Dženan Kulović[1]

Dijana Husaković[2]

Esmir Husetović[3]

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CONFIGURATIONS AND COMPETING VALUES CULTURE MODEL

ABSTRACT

Organizational configuration affects a number of management components, both hard and soft. Hard components include: organizational structure, strategy and control, and soft components are: organizational culture, organizational learning, leadership, motivation, organization power, organizational change, rewarding employees, evaluating performance and connection between individual and organization. Therefore, it can be said that organizational configuration affects organizational culture. The organizational configuration creates a framework in which a specific type of organizational culture is applied. For an organization to be successful in achieving its goals, there needs to be a high degree of agreement between the chosen model of organizational configuration and the type of organizational culture. Therefore, each model of organizational configuration corresponds with a precisely defined type of organizational culture, because only in that way organization will avoid problems in its functioning. This paper is an exploratory type, which means that it will create assumptions about the degree of agreement between specific models of organizational configurations and certain types of organizational cultures. In this paper, based on theoretical implications, assumptions are created about the degree of agreement of Mintzberg's models of organizational configurations, which are recognized in the literature as Mintzberg's basic types of configurations and typologies of organizational cultures according to Cameron and Quinn, better known as the competing value model. Situational elements that form models of organizational configurations according to Mintzberg and the dimensions on the basis of which are performed the typology of organizational cultures according to Cameron and Quinn are taken into account.

Keywords: *organizational structure, models of organizational configurations, organizational culture, types of organizational cultures, management*

JEL: *M14, L22*

---

1   Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica, e-mail: dzenan. kulovic@unze.ba

2   Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica, e-mail: dijana.husakovic@unze.ba

3   Senior Assistant, Faculty of Economics, University of Zenica, e-mail: esmir.husetovic@unze.ba

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational culture has a strong influence on the functioning of any organization. It is an extremely complex concept and can be viewed from different aspects. Thanks to different aspects of observation, there are numerous definitions of organizational culture. Organizational culture can be defined as a pattern of values or fundamental assumptions invented, discovered, or developed by a particular group that has proven to be good enough, and new members need to be taught this pattern as the right way to perceive, think, and feel (Schein, 1992).). It is clear from the above that organizational culture should be learned by all members of one organization. Organizational culture is a general pattern of behavior, common beliefs, and values of their members (Weihrich, Koontz, 1998). It affects goals, cash, and the type of action. It is a source of motivation, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction (Walter, Dobson, Williams, 1989). Also, one of the most important definitions is that organizational culture is a system of assumptions, values, norms and attitudes manifested through symbols, developed and adopted by members of an organization through shared experience and helping them determine the meaning of the world around them and how they treat him (Janićijević, 2013). This definition of organizational culture has three very important components. First, organizational culture consists of collective cognitive structures such as assumptions, values, norms, and attitudes, but also of symbols that materialize and manifest its cognitive content (Brown, 1998). Second, organizational culture is the result of the shared experiences of the members of the organization in solving the problems they face, and in solving the problems of external adaptation to the environment and internal integration of the collective (Schein, 2004). Third, collective cognitive structures, which make up the content of organizational culture, provide a framework and guide to members of the organization in interpreting reality and the world around them (Berger, Luckmann, 1966; Geertz, 1973). Organizational culture defines the behavior of each member of an organization. In situations when employees do not find satisfaction in the work environment or they lack motivation or vision, the development of their mental and creative abilities is hindered (Žugaj et al., 2004).

Organizational culture has several very important characteristics that determine it. First of all, organizational culture requires a holistic approach, it should include all members of one organization. Furthermore, organizational culture has the purpose of adapting the individual to the environment, and can be a means through which creativity is expressed. Beliefs, vision and goals that are in the service of defining the company's strategy can also be part of the organizational culture, and they can be compatible with the organizational culture, and they can also deviate from it.

