



***The organizational communication and workgroups
According to the Strategic Analysis Theory***

BEKHOUCHE Oussama^{1,*} BADRAOUI Soufyane²

¹ Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University (Algeria), oussama.bekhouche@univ-tebessa.dz
Laboratory of Studies in Digitization and Electronic Information Industry in Libraries, Archives, and
Documentation

² University Centre of Maghnia (Algeria), badraoui.soufyane@cumaghnia.dz

Received: 18 / 02 / 2024

Accepted: 28 / 04 / 2024

Published: 30 / 04 / 2024

Abstract:

This scientific paper aims to shed light on one of the important modern approaches in the field of organizational sociology, specializing in analyzing communication and organized actions within groups and actors in organizations. The actors (individuals and groups) are considered to have relative rationalities and goals often contradictory to the organization's objectives. This aspect, which classical theories like Max Weber's bureaucratic theory struggled to comprehend, will be addressed in this article through the strategic analysis of Michael Crozier and Erhard Friedberg as a paradigm that focuses on interpreting and analyzing social actions and power relations within work groups.

Keywords: *Authority; Organization; Organizational Communication; Strategic Action; Workgroups.*

*Corresponding Author

I- INTRODUCTION

The studies conducted by the French sociologist Michel Crozier have significantly contributed to the knowledge field of organizational sociology. He worked on embodying new mechanisms and methods to understand organizational structures and the actions of actors within them, which he termed "Strategic Analysis." This approach focuses on comprehending individual and collective actions, examining how they are constructed based on various behaviors performed by actors within the organization.

Crozier began by challenging macro-sociological theories that suggest that organizational behaviors and objectives are controlled and manufactured by the organization through regulations, laws, and task distribution. In the first part of his approach, he sought to debunk these theories.

In the second part, Crozier relied on the various fundamental insights that previous theories had brought, such as the theory of social action by Max Weber, symbolic interactionism by George Herbert Mead, and functionalism by Talcott Parsons. He viewed these as foundational elements for his analyses, surpassing the limitations of bureaucracy found in Max Weber's theories.

Crozier emphasized the necessity of adopting microsociological analysis and methodological individualism to understand and analyze organizations. He argued that social and organizational structures are merely products of individual actions. Therefore, strategic analysis laid the foundation for studying, understanding, and analyzing organizational structures from the perspective of actors, emphasizing that actors with limited freedom, authority, and rationality collectively shape the organization to achieve their goals within its overall objectives.

Synthesizing these points, the strategic analysis approach is built upon a set of assumptions and principles that will be adopted in our study, both in terms of field approach and understanding the behaviors of actors within the organizational context.

II -Assumptions and principles of strategic analysis

1-The actor

Michael Crozier considers the actor within the organizational system to be an element of rational management within limits, as he always enjoys a margin of freedom, no matter what the circumstances or the degree of control in the organization. He also often tries to create a field of power for himself with the various resources available to him and in the most possible ways, whether those ways are legal or illegal. (Crozier & friedberg, 1977)

From another perspective, through his different positions and daily interactions with others, the actor within the organization is able to aggregate within the group, which is considered itself as a single actor and is formed for a shared goal, and that imposes on its members to be coherent. After achieving their shared goals, the members of the group will disintegrate again, and each actor will return to his game and win his stakes and achieve his own interests in the organization independently. (Crozier & friedberg, 1977)

2- The strategic action

The concept of strategic action falls within the framework of strategic analysis theory, resulting from Michael Crozier's field studies aiming to understand and analyze the internal structure of organizations, the external environment, and the actions characterized by limited rationality of actors, whether individuals or groups. (barabel, meier, & teboul, 2013)

To comprehend the complex relationships among actors in the organization, Crozier believes that each actor, endowed with limited rationality, tries to create a personal strategy to achieve their goals, often conflicting with the organization's objectives. The actor relies on available resources and legal loopholes in mysterious ways. Consequently, each actor within the organizational structure has unique goals, traits, and resources, leading to the formulation of an unpredictable and mysterious strategy to prevent others from detecting or predicting their behavior while pursuing their goals. (Khribesh, 2011)

2-1- Strategic action is primarily categorized into two strategies:**2-1-1- The defensive strategy**

The actor in the organization enjoys a set of privileges that the organization had granted him, which he considers a major stake, so he exercises a set of actions through which he aims to keep the organization fixed on the same organizational data and characteristics in order to preserve those privileges, a department head, for example, maintains his relationships with the actors in the organization he works at, whether those actors occupy higher or lower positions than him, in order to preserve his professional position as it has a margin of freedom that allows him to achieve his goals. Thus, the actor is in a defensive confrontation against all forms of change. (Khribesh, 2011)

