

Katharina Kretschmer

Performance Evaluation of Foreign Subsidiaries

With a foreword by Prof. Dr. Stefan Schmid

GABLER EDITION WISSENSCHAFT

Contents

Figures XVII

TablesXIX

1 Introduction1

1.1 Performance Evaluation of Foreign Subsidiaries as a Management Problem1

1.2 Research Background and Research Questions2

1.3 Outline of the Study4

2 Defining Performance Evaluation and Its Role as Control Mechanism.....7

2.1 Performance Evaluation as Control Mechanism.....7

 2.1.1 Control7

 2.1.2 Performance as Achievement of Legitimate Goals 12

 2.1.3 Evaluation as Control Step 16

2.2 The Concept of Performance Evaluation.....17

 2.2.1 The Role of Performance Evaluation within the Control Mix 18

 2.2.2 The Content of Performance Evaluation20

 2.2.3 The Process of Performance Evaluation22

2.3 An Integrative Concept of Performance Evaluation24

3 Review of the Literature on Performance Evaluation of Foreign Subsidiaries.27

3.1 Objectives and Methodology of the Literature Review.....27

3.2 Descriptive Contributions on Performance Evaluation of Foreign Subsidiaries30

 3.2.1 Topics of Descriptive Contributions31

 3.2.2 Differentiation of Performance Evaluation in Descriptive Contributions32

 3.2.3 Methodologies and Research Design of Descriptive Contributions34

3.3 Explanatory Contributions on Performance Evaluation of Foreign Subsidiaries35

 3.3.1 Topics of Explanatory Contributions35

 3.3.2 Differentiation of Performance Evaluation in Explanatory Contributions36

 3.3.3 Methodologies and Research Design of Explanatory Contributions40

3.4 Conclusions and Implications of the Literature Review.....42

4	The Research Framework.....	45
4.1	A Contingency Framework of Role-Specific Performance Evaluation.....	45
4.1.1	Contingency Theory as Theoretical Background	45
4.1.1.1	Introducing Contingency Theory	46
4.1.1.2	Excluding Other Organization Theories	48
4.1.2	Developing a Contingency Framework of Role-Specific Performance Evaluation	52
4.1.2.1	General Contingency Framework of Role-Specific Performance Evaluation	52
4.1.2.2	Selection of Role Typologies to Specify the Contingency Factor	54
4.1.2.3	Identification of Two Relevant Role Typologies	59
4.1.2.4	Specified Contingency Framework of Role-Specific Performance Evaluation	64
4.1.3	Review of the Contingency Framework	65
4.2	Propositions on Role-Specific Performance Evaluation	68
4.2.1	Performance Evaluation of Subsidiaries in Bartlett and Ghoshal's Role Typology	69
4.2.1.1	Predictions for the Strategic Importance of the Market	69
4.2.1.2	Predictions for the Competence of the Local Organization	72
4.2.1.3	Propositions on the Impact of the Subsidiary Roles on Performance Evaluation.....	74
4.2.1.3.1	Strategic Leader	74
4.2.1.3.2	Contributor	75
4.2.1.3.3	Implementer	77
4.2.1.3.4	Black Hole	78
4.2.2	Performance Evaluation of Subsidiaries in Gupta and Govindarajan's Role Typology.....	79
4.2.2.1	Predictions for Knowledge Inflow	80
4.2.2.2	Predictions for Knowledge Outflow	81
4.2.2.3	Propositions on the Impact of the Subsidiary Roles on Performance Evaluation.....	84
4.2.2.3.1	Integrated Player	84
4.2.2.3.2	Global Innovator.....	86
4.2.2.3.3	Local Innovator.....	87
4.2.2.3.4	Implementor	88

5	The Empirical Study	91
5.1	Research Design	91
5.1.1	Rationale for a Qualitative Case Study Approach	91
5.1.2	The Multiple Case Design	93
5.1.2.1	Introduction on the Case Design	93
5.1.2.2	The Selection of Business Units as Cases	94
5.1.2.3	The Selection of Subsidiaries as Units of Observation	96
5.2	Operationalization of the Elements of the Contingency Framework	99
5.2.1	Operationalization of the Role Typologies	99
5.2.1.1	Operationalization of Bartlett and Ghoshal's Subsidiary Roles	100
5.2.1.1.1	Background of the Classifying Dimensions	100
5.2.1.1.2	Strategic Importance of the Market	102
5.2.1.1.3	Competence of Local Organization	104
5.2.1.2	Operationalization of Gupta and Govindarajan's Subsidiary Roles	107
5.2.2	Operationalization of the Performance Evaluation Concept	111
5.2.2.1	Operationalization of the Role of Performance Evaluation within the Control Mix	111
5.2.2.2	Operationalization of the Content of Performance Evaluation	114
5.2.2.3	Operationalization of the Process of Performance Evaluation	116
5.3	Data Collection	118
5.4	Data Analysis	122
5.5	Review of the Research Approach	129
6	Empirical Findings	133
6.1	Empirical Findings on "Eucom"	133
6.1.1	Introducing Eucom and Its Subsidiaries	133
6.1.2	The German Subsidiary of Eucom	135
6.1.2.1	The Roles of the German Subsidiary – Contributor and Global Innovator	136
6.1.2.2	The Evaluation of the Performance of the German Subsidiary	139
6.1.3	The Spanish Subsidiary of Eucom	148
6.1.3.1	The Roles of the Spanish Subsidiary – Implementer and Local Innovator	148
6.1.3.2	The Evaluation of the Performance of the Spanish Subsidiary	152
6.1.4	The Finnish Subsidiary of Eucom	158
6.1.4.1	The Roles of the Finnish Subsidiary – Strategic Leader and Global Innovator	158
6.1.4.2	The Evaluation of the Performance of the Finnish Subsidiary	162