Organizational culture also has its content. A review of numerous theoretical and empirical papers, aimed at identifying the content of organizational culture, shows that this content can be structured into two large and heterogeneous groups of components: cognitive and symbolic (Janićijević, 2013, Schein, 2004). The main difference between these components is that the cognitive components are in people's heads, respectively they are invisible, while the symbolic components are visible, which can be seen and felt. The cognitive components of organizational culture apply only to people who are members of the organization. At the same time, the symbolic components can also be seen by people who do not belong to the organization nor are they connected to it in any way. Through numerous researches, different authors have given different importance and priority to one or another component of organizational culture. Thus, a large group of authors mainly emphasized the importance of cognitive structures as elements of organizational culture, while they diminished the importance of symbols and reduced their role as a means of discovering the real content of culture such as cognitive elements (Schein, 2004). According to Balthazard et al., De Long and Fahey, symbols are a product of culture, but not an element of its content (Balthazard et al., 2006; De Long, Fahey, 2000). Another group of authors, who explore culture from the paradigm of interpretivism and who mainly define it through material definitions, see symbols as a key element of organizational culture (Smirchich, Morgan, 1983; Frost et al., 1991). Based on the above, these authors believe that in fact organizational culture is only the visible part, such as symbols, and based on that, a conclusion is made about what is the organizational culture in an organization. Organizational culture could not be implemented or manifested in a particular organization if it did not have the organizational configuration that allows it. The organizational configuration model provides all the assumptions for applying the type of organizational culture.

There are basic organizational forces within every organization. These forces, according to Mintzberg (1991) are focus, efficiency, expertise, concentration and innovation. Each of these forces will direct the organization towards the appropriate organizational culture, respectively the basic force will be the guide for choosing the type of culture. Therefore, first, there must be an organizational configuration and its basic strength, and only then an organizational culture is formed. For this reason, the one-way impact of organizational configuration models on the type of culture will be observed. The described relationship of influence is, however, too general and requires a detailed presentation of this impact, which consists in setting and testing the hypothesis of a one-way relationship between organizational configuration and organizational culture. In other words, it is necessary to prove that certain types of organizational culture correspond to specific models of organizational configurations. A review of previous research, we can conclude that so far there have been no papers that treat this relationship, so this paper's goals are to fill this gap.

The research conducted within this paper is exploratory in nature, which means that it will generate hypotheses that will be suitable for empirical testing. The paper is structured as follows. In the first part of the paper, the types of organizational configurations according to Mintzberg will be elaborated. Then, in the second part of the paper, different taxonomies of the organizational culture of the company will be presented. Finally, in the last part of the paper, hypotheses about the congruence of the type of organizational culture and the model of organizational configuration will be generated.

2. Organizational configuration

The life of a company is inconceivable without organization, without an internal system of connections and relationships. An organization is a social entity, with relatively clear boundaries, in which its members in a structured and coordinated manner, relatively continuously, perform activities to achieve their goals (Daft, 2010). When it comes to organizational configurations, this term is often equated with the term organizational structure. However, these concepts need to be distinguished. Mintzberg (1979) simply defines organizational structure as the sum of the ways in which an organization divides its work into different tasks and then achieves coordination between them. The organizational structure represents relatively stable, planned or spontaneous patterns of actions and interactions that members of the organization undertake to achieve the goals of the organization (Janićijević, 2013). The model of organizational configuration shows how an organization is structured by parts and how they are connected, then what the lines of authority or chain of command look like, respectively how the decision-making system is arranged (Janićijević et al., 2020). Based on different definitions of organizational configuration, different elements that make up the organizational configuration can be defined.

Mintzberg (1979) states that situational elements such as the size and age of the organization, its technical production system, business strategy (which business strategy the company applies), and various characteristics of its environment play an important role in choosing the organizational configuration model and its power distribution system (e.g., how tightly controlled it is from the outside). Situational elements need to be observed because some authors (Mintzberg, 1979) consider that situational elements form organizational configurations. Considering these elements, Mintzberg (1979) identified five basic organizational configurations, which can be recognized in the literature as basic organizational configurations, and they are simple configuration, machine configuration, professional configuration, innovative configuration and divisional configuration. Table 1 shows the listed models of organizational configurations with their most important situational elements.

Table 1: Models of organizational configurations and situational elements that make them up

Organizational configuration	Situational elements				
	Environment	Power	Size and age	Business strategy	Technology
Simple configuration	simple/ dynamic	managerial control	small and young	differentiation	simple/ unregulated
Machine configuration	simple/stable	external control	old and big	lower costs	assembly line
Professional configuration	complex/ stable	professio-nals	-	differentiation	unregulated
Innovative configuration	complex/ dynamic	experts	small and young	differentiation/ innovation	microproce-ssor
Divisional configuration	multiple en-vironments	division managers	old and big	diversification	more technology

Source: *Adapted from Mintzberg, H .: The Structuring of Organizations, Prentice Hall, 1979.*

