

*Value co-creation in ICT services
company: a case study of a cross-border
acquisition*

Article

Accepted Version

Heim, I. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3023-4839>, Han, T. and Ghobadian, A. (2018) Value co-creation in ICT services company: a case study of a cross-border acquisition. *Journal of East-West Business*, 24 (4). pp. 319-338. ISSN 1528-6959 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10669868.2018.1467841> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/76713/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10669868.2018.1467841>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in

the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online



Value co-creation in ICT services company: a case study of a cross-border acquisition

Journal:	<i>Journal of East-West Business</i>
Manuscript ID	WJEB-2017-0014.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Value co-creation, Knowledge-intensive business services, Post-acquisition integration, Russia

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Value co-creation in ICT services company:
a case study of a cross-border acquisition**

Abstract

Post-merger and acquisition (M&A) integration is especially important for the services industry, where value co-creation between actors plays crucial role. This paper is a qualitative single case study of a multinational company (MNE) in information technology (ICT) industry, and the post-acquisition processes of its subsidiary in Russia. The main contribution of this article is the application of a value co-creation view, which until now has only been applied in the field of service industry research, to the settings of the international business. We also identify the actors and their roles and activities in the value co-creation in the Russian context.

Introduction

Firms in the service industry frequently use cross-border acquisitions as a tool to expand business to the international stage in order to generate higher value and profit (Ahlstrom 2010). However, no simplistic linear relationship has been found between cross-border M&As and value creation. As international business research is explicitly multidisciplinary, it can benefit from the complementary insights provided by theories from other fields (Doz 2011). This paper aims to integrate the value co-creation view which has been widely discussed in the marketing and IT business services disciplines

(e.g. Gummesson and Mele 2010; Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013) to the discussion of post-merger performance of MNE's subsidiary in the ICT industry, and therefore to contribute to the international business literature by the application of value co-creation theory to international business settings in emerging markets. In this paper we discuss a comparative case study of two consequent acquisitions within one company and explain why first acquisition was successful, when the second one failed using a theory of value co-creation. We elaborate on a value co-creation framework, adding that actors in the network participate in the process of value co-creation. Moreover, given the fact that the integration process of cross-border acquisitions is a highly complicated activity which involves numerous participants and complex interactions, value co-creation theory (e.g. Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013), provides important explanations on how to achieve a higher performance, and will be critically discussed in this paper.

From our point of view the value creation process in the service sector of the economy differs significantly in comparison to the manufacturing sector, as the main assets of service companies, namely people and customers, are intangible by nature, and can move to competitors, thus leading to competitive disadvantages. In these transactions co-operation between *the headquarters, subsidiary, employees, local market (suppliers) and customers* can play a crucial role. In contrast, with acquisition in the manufacturing sector, MNEs gain mostly tangible assets in the form of production facilities, equipment etc. These specific features of a service sector make management of ICT companies riskier in terms of post-acquisition integration, and management of the process of value co-creation become a key success factor in performance management. This research is relevant to subsidiary management, offering a new view on why different factors can lead

1
2
3 to the failure of the acquisition. We demonstrate that in the post-acquisition integration
4 phase the value co-creation process can be unbalanced. We also identify the main actors
5
6 in this process in the subsidiary. A case study of the acquisition in ICT industry in Russia
7
8 is used as an example to illustrate it.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Literature review**