2-1-2- The offensive strategy

In this type of strategies the actor does not seek to preserve the privileges and gains which he obtains in the organization. The actor is able through his professional positioning to build several forms of offensive strategies that we will try or touch on as follows:

2-1-3 The bargaining strategy

In the framework of this form of strategies, the actor takes advantage of the skill gap between him and his peers in addition to his position in the organization to snatch immediate or urgent privileges and gains, for instance, one could look at the situation where the actor is the only industrial maintenance worker who knows how to fix a production machine, so the manager requests him to fix it outside working hours so that they do not delay the production process. From this point of view, the strategic actor adopts a bargaining strategy with the official on fixing the machine in exchange for obtaining paid days off or another bargaining demand that they agree on in advance. (Issa, 2010)

2-1-4- The investment strategy

In this form of strategies, the actor, according to the professional position he occupies, seeks to obtain long-term gains, such as working on getting a promotion so that he could attain good positioning in the organization, which enables him to adopt other strategies through which he achieves his goals and objectives within the organization from one side and improving his social status from another. Hence, in order to achieve the afore-mentioned goals the actor works on winning the trust of the decision-makers in the organization, as well as improving his image to his co-workers by exercising his responsibilities, duties, and obligations towards the organization, in addition to completing the tasks assigned to him to the fullest extent. (Lesca & Shuler, 1998)

Based on the above, we can understand that strategic action in all its forms and shapes can be carried out by everyone in the organization, whether it is legitimate authority based on laws and what the functional position grants, or the rest of the actors, each with the skills - whether technical or otherwise - that they distinguish themselves from others or that others do not master. Therefore, the exercise of power between the various actors in the organization takes place in a relational framework governed by individual or collective goals, privileges and interests that each party aspires to achieve and acquire, even if they contradict the goals of the organization or are illegal. This makes the actors work to find the loopholes necessary to achieve those goals.

3- Area of doubt (ambiguity)

Michel Crozier considers that the area of doubt or ambiguity is one of the sources from which actors within the organization gain power (Bagla, 1998)

In a study he conducted at a factory, part of which focused on the triad of "production workers", "maintenance workers" and "workshop manager", he discovered that the area of doubt was greater for "maintenance workers" than for the remaining dyad of "production workers" and "workshop manager". The social relations system of the maintenance work group at the tobacco

factory expands its sphere of power and makes its various strategies unpredictable to others, (Chazel, Favereau, & Friedberg, 1994) including "production workers" and "workshop manager". For example, when the maintenance group receives inquiries from the workshop manager about the lack of smooth operation of the factory, the group members always try to justify their answers by claiming that production workers do not know how to operate the machines properly, so the machines stop due to the breakdowns caused by the improper use, yet they are always working hard and meticulously to repair them until they are ready to be used again. Based on the above, it becomes clear to us that the maintenance workers, through this method of maneuver, are taking control of the area of uncertainty and the margins of freedom compared to production workers who are only subject to power and do not exercise it due to the lack of areas of uncertainty. Therefore, they are faced with only two options: either work or be fired, but the maintenance workers cannot be dispensed with by the factory because they have long experience in repairing the factory's machines. As for the workshop manager, he is considered to be the owner of power, within the triad that we mentioned earlier, by virtue of his position and the authority that the organization grants him, yet the power within this organizational system is enjoyed and exercised by the maintenance group, which is considered to be parallel power to the organization's power. This parallel power was created as a response to the coercions imposed on maintenance workers by the organization and to achieve their goals in a different way without violating the organization's laws (Alioua, 2018)

4- Bet

The concept of bet represents the situation in which the actor, whether an individual or a group, constantly feels that they are at stake, facing the possibility of either gaining or losing in achieving their goals within the organization. In this context, bet can also be considered as the set of goals characterized by change and instability. This prompts the actor, whether independently or as part of a work group, to craft their strategy towards others, be they individuals, groups, or official authorities. This strategic approach involves anticipating and dealing with both expected and unexpected reactions from others, utilizing the appropriate timing and relative rationality based on the available resources to win the bet. (Sahraoui & Ben Ramdan, 2022) However, the actor within the organization may encounter unexpected obstacles that could force them to relinquish some goals and discover new ones (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977).

