

THE COORDINATION BETWEEN THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OF THE FIRM: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN THE PUBLIC SECTOR AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN TUNISIA

Mohamed Karim AZIB

Faculty of Economic Sciences and Management of Tunis

Permanent Lecturer, Department of Management

Member of the Research Unit General Management Studies (GEMAS)

E-mail : MohamedKarim.Azib@fsegt.rnu.tn

Mohamed FRIQUI

Faculty of Economic Sciences and Management of Tunis

Professor, Department of Management

Head of the Research Unit General Management Studies (GEMAS)

E-mail : Mohamed.Frioui@fsegt.rnu.tn

—Abstract —

The institutional framework is the business environment; the management system should allow the firm to be adapted to the context, to react and to try to change its institutional framework. The objective of this research work was to answer the following question: **the management of the company is it tributary of the coordination between the institutional framework and the management system?** The conceptual analysis demonstrates that the institutional framework conditions the management of the firms through its three components: the market, the legal context and the sociological referential. Concerning the influence of the management system on the institutional framework, the conceptual analysis has shown that it is practiced through three components: the ethics, the mode of functioning and the procedure of regulation. The empirical results permitted, firstly, to validate the components as well as the means of influence used by the institutional framework and the management system; then, to confirm the existence of a reciprocity relation and to evaluate the importance of the influence of each component in this relationship, and finally, to identify the significant differences between the private and the public sectors in Tunisia.

Key words: *Institutional framework, Market, Legal context, Sociological referential, Management system, Ethics, Mode of functioning, Procedure of regulation.*

JEL Classification : M10, M14, M20, D02, D40, K00, K40, L32, Z10

1. INTRODUCTION

The company's business requires consideration of internal and external elements involved in managerial practice. The internal components are related to the managerial system that determines the organizational culture, the work practices and the monitoring mechanisms; external elements concern the institutional framework, through the various dimensions of the environment that are generating opportunities and threats. Therefore the objective of this research work is to answer the following question: **the management of the company is it tributary of the coordination between the institutional framework and the management system?** The analysis of this relationship would enable to know whether the management system is simply a by-product of the institutional framework that imposes its logic of evolution, or if the management system is able to react, adjust or even change the institutional framework.

2. The influence of the institutional framework on the management system

The interactions between the actors of the business environment requires the existence of institutions based on normative and stable rules, favoring the creation of social relationships and connections in order to control and direct behavior (Livian, 1998). The study of various institutional approaches of the environment (Naguib, 2006; Berthelie and al., 2003; Meisel and Ould Aoudia, 2007; Frioui, 2006; Azib, 2012) has shown that the different axes of the institutional framework (IF) are: the “space of exercising the activity” based on “market” conditions, the “regulatory texts” constituting the “legal context” and the “behavioral factors” serving as “sociological referential” (Azib, 2012:28; Frioui, 2006:3).

2.1. The influence of the market on the management system

The market (M_{IF}) is the space where the company chooses its field of activity to achieve its mission (Azib, 2012), to satisfy the expectations of its environment (Naguib, 2006) and create values. The market is the place to express preferences, concluding transactions, making efficient allocation of resources ; but in all cases, the durability and the performance of the firm in the market depend on its level of competitiveness (Bethelie and al., 2003; Meisel and Ould Aoudia, 2007; Naguib, 2006; Frioui, 2006). The market (M_{IF}) acts on the management activity, through three means of action: the conditions of “access”, the “functioning mechanisms” and the “regulation” terms (Azib, 2012:173). Market access (A_M) is related to the competitive factors and barriers, favoring or impeding the entry of a firm in a

business sector. The functioning mechanisms (F_M) of the market should allow arbitration between the preference functions and the efficient allocation of resources. Market regulation (R_M) aims to resolve conflicts of interest, to manage the abundance or scarcity, to correct the imperfections or to punish the improper or unethical behaviors observed.

2.2.The influence of the legal context on the management system

The legal context (LC_{IF}) contains the regulatory texts governing the business activities of the firms (Frioui, 2006; Azib, 2012). The legal context contributes to create a climate of trust, ensures the security of transactions and arbitrates conflicts between economic agents. The stability, the legitimacy and the effectiveness of legal rules and procedures are based on the existence of public and private institutions (Bethelier and al., 2003; Meisel and Ould Aoudia, 2007; Naguib, 2006). The legal context influences the system of management, through three means of influence: the “directives”, the “consecration of professional practices” and the “interpretation” of rules (Azib, 2012:174). The directives (D_{CL}) are codified, formal and general; they are mandatory because their implementation is imposed by the power of government. The consecration of professional practices (CPP_{CL}) aims at institutionalizing certain techniques, procedures, methods or behaviors prevalent, transmitted and perpetuated within an organization, a profession or a business sector. The interpretation (I_{CL}) of rules reflects the differences in the understanding and explanation of a regulatory text.