Simple configuration is often present in young and small companies, in part because aging and growth encourage them to bureaucratize, but also because their vulnerability makes many of them fail (Mintzberg, 1981). This configuration is formally and legally organized in the form of a private company (one person who owns the entire property) or a partnership, and as such represents an appropriate framework for the organizational organization of business activities belonging to the small business (Šunje, 2002). Therefore, this is the initial model applied by almost all companies in the first days of their work (Janićijević et al., 2020). As can be seen from the table, a simple configuration mostly operates in a simple and dynamic environment, all power is in the hands of the manager/owner, business strategy is differentiation, and technology is simple and unregulated. This configuration consists of a top manager and several employees in the operational part (Mintzberg, 1993).

Machine configuration is one in which all the processes that take place are defined by standards. Thanks to defined standards, procedures and rules, these configurations have a high level of formalization. Many analysts (technostructures) are needed to design and maintain its standardization systems - especially those that formalize its behavior and plan its actions (Mintzberg, 1981). From the point of view of age and size, there is no doubt that the machine configuration is both old and large on all grounds, especially on the number of employees (assembly line technology as a lower-level technology employs a large number of low-skilled workers in the basic business process) (Šunje, 2002). The environment for machine bureaucracy is usually stable, and the goal is to achieve internal efficiency (Mintzberg, 1993).

As for the other elements, as can be seen from the table, in the machine configuration all the power is in the so-called external control, ie in the hands of shareholders and other groups of stakeholders, the business strategy is based on low costs, and the technology is on the principle of the assembly line.

Professional configuration is a configuration that is relatively formalized but decentralized to give professionals autonomy (Mintzberg, 1993). All types of businesses based on the engagement of trained professionals are organized within the professional configuration (Šunje 2020). This is not a structure in which one innovates, but one in which what is already known is brought to perfection (Mintzberg, 1981). As can be seen from the table, the professional configuration mostly operates in a complex and stable environment, all the power is in the hands of professionals, business strategy is differentiation, and technology is unregulated. Professionals in professional configurations deal only with a certain field and develop their expertise and knowledge in it (Janićijević et al., 2020).

Divisional configuration was created to solve the problem of machine configuration adaptability. By introducing another cover level of administration that is able to add and remove divisions, the organization has found a way to adapt to new conditions and disperse its risk (Mintzberg, 1981). Each division is organized on the principles of machine or the principles of innovative configuration, depending on the type of business, or the characteristics of the organizational context of the division (Šunje, 2002). The number of divisions depends on the size of the company and the breadth of its market presence (Janićijević et al., 2020). As can be seen from the table, divisional configuration mainly operates in several types of environments, all power is in the hands of division managers, business strategy is diversification, respectively one business represents one division, and in terms of technology, these configurations use multiple technologies of different characteristics.

Innovative configuration is the most difficult of the five configurations to explain because it is both complex and non-standardized (Mintzberg, 1981). Innovative configurations must be adaptable and resource-efficient, and the primary goal is innovation and rapid adaptation to dynamic environments (Mintzberg, 1993). As for other elements, as can be seen from the table, in an innovative configuration all power is in the hands of experts, business strategy is differentiation, ie innovation, and the technology used in these configurations is based on the use of microprocessors. All organizations in the business that emerged with the emergence of microprocessors (personal computers: hardware, software, telecommunications, etc.) are organized on the principles of innovative configuration (Šunje, 2002). The undoubted source of the popularity of this model is its innovation, flexibility and adaptation to the conditions of high turbulence in the environment that dominates a large number of industries (Janićijević et al., 2020).

The choice of organizational configuration model is a significant factor in the success of the organization. When choosing the same, managers should consider a number of factors. Inadequate organizational configuration not only reduces the efficiency of the company's business but can also disrupt the company's organizational culture. Among others, two situational elements that are important for the choice of organizational configuration, and have an impact on the organizational culture of the company are the age and size of the company and the environment in which the company operates. In this paper, four types of configurations will be considered, and divisional configuration will be excluded, because according to Janićijević (2013), the divisional configuration is a complex configuration, because each division can opt for other types of organizational configurations. Table 2 shows the organizational configurations according to the situational elements of size and age and environment.