5- Tangible action system

According to Michel Crozier, the tangible action system is the sum of interactions and relationships that develop within work groups, initiated by members outside the formal work framework. It is structured within the organizational context to face various pressures and daily life challenges, while striving to achieve common goals for the members. Alternatively, (Khrishesh, Strategic Analysis of Michel Crozier, 2011) Dauberville Béatrice sees tangible action framework, (Dauberville, Gilbert, & Pigeyre, 1996) as defined by both Michel Crozier and Erhard Friedberg, as the organization having the minimum level of coherence and regularity, resembling the chaos present in the strategic relationships of actors (individuals or groups) within the same organization (Issa, *Entreprise Culture : Field Study of the Public Economic Institution of Algeria*, 2004-2005).

In simpler terms, it is any organization consisting of several actors seeking to form a framework of mutual relationships in a structured manner to regulate the sequence of interactions and communications among them. This is done to form alliances and protect their goals from various obstacles that may threaten their achievement within the organization (Lemdir, 2017).

To understand the tangible action framework more effectively, we will attempt to delve into two essential patterns as follows:

5-1- Maneuvering and Probability

Strategic analysis does not align with deterministic structural constraints, as various social patterns can never be fully controlled or regulated. Especially in the case of groups, the actors forming these patterns cannot be confined within strict and entirely restrictive rules. Consequently, they are compelled in their communications and interactions with others to

strategically utilize the margins of freedom (Crozier M. , *Le Phénomène Bureaucratique*, 1963)

5-2- Relationship Regulation Pattern

Everything produced by actors within the organization, in terms of mechanisms and rules regulating their work, aims to guide their actions and behaviors within the interactive framework governing them. This is done to facilitate their tasks and prepare for facing various obstacles within the organization. For example, if a problem arises in production or maintenance, what should the worker do? Should they contact the immediate supervisor, the monitoring assistant, or the general manager? This means that the actors have created a pattern of informal boundaries and frameworks that govern and regulate their actions (Lemdir, 2017).

5-3- Alliance Pattern

The framework of relationships among actors in the organization constitutes a pattern governed by a series of alliances, even if these alliances are situational, tied to a specific position rather than another. Based on this, the selection of optimal methods and various tools and resources allows the group to address the various problems it encounters or the issues raised. Identifying the strategist within the group is crucial for this pattern, as the group considers them capable of winning the case or finding a solution that ensures achieving its goals due to their distinctive qualifications – scientific and technical knowledge, practical experience, and personal characteristics. In this way, the strategic actor knows who their allies are, those who will support them. On the other hand, the organization is often susceptible to suspicions, leading each actor (individual or group) to maneuver through their own strategies, conflicting with others to propose suggestions or solutions they want to impose to maintain their gains and their position within the organizational framework. The relationship regulation pattern differs from the alliance pattern as the latter occurs in situational and emergent cases, whereas the former is constant, always seeking to organize stable relationships and structure them (Issa, *Entreprise Culture : Field Study of the Public Economic Institution of Algeria*, 2004-2005).

6- Organization

Michel Crozier believes that organizations are not what they are seen to be by those who criticize them as mechanisms of coercion. He also believes that the conflict that exists within them is not premeditated. At the same time, that conflict between individuals or groups is nothing more than an expression of the different stakes and contradictions that exist between them. The organization is built socially with all the stakes and forms of coordination. It is far from the definitions of material. (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977) In the same context, the organization is a sociological phenomenon and a changing social construction that relies on games that help it to integrate with the strategies of the actors at its level, according to Michel Crozier and Erhard Friedberg.

On the other hand, and according to Michel Crozier, the organization does not move or function like a machine and can never be so. (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977) Its performance is related to the efficiency of the actors within it, especially with regard to coordinating activities between them in rational ways. This requires that actors be able to play or cooperate with each other (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977).

Crozier also tried, in his approach and within the framework of the relationship between the individual and the organization, to reconcile two prominent trends in explaining the social behavior of the actor (Lemdir, 2017).

The first trend, which interpreted social behavior from the standpoint of individual determinism. This means the influence of the various components that contribute to the behavior of individuals, such as their personal history, socio-cultural and class background. This is what the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu addressed in the concept of habitus (Bourdieu, 1980)

The second trend, which is the sociological trend that interpreted the social behavior of individuals based on collective consciousness. This means that individuals are not able to determine their choices and decisions independently of collective thinking. This is what is called sociological bias, represented by the French sociologist Émile Durkheim (Durkheim, 1978)

From the above, we find that Michel Crozier, within the framework of his total criticism of the bureaucratic conception presented by Max Weber (Weber, 2019) and absolute rationality, has tried to reconcile the two aforementioned trends on the basis of his belief that the relational interaction between the actor and the organization is nothing more than a game that is governed by different strategies for each party, according to the goals and objectives, as well as the totality of the constraints to which the individual or the active group in the organization is exposed to, which usually consist of those restrictions, controls and official procedures that the organization imposes on them in order to define for them the framework and limits of their actions and movements.