2.3.The influence of the sociological referential on the management system

The sociological referential (SR_{IF}) is manifested through norms, values and customs recognized in a society in order to organize community life (Frioui, 2006; Azib, 2012); the sociological referential reflects the culture of a country, the expectations of civil society, determines the nature of social relations and affects the corporate culture (Bethelier and al, 2003; Meisel and Ould Aoudia, 2007; Naguib, 2006). The sociological referential conditions the managerial activity of the firm by three means of action: the “consecration of current practices”, the “adoption of new systems” and the “free will” (Azib, 2012:175). The consecration of current practices (CCP_{SR}) can be observed through the sharing of norms, values and practices, assimilated and internalized by members of the society through a process of socialization which requires regulation and the exertion of pressure to correct deviant behavior in order to maintain societal cohesion. The adoption of new systems (ANS_{SR}) is manifested by the emergence of new norms, values and

practices from societal movements, conflicts or external influences leading to the questioning of the established order with its current practices. The free will (FW_{SR}) reflects the desire to be independent of influences, through, deliberate choices to realize the own ambitions and preferences.

3. The influence of the management system on the institutional framework

The study and the synthesis of various approaches of management system (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970; Mélése, 1968, 1972; Capet and al., 1986; Laflamme, 1979; Tabatoni and Jarniou, 1975; Desreumaux, 1992; Darbelet and al., 2004; Frioui, 2006; Azib, 2012) led to identify the components involved in the influence of the managerial system on the institutional framework. The values, the culture and the norms determine the “ethics” and guide the “will of action” (Azib, 2012:108; Frioui, 2006:7). The organizational model, the mode of exercising power and decision-making procedure configure the “mode of functioning” by setting an “operating system” (Azib, 2012:130; Frioui, 2006:7). The control and the steering of the activity require the establishment of a “procedure of regulation” with several “axes of evaluation” (Azib, 2012:154; Frioui, 2006:7).

3.1. The influence of the ethics on the institutional framework

The ethics manifests the will of action by a set of principles, norms, standards and professional practices to manage relationships, guide and legitimize the behavior (Frioui, 2006; Azib, 2012). Ethics reflects the cultural and the psychosocial context (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970), the values (Laflamme, 1979) and the interests of various stakeholders involved in the activity of the company (Capet and al., 1986). The ethics (E_{MS}) results from the coordination between the “values scale of stakeholders” ($VSSH_E$), the “preference function of manager-leader” ($PFML_E$) and the “social scale of values” (SSV_E) in order to practice a governance based on the balance of interests (Frioui, 2006:8; Capet and al., 1986; Darbelet and al., 2004; Azib, 2012:176). The ethics and its components act on the institutional framework, through, the “transparency”, the “regularity” and the “reciprocity” (Azib, 2012:177). The transparency (T_E) needs the clarity of procedures and the issuance of sincere information, required in decision-making process and useful for creating a climate of trust between business partners. The regularity (REG_E) reflects the desire of the company to be fair, accountable to the stakeholders and to conform to rules and contracts established. The reciprocity (REC_E) shows the disposition of the firm to establish a network of relationships based on exchanges and partnerships profitable for all parties participating.

3.2.The influence of the mode of functioning on the institutional framework

The mode of functioning determines the operating system; it's based on the process and the flows exchanged (Darbelet and al., 2004), the nature of the activity, the mode of animation and exercise of power (Tabatoni and Jarniou, 1975; Capet and al., 1986), the rules and principles of management (Mélèse, 1968, 1972). The mode of functioning covers several managerial aspects: the structure, the technology (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970; Laflamme, 1979), the operating cycle, the communication (Mélèse, 1968, 1972; Desreumaux, 1992), the decision and the planning (Laflamme, 1979). The mode of functioning (MF_{MS}) is configured by the available "resources" (RESS_{MF}), the "leadership style" (LS_{MF}) and the "organizational cutting" (OC_{MF}) that delimits the responsibilities (Frioui, 2006:9; Azib, 2012:177); these components act on the institutional framework with three means of influence: the "appreciation" of the situation, the "referential" practices and the "manifestation" of choices (Azib, 2012:178). The appreciation (APP_{MF}) is the result of internal and external diagnosis made by the company that can be a source of learning, reform proposals, recommendations, solutions and detecting best practices to be disseminated. The referential (REF_{MF}) practices established by the company serves as an example, determines the standard to follow; it's an element of comparison and positioning. The manifestation of choices (MAN_{MF}) is the realization of decisions, policies and strategies established. The firms manifest their managerial behavior by the lobbying practiced, by their degree of approval, by the intensity of their opposition or by their indifference.