17 *Network theory and value co-creation in knowledge-intensive industries*

18
19
20 Integrating the post-acquisition process in the cases of cross-border deals involves the
21 issue of MNE management, leading the focus of researchers to that of understanding
22 MNEs, through for example, understanding the factors affecting post-merger survival of
23 the subsidiary in the long-term perspective. Important works such as the ‘heterarchy’
24 perspective (Hedlund 1986), the perspective of the MNE’s inter- and intra-organizational
25 relationships (Ghoshal and Bartlett 1990), and the differentiated network view (Nohria
26 and Ghoshal 1997), provide the basis for the development of the network theory. Instead
27 of the view assuming that MNEs are hierarchically structured entities with headquarters
28 at the top and a number of dependent subsidiaries with similar roles, the network theory
29 regards the MNE as an internally differentiated inter-organizational network (Ghoshal
30 and Bartlett 1990). Later research conceptualized the multinational subsidiary as a semi-
31 autonomous entity with entrepreneurial potential within a complex, competitive
32 environment, consisting of an internal environment of other subsidiaries, internal
33 customers and suppliers, and an external environment of customers, suppliers, and
34 competitors (Birkinshaw and Hood 1998; Birkinshaw, Hood and Young 2005). Based on
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the network theory, the subsidiary is no longer a subordinate identity; rather, it should be
4
5 the node in a greater network, through which it builds relationships with the internal and
6
7 external actors (Rugman and Verbeke 2003). Recent studies extend the research stream,
8
9 trying to identify how the interactions between the factors of autonomy, inter- and intra-
10
11 organizational relationships affect performance (Gammelgaard et al. 2012). The
12
13 argument also comes with the notion of embeddedness, which refers to the relationships
14
15 between partners within the organizational and inter-organizational networks. On the one
16
17 hand, through the embeddedness between partners including suppliers, customers and
18
19 research institutions, MNEs are able to integrate the sources of innovation and create
20
21 more value for the organization. On the other hand, it is a challenge for headquarters to
22
23 control knowledge acquisition directly, due to information deficiencies, and this
24
25 encourages the subsidiaries to be given more autonomy (Young and Tavares 2004). In
26
27 conclusion, international business literature and particularly network theory apply an
28
29 inter-organizational approach in investigating organizational characteristics of MNEs,
30
31 explaining resource structure and different level of connectedness in different national
32
33 environments. However, it fails to explain how exactly value is co-created by a sharing of
34
35 resources in such networks in the service industries.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 At the same time, the service industry perceives significant growth worldwide with most
44
45 advanced economies dominated by the services sector. Even countries that have
46
47 traditionally focused on manufacturing are experiencing growth of service industries.
48
49 Service science is an emerging interdisciplinary research area that focuses on
50
51 “fundamental science, models, theories, and applications to drive service innovation,
52
53 competition, and well-being through co-creation of value” (Ostrom et al. 2010, p. 5).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Service science is the study of service systems and of the co-creation of value within
4 complex configuration of resources, where value creation is seen as a core purpose and
5 central process of economic exchange (Vargo et al, 2008). Gummesson and Mele (2010)
6 discuss the role of value co-creation in the resource integration process, where actors
7 access their resources, stimulating the formulation of a dynamically interactive network.
8 Firstly, it is necessary to distinguish between co-creation and co-production. Co-creation
9 is a more general concept that “encompasses all the specific theoretical and empirical
10 occurrences in which companies and customers generate value through interaction”
11 (Vargo and Lusch 2008). Galvagno and Dalli (2014) define co-creation as the interaction
12 of suppliers and customers for the development of new business opportunities. In
13 contrast, co-production is a component of co-creation of value and captures “participation
14 in the development of the core offering itself” (Lusch and Vargo 2006, p. 284). In other
15 words, co-production is the active involvement of a customer in service production and
16 delivery (Auh et al 2007).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Recent research has also explored the importance of the collaborative process of value
37 co-creation in the context of knowledge-intensive business services (Gummesson and
38 Mele 2010; Vagro and Lusch 2011; Aarikka-Stenroos and Jaakkola 2012; Jaakkola and
39 Hakanen 2013). For instance, in the context of solution network, Jaakkola and Hakanen
40 (2013) provided a novel conceptual framework that explains the value co-creation during
41 the interaction between actors, resources and activities. However, value co-creation has
42 rarely been discussed in MNE management, where a considerable number of actors
43 including headquarter, subsidiaries, local markets and their customers, are involved.
44 Based on the network and value co-creation views, we define actors as the node in the
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 MNE network, including the headquarters, subsidiaries, employees, local market
4 (suppliers) and customers. We define co-creation in MNE settings as interaction between
5
6 headquarters, subsidiary, employees, subcontractors, and customers with each other for
7
8 the development of new business opportunities.
9
10

11 12 13 14 15 16 **A conceptual model** 17

18
19 In this research we adopt a model of value co-creation in knowledge-intensive industries
20 (Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013), and apply it to the circumstances of the MNE (Figure 1
21 below). This model considers the value co-creation process from the subsidiary's
22 perspective as MNE's activities in the host country are organized around the subsidiary.
23
24 Business value is "co-created by economic actors who exchange a variety of resources
25 that go beyond goods and money" (Michel et al. 2008, p. 154). The actors in such a
26 model are linked through value propositions, seeking equitable exchange from the
27 mutually connected relationship (Gummesson and Mele 2010; Jaakkola and Hakanen
28 2013).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The actors in our model are of two types:
42
43