This makes the actor face the need to overcome those obstacles without violating the laws, but according to organized strategies that differ from one actor to another, and this is subject to the total differences between them, whether in terms of positioning in the organization, the resources available, the group to which the individual belongs and its goals, as well as his circumstances and organizational situation in everyday life, i.e., the extent of the actor's possession and control of the areas of uncertainty.

According to the French sociologist Philippe Bernoux, the strategic analysis approach is based on four basic assumptions, which he addressed in his book "The Sociology of Enterprises", which we will try to address as follows: (Bernoux, La sociologie des entreprises, 1999)

The first assumption: The organization is a social construction and the actions of the actors are established and based on the various constraints to which they are exposed (Bernoux, La sociologie des entreprises, 1999).

The second assumption: The actor within the organization enjoys a margin of freedom. The actor always tries, with the resources available to him, to preserve this margin or to maximize it and develop it, in response to the organization's attempts to reduce or eliminate it. This is in order to be somewhat independent of the choices and participations that are imposed on him and to have the ability to ignore them completely or to accept part of them (Bernoux, La sociologie des entreprises, 1999).

The third assumption: According to Michel Crozier, the actors at the level of the organization do not accept to be treated as tools or to be used only to achieve the goals of the organization. This indicates that each actor in the organization has specific goals and objectives that he also tries to achieve and does not accept to erase them for the mere sake of achieving the goals of the organization at his expense. It also does not mean that the goals of the organization are absolutely contradictory to the goals of the actor, according to Philippe Bernoux, who sees in the same context that it is impossible for the organization, regardless of its degree of control and monitoring of the actions of individuals to control them. Because this rationality will always remain limited and non-absolute because the organization contains other rationalities that are different from it and from each other, and each of them works to achieve specific goals (Bernoux, La sociologie des entreprises, 1999).

The Fourth Assumption: With regard to the strategies of actors in the organization, Michel Crozier considers that, whether in the framework of interactions between them, or between them and the organization to which they belong, they are characterized by rationality, but this latter is limited due to the existence of other strategies and rationalities that are opposed or work to achieve different goals, in addition to the existence of various obstacles that make them not ideal.

To this extent, no actor, individual, group, or organization can achieve the absolute level of rationality for several reasons such as time, the right situation, and the availability of various means and resources, etc. This makes the actor face the need to accept the relativity of this rationality as it is, since it is less harmful than not having it completely, and that it is the maximum that he may be able to achieve in the midst of the obstacles to which he is subject (Bernoux, La sociologie des entreprises, 1999).

7- Rationality

This concept can be considered to indicate the rationalization of various acquired resources, and thus the achievement of predetermined goals. It is also impossible for there to be one

rationality because there are several strategies and mechanisms that also seek to achieve certain goals and objectives according to the available resources. As Simon and March see, the individual has always sought to adopt a kind of single-minded thinking in solving various problems and also in order to achieve his gaimes. (March & Simon, 1958) In this context, Michel Crozier and Erhardh Friedberg believe that this form of thinking is incorrect and does not fall within the contexts of rationalization in the way that Max Weber sees it. (Lash & Whimster, 2014) Since the goals and rationalities of actors cannot be considered as abstract things, but rather as data that must be built socially, and the rationalities and margins of freedom of actors are always relative. The problem goes beyond ways of thinking or patterns, but is largely related to the strategies that actors make in order to observe, understand, and know the dimensions of the situation they are in (material, structural, behavioral, resources, etc.), which makes them determine the appropriate action for the situation (Crozier & Friedberg, *L'acteur et le system*, 1981)

8- The Power and authority between Bernoux, Sainsaulieu, Alter, Dupuy and Crozier...Continuity of discussion

Considering the organization as a set of interacting and integrated systems according to the functional paradigm, where groups are structured and organized according to what is required by the rational theory, (Mintzberg, Nizet, & Pichault, 1996) where each group works to build different strategies in order to gain more margins of freedom or areas of uncertainty and thus acquire as much power as possible. In an attempt to overcome those concepts related to power in its classical form, which is based on the hierarchy that gives power officially, and which sees power in the organization as being the "right to lead and the ability to subjugate individuals to obedience and impose it on them" (Fayol, 1990).

We will review the various theses and concepts that have dealt with the issue of power, as the latter carries within it different dimensions and visions than those traditional visions, according to what many field studies have reached, as well as according to what the epistemological nature of the sociology of organizations requires (Coster & Pichault, 1998).

Philippe Bernoux sees power as "the ability of the actor in the organization to work on using the conditions of negotiation with the other for his personal benefit according to what the cooperative system requires on the individuals of the organization, which makes the actor according to what the system imposes of constraints, seeks to obtain more resources so that he can obtain a margin of power" (Bernoux, *La sociologie des entreprises*, 1995).

According to Philippe Bernoux, power in the framework of its reciprocal relations at the level of the organizational system is characterized by a set of constraints to which the actor is subject in one way or another and in a necessary way, which makes him in a constant search for obtaining a margin of freedom that allows him, according to what he also acquires of resources, to put forward and present his conditions to the party that exercises coercion. This is something that allows him to enter the framework of negotiation.

As for Renaud Sainsaulieu, he tried to present power as "that process through which the actor in the organization obtains various means and mechanisms of maneuvering according to his socio-professional position so that he can enter the game according to what is required by professional relations. Various authoritarian features can also be presented and described as being subject to exchange and relationality in a specific temporal and spatial framework, on the other hand, it is limited" (Sainsaulieu, 2014).

According to Renaud Sainsaulieu's definition of power, the actor derives a set of resources from the organizational structure that are considered inputs enhancing and solidifying their position within the organization. Subsequently, the actor can employ these resources to assert themselves in work relationships built on maneuvering, cooperation, alliances, and negotiation.

Norbert Alter, on the other hand, views power as a means through which the actor establishes a certain position within the organization, confirming their strength and capability through negotiations that recognize them as a powerful party by others. The professional position of the actor within the organization and the various resources acquired enable them to impose their strength or, more precisely, achieve recognition (Alter, 2010).

In his book titled "Give and Take: Cooperation in the Enterprise," Norbert Alter attempted to explain the concept of power in the organization and the legitimacy it is based on. He added another dimension to the concept of power, represented by "recognition." Despite achieving various goals in the organization, such as the professional position or the ability to impose authority or engage in negotiation, the actor seeks recognition as a powerful party. Thus, the importance of power for the actor, in this context, is intertwined with being recognized, making power both a goal and a means toward recognition simultaneously.

Francois Dupuy defines power as "control over something important for others, whether an organization, an individual, or a group". (Dupuy, 2015) This definition refers to Dupuy's view that achieving and accessing power by the actor is not done in isolation from exploiting the weaknesses and shortcomings of the other party. This exploitation enables the actor to enter into negotiation and bargaining with the other party regarding a certain matter. The form represents and reflects the relational framework of power in one way or another.

So, power is considered one of the most important concepts that Crozier and Friedberg dealt with in strategic analysis. Power is known as a structured framework of exchange and negotiation relationships, which allows actors, whether individuals or groups, to influence other actors (individuals or groups). (Pritton, 2016) The multiplicity of power relational contexts requires different actors to focus on their own margins of freedom and maneuver through them. Not only that, but to defend them and try to expand those margins through negotiation, and then to give the strategic image to build the group's action (Ballé, 2009). According to H.SIMON and G.MARCH, power practices are clearly evident when two or more parties possess resources in a disparate manner, which requires mandatory exchange to manage them. This contributes to the difficulty of knowing their behaviors or positions, and therefore predicting and controlling them (Bernoux, 2002).

The simplest and most accurate concept of power is the power of "A" over "B", which is the ability of "A" to get in his relationship with "B" what he wants, which "B" would not have done without the intervention of "A" (Crozier M. , 1963)

As Michel Crozier explained, the main factor of power is the acquisition of areas of doubt which are represented, according to the study he conducted at the tobacco factory, in the breakdown of machines, and on this basis, power was seized by the maintenance staff (Khrishesh, Michel Crozier's Theory of Organizational Analysis, 2007)

Crozier and Friedberg also identify the various sources of power, which are considered in themselves areas of doubt for the actors in the organization, and the strength of the actor depends on the size of the area of uncertainty that he possesses and is good at using as follows:

8-1- Control of external relations

On the assumption that the organization is an open system to the external environment that affects it and is affected by its various fluctuations and changes, the actor's control over the formation of a network of relations with the external environment and with various other institutions according to his experience contributes to the stability of the organization and enables him to build his strategies and gain power (Crozier & Friedberg, *L'acteur et le système : Les contraintes de l'action collective*, 1981).

8-2- Control of communication channels and information flow

Since the organization is one of the forms of human organizations, the total individuals within it are always in a state of interaction and communication so that different functions, actions and organizational processes are carried out. Therefore, it will be incumbent on the management of the organization to ensure the required level of decisions and information dissemination, as each actor in the organization needs information from the other actors, whether they are at the same organizational level that he occupies, or at other levels higher or lower than him. The actor or actors who control the channels of communication and the flow of information seize a part of power and exercise it over other groups, as they are in need of that information, whether to perform their various professional functions or build their own personal

strategies. The actor or group that owns the information can also change or restrict it according to their goals and objectives. Therefore, the actor or group that does not control the channels of communication always lives in dependence on those who control the information and possess it (Crozier & Friedberd, *L'acteur et le système : Les contraintes de l'action collective*, 1981).

8-3- Mastering the use of organizational rules

Despite the existence of many organizational rules, these rules are complex. They are designed in the first place to overcome the sources of uncertainty that the actors possess, but the paradox lies in their partial failure to fully address these sources. Instead, these rules can create additional sources of power or areas of uncertainty within the organization to be immediately exploited by those who are good at using the rules or loopholes in their favor (Crozier & friedberg, 1977)

To understand a crucial aspect contributing to the establishment of power relations within an organization, we will explore power resources as follows:

8-4- Coercion

Coercion is linked to power through the means and mechanisms it produces to enforce obedience on others. The authority figure can exercise coercion through various means, whether administrative, physical, or other. According to R. Boudon and F. Bourricau, power is implicitly present in any power relationship, and power should not be equated solely with coercion. Coercive measures can extend to dismissal in organizational contexts. (Boudon & Bourricaud, *Dictionnaire critique de la sociologie*, 1982) The power dynamics involve pre-defined punishments and procedures, shaping the way power is exercised to enforce compliance (Bernoux, *La sociologie des organisations- Imitation théorique suivie de douze cas pratiques*, 1985).

In this context, the actor, represented by the organizational authority figure, possesses, officially, the power or coercion guaranteed by the organization. This power helps impose coercion and obedience, allowing the actor to achieve their interests by exercising coercion in various forms on other actors within the organization. Consequently, these actors, in turn, try to counteract such actions with strategies and maneuvers that manifest the power dynamics.

8-5- Legitimacy

Legitimacy is a fundamental and foundational element of power within an organization, granted by the organizational structure and leadership position. Legitimacy can be considered as the quality derived from an individual's position in the organization, empowering them to give orders to subordinates for the execution of assigned tasks. (Dusa, Hussein, & Saussen, 2009) Legitimacy, according to the French sociologist Philippe Bernoux, is the conflicting resource around power, where the possessor of power can legitimize their decisions, essentially an acknowledgment for the person in power (Lafaye, 2009).

As viewed by MacIver, it is the "established right within any social system intended to express various judgments towards issues, resolve conflicts, and formulate policies, or, in a broader sense, to perform the role of leadership. According to this definition, it is the legitimate face of power." (Ibrahim, 1999)

In the context of Michel Crozier's strategic actor approach, legitimacy within an organization is built on the benefits that arise based on predefined goals set by the actor. This is because the actor, being subordinate to others and relying on the formality of legitimacy granted by the organization, is tied to formal legitimacy. Regarding legitimacy, Crozier, in his book "*Pouvoir et organisation*," notes that the act of striking was initially considered unethical as it lacked a legitimate framework or reference. However, it evolved, especially with workers' ongoing struggles for their professional conditions, sometimes even being viewed as a duty (Crozier M. , *Le monde des employés de bureau*, 1965).

In light of the discussed issues surrounding legitimacy, it can be concluded that formal power, defined by formal legitimacy, contradicts power exercised through coercion. Consequently, the actor, in both cases, must adopt either an offensive or defensive strategy towards formal power. Utilizing available resources and considering their professional status, the actor aims to enter the game, creating informal power parallel to formal power to preserve their gains, goals, or general stakes.

According to Michel Crozier, organizations typically attempt to regulate and define power relations through the organizational structure, regulations, and official laws that restrict the

freedom of action for actors. In this context, Crozier poses two important questions:

1. What mechanisms and methods does the organization employ to uncover the actions and behaviors of actors that they often seek to conceal, allowing predictions of future actions?
2. How can the organization influence the games and strategies of actors at its level in the power relations they engage in?