3.3.The influence of the procedure of regulation on the institutional framework

The procedure of regulation is based on the objectives, trends, measurement standards and deviations (Mélèse, 1968, 1972; Tabatoni and Jarniou, 1975), the achievements and the potential to enhance (Capet and al., 1986). The procedure of regulation should promote the recognition of merit (Laflamme, 1979; Desreumaux, 1992). The procedure of regulation (PR_{MS}) supposes the consideration of three main axes of evaluation: the "result" (R_{PR}) achieved, of the "behaviour" (B_{PR}) adopted and of the "effort" (EFF_{PR}) provided (Frioui, 2006:10; Azib, 2012:178-179); these components influence the institutional framework with three means of action: the "maintain of the status quo", the "monitoring of the evolution" and the "initiation of the change" (Azib, 2012:179). The maintaining of the status quo (MSQ_{PR}) reflects the will of the company to

preserve the gains, to reduce risk, to sustain a favorable situation and to institutionalize its practices. The monitoring of the evolution (ME_{PR}) demonstrates the desire of the firm to be part of change and to track progress. The initiation of the change (IC_{PR}) involves a pulse behavior and anticipation based on innovation.

4. The coordination between the institutional framework and the management system: the research proposal

The conceptual analysis demonstrates the existence of a coordination based on a mutual influence between the institutional framework and the management system. The influence of the institutional framework is based on three components (with their means of influence): the market (access, functioning mechanisms and regulation), the legal context (directives, consecration of professional practices and interpretation) and the sociological referential (consecration of current practices, adoption of new systems and free will); the institutional framework influences the configuration of the management system that undergoes its impact and must be adapted to its requirements, its evolution, its constraints and its pressures (first hypothesis). Concerning the management system, the conceptual analysis has shown that it reacts, adjusts and changes differently the axes of the institutional framework (second hypothesis) through three main components and their subcomponents (with their means of influence): the ethics (transparency, regularity and reciprocity), the mode of functioning (referential, appreciation and manifestation) and the procedure of regulation (maintaining the status quo, monitoring evolution and initiation of change).

5. The empirical validation of the research proposal

The empirical study will be devoted, first, to the explanation of the approach taken in data collection and, then, to the analysis of the survey results.

5.1. The data collection method

The empirical results of the survey, completed in December 2010, are based on responses from a sample of private and public firms in Tunisia. Data collection was based on a probabilistic method of disproportionate stratified sampling (Evrard and al., 2000) with two groups of firms distinguished according to capital ownership. In fact, the target sample includes 122 companies (a sampling rate of 12.63% from a population comprising 966 firms) including 88 private companies (from a population of 863 firms: limited companies and limited liability

companies not totally exporting with a workforce ≥ 100 employees; source: NIS, 2008) with a sampling rate of 10.19% and 34 public firms (from a population comprising 103 firms; source: Decree No.2006-2579 of 2 October 2006) with a sampling rate of 33%. The analysis of the results will be made by three levels: overall results (Ov), private sector results (Pv) and public sector results (Pb).

