

culture, three types of attitude, a system of theft, a map of their environment and high levels of situational awareness is usually enough to get managers running away. It doesn't fit into a simple 2 x 2. It also doesn't matter for many organisations because you only need high levels of situational awareness and adaptive structures if you're competing against organisations who have the same or you're at the very sharp end of ferocious competition. Personally, for most companies then I'd recommend using a cell based structure and reading "boiling frogs" from GCHQ which is an outstanding piece of work. It will give you more than enough ideas and it contains a very similar structure.

I will note that in recent years I've heard plenty of people talk about dual structures. I have to say that from my perspective and experience that these are fundamentally flawed and you're being led up the garden path. It's not enough to deal with the extremes, you must manage the transition in between. Fail to do this and you will not create an organisation that copes with evolution. If you focus on the extremes then you will diminish the all-important middle, you will tend to create war between factions and because the components of the pioneers never evolve (the Town planners will describe these systems as "flaky") then you create a never growing platform and on top of this an increasing spaghetti junction of new built upon new. I've experienced this myself back in 2003 along with the inevitable slow grinding halt of development and the calls for a death star project of immense scale to build the "new platform for the future". I've never seen that work.