Table 2: Organizational configurations according to situational elements of size and age and environment

	small and young companies	large and old companies
simple environment	Simple configuration	Machine configuration
complex environment	Innovative configuration	Professional configuration

Source: *Author's work.*

As can be seen from Table 2, simple configurations can be said to be mainly represented in small and young enterprises operating in a simple environment. The machine configuration is applied in large and old companies that operate in a simple environment. Innovative configurations are represented in small and young companies operating in a complex environment. Finally, the professional configuration is applied in large and old companies operating in a complex environment. These elements are important for determining the impact of organizational configuration models on organizational culture. In order to more easily define the mentioned influence, it is necessary to present different taxonomies of organizational cultures.

3. Types of organizational cultures

For the purpose of defining the influence of organizational configuration on organizational culture, it is necessary to classify the types of organizational cultures. Numerous and diverse classifications of types of organizational cultures can be found in the literature (Handy, 1979; Deal, Kennedy, 2011; Balthazard et al., 2006; Denison, Mishra, 1995). However, for the purposes of analyzing the impact of organizational configuration models on the type of organizational culture, classification by Cameron and Quinn (Cameron, Quinn, 2011) or the so-called competing value model is helpful.

The criteria for distinguishing crop types used in this classification are (Janićijević, 2013):

1. Flexibility, change, dynamism versus stability, order, predictability.

2. Internal orientation, integration, harmony versus external orientation, differentiation, competition.

Based on these two dimensions of organizational cultures, a four-field matrix can be constructed that recognizes the following types of organizational cultures: clan culture, hierarchy culture, market culture, and adhocracy culture (Cameron, Quinn, 2011).

In clan culture, the metaphor for the organization is the family, respectively the organization is a friendly place for the members of the organization. The long-term commitment to human resource development is emphasized and great importance is attached to cohesion and work ethic (Janićijević, 2013). The leader in the organization is generally considered to be the head of the family or organization. Members of the organization are encouraged to express ideas and creativity. Decision-making is often made through informal channels (Van Muijen et al., 1999).

There is a high level of formalization and rules in hierarchical culture. Everyday work of people is defined by rules and procedures. Stability, predictability and job security are highly valued (Janićijević, 2013). In this culture, the emphasis is on the long-term efficiency of the organization, and on achieving low costs. In addition, it insists on the acceptance of common values in the organization. Internal orientation towards control in this type of culture forms an orientation towards rules in which rationality, procedures, hierarchy, authority, and division of labor are emphasized (Guerra et al., 2005; Van Muijen et al., 1999).

Adhocracy culture makes the organization a dynamic, creative and entrepreneurial place (Janićijević, 2013). The members of the organization are ready to take risks, experiment and try new things. New products and services are a measure of success in an organization. Creativity, enterprise and adaptability are emphasized (Keskin et al., 2005). External orientation as well as flexibility orientation in this type of culture imply innovation orientation and imply change, innovation, information seeking, anticipation, openness and experimentation (Guerra et al., 2005; Van Muijen et al., 1999).

Market culture requires that the organization is result-oriented, it is important to get the job done. So, in this culture, the task of the organization is important. This culture is called the rational goal perspective and is characterized by stability and external focus (Keskin et al., 2005). It focuses on the external environment instead of internal affairs (Cameron and Quinn, 2005).

Market-type organizations value competitiveness, productivity, clarity of goals, efficiency, and achievement (Cameron, Quinn, 2005; Gray, Densten, 2005), connecting members through goal orientation and competitiveness. The combination of external focus and control in this cultural type results in the orientation of managers and employees towards goals: rationality, performance, achievement, responsibility, and performance-based rewards (Guerra et al., 2005; Van Muijen et al., 1999).

Combining the criteria of flexibility, dynamism versus stability, predictability and internal orientation, integration, harmony versus external orientation, differentiation and competition, the classifications of cultures shown in Table 3 can be constructed.

Table 3: Types of organizational cultures according to Cameron and Quinn

	Flexibility	Stability
Internal focus	Clan culture	Hierarchy culture
External focus	Adhocracy culture	Market culture

Source: *Cameron, K. S., Quinn, R. E.: Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011.*

From previous research, it can be concluded that the impact of organizational configurations on hard variables such as strategy and control, then the impact on soft variables such as leadership, power, motivation and reward, while the impact of organizational configuration models on organizational culture is not enough researched. Recognizing the fact that the organizational configuration is an integral part of the organization, and that it creates conditions for the implementation of organizational culture, a problematic question arises: Does the selected model of organizational configuration show a high degree of agreement with the dominant type of organizational culture?