Table 1: The cronbach's alpha results

Variables	Symbols	Components or means of influence	Cronbach's Alpha		
			Or	Pv	Pb
	IF	$M_{IF} / LC_{IF} / SR_{IF}$	0,667	0,603	0,7938
Institutional framework (IF) main components	M_{IF}	$A_M / F_M / R_M$	0,6405	0,6353	0,6615
	LC_{IF}	$D_{CL} / CPP_{CL} / I_{CL}$	0,6984	0,6028	0,8967
	SR_{IF}	$CCP_{SR} / ANS_{SR} / FW_{SR}$	0,7113	0,6379	0,8411
	MS	$E_{MS} / MF_{MS} / PR_{MS}$	0,6524	0,5396	0,7904
Management system (MS) main components	E_{MS}	$VSSH_E / PFML_E / SSV_E$	0,627	0,581	0,6902
	MF_{MS}	$RESS_{MF} / LS_{MF} / OC_{MF}$	0,6332	0,6693	0,5518
	PR_{MS}	$R_{PR} / B_{PR} / E_{PR}$	0,715	0,5092	0,8344
Ethics subcomponents	SHSV_E	$T_E / REG_E / REC_E$	0,6809	0,5796	0,7976
	MLFP_E	$T_E / REG_E / REC_E$	0,8133	0,7763	0,8381
	SSV_E	$T_E / REG_E / REC_E$	0,8676	0,8615	0,8858
Mode of functioning subcomponents	RESS_{MF}	$APP_{MF} / MAN_{MF} / REF_{MF}$	0,7054	0,695	0,726
	LS_{MF}	$APP_{MF} / MAN_{MF} / REF_{MF}$	0,7095	0,675	0,7761
	OC_{MF}	$APP_{MF} / MAN_{MF} / REF_{MF}$	0,8162	0,8068	0,8613
Procedure of Regulation subcomponents	R_{PR}	$MSQ_{PR} / ME_{PR} / IC_{PR}$	0,6359	0,6796	0,6192
	B_{PR}	$MSQ_{PR} / ME_{PR} / IC_{PR}$	0,7627	0,7554	0,792
	EFF_{PR}	$MSQ_{PR} / ME_{PR} / IC_{PR}$	0,8201	0,8015	0,8492

The collect of responses was conducted through a survey based on 5 points Likert scale in order to evaluate the relative importance of the components and the means of influence proposed. The results of the Cronbach's alpha (Table 1) validated the reliability of the measurement scale and the internal coherence between items and their reliability to evaluate the mutual influence between the institutional framework and the management system.

5.2.The validation of components of the institutional framework and the management system

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett's test of sphericity, always significant, allowed the use of factor analysis in order to reduce the number of variables (Table 2).

Table 2: The main results of the principal component analysis

Extracted factors	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy			Total Variance Explained, Extraction sums of squared loadings					
				Overall		Privat sector		Public Sector	
	Ov	Pv	Pb	Tot	% of variance = cumulative %	Tot	% of variance = cumulative %	Tot	% of variance = cumulative %
M_{IF}	0,627	0,610	0,607	1,78	59,37	1,76	58,74	1,88	62,65
LC_{IF}	0,659	0,630	0,709	1,87	62,45	1,67	55,80	2,51	83,75
SR_{IF}	0,663	0,617	0,616	1,91	63,68	1,75	58,32	2,30	76,71
IF	0,703	0,630	0,610	2,14	71,27	2,09	69,59	2,27	75,59
VSSH_E	0,606	0,596	0,602	1,84	61,41	1,66	55,36	2,15	71,58
PFML_E	0,707	0,680	0,678	2,19	72,87	2,08	69,25	2,28	76,08
SSV_E	0,724	0,710	0,747	2,38	79,45	2,37	78,93	2,46	81,96
RESS_{MF}	0,674	0,672	0,652	1,91	63,53	1,88	62,81	1,98	66,08
LS_{MF}	0,657	0,645	0,665	1,91	63,52	1,83	60,92	2,09	69,49
OC_{MF}	0,711	0,709	0,581	2,20	73,27	2,17	72,41	2,35	78,37
R_{PR}	0,581	0,640	0,528	1,81	60,42	1,88	62,60	1,83	60,83
B_{PR}	0,604	0,602	0,607	2,10	70,03	2,07	68,91	2,24	74,76
EFF_{PR}	0,650	0,660	0,598	2,24	74,75	2,18	72,60	2,36	78,54
E_{MS}	0,654	0,665	0,623	2,11	70,24	1,98	65,91	2,37	79,00
MF_{MS}	0,735	0,719	0,724	2,42	80,80	2,32	77,32	2,66	88,60
PR_{MS}	0,712	0,650	0,764	2,54	84,52	2,47	82,41	2,73	90,98
MS	0,777	0,722	0,763	2,38	79,21	2,26	75,33	2,61	86,82

Each factor was extracted from three items proposed (components or means of influence), without using varimax method. In all the cases the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant.

The principal component analysis (Table 2) confirmed the elements and the means of action implemented by the institutional framework to influence the management system; the principal component analysis validates, also, the components, the subcomponents and the means of action used by the management system in order to act on the institutional framework.

5.3. The evaluation of the interaction between the institutional framework and the management system: the realization of the coordination

The results of Pearson correlations (Table 3) confirm the existence of a co-evolution, a reciprocity permitting the coordination between the institutional framework and the management system. The overall results show that the most important correlations are noted between this pairs of variables: "Institutional framework / Procedure of regulation", "Institutional framework / Ethics" and

“Management system / Sociological referential”. The results of the private sector reveal that the most important correlations were noted with these binomials: “Institutional framework / Procedure of regulation” and “Management system / Market”. In the case of the public sector, the highest correlations concern ethics in relation with the legal context and the institutional framework

Table 3: The validation of the correlations between the institutional framework and the management system (Pearson correlations)

	IF			M _{IF}			LC _{IF}			SR _{IF}		
	Ov	Pv	Pb	Ov	Pv	Pb	Ov	Pv	Pb	Ov	Pv	Pb
MS	0,713	0,677	0,829	0,632	0,635	0,681	0,534	0,457	0,756	0,641	0,609	0,726
E_{MS}	0,647	0,599	0,827	0,535	0,546	0,600	0,522	0,412	0,854	0,583	0,548	0,699
OM_{MS}	0,596	0,541	0,753	0,571	0,535	0,697	0,412	0,342	0,626	0,527	0,479	0,651
PR_{MS}	0,660	0,624	0,736	0,582	0,572	0,607	0,491	0,437	0,633	0,601	0,560	0,678

All the correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The results of multiple linear regressions confirm the existence of mutual influence and, therefore, a coordination between the institutional framework and the management system, the importance and the significance of the impact of their components vary with the level of result analysis (Tables 4 and 5).

Table 4: The influence of components of the institutional framework on the management system (Model Summary with stepwise method)

Evaluation de l'influence : standardized coefficients	Adjusted R Square	Analysis level
MS = 0,420 SR _{IF} + 0,402 M _{IF} + 4,626 E-17	(0,515)	(overall)
MS = 0,436 M _{IF} + 0,382 SR _{IF} - 1,46 E-16	(0,497)	(privat sector)
MS = 0,562 LC _{IF} + 0,423 M _{IF} - 9,05 E-17	(0,695)	(public sector)

The empirical results concerning the influence of the institutional framework on the management system (Table 4) shows that the management system is in general conditioned, in first position, by the sociological reference. The management system of private enterprise is, first, influenced by the market. In the case of public sector, management system is, primarily, conditioned by the legal context (validation of the first hypothesis). The management system must comply with societal culture in order promote the integration of the enterprise in its local environment. Private enterprise must be competitive to ensure its survival and continuity of income. The management of public organizations is characterized by the priority given to the conformity with procedures and the instructions.

Table 5: The influence of components of the management system on the institutional framework (Model Summary with stepwise method)

Evaluation de l'influence : standardized coefficients	Adjusted R Square	Analysis level
IF = 0,410 PR _{MS} + 0,369 E _{MS} - 1,21 E-17	(0,501)	(overall)
IF = 0,410 PR _{MS} + 0,343 E _{MS} - 3,46 E-17	(0,449)	(privat sector)
IF = 0,827 E _{MS} - 3,33 E-17	(0,674)	(public sector)

Concerning the influence of the management system on the institutional framework (Table 5), the overall results and the private sector results show that the procedure of regulation is the component of the management system that most influences the institutional framework; concerning public organizations, ethics is the only component having a significant influence on the institutional framework (validation of the second hypothesis). The performance levels achieved by firms, their efforts to progress and the kind of behavior that they adopt, affect the situation of their business environment. The ethical commitment of firms promotes fair practices, social responsibility and, therefore, transparent and regular transactions; the ethics commitment favors a climate of trust, the dynamism of trade and the efficient use of resources. The public enterprises influence the institutional framework, through, their ethics marked by their public interest mission, the requirement of regularity and diligence on the part of managers and the dominance of government's will in economic and social action.

5.4. The significant differences between the private and the public sectors

The results of group means (M_{OV} , M_{PV} , M_{Pb}) by the one-way ANOVA analysis revealed a greater attention in public organizations to directives established by the legal context ($M_{OV} = 4,11$; $M_{PV} = 3,96$; $M_{Pb} = 4,5$; sign. = 0,004). The private sector differs from the public sector through greater importance given to the market ($M_{OV} = 4,61$; $M_{PV} = 4,68$; $M_{Pb} = 4,44$; sign. = 0,055). The results of the discriminant analysis show that ethics is the component of the management system that distinguishes between the public sector and the private sector (box'M = 6,42; sign. = 0,012; canonical correlation = 0,215; Wilks' Lambda = 0,954; sign. = 0,017; canonical discriminant function coefficient = 1,02; constant = 0).

