

## OPTIMISATION OF ORGANISATION STRUCTURE AS AN ADAPTATION MECHANISM

*Pavlo Denysenko*  
*Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine*

In the situation of transition economy one of the biggest problem is adaptation of firm activity to new forms and rules of business-making. It can be achieved by restructuring of organization system of management as a mechanism of changes implementation. Organizational forms of management in the conditions of vagueness of market and instability of external environment are expected to be characterized by the high degree of adaptability to the external environment and strengthening of role of operative management. It generates a tendency of restructuring to more decentralized and flexible structures in which particular employee gets larger responsibility, but at the same time rights to use assets and of personnel management are broadened out.

Main typical defects of present organization systems are:

- excessive dependence of structural subdivisions upon the highest leaders and overloading of these leaders;
- presence of great number of general director deputies with intersecting ranges of responsibility;
- appearance along with subdivisions, typical for the command methods of management, additional subdivisions related directly to the market economy but with unformed yet functions, and, as a result, doubling of functions;
- absence of serious informative support of enterprise and its subdivisions activity;
- absence or just formal presence of special economic-financial subdivision or worker responsible for the results of financial activity;
- absence of changes control managers and group of the strategic planning.

Nowadays the classical linear-functional structures of management are used only in small and partly in the middle-size companies. Big corporation prefer divisional approach. It means that first leaders and managers delegate part of their functions and even rights to the lower levels managers. It brings more importance (and therefore more costs) to the control departments.

Another aspect is a new way of decision-making process with domination of collectively approved projects and plans, etc. instead of individual orders of main leader. Positive sides of this trend are:

- Group has much more amount of important knowledge than a single expert. It may be use effectively in project-making.
- Collectively approved change is more acceptable for each member of the group. It will make an implementation easier.
- Decision of the expert group is more accurate if it related to checking-out somebody's ideas. It is used in expert methods of estimation.

But there are some negative points in collective decision-making.

- Individuals with a higher status has more influence on final decision.
- During "hot" debates group can loose the main target.
- Groups loose a lot of time on solving personal conflicts.

We are more interested in increasing of costs and time loss. Also we can take into account general corporate culture changes including number of new ideas from employees or standing for common rights in groups of workers at different level.

Time loss we are able to estimate using managers and departments schedule and fixing time of decision preparation and approvement in case of linear-functional management and project-team work. The same situation can be used in costs increasing estimation during the "democratization" process. It can be find in financial reports of enterprise by the way of summing up additional costs spreading to controlling departments and managers, additional wages of managers or analytical teams of middle-level strategic management etc. But these two parameters should be analyzed together to show the kind of "effectiveness-change/cost-change" ratio.

Estimating of corporate culture changes is harder and today has only expert opinion methods available. Researchers usually mention three levels of business transformation.

During transformations of the first level company just assumes certain measures for the reaching of required result and changes nothing in usual style of work. Example of such transformation is the selection of basic business among all types of activity and concentration of main resources on it.

With transformations of the second level employees have to study the new way of working, but some characteristics will be already available. For example, a company that grows due to innovative activity can establish the collaboration with universities and research institutes and this way provide itself with new wave of new ideas and of new commodities to be produced.

The third level of transformations is the level of the deepest, cultural changes. For example, company will be able to fix its competitiveness only by fundamental reorganization of corporate culture. In other words company has to turn from the market-event-reacting culture to the initiative-making culture, or from a hierarchical culture — to cooperative, etc.

To reach a success in frequently changeable world of economy in transition small firms and huge corporations should find the most adequate structure of organization system. The hard choice between individualism and team-building may has only special solution for particular enterprise including elements of both variants. But right or wrong solution can be the efficiency determinant of all enterprise activity in general.