4. Matching organizational configuration models and types of organizational culture

The presented models of organizational configurations and types of organizational cultures have a high degree of matching between the criteria used to differentiate organizational configurations and types of organizational cultures. In a simple configuration, a culture will dominate in which the leader in the organization is generally considered to be the most important part of the organization. The organization is support-oriented and highly values teamwork, consensus and participation, care for people and individual development.

In a machine configuration, a culture in which there is a high level of formalization and rules will prevail. Everyday work of people is defined by rules and procedures. The emphasis is on rationality, hierarchy, authority and division of labor. The professional configuration will be dominated by a culture in which the organization is result-oriented, respectively it is important to perform tasks that will lead to results. This culture is characterized by stability and external focus. Professional configurations value competitiveness, productivity, clarity of goals, efficiency and achievement. An innovative configuration will be dominated by a culture in which the organization is a dynamic, creative and entrepreneurial place. The members of the organization are ready to take risks and are ready to experiment and try new things. New products and services are a measure of success in an organization. Creativity, enterprise and adaptability are emphasized.

Preliminary analysis indicates that a particular model of organizational configuration will imply the selection and application of a particular type of organizational culture. In this part, it is important to mention the exploratory research conducted by Janićijević (2013), which defines the agreement of organizational configurations with Handy's and Tropmenars' typology of organizational cultures. When talking about Handy's typology of cultures, the assumptions created by Janićijević are as follows: machine configuration shows a high degree of agreement with the culture of roles, simple configuration shows a high degree of agreement with the culture of power, professional configuration shows a high degree of agreement with the culture of tasks, and innovative configuration shows high degree of agreement with the culture of support (Janićijević, 2013). Tropmenars' typology of organizational cultures assumes the following assumptions: machine configuration shows a high degree of agreement with the Eiffel Tower culture, simple configuration shows a high degree of agreement with the family culture, professional configuration shows a high degree of agreement with the guided missile culture, and innovative configuration shows a high degree of agreement with incubator culture (Janićijević, 2013). It is important to note that the research is of an exploratory nature, respectively assumptions have been created that need to be investigated empirically. Since there is no exploratory research that links the models of organizational configurations and the typology of Cameron and Quinn cultures, the goal is to create the assumptions of this combination.

Adhocracy culture emphasizes creativity, enterprise and adaptability. For this reason, it is assumed that the degree of creativity and adaptability is at a high level in small organizations. Innovative configuration is mainly applied in small and young organizations that need to show a high degree of flexibility and creativity, because this model of organizational configuration is complex and non-standardized. Given this complexity and non-standardization, it is clear that innovative configurations

operate in a complex environment. Based on the above, a hypothesis can be made:

H1 Adhocracy culture will imply a high degree of agreement with the innovative configuration.

In hierarchy culture, the emphasis is on rules, procedures and norms in performing tasks and behaviors. Employees are required to follow defined rules, which reduces creativity in the organization. In the case of machine configuration, all important processes are covered by written procedures, with many instructions and rules, the observance of which is at a high level. From the point of view of age and size, there is no doubt that the machine configuration is both old and large on all grounds, and especially on the basis of the number of employees. Based on the above, a hypothesis can be made:

H2 Hierarchy culture will imply a high degree of agreement with the machine configuration.

Market culture requires that the organization is result-oriented. So, in this culture, the task of the organization is important. Market-based culture organizations value competitiveness, productivity, and achievement. The professional configuration mostly operates in a complex and stable environment. In terms of age and size, the professional configuration is old and big. Professionals in professional configurations deal only with a certain field and develop their expertise and knowledge in it. Based on the above, a hypothesis can be made:

H3 Market culture will imply a high degree of agreement with the professional configuration.

In clan culture, the leader in the organization is generally considered to be the head of the family or organization. The leader mostly makes all the decisions in the organization and this culture shows the best results in small businesses. With a simple configuration, the company is too small and young to define rules and procedures. All decisions are made by the leader in the organization. In this configuration, everyone does everything, that is, they do what the leader demands of them. Based on the above, a hypothesis can be made:

H4 Clan culture will imply a high degree of agreement with a simple configuration.

Table 4 shows the agreement between different types of organizational configurations, from the aspect of the size and age of the company and the environment in which the company operates, with the types of organizational cultures according to Cameron and Quinn.

Table 4: Matching of models of organizational configurations and types of organizational culture

Size and age of the company / Changes Environment /Focus	Small and young/Flexibility	Big and old/Stability
Simple/Internal focus	Simple configuration Clan culture	Machine configuration Hierarchy culture
Complex/External focus	Innovative configuration Adhocracy culture	Professional configuration Market culture

Source: *Author's work.*

Based on the agreement of basic criteria for differentiation of organizational cultures and parameters of organizational configurations, a matrix was constructed according to which in simple configuration there is a high degree of agreement with clan culture, in machine configuration there is a high degree of agreement with hierarchy culture, in innovative configuration there is high agreement with adhocracy culture, and in the professional configuration there is a high degree of agreement with market culture.

5. DISCUSSION

In this paper, the assumptions that the organizational configuration model influences the choice of the type of organizational culture are analyzed. The assumptions were made on the basis of the theoretical basis that dealt with this issue. These assumptions need to be empirically investigated and tested by testing the hypotheses generated in this paper. So, it is necessary to analyze the degree of agreement between certain models of organizational configurations and certain types of organizational culture. It is clear that recommendations can be given to the management of the company in terms of which model of organizational configuration best suits which type of organizational culture. This will certainly contribute to the efficiency and success of the organization, while reducing problems in the organization to an optimal level. In addition, this paper pointed out the need to investigate the impact of organizational configuration models on other components of management, both on hard components: organizational structure, strategy and control, and on soft components: organizational learning, leadership, motivation, power in the organization, organizational change, rewarding employees, evaluating performance, and the connection between the individual and the organization.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper has several significant implications. The most significant implication of the paper is the usefulness of further research on the degree of agreement between the model of organizational configuration and the type of organizational culture. This degree of agreement needs to be analyzed for the reason that a higher degree of agreement between the model of organizational configuration and the type of organizational culture leads to less problems in the functioning of the organization. Therefore, it is necessary to empirically test this degree of agreement by testing the hypotheses generated in this paper. Also, this paper has several limitations. The first and basic limitation lies in the very nature of work. Namely, it is of an exploratory and theoretical character. The paper resulted in hypotheses about the degree of agreement between the model of organizational configuration and the type of organizational culture, which have yet to be empirically proven. The fact that it relies exclusively on one division of organizational configurations and one typology of organizational cultures can be mentioned as a limitation of the work. Given the large number of classifications, both models of organizational configurations and types of organizational culture, it is possible to obtain different results by applying other classifications. It is important to note once again that this paper is of an exploratory nature, ie that without empirical verification of the assumptions that have been created, the knowledge that will come from this paper is not completely valid.

LITERATURE

1. Balthazard, P., Cooke R.A., Potter R.E.: *Dysfunctional Culture, Dysfunctional Organization: Capturing the Behavioral Norms That Form Organizational Culture and Drive Performance*, Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21 (8), 709-732., 2006.

2. Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T.: *The Social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1966.

3. Brown, A: *Organizational Culture*, Edinburgh: Person Education, 1998.

4. Cameron, K. S., Quinn, R. E.: D*iagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011.

5. Daft, R.: *Organizational theory and design*, Mason , OH: Cengage Learning, 2010.

6. De Long, D. W. and Fahey, L.: *Diagnosing Cultural Barriers to Knowledge Management*, Academy of Management Executive, 14 (4), 113-127, 2000.

7. Deal, T., Kennedy, A.: *Corporate cultures: the rites and rituals of corporate life*, 2nd ed., New York: Perseus Books Publishing, 2011.

8. Denison, D. R., Mishra, A. K.: *Toward a theory of organizational culture and efectiveness*, Organization Science, 6(2), pp. 204-223, 1995.

9. Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C., Martin, J. eds.: *Reframing organizational culture*, Newburry Park, CA: Sage, 1991.

10. Geertz, C.: *The Interpretation of cultures*, New York: Basic Books, 1973.

11. Gray, J. H., Densten, I. L.: *Towards an integrative model of organizational culture and knowledge management*, International Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 9(2), 594-603, 2005.

12. Guerra, J. M., Martínez, I., Munduate, L., & Medina, F. J.: *A contingency perspective on the study of the consequences of conflict types: The role of organizational culture*, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 14(2), 157-176, 2005.

13. Handy, C.: *Gods of management*, London: Pan, 1979.

14. Hofstede, G.: *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*, 2. izdanje, Sage Publications, London, UK, 2001.