6. CONCLUSION

The objective of this research work was to analyse the coordination between the institutional framework and management system. The conceptual and the empirical analyzes have validated the two research hypotheses. The first

hypothesis considers that the institutional framework, dynamic or turbulent, imposes its logic of evolution to management system implemented in companies that do not have the position, size and resources that should give them the power of influence on their environment. The second hypothesis stipulates that the management system of enterprises may be able to adjust and change the institutional framework, through the evaluations and the recommendations of reforms proposed by the managers, the nature of strategic behavior manifested, the innovations realised, the standards imposed, the pressures on policy makers and the communication with the public. To influence their environment, companies can use, too, their results, their reputation, their size and scale, their competitive advantage, their resources and capacities, their bargaining power and their network of relationships.

The contribution of this research work is the diversity of components and means of influence proposed to analyze the coordination between the institutional framework and the management system. The empirical analysis showed, firstly, the most influential components of the institutional framework and, secondly, the components of the management system most likely to enable the company to respond to evolution of its institutional framework. Furthermore, this research work has allowed identifying the distinguishing characteristics between the public sector and the private sector in Tunisia. This research work needs to be deepened by studying changes in the institutional framework and in the management system after the revolution and by a comparative analysis of coordination between the institutional framework and the management system in the contexts of an economy in transition and a developed economy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Azib, Mohamed Karim (2012), "La coordination entre le cadre institutionnel et le système de gestion dans le management de l'entreprise : analyse comparative entre le secteur privé et le secteur public en Tunisie", Thèse de Doctorat en Sciences de Gestion (sous la direction de Mohamed Frioui), Faculté des Sciences Economiques et de Gestion de Tunis, Université de Tunis El Manar, Tunis.

Bertheliet, Pierre, Alain Desdoigts and Jacques Ould Aoudia (2004), "Profils institutionnels. Une base de données sur les caractéristiques institutionnelles de pays en développement, en transition et développés", *Revue Française d'Economie*, Vol.19, No.1, pp. 121-196.

- Capet, Marcel, Geneviève Causse and Jeanne Meunier (1986), *Diagnostic, organisation, planification d'entreprise*, T.1: diagnostic et politique générale, Paris, Economica.
- Darbelet, Michel, Laurent Izard and Michel Scaramuzza (2004), *Notions fondamentales de management*, Vanves, Foucher.
- Decree No.2006-2579 of 2 October 2006, "List of public establishments, considered as public enterprises", Tunisia.
- Desreumaux, Alain (1992), *Structures d'entreprise : analyse et gestion*, Paris, Vuibert.
- Evrard, Yves, Bernard Pras and Elyette Roux (2000), *Market, études et recherches en Marketing*, Paris, Dunod.
- Frioui, Mohamed (2006), *Le cadre institutionnel et la problématique managériale. Cas vivants de management*, Tunis, Yamama.
- Kast, Fremont and James Rosenzweig (1970), *Organization and management, a system approach*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Laflamme, Marcel (1979), *Le management : approche systémique - théorie et cas*, Québec, Gaëtan Morin.
- Livian, Yves-Frédéric (1998), *Organisation : théories et pratiques*, Paris, Dunod.
- Meisel, Nicolas and Jacques Ould Aoudia (2007), "Une nouvelle base de données institutionnelles : profils institutionnels 2006", *Les Cahiers de la DGTPE*, No. 2007-09, Paris, Direction Générale du Trésor et de la Politique Economique.
- Mélèse, Jacques (1968), *La gestion par les systèmes*, Paris, Hommes et Techniques.
- Mélèse, Jacques (1972), *L'analyse modulaire des systèmes de gestion*, Paris, Hommes et Techniques.
- Naguib, Rabia (2006), "La tension entre le mondial et le local: vers une gestion conciliant l'économique et le social", *Gestion, Revue Internationale de Gestion*, Vol. 31, No.1, pp. 48-58.
- National Institute of Statistics: NIS (2008), "National Directory of Enterprises".
- Tabatoni, Pierre and Pierre Jarniou (1975), *Les systèmes de gestion : politiques et structures*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France (PUF).