
5. *Ionescu Gh. Gh., (2001), Management organizațional (Organizational Management). editura Tribuna Economică, București*
6. *Hofstede, G. (2001), Managementul structurilor multiculturale, Software-ul gândirii (Multicultural Structure Management, the Thinking Software), editura Economică, București*
7. *lonescu, Gh., Gh., Cazan, E., Negruşa, A., L. (2001), Management organizațional (Organizational Management), editura Tribuna Economică, București*
8. *Le Saget, M. (1996), Management intuitiv (Intuitive Management), editura Economică, București*
9. *Mathews, J., (1996), Holonic Organizational Architecture in Human Systems Management, vol.15, nr.1*
10. *Nath, R. (1988), Comparative Management, A Regional View, Cambridge, Massachusetts*
11. *Nicolescu, O., Verboncu, I., Profiroiu, M., Starea de sănătate a managementului din România în 2010 (Health Condition of the Romanian Management in 2010), editura Prouniversitaria, Bucuresti, p.183*
12. *Purdea, D, Hadi, J., Manole, I. (2004), Management comparat (Compared Management), editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, p.152*