15. Janićijević, N.: *Organizaciona kultura i menadžment*, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Ekonomski fakultet, Centar za izdavačku delatnost, Beograd, 2013.

16. Keskin, H., Akgun, A. E., Gunsel, A., Imamoglu, S. Z.: *The relationship between adhocracy and clan cultures and tacit oriented KM strategy*, Journal of Transnational Management, 10(3), 39-53, 2005.

17. Mintzberg, H., *Structure in five s. Designing effective organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1993.

18. Mintzberg, H.: *Organization design: fashion or fit?*, Harvard Business Review, 1981.

19. Mintzberg, H.: *The Structuring of Organisations*, Prentice Hall, 1979.

20. Muijen, J. J. V., Koopman, P., DeWitte, K., De Cock, G., Susanj, Z., Lemoine, C., Bourantas, D., Papalexandris, N., Braniycski, I., Spaltro, E., Jesuino, J., Das Neves, J. G., Pitariu, H., Konrad, E., Peiro, J., Gonzales-Roma, V., Turnipspeed, D.: *Organizational Culture: The Focus Questionnaire*, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(4), pp. 551-568., 1999.

21. Novak, M.: *Organizacija rada u socijalizmu*, Informator, Zagreb, X. Izdanje, 1989.

22. Schein, H. E.: *Organizational Culture and leadership*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1992.

23. Schein, H. E.: *Organizational Culture and leadership*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2004.

24. Smircich, L., Morgan, G.: *Leadership: The management of meaning*, Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18, 257-273, 1982.

25. Stoner A. F., Freeman E. R., Gilbert D. R., Jr.: *Menadžment*, Želnid, Beograd, 2000.

26. Šunje, A.: *Top - menadžer, vizionar i strateg*, Tirada d.o.o. Sarajevo, 2002.

27. Walters, M., Dobson, P., Williams, A.: *Changing Culture, Institute of Personal Management*, London, 1989.

28. Weihrich, H., Koontz H.: *Menadžment*, Mate, Zagreb, 1998.

29. Žugaj, M., Bojanić - Glavica, B., Brčić, R., Šehanović, J.: *Organizacijska kultura*, Tiva tiskara Varaždin, Varaždin, 2004.

Dženan Kulović

Dijana Husaković

Esmir Husetović

POVEZANOST ORGANIZACIONIH KONFIGURACIJA I MODELA KONKURIŠUĆIH VRIJEDNOSTI

SAŽETAK

Organizaciona konfiguracija utiče na brojne komponente menadžmenta, kako tvrde, tako i meke. U tvrde komponente se ubrajaju: organizaciona struktura, strategija i kontrola, a meke komponente su: organizaciona kultura, organizaciono učenje, liderstvo, motivacija, moć u organizaciji, organizacione promjene, nagrađivanje zaposlenih, ocjenjivanje učinaka i povezanost pojedinca i organizacije. Dakle, može se reći da organizaciona konfiguracija utiče na organizacionu kulturu. Organizaciona konfiguracija stvara okvir u kome se primjenjuje određeni tip organizacione kulture. Da bi organizacija bila uspješna u ostvarivanju svojih ciljeva potrebno je da postoji visok stepen slaganja između odabranog modela organizacione konfiguracije i tipa organizacione kulture. Dakle, svakom modelu organizacione konfiguracije odgovara tačno definisani tip organizacione kulture, jer samo na taj način organizacija će izbjeći probleme u svom funkcionisanju. Ovaj rad je eksplorativnog karaktera, što podrazumijeva da će se u istom kreirati pretpostavke o stepenu slaganja određenih modela organizacionih konfiguracija i određenih tipova organizacionih kultura. U ovom radu su, na osnovu teorijskih implikacija, kreirane pretpostavke o stepenu slaganja Mintzbergovih modela organizacionih konfiguracija, koji su u literaturi prepoznati kao Mintzbergovi bazični tipovi konfiguracija i tipologije organizacionih kultura prema Cameronu i Quinnu, poznatije kao model konkurišućih vrijednosti. U obzir su uzeti situacioni elementi koji tvore modele organizacionih konfiguracija prema Mintzbergu i dimenzije na osnovu kojih se vrši tipologija organizacionih kultura prema Cameronu i Quinnu.

Ključne riječi: *organizaciona struktura, modeli organizacionih konfiguracija, organizaciona kultura, tipovi organizacionih kultura, menadžment*

JEL: *M14, L22*