In light of the previous discussion, Crozier attempted to reinforce it by proposing additional answers to the earlier questions. At the same time, he introduced methods that organizations adopt to control power relations:

8-5-1- Through the Resources Provided by the Organization to the Actor Based on Their Professional Position

The organization grants various resources to actors based on their professional positions. These resources differ in terms of utilization methods, importance, and associated goals. For instance, Crozier highlighted the maintenance worker as a crucial resource contributing to the organization's productivity and goal achievement. Maintenance workers, for example, hold power as they can strategically pass on their actions and games through a zone of suspicion, becoming a source of authority. However, these actors cannot directly exploit their resources within the power relations framework, as the domain they want to influence is interconnected with several other areas involving different actors. This compels any actor in the organization to adopt a limited rationality, balancing the resources they acquire with the challenges they face to maintain their professional position and avoid conflicts and problems that might jeopardize their authority. (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977)

8-5-2- Through Various Communication Channels

Since communication and information play a crucial role for actors, the organization attempts to control the flow of information, determining which actors should receive information to enhance their power over others. This enables the organization to influence and predict the actions of actors by controlling the flow of information to specific individuals. (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977)

8-5-3- Through Conditions Limiting the Actor's Exploitation of Resources

The organization defines the stakes for actors at its level through various conditions restricting their risks and related strategies. Internal laws and organizational regulations, such as internal promotions, include areas of uncertainty, and their importance varies for different actors. This encourages actors to utilize different resources and exploit areas of suspicion. Conditions like promotion exams limit the actor's use of resources, preventing them from reaching more important positions of power. For instance, a promotion competition based on qualifications and seniority reduces the number of participants, as not all meet the imposed conditions. Therefore, the position does not represent a significant stake for those unable to use their resources for it. Consequently, actors with the necessary conditions exploit their resources and controlled zones of uncertainty to secure the position. (Crozier & Friedberg, 1977)

III Conclusion

This scientific paper concludes by referencing Michael Crozier's insights, emphasizing that organizations are not merely institutions in the conventional sense but rather social structures, and the actions of individuals and groups within these structures are not considered mere natural behavior. In this context, the behaviors of individuals, groups, and their dynamics are mostly based on strategies and power relations.

Strategic analysis proves significant as a modern microsociological approach to understanding both organizational structures and the behavior of actors within them. This approach considers the individual or group as a key factor in various organizational processes, focusing on the limited rationality of individuals and groups.

Furthermore, strategic analysis stands out by affirming that an organization is not an isolated entity but part of an environment or society consisting of diverse actors who play a vital role in influencing the organization. From Renaud Sainsaulieu's perspective, strategic analysis transforms the actor into a strategic human, highlighting strategic thinking as a key characteristic involving negotiation, bargaining, and power relations. Rationality is thus a prominent aspect. The collective actor appears as a symmetrical social formation. (Sainsaulieu, *Sociologie De L'organisation Et De L'entreprise*, 1987).

Sainsaulieu notes the complexity of this systemic analysis, attributing it to the necessity of

considering the intellectual, cultural, moral, normative, and ideological representations and backgrounds of active groups. He adds that a holistic and constant interpretation of the actions of actors cannot solely rely on the intellectual or ideological aspects. For example, symbolic violence exercised by the local culture pervasive in the organization, dominating the behavior of active groups at its level, contributes to the complexity of understanding various strategies and patterns of relational power. (Sainsaulieu, *Sociologie de l'entreprise- Organisation, culture et developpement*, 1997) .

– **Referrals and references:**

Books:

- Alter, N. (2010). *Donner et Prendre- La coopération en entreprise*. La découverte, Paris
- Bagla, L. (1998). *Sociologie Des Organisations.*, La decouverte, Paris.
- Ballé, C. (2009). *Sociologie Des Organisations*, Que je sais, Paris
- barabel, m., meier, o., & teboul, t. (2013). *les fondamentaux du management*, Dunod, Paris.
- Bernoux, P. (1995). *La sociologie des entreprises*, Seuil, Paris.
- Bernoux, P. (1999). *La sociologie des entreprises*, Seuil, Paris.
- Bernoux, P. (1985). *La sociologie des organisations- Imitation théorique suivie de douze cas pratiques*, Seuil, Paris.
- Bernoux, P. (1985). *La sociologie des organisations- Imitation théorique suivie de douze cas pratiques*, Seuil, Paris.
- Boudon, R., & Bourricaud, F. (1982). *Dictionnaire critique de la sociologie*, P.U.F, Paris.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). *L'habitus en sociologie entre objectivisme et subjectivisme*, Minuit, Paris.
- Coster, M. D., & Pichault, F. (1998). *Traité de sociologie du travail*, De Boeck Supérieur, Paris.
- Crozier, M. (1965). *Le monde des employés de bureau*, Seuil, Paris.
- Crozier, M. (1963). *Le Phenomène Bureaucratique*, Seuil, Paris.
- Crozier, M., & Friedberd, E. (1981). *L'acteur et le système : Les contraintes de l'action collective*, Seuil, Paris.
- Crozier, M., & friedberg, e. (1977). *L'acteur et le systtem*, Seuil, Paris
- Dauberville, B., Gilbert, P., & Pigeyre, F. (1996). *Les science humaines dans l'entreprise*, economica, Paris.
- Dupuy, F. (2015). *La faillite de la penséemanagériale. Lost in management*, vol2, Seuil, Paris.
- Durkheim, E. (1978). *De la division du travail social*, P.U.F, Paris.
- Fayol, H. (1990). *Administration industrielle et générale*, ENAG, Alger.
- Ibrahim, O. (1999). *Introduction to Sociology*, Al-Shourouk, .Amman.
- Issa, M. E. (2010). *Organization Sociology- from organization sociology to entreprise sociology*, Ambblast printing, Algeria.
- Lafaye, C. (2009). *La sociologie des organisations*, Armand, Colin Paris.
- Lash, S., & Whimster, S. (2014). *Max Weber- Rationality and Modernity*, Routledge, London.
- March, J., & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*, Jhon Wiley&Sons, Inc, New Jersey.
- Sainsaulieu, R. (2014). *L'identité au travail*, Presse de Science Politique, Paris

- Sainsaulieu, R. (1997). *Sociologie de l'entreprise- Organisation, culture et developpement*. Presses Sciences Po et Dalloz, Paris.
- Sainsaulieu, R. (1987). *Sociologie De L'organisation Et De L'entreprise*, Presses Sciences Po et Dalloz, Paris.
- Weber, M. (2019). *Economy and Society. Tr: Keith Tribe*, Harvard University Press, London.

Journal article :

- Alioua, A. (2018). Conflict and Conflict Management at Alan Tourine, Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Crozier. *Journal of the Rissala for Humanitarian Studies and Research*, Algeria 3(4), 151.
 - Bernoux, P. (2002). L'influence de March sur la sociologie des organisation en france. *Revue francaise de gestion, France*, 139(03), 195.
 - Chazel, F., Favereau, O., & Friedberg, E. (1994). Symposium le pouvoir et la régle. *Sociologie du travail* , 36(01), 85.
 - Dusa, A., Hussein, J., & Saussen. (2009). Organizational "Power of Administrative Leadersand it's Influence on Leadership Behaviour. *journal of administration and economics*, Iraq, 75, 182-183.
 - Khribesh, A. (2007). Michel cozier's Theory of Organizational Analysis. *Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences* , Algeria, 08 (16), 234.
- Khribesh, A. (2011). The Analysis strategic at Michel Crozier, Damascus University review, Syria, 27(01+02), 580-594.
- Lemdir, M. (2017). Sociology of Organizations : From Max Weber to Michel Crozier. *journal of the generation of humanities and social sciences*, Morroco,34, 79.
 - Lesca, H., & Shuler, M. (1998). Vieille Stratégique-comment ne pas etre noyé sous les informations-. *Les économies et société*, France, 02, 159-177.
 - Mintzberg, H., Nizet, J., & Pichault, F. (1996). L'analys des Organisations a l'entreprise a l'épreuve des faits. *L'expansion management review*, France, 80, 88-90.
 - Sahraoui, H., & Ben Ramdan, S. (2022). Strategic Action of the Actor within the format "Strategic Analysis Approach". *journal of social studies and research*, Algeria, 10(01), 225.

Internet websites:

- Issa, M. E. (2004-2005). Entreprise Culture : Field Study of the Public Economic Institution of Algeria,. *Doctoral thesis not published in sociology, University of Algiers 02*, Algiers, Algeria, [file:///C:/Users/imad/Downloads/BENAISSA_MEDELMAHDI%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/imad/Downloads/BENAISSA_MEDELMAHDI%20(1).pdf) (consulted on 20/01/2024).
- Pritton, G. (2016). Une présentation de l'analyse Stratégique, selon Michel CROZIER et Erhard Friedberg. Présentation schématique, sur docplayer.fr: <https://docplayer.fr/10590233-Une-presentation-de-l-analyse-strategique-selon-michel-crozier-et-erhard-friedberg-presentation-schematique-gerard-pirotton.html> (consulted on 02/02/2024).