6.1.5	Discussion of the Performance Evaluation at Eucom	170
6.1.5.1	Performance Evaluation of the Eucom Subsidiaries in Bartlett and Ghoshal's Role Typology	170
6.1.5.1.1	Performance Evaluation of the Strategic Leader.....	170
6.1.5.1.2	Performance Evaluation of the Contributor	172
6.1.5.1.3	Performance Evaluation of the Implementer	173
6.1.5.2	Performance Evaluation of Eucom Subsidiaries in Gupta and Govindarajan's Role Typology	174
6.1.5.2.1	Performance Evaluation of the Integrated Player.....	174
6.1.5.2.2	Performance Evaluation of the Global Innovator.....	175
6.1.5.2.3	Performance Evaluation of the Local Innovator.....	176
6.1.6	Standardization versus Role-Differentiation in Performance Evaluation at Eucom	177
6.2	Empirical Findings on "Gloneer"	181
6.2.1	Introducing Gloneer and Its Subsidiaries	181
6.2.2	The Gloneer Subsidiary "Germany L"	186
6.2.2.1	The Roles of Germany L – Strategic Leader and Local Innovator ...	186
6.2.2.2	The Evaluation of Germany L's Performance	190
6.2.3	The Gloneer Subsidiary "USA L"	198
6.2.3.1	The Roles of USA L – Strategic Leader and Local Innovator.....	198
6.2.3.2	The Evaluation of USA L's Performance.....	199
6.2.4	The Gloneer Subsidiary "Switzerland"	206
6.2.4.1	The Roles of "Switzerland" – Contributor and Local Innovator.....	206
6.2.4.2	The Evaluation of "Switzerland's" Performance	210
6.2.5	The Gloneer Subsidiary "Germany S"	216
6.2.5.1	The Roles of Germany S – Contributor and Local Innovator	216
6.2.5.2	The Evaluation of Germany S' Performance.....	218
6.2.6	The Gloneer Subsidiary "Sweden"	224
6.2.6.1	The Subsidiary "Sweden" – Contributor and Local Innovator.....	224
6.2.6.2	The Evaluation of "Sweden's" Performance.....	226
6.2.7	The Gloneer Subsidiary "Germany P"	231
6.2.7.1	The Roles of Germany P – Contributor and Global Innovator.....	232
6.2.7.2	The Evaluation of Germany P's Performance	235
6.2.8	The Gloneer Subsidiary "Great Britain"	241
6.2.8.1	The Roles of "Great Britain" – Implementer and Local Innovator	241
6.2.8.2	The Evaluation of "Great Britain's" Performance	244
6.2.9	The Gloneer Subsidiary "China"	250

6.2.9.1 The Roles of “China” – Black Hole and Implementor	251
6.2.9.2 The Evaluation of “China’s” Performance	255
6.2.10 The Gloneer Subsidiary “India”	263
6.2.10.1 The Roles of “India” – Black Hole and Implementor.....	263
6.2.10.2 The Evaluation of “India’s” Performance	265
6.2.11 Discussion of the Performance Evaluation at Gloneer.....	270
6.2.11.1 Performance Evaluation of the Gloneer Subsidiaries in Bartlett and Ghoshal’s Role Typology	271
6.2.11.1.1 Performance Evaluation of the Strategic Leaders	271
6.2.11.1.2 Performance Evaluation of the Contributors.....	274
6.2.11.1.3 Performance Evaluation of the Implementer	277
6.2.11.1.4 Performance Evaluation of the Black Holes	277
6.2.11.2 Performance Evaluation of Gloneer Subsidiaries in Gupta and Govindarajan’s Role Typology	279
6.2.11.2.1 Performance Evaluation of the Global Innovator	280
6.2.11.2.2 Performance Evaluation of the Local Innovators	281
6.2.11.2.3 Performance Evaluation of the Implementors	283
6.2.11.3 Standardization versus Role-Differentiation in Performance Evaluation at Gloneer	284
6.3 Comparison of the Role-Specific Performance Evaluation at Eucom and Gloneer.....	289
7 Contributions, Limitations and Implications for Future Research.....	293
Appendices	301
References	331