- 44 1. The intra-organizational context includes relationships within MNE structure, i.e.
45 between headquarters, a subsidiary and its employees.
46
47 - Headquarters and a subsidiary: headquarters provides a subsidiary with
48 knowledge about their global products and services; the subsidiary provides
49 headquarters with knowledge about local markets;
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 - Employees and a subsidiary: employees provide a subsidiary with their
4 knowledge and skills; a subsidiary provides employees with training, projects and
5 work;
6
7
8
9
- 10 2. The inter-organizational context includes relationships between a subsidiary, its
11 customers and subcontractors. These actors are also placed in the settings of a local
12 context which is defined by the local institutional context of the specific country.
13
14
15
16
17 - Customers and a subsidiary: customers provide the subsidiary with knowledge
18 about their business processes, participating in projects with their internal teams
19 working in coordination with the subsidiary; the subsidiary provides customers
20 with know-how and services;
21
22
23
24
25
26 - A Subsidiary – Subcontractors: for some projects a subsidiary may not possess all
27 the necessary resources and therefore needs to subcontract a local company. In
28 this case a subcontractor provides a subsidiary with specific knowledge that is
29 required for delivering services; a subsidiary provides the subcontractor with
30 access to the world-leading expertise and participation in project.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 In business networks, all the actors are both provider and user of resources at the same
40 time, as each of them absorbs and contributes resources through their embeddedness
41 (Cantú, Corsaro and Shehota 2012). Meanwhile, actors are bonded by “closeness,
42 appreciation and perceived commitment, that influence and are influenced by resources
43 and the activities through which the resources are integrated” (Jaakkola and Hakanen
44 2013). Therefore, from the value co-creation perspective, we make two assumptions.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Firstly, the value network is dynamic and heterarchical, which means each actor also
54 occupies a dynamic position in the network (Jaakkola and Hakanen 2013). The position
55
56
57
58
59
60

will be perceived differently depending on the position of actors who observe. Since each actor has several unique relationships with others, known as the portfolio of relationship, actors will strive to improve their position by strengthening or expanding their temporary portfolio of relationships (Abrahamsen, Henneberg and Naudé 2012). This also indicates that the organizations which insist on a fixed and hierarchically organized system can hardly achieve value co-creation, as they are not flexible enough to adopt the dynamic changes across the network. Secondly, the position will affect or determine the resources



y actors, which is the reason why all actors will strive to improve their positions (Abrahamsen, Henneberg and Naudé 2012; Mattsson and Johanson 1992), since the bond is determined by the closeness between actors. Closeness, or in some cases, knowledge,

1
2
3 **Figure 1. Value co-creation in a knowledge-intensive industry at MNE network**
4
5 **level.**
6

7
8 also represents the power the actor has. Concerning autonomy for example, in the
9 network of headquarters, subsidiaries, local markets and their customers, customers are
10 naturally connected with the respective subsidiaries, sometimes, directly with the
11 headquarters.
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 In the portfolio of relationships for customers, their closeness with respective subsidiaries
19 or headquarters determines the position in this unique network, for example, if the
20 subsidiaries have already built a mutual trust relationship with customers, or own better
21 knowledge of the local market. Headquarters which forcefully controls their subsidiaries
22 will break the balance of a properly functioning network and therefore, lead to failure in
23 post-acquisition integration, and lose its value.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 To sum up, we conceptualize the value co-creation for MNEs as a value creating process
34 occurring through dynamic interactions and changes within the MNE network, where the
35 actors strive to improve their positions, in order to access better resources and affect
36 others. In the post-acquisition integration process for cross-border deals, acquirers have
37 to clearly understand their network and the network owned by the acquired subsidiaries,
38 and cautiously integrate the network without destroying the opportunities for achieving
39 value co-creation. This also means acquirers have to adapt a dynamic approach regarding
40 the network and the actors within it, keep the balance of positions and grant appropriate
41 autonomy to their subsidiaries.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Based on the literature review and value co-creation process in the MNE network (Figure
4
5 1), the research questions in this case study will be the following:

- 6
7
8 1) How value co-creation can be affected in cross-border acquisitions?
9
10
11 2) How unbalance in value co-creation affects subsidiary performance in the post-
12
13 acquisition integration phase?
14
15

16 17 18 **Method**

19
20
21 Our research is based on a single-site qualitative case study exploring a phenomenon
22
23 within the real-business context where the boundaries between phenomena and context
24
25 are not clearly evident (Eisenhardt 1989; Ellet 2007; Yin 2009; Ghauri and Gronhaug
26
27 2010). It explores strategic change in the form of two consequent acquisitions in the
28
29 MNC and its influence on the value co-creation process in a knowledge-intensive
30
31 industry and therefore subsidiary performance, i.e. focuses on collecting information
32
33 about specific objects, events or activities, such as a particular business unit or
34
35 organization (Sekaran and Bougie 2013). This case is of particular interest because
36
37 service companies have received significantly less academic attention in terms of their
38
39 internationalization process (Panibratov and Latukha 2014).
40
41
42
43

44
45 A single case study is an appropriate design for the research as this case is unique: two
46
47 subsequent acquisitions by the companies headquartered in the same country allow us to
48
49 exclude the factor of the national culture, and the factor of resistance to change on the
50
51 subsidiary side, as the first acquisition went successfully, we can assume that employees'
52
53 resistance to change was at the minimal level to the date when the second acquisition
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 took place. As it is very difficult to find similar cases in the same country settings, we
4
5 want to report our findings in a single case study research design. The case study research
6
7 method is particularly suited for testing and communicating a theory by showing its
8
9 applicability in real business settings (Ulriksen and Dadalauri 2016). The aim of this
10
11 research is to answer the research questions of how value co-creation process can be
12
13 affected in cross-border acquisitions and how unbalance in the process of value co-
14
15 creation can affect subsidiary performance in the post-acquisition integration phase. This
16
17 will lead to the development of the model: explaining how value co-creation can be
18
19 affected in the post-acquisition integration phase. In other words, we use an “explanatory
20
21 “case study approach to test out propositions, revise existing theories and establish causal
22
23 relationships, as well as for verification of the theory in different settings (Welch et al.
24
25 2011).

26
27
28
29
30
31 Case studies involve data collection through multiple sources such as verbal reports,
32
33 personal interviews, observations and written reports, including financial reports,
34
35 archives, budgets and operating statements as well as market and competitions reports.
36
37 (Ghauri and Gronhaug 2009). We decided to use historical financial data because
38
39 academics in international business have seen the firm as a dynamic unit, changing
40
41 overtime (Rugman 1996 a, b). We used triangulation in order to facilitate validation of
42
43 data received from different sources (Ghauri 2004; Ghauri and Gronhaug 2010), by
44
45 checking the performance of a subsidiary claimed by the interviewee, checking annual
46
47 accounts, or archives, or by interviewing another manager or company representative.
48
49
50
51

52
53 The lead author conducted nine in-depth, face-to-face interviews with key managers from
54
55 the subsidiary and the headquarters. Semi-structured interviews included an outline of the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 topics to be covered, with suggested questions. The questions and their sequence were
4
5 not strictly predetermined. Interviewees could decide which questions they would like to
6
7 start with or the topic they considered important in relation to the research question, and
8
9 wanted to discuss additionally in the course of the interview.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Findings

17
18
19 We reviewed company documentation on subsidiary development in Russia, including
20
21 documents in the information database, intranet, and the information from interviews, and
22
23 found the following. The subsidiary in Russia was acquired as a privately-owned
24
25 company in 2005 by Company 1 (Germany, cross-border acquisition), and in 2009 –
26
27 Company 1 was subsequently acquired by Company 2 (Germany, domestic acquisition).
28
29 In this case study, the performance of the subsidiary dramatically weakened within five
30
31 years of second acquisition (Figure 2 below).
32
33
34
35



Figure 2. Subsidiary performance in Russia in 2005 - 2013.

We consider these two consequent acquisitions as cross-border in relation to the subsidiary in Russia (Figure 3 below). Before the acquisition, this privately-owned company served as a partner in the local market of Russia and CIS. A partner had about 150 full-time employees and after acquisition became the second biggest subsidiary within Company 1 in Eastern Europe. The subsidiary's main function was the sale of software licenses, consulting projects, consultation in the local market, and cooperation with other subsidiaries on global projects which took place in Russia. The principal customers for the company were oil and gas companies such as Lukoil, Rosneft, Gazprom, Tatneft, Surgutneftgas, TNK-BP as well as KazMunayGas, the Kazakhstani National Oil and Gas Company, as well as the other major companies from different sectors such as energy and banking.




Figure 3. Acquisition's steps.

From the performance development point of view, we found that subsidiary development could be separated into two periods: development (2005–2008) and decline (2010–2013) which clearly correlates with a change of ownership at headquarters level. We asked respondents about their experience in this period of time (before and after change of ownership in 2009), in order to identify which practices and management decisions had

1
2
3 influenced the performance of the subsidiary from their point of view. Analysis of the
4 interview data included creating two kinds of documents: a set of spreadsheets and a list
5 of quotations. There was one spreadsheet for each issue or question discussed; the rows
6 corresponded to interviewees and columns corresponded to the opinion about the issue.
7
8 This made it possible to instantly compute the number of respondents expressing a
9 particular view. The list of quotations expressed the type of response with reference to
10 the interview transcript where the quotation was found. This analysis of the interview
11 data explored several reasons behind the performance development which all participants
12 mentioned as critical. These findings are discussed below.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Subsidiary – Employees links*

28
29
30 Data show that in the post-acquisition integration it is important to retain employees as
31 they are the key actors in the process of value co-creation in knowledge-based industries.
32
33 Initially, the subsidiary's managing director confirmed the intention to work further with
34 the new owner, but as a result of many disagreements on how the business should be
35 organized she finally decided to leave the subsidiary at the end of 2011 and set up her
36 own company. Three months later, headquarters hired a new managing director. This
37 appointment was not successful due to his bad relationships with the subsidiary team. As
38 a result, a large section of employees (about 60 percent) decided to leave the subsidiary at
39 the beginning of 2012. The new managing director resigned from the subsidiary seven
40 months after he started, and since then there has been no fulltime managing director.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 This analysis shows that initially a subsidiary management and employees had close
54 relationships, high intensity and speed of value co-creation: the role of the local
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 management at intra-organizational level was to coordinate activities between
4 departments and between employees and headquarters. However, after the second
5 acquisition the relationships with employees became more distant as management team
6 was deprived of power, this resulted in low speed of value co-creation. Interdepartmental
7 activities were not coordinated and this resulted in the conflict of interests between sales
8 and delivery team - sales team wanted to sale the projects which were not feasible (see
9 Table 1 below, Link 1).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Headquarters – Subsidiary links

23
24
25 Data show that in the post-acquisition integration phase it is important to keep the
26 balance between autonomy and centralisation as this may influence the process of value
27 co-creation in knowledge-intensive industries. Before the acquisition at headquarters
28 level, and following the change in the headquarters team, the Russian subsidiary
29 possessed considerable autonomy. The degree of autonomy changed considerably since
30 the time the new HQ management team was appointed, with a clear trend towards more
31 centralization and bureaucratization. The interviews show that there was a shift from
32 strategic control to operational control of the subsidiary, whereas in the area of strategy it
33 was not necessarily to make any decisions concerning the subsidiary's strategy (see Table
34 3 below). All the interviewees mentioned that cooperation in general worsened, the extent
35 of control by the headquarters dramatically increased, and that performance was
36 negatively influenced by these factors.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The following quotation from the subsidiary sales managers' interviews illustrate these
54 findings:
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “After the change of management team everything had to be approved or even decided in
4 the HQ. The communication and decision-making process slowed down on the HQ side,
5 answers were delayed. Strategy changed: more attention had to be given to software
6 sales and less on consulting. From the HQ point of view consulting became unimportant.
7 This was a mistake due to ignorance of the market. As a consequence, headquarters often
8 did not approve project teams or project tasks, and finally contracts with customer could
9 not be signed due to delay in the approval process or even refusal to approve. Sometimes
10 we had un-applicable recommendations which we had to discuss with headquarters,
11 which lead to either the loss of time or of the offer itself. After some time, employees with
12 specific qualification started to retire and we had no specialists to execute projects or
13 certain parts of project. Lack of communications between the subsidiary and the
14 headquarters lead to a decrease in revenue. Headquarters as a decision-making party
15 did not offer adequate ways of performance optimization».

Distance between headquarters and the subsidiary

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Data show that in the post-acquisition phase it is important to maintain embeddedness of
39 the subsidiary with external actors, such as for example customers and subcontractors, in
40 order to maintain the value co-creation process.
41
42
43
44

45
46 The following quotation, a head of the project office explains that after the second
47 acquisition, centralisation has increased and this had negative influence on the business
48 performance:
49
50
51

52
53 “The business of the new owner has been focused on the large deals. This assumed long
54 process of contracts approval. Well it is justified to minimise risks in this case. Our
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 *transactions were smaller in terms of their size. Respectively, these long bureaucratic*
4 *procedures in our case have complicated our relationships with customers... This culture*
5 *of control and risk minimisation doesn't fit to the developing markets, