

Index

A

ABB: complex spreadsheet, 165;
geography-business matrix, 102–106;
global account teams, 115–117; information system supporting planning, 154; matrix experience, 246–247

Accounting systems, and power distribution in matrix, 78–79

Aerospace industry, 8–9, 188. *See also*

- Boeing

Ahold, 168

Albans, B., 173

Allianz of Germany, 132, 133

American Express, 26, 247

American Express International, 187

Anderson, R., 246

Aramco, 241–242

AT&T, 240

Axelrod, B., 183

B

Bain & Company, 191, 194

Balance of power *See* Power balance

Balanced matrix, 76, 77, 102–106

Barnevik, P., 154, 246

Bartlett, C., 183, 187

Baton pass model, 22, 51–63; in consumer goods industry, 51–54; in matrix within a matrix, 71; in pharmaceutical industry, 54–63

Bechtel, 9, 245

Beer, M., 215

Berry, L., 181, 182

Best Buy, 109

BMW, 144, 151, 163–164

Boeing, 8–9, 236–238, 245

BP, 82

Bucy, F., 244

Budgets, and power balance, 80–81

Bundling products, 125

Bunker, B., 173

Business lite matrix, 76, 79

Business-dominant matrix, 77, 81–82, 106–107

C

Canon, 171–172

Capabilities: and matrix execution, 231–234; and matrix implementation, 218–226

Carrefour, 126, 168

Carroll, D., 239

Center for Effective Organizations (USC), 245

Chrysler, 47–50

Ciba-Geigy, 46

Citibank: complex team design, 165, 167–168; front-back structure, 116–117, 125, 127; implementation of matrix, 224, 225–226, 230; rotational assignments, 188–189; shift in matrix, 94

Citigroup, 131, 132

Clark, K., 58

Colgate Palmolive, 76

Collaboration, for matrix implementation, 10, 229

Communication processes, 140, 143–151; formal, 14, 145–150, 151; importance of, 143–144; informal, 143, 144–145, 151

Compaq, 173

Complex matrix organizations, 87–89; complex team design in, 165, 167–170; examples of planning in,

Complex matrix organizations
(*Continued*)
170–172; meetings for planning in,
172–178; multiple levels in, 161–164;
planning spreadsheets for, 162,
164–165, 166. *See also* Four-
dimensional structures; Front-back
hybrid model; Three-dimensional
structures

Computer industry, 79. *See also* HP;
IBM; Intel

Conflict, acceptance of, 202–204

Conflict resolution: creating culture
for, 189–190; jams for, 175–178;
large-scale meetings for, 172–175;
leadership role in, 201, 203–208;
and planning processes, 153, 156

Consumer goods industry: baton pass
model, 51–54. *See also* General Electric
(GE); Procter & Gamble (P&G)

Coordination: cross-border, 92–95,
99; mechanisms for, and planning
processes, 156–157

Corporate function–business unit
matrix, 248

Corporate function–profit center matrix,
25–30, 69

Costs, fixed, and cross-border coordina-
tion, 92–93

Crane, D., 179

Credit Suisse, 188–189

Cultural differences, and two-hat
structure, 43

Customer profit centers, 225–226

Customers: and cross-border coordi-
nation, 93–94; as dimension of
global accounts, 115, 116; and four-
dimensional structure, 115, 126–127;
and front-back hybrid model,
116–117, 123–126

D

Davis, S., 9, 201

Decision accelerators (DAs), 173, 175

Decision authority, and power
balance, 80

Degussa Catalytic Converters (DCC),
162–163

Degussa Chemical Company, 197–199
Departmentalization, as dimension of
structure policies, 15

Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC),
9, 149, 245

Dispute resolution. *See* Conflict
resolution

Distribution of power. *See* Power
distribution

Dotted-line relationships, 29–30, 241, 247

DoubleClick, 185

Downey, D., 14

Doz, Y., 95

Dual-authority system. *See* Two bosses

E

Eccles, R., 179

Electronics specialty industry, matrix
within a matrix in, 65–66

Eli Lilly: baton pass matrix structure,
54, 55–63; budgets given to product
managers, 80–81

Employee value propositions (EVPs),
183–184

Escalation process, 205–206

Evaluation: and HR policies, 150; joint,
by two bosses, 195; of manager of two
bosses, 147–150

Exxon Research and Engineering, 240

F

Fayol, H., 7

Fluor, 9, 245

Function–business unit matrix, 248

Ford, 246

Four-dimensional structures, 88,
115–116, 126–127. *See also* Front-
back hybrid model

Front-back hybrid model, 88, 116–127;
business unit model compared to,
119, 120; combination of matrix
model and, 119, 121, 122; future use
of, 248; IBM example of, 88–89,
129–137; reasons for choosing,
123–126; structure of, 116–119

Fujitsu-Siemens, 137

Function–profit center matrix, 25–30, 69

Future Search—The Network, 173

G

Galbraith, J., 9, 12, 14, 97, 123, 167,
216, 229, 238

General Electric (GE), 119, 120, 190, 193

General Motors, 126
 Geography-business matrix, 76, 77, 102–106
 Geography-dominant matrix, 76, 77, 98–102
 Ghoshal, S., 187
 Global account teams, 115–116, 127
 Goals: alignment of, and planning process, 153–155; rewards distributed on basis of, 79–80; two-boss manager managed by, 148, 149; voice in setting, 79
 Government participation, and international matrix form, 95–97, 99
 Grove, A., 170, 190, 240

H

Haggerty, P., 244
 Handfield-Jones, H., 183
 Hemp, P., 176
 Henderson, R., 35, 37
 Hewitt Associates, 181
 Hofstede, G. H., 43
 Horizontal processes, 16
 HP, 78–79, 137, 173
 Human capital: defined, 180; and recruitment and selection, 180–186, 197; and talent development, 186–190. *See also* Managers; Staff
 Human resources (HR) policies, 179–199; best models for, 179; for building human capital, 180–190; for building social capital, 196–199; and evaluation process, 150; and Star Model, 17; to support reward systems, 190–196

I

IBM: conflict management process, 207–208; front-back hybrid structure, 88–89, 129–137; jams, 175–178; systems integration capability, 125
 Ikea, 109
 Implementing matrix, 215–230; by building capabilities first, 218–226; collaboration needed for, 10, 229; inappropriately and incompletely, 11–12, 241–243; incremental approach to, 226–229; using Star Model, 215–218
In Search of Excellence (Peters and Waterman), 9, 244–245

Information, consistent throughout matrix, 78, 79
 Information systems, and power balance, 78–79
 Intel: author's work with, 240; conflict resolution training, 207; culture for conflict management, 190; global product of, 93; planning process, 170–171; use of matrix by, 9, 245
 International business portfolio, diversity of, and international matrix form, 97–98, 99
 International matrix: balanced matrix form of, 76, 77, 102–106; business-dominant matrix form of, 77, 81–82, 106–107; considerations when choosing form of, 92–98, 99; differentiated structures for, 107–109; future use of, 248; geography-dominant matrix form of, 76, 77, 98–102. *See also* Multinational companies

J

Jams, 175–178
 Janoff, S., 172–173
 Japanese companies, planning process, 171–172

K

Kates, A., 14
 Kodak, 245–246
 Kohl's, 109, 110, 111, 112
 Kraft, 76
 Kreulen, J., 175

L

Lafley, A. G., 247
 Large-scale meetings, 172–175
 Lateral processes, 16
 Latham and Watkins, 193–194
 Lawler, E. E. III, 97, 245
 Lawrence, P., 9, 201
 Leadership, 141, 201–213; conflict resolution role of, 201, 203–208; management of top team by, 201, 208–210; power balanced and aligned by, 201–202, 210–213
 Line-and-staff model, 7, 25, 69
 Lorsch, J., 179, 180, 185, 193

M

- Maister, D., 179, 181
 Malknight, T., 55
 Managers: communication between, 5, 146–147; country, 81–85, 102–104; global business, 79, 80–85, 102–104; joint evaluation of, by two bosses, 195; two-boss, selection and evaluation of, 147–150
 Marks & Spencer, 109
 Mars Pet Food, matrix within a matrix, 70–73
 Matrix: author's experience with, 235–248; capabilities for executing, 231–234; defined, 3; examples of, 3–6; future of, 2–3, 247–248; origin of, 7–9, 25; reasons for choosing, 1–2; reasons for reduced interest in, 10–12, 241–245. *See also* Implementing matrix
 Matrix (Davis and Lawrence), 9
 Matrix organizations: characteristics of, 3–4; evolution of concept of, 235–248. *See also* Complex matrix organizations; Simple matrix organizations
 Matrix structures. *See* Four-dimensional structures; Six-dimensional structures; Three-dimensional structures; Two-dimensional structures
 Matrix within a matrix, 22, 65–73; defined, 65; design alternatives, 65–69; Mars Pet Food, 70–73; Time Warner, 69–70
 Mayo Clinic, 181–183
 McKinsey & Company, 185, 192, 193, 194, 245
 McLean, A., 183
 Meetings: large-scale, 172–175; online (jams), 175–178
 Metro, 126, 168
 Michaels, E., 183
 Microsoft, 185
 MIT, 238–239
 Multibusiness corporations, 5–6, 248
 Multinational companies: example of matrix structure in, 6; future use of matrix by, 248; inappropriate implementation of matrix by, 11–12; methods for balancing power in, 75–82; reasons matrix structure chosen by, 1–2; return of country managers in, 212. *See also* International matrix

N

- Nestlé: Citibank's team design for, 167–168; differentiated structures, 108–109; diversity of international business portfolio, 98; geography-dominant matrix, 76, 98–102; regional structure for profit centers, 26
 New York Management Center (NYMC), 239
 Newswanger, J., 175
 NL Industries, 241
 Nohria, N., 215
 Nokia, 2
 Nordstrom, 109
 Northwestern Bank Corporation, 240
 Northwestern Bell, 240

O

- Organization design: and behavior, 18, 19; and strategy, 18–19. *See also* Star Model

P

- Palmisano, S., 176–177
 Peck, M., 8
 People, as Star Model design policy category, 17
 Peters, T., 9, 244–245
 Pharmaceutical industry: baton pass model, 54–63; example of large-scale meeting, 173–175; two-dimensional structure for R&D lab, 35–40. *See also* Eli Lilly
 Philips, 76, 82, 108
 Planning processes, 140–141, 153–178; in complex matrix organizations, 161–178; and conflict resolution, 153, 156; and coordination mechanisms, 156–157; examples of, in complex matrix, 170–172; and goal alignment, 153–155; jams for, 175–178; large-scale meetings for, 172–175; objectives of, 153; spreadsheets for, 157–160, 162, 164–165, 166; in two-dimensional structure, 153–160; voice in, and power balance, 79
 Power balance, 22–23, 75–85; as characteristic of matrix organizations, 3, 5, 75; continuum of, across geography-business matrix, 76, 77; leadership's

- role in creating and aligning, 201–202, 210–213; methods of creating, 75–82; responsibility charts for aligning, 82–85
- Power distribution: and accounting systems, 78–79; as dimension of structure policies, 14–15; shift in, 76, 82, 108
- PPG, 125–126
- Processes, as Star Model design policy category, 15–16
- Procter & Gamble (P&G): complex team design, 165, 168–170; corporate matrix structure, 26, 28–29; customer-focused structure, 116–117; diversity of international business portfolio, 97; front-back model implemented by, 126, 247–248; shift in power distribution in matrix of, 76
- Product-function matrix model, 67–69
- Products and markets, and cross-border coordination, 93
- Profit centers: customer, 225–226; function–profit center matrix, 25–30, 69
- ## R
- R&D lab: example of matrix structure, 3–5, 25; matrix structure adopted for, 9; two-dimensional structure, 35–40
- Recruitment policies, 180–186, 197
- Responsibility charts, 82–85
- Retailers, three-dimensional matrix models, 109–112
- Rewards/reward systems: distributed on basis of goals, 79–80; HR policies to support, 190–196; as Star Model design policy category, 16–17, 240
- Roles: leadership, in matrix organization, 201–213; responsibility charts for clarifying, 82–85
- Rotational assignments, 187–189, 197
- Royal Dutch Shell, 45–46, 95–96
- ## S
- Sales organization: formal communication in, 145–150; two-dimensional structure, 30–35
- Sandberg, J., 247
- Scherer, F., 8
- Shape, as dimension of structure policies, 14
- Shell, 45–46, 95–96
- Shepard, M., 244
- Siemens, 79
- Simple matrix organizations, 21–23; creating power balance in, 75–82; formal communication in, 145–150; roles and responsibilities in, 82–85. *See also* Baton pass model; Two-dimensional structures; Two-hat model
- Six-dimensional structures, 88–89, 129–137
- Social capital: building, 196–199; defined, 196
- Solid-line relationships, 29–30, 241
- Sony, 171
- Spangler, W. S., 175
- Specialization, as dimension of structure policies, 14
- Spreadsheets, planning, 157–160, 162, 164–165, 166
- Staff: line-and-staff model, 7, 25, 69; and power balance, 76, 78; staff roles, 29. *See also* Human capital; Managers; Staff
- Star Model: categories of design policies in, 13–17; defined, 12; implementing matrix using, 215–218; implications of, 17–19; of pharmaceutical lab matrix, 37, 39–40; reward systems added to, 240
- Stewart, T., 176
- Strategy: relationship between organization design and, 18–19; as Star Model design policy category, 13–14
- Structure: altering, to shift power balance, 76; overemphasis on, 17–18; as Star Model design policy category, 14–15
- SWANs, 181
- ## T
- Talent: developing, 186–190; recruiting, 180–186, 197. *See also* Human capital; Managers; Staff
- Target, 109
- Taylor, F., 7
- Teams: complex, in complex matrix designs, 165, 167–170; core, 167–168; customer, at BMW, 163–164; extended, 167–168; global account, 115–116, 127; leadership's design and maintenance of, 204–207; stealth

- Teams: (*Continued*)
 matrix designs emphasizing, 246; top, leadership's management of, 201, 208–210; and two-hat model, 42, 50
 Tesco, 109, 126, 168
 Texas Instruments (TI), 9, 244
 Thomke, S., 55
 Three-dimensional structures, 88, 91–113; balanced matrix as, 76, 77, 102–106; business-dominant matrix as, 77, 81–82, 106–107; considerations when choosing form of, 92–98, 99; and differentiated organizational structures, 107–109; future use of, 248; geography-dominant matrix as, 76, 77, 98–102; retailers' variations of, 109–112
 3M, 76, 107
 Tierney, T., 179, 180, 185, 193
 Time Warner (TW), 26, 27, 69–70, 98
 Toyota, 97
 Toyota Production System (TPS), 203
 Training, 189–190, 197, 207–208
 Transportability, and cross-border coordination, 94
 Two bosses: communication between, 5; dotted- vs. solid-line relationship with, 29–30; dual reporting to, 3, 5; with four-dimensional structure, 116; joint evaluation of manager by, 195; for power balance, 81–82; selection and evaluation of manager of, 147–150
 Two-dimensional structures, 21, 25–40; for function–profit center matrix, 25–30; origin and history of, 25; for pharmaceutical R&D lab matrix, 35–40; planning processes in, 153–160; for R&D lab matrix, 3–5, 25; for sales organization matrix, 30–35. *See also* Baton pass model; Simple matrix organizations; Two-hat model
 Two-hat model, 21–22, 41–50; described, 41, 42; disadvantages of, 44; examples of, 44–50; in matrix within a matrix, 66–67, 71, 73; reasons for choosing, 41–44
- U**
- Unilever, 126
 United Technologies, 26
 Unity-of-command principle, 7
- V**
- Vadsz, L., 170
 Vertical processes, 15–16
- W**
- Wal-Mart, 109, 126, 168–170
 Walker, J., 179
 Waterman, R., 9, 244–245
 Watson, T., 176
 Weisbord, M., 172
 Welch, J., 190
 Wells Fargo Bank, 125
 Wharton School, 239
 Wheelwright, S., 55, 58
 Wilson, T., 237, 238
 Winby, S., 173
 Wright-Patterson (W-P) airbase, 242–243