

Brief Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Context.....	1
1.2 Goals of the Study.....	2
1.3 Outline of the Study	3
2. Central Concepts.....	5
2.1 Multinational Network Corporations	5
2.2 Subsidiary Roles in Multinational Network Corporations.....	13
2.3 Perception Gaps Concerning Subsidiary Roles	27
2.4 Headquarters-Subsidiary Conflict.....	39
2.5 Summary and Conclusions.....	52
3. Conceptual Framework	54
3.1 Open System Approach According to Katz and Kahn.....	54
3.2 Multinational Network Corporations as Open Systems.....	77
3.3 Research Framework	93
4. Empirical Study	111
4.1 Research Design	111
4.2 Data Collection.....	118
4.3 Data Analysis.....	135
4.4 Scientific Quality Criteria	142
5. Empirical Findings.....	147
5.1 Introduction.....	147
5.2 The Cases	155
5.3 Perception Gaps Concerning the Subsidiary's Role.....	203
5.4 Implications of Perception Gaps for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship.....	219
6. Discussion	240
6.1 Limitations of the Present Study.....	240
6.2 Implications for the International Business Literature	245
6.3 Avenues for Future Research	250
6.4 Managerial Implications	253
6.5 Summary	256

Appendix.....257

References267

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Context.....	1
1.2 Goals of the Study.....	2
1.3 Outline of the Study	3
2. Central Concepts.....	5
2.1 Multinational Network Corporations	5
2.1.1 General Characteristics of Multinational Corporations.....	5
2.1.2 Towards a Network Model of Multinational Corporations	6
2.1.3 Characteristics of Multinational Network Corporations.....	10
2.2 Subsidiary Roles in Multinational Network Corporations.....	13
2.2.1 The Subsidiary Role Concept in the International Business Literature.....	13
2.2.2 Subsidiary Role Typologies	16
2.2.3 Approach to Subsidiary Roles in the Present Study	20
2.2.3.1 Selection of Subsidiary Role Typologies	20
2.2.3.2 Differentiation of Subsidiary Roles According to Bartlett and Ghoshal.....	22
2.2.3.3 Differentiation of Subsidiary Roles According to Gupta and Govindarajan	25
2.3 Perception Gaps Concerning Subsidiary Roles	27
2.3.1 Attributes of Perception Gaps.....	27
2.3.1.1 The Subjective Nature of Perception	27
2.3.1.2 Perception Gaps vs. Perception Errors	28
2.3.2 Perception Gaps in the International Business Literature	30
2.3.2.1 Approaches to Perception Gaps	30
2.3.2.2 Contributions on Perception Gaps Concerning Subsidiary Roles	32
2.3.2.3 Overview of the Research Field	37
2.3.3 Approach to Perception Gaps in the Present Study	38
2.4 Headquarters-Subsidiary Conflict.....	39
2.4.1 General Conflict Literature.....	39
2.4.2 Headquarters-Subsidiary Conflict in the International Business Literature.....	43
2.4.3 Approach to Headquarters-Subsidiary Conflict in the Present Study	46
2.4.3.1 Overview	46
2.4.3.2 Conflict Issues.....	47
2.5 Summary and Conclusions.....	52
3. Conceptual Framework	54
3.1 Open System Approach According to Katz and Kahn.....	54

- 3.1.1 Selecting a Conceptual Approach for the Present Study.....54
 - 3.1.1.1 Categories of Organizational Theories54
 - 3.1.1.2 System Theoretical Approaches to Organizations.....58
- 3.1.2 Overview of the Open System Approach.....60
 - 3.1.2.1 Point of Departure60
 - 3.1.2.2 Characteristics of Open Systems.....61
 - 3.1.2.3 Social Organizations as Open Systems.....64
- 3.1.3 Role Theoretical Framework67
 - 3.1.3.1 Overview of Role Theory67
 - 3.1.3.2 Role Theoretical Framework Within the Open System Approach70
- 3.1.4 Conflict Model74
- 3.2 Multinational Network Corporations as Open Systems.....77
 - 3.2.1 Applicability of the Open System Approach.....77
 - 3.2.1.1 Parallels Between Network Perspectives and the Open System Approach77
 - 3.2.1.2 Specific Demands of Multinational Network Corporations.....79
 - 3.2.1.3 Dealing with the Duality of Individuals and Organizational Units.....83
 - 3.2.2 Subsidiary Roles from a Role Theoretical Perspective.....85
 - 3.2.3 Headquarters-Subsidiary Conflict from an Open System Perspective.....89
- 3.3 Research Framework93
 - 3.3.1 Overview93
 - 3.3.2 Likelihood of Perception Gaps94
 - 3.3.2.1 Perception Gaps Concerning the Subsidiary’s Overall Role94
 - 3.3.2.2 Perception Gaps Concerning the Importance of the Subsidiary’s Market96
 - 3.3.2.3 Perception Gaps Concerning the Subsidiary’s Capabilities97
 - 3.3.2.4 Perception Gaps Concerning Knowledge Flows97
 - 3.3.2.5 Summary99
 - 3.3.3 Consequences of Perception Gaps99
 - 3.3.3.1 Conflict as General Consequence Proposed by the Conceptual Framework.....99
 - 3.3.3.2 Perception Gaps Concerning the Importance of the Subsidiary’s Market 101
 - 3.3.3.3 Perception Gaps Concerning the Subsidiary’s Capabilities 104
 - 3.3.3.4 Perception Gaps Concerning Knowledge Inflow 106
 - 3.3.3.5 Perception Gaps Concerning Knowledge Outflow 108
 - 3.3.4 Summary..... 110
- 4. Empirical Study111**
 - 4.1 Research Design 111
 - 4.1.1 Rationale for a Case Study Approach 111
 - 4.1.2 Overview of the Case Study Design 113
 - 4.1.2.1 Unit of Analysis..... 113

4.1.2.2	Case Selection	114
4.1.2.3	Types of Data.....	116
4.1.3	Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework.....	117
4.2	Data Collection.....	118
4.2.1	Questionnaire	118
4.2.1.1	Goals.....	118
4.2.1.2	Procedure	119
4.2.1.3	Operationalization of the Subsidiary Role Dimensions.....	120
4.2.1.4	Operationalization of Headquarters-Subsidiary Conflict.....	124
4.2.2	Interviews	129
4.2.2.1	Goals.....	129
4.2.2.2	Procedure	130
4.2.2.3	Interview Guideline.....	131
4.2.3	Respondents.....	133
4.3	Data Analysis.....	135
4.3.1	Questionnaire	135
4.3.1.1	Overview	135
4.3.1.2	Subsidiary Role Dimensions.....	135
4.3.1.3	Headquarters-Subsidiary Conflict	136
4.3.2	Interviews	137
4.3.2.1	Overview	137
4.3.2.2	The Code List.....	139
4.3.2.3	From Individual Codes to Patterns	141
4.4	Scientific Quality Criteria	142
4.4.1	Overview	142
4.4.2	Objectivity	142
4.4.3	Reliability.....	143
4.4.4	Validity.....	144
5.	Empirical Findings.....	147
5.1	Introduction.....	147
5.1.1	The Two Companies	147
5.1.1.1	Company A, the Strategic Business Unit Autocomp and Autocomp's Subsidiaries	147
5.1.1.2	Company B, the Division Construc and Construc's Subsidiaries.....	149
5.1.2	Comments on the Subsidiary Role Dimensions	150
5.1.3	Identifying Perception Gaps.....	152
5.1.3.1	Perception Gaps vs. Artefacts.....	152
5.1.3.2	Individual Differences.....	153
5.1.3.3	Role Behaviour vs. Role Expectations	153

5.1.4	Chapter Overview	154
5.2	The Cases	155
5.2.1	Overview	155
5.2.2	Hungary	156
5.2.2.1	Perceptions of the Role Dimensions	156
5.2.2.2	Implications for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship	161
5.2.2.3	Interpretation According to the Conceptual Framework	162
5.2.3	Poland	165
5.2.3.1	Perceptions of the Role Dimensions	165
5.2.3.2	Implications for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship	168
5.2.3.3	Interpretation According to the Conceptual Framework	168
5.2.4	Turkey	169
5.2.4.1	Perceptions of the Role Dimensions	169
5.2.4.2	Implications for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship	175
5.2.4.3	Interpretation According to the Conceptual Framework	177
5.2.5	Mexico	182
5.2.5.1	Perceptions of the Role Dimensions	182
5.2.5.2	Implications for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship	188
5.2.5.3	Interpretation According to the Conceptual Framework	188
5.2.6	China	189
5.2.6.1	Perceptions of the Role Dimensions	189
5.2.6.2	Implications for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship	194
5.2.6.3	Interpretation According to the Conceptual Framework	195
5.2.7	USA	197
5.2.7.1	Perceptions of the Role Dimensions	197
5.2.7.2	Implications for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship	201
5.2.7.3	Interpretation According to the Conceptual Framework	201
5.3	Perception Gaps Concerning the Subsidiary's Role	203
5.3.1	Subsidiary Role Dimensions in the Present Study	203
5.3.1.1	Overview	203
5.3.1.2	Conceptual and Empirical Review of the Individual Dimensions	204
5.3.1.3	Critical Reflection on the Proposed Subsidiary Role Concept	212
5.3.2	Perception Gaps in the Present Study	214
5.3.2.1	Overview	214
5.3.2.2	Conceptual Structure of the Identified Perception Gaps	215
5.3.2.3	Critical Review of Perception Gaps	218
5.4	Implications of Perception Gaps for the Headquarters-Subsidiary Relationship	219
5.4.1	The Empirical Findings in the Context of the International Business Literature	219
5.4.1.1	Overview	219

5.4.1.2	Importance of the Subsidiary's Market.....	219
5.4.1.3	Product Scope	220
5.4.1.4	Subsidiary's Capabilities.....	221
5.4.1.5	Knowledge Inflow to the Subsidiary	221
5.4.1.6	Knowledge Outflow from the Subsidiary	222
5.4.1.7	Subsidiary's Autonomy and Involvement in Value Chain Activities.....	223
5.4.1.8	Conclusion	224
5.4.2	Fit of the Conceptual Framework in the Light of the Empirical Findings.....	224
5.4.2.1	Overview	224
5.4.2.2	Conflict as Implication of Perception Gaps	225
5.4.2.3	Role Related Conflict and Further Implications	227
5.4.2.4	Critical Review of the Conceptual Framework.....	234
5.4.2.5	Extension of the Conceptual Framework.....	235
5.4.2.6	Conclusion	238
6.	Discussion	240
6.1	Limitations of the Present Study.....	240
6.1.1	Scope of the Study	240
6.1.2	Conceptual Issues	241
6.1.3	Methodological Issues.....	243
6.2	Implications for the International Business Literature	245
6.2.1	Knowledge about Subsidiary Roles	245
6.2.2	Conceptual Contribution.....	246
6.2.3	Methodological Implications.....	248
6.3	Avenues for Future Research.....	250
6.3.1	Research on Perception Gaps Concerning the Subsidiary's Role.....	250
6.3.2	Theoretical Consolidation.....	252
6.3.3	Methodological Approaches	252
6.4	Managerial Implications	253
6.5	Summary	256
Appendix.....	257
Appendix A	Questionnaire Results on Disagreement and Interference.....	257
Appendix B	Final Code List.....	263
References.....	267