

*Krackhardt, David

1993 "Organizational Aspects of Turkey's Mass Media Family Planning Campaign." In T. E. Becker & E. M. Rogers (eds.), Organizational Aspect of Health Communication Campaigns: What Works. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. 93-100.

Organizational Aspects of Turkey's Mass Media Family Planning Campaign

DAVID KRACKHARDT
Carnegie Mellon University

One of the perplexing problems in the study of organizations is the definition of what an organization is—more specifically, what the boundaries of an organization are (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Scott, 1981). For example, are members of the board of directors of a publicly held company members of the organization? Are volunteer workers at a hospital members of the hospital? If a large conglomerate buys 51% of a smaller firm, are the small firm's employees members of the large conglomerate? What if the conglomerate buys 49% of the firm? Some theorists have argued that an organization is an inherently open system, interacting with, and an integral part of, a bounded environment (Scott, 1987, pp. 161-163). Membership in such a system is not limited to the list of remunerated employees but rather should be extended to include the field of individuals who transact business with the firm, including suppliers and customers.

This problem has been exacerbated with the recent advance of two forms of organization, the industrial cooperative, such as the powerful *kigyo shudan* in Japan (Biggart & Hamilton, 1990), and international conglomerates. Both of these forms are present in the Turkish case study that I comment on here. The case study is an account of a cooperative effort by five distinct organizations, each with a different mission and constituency, to educate and influence the general public of Turkey about contraceptive practices. The five organizations

represent a spectrum of interests and organizational forms. One is a U.S. educational institution; the other four are Turkish. Three are publicly financed; two are privately funded. One is a for-profit firm; four are nonprofit organizations. Although actual sizes are not given, I infer from the descriptions that they range in size from a very large bureaucracy (the Turkish Ministry of Health and Social Assistance) to a relatively small group of academics (Johns Hopkins University's Population Communication Services). Despite these pronounced differences, the five organizations managed to put together an apparently highly successful campaign.

The boundaries of organizations are often ambiguous. This vagueness is particularly evident in the present study. Organizational theory most often speaks at one of two levels: Either the theory relates the attributes of the individual organization to a set of outcomes, or it looks at a market of organizations and predicts a set of outcomes for this larger set of entities. What we face in the Turkish case is a single outcome for a set of five organizations acting in concert, almost as if they were part of the same entity. Such collaboration is becoming more common, as consortia, cooperatives, and international firms emerge in a global political and economic community.

I will proceed by treating the five organizations as if they were one organization, loosely speaking. The campaign that brought them together makes them a temporary organization at best, but nonetheless for our purposes here the five organizations act together in ways consistent with many types of organizations. Although this assumption of unity may be shaky, it permits connections to organization theory that are useful to the present analysis.

Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) proposed the first systematic theory relating differentiated parts of an organization to a diverse environment. Their theory is particularly illustrative here. According to Lawrence and Lorsch, organizations are made up of subunits that are often quite different in structure, makeup of personnel, and orientation of managers. For example, a production department might be composed mainly of blue-collar workers. Their primary orientation is toward the short term (how do we meet today's production schedule?). In contrast, the R&D group of the same firm may be composed of professional engineers or scientists who have very different orientations. Their primary concern might be to develop a new product that would not be ready for the market for many years. Production units are often bureaucratic in their structure; the R&D group is often

very "organic," where rules and lines of authority are much less stable and clear. The environment that the R&D people respond to is often highly technical and fast-changing. By contrast, the production unit is relatively isolated from this volatile environment, responding to less technical demands from internal management about how many products to produce.

As Lawrence and Lorsch point out, these differences often are fertile ground for conflict in an organization. Rules that motivate and govern the behavior of the production group are not likely to work very well with people in an R&D lab. The goals of each group are so different that conflicts about the priorities of the organization and the budget allocation decisions are difficult to resolve. Yet it is important to the organization to maintain these differences. It is in the organization's interest to have an R&D group that is composed of future-oriented thinkers, whose primary concern is what the company's new products might look like in future years. It is also in the organization's interest to foster a cost-reduction-oriented production group, whose primary concern is to make sure that production schedules are met.

Lawrence and Lorsch suggest that organizations that face volatile, technically complex environments are better off with differentiated units within the organization to deal with the different parts of the complex environment. To deal with conflicts and other costs of such a differentiated organization, Lawrence and Lorsch suggest that more resources also have to be spent on integrating these differentiated units. A moderate amount of integration can be performed by individual liaisons, whose task is to communicate with and between the differentiated groups. Such individuals keep others informed about problems they are having, mediate conflicts that arise, and offer suggestions about how one group might facilitate the goals of another.

When the differentiation among groups is very high, then stronger integration measures are called for than a single liaison individual can provide, claim Lawrence and Lorsch. In such cases, the integration role may fall to an entire department. Lawrence and Lorsch found that marketing departments often can fill this role, since their orientation and structure tends to be intermediate between that of the production and the R&D units.

In the case of the Turkish family planning campaign, we have highly differentiated groups with great promise of conflict, as noted by Kincaid and his co-authors. Each of the groups brought a different expertise to the problem at hand, that of effectively delivering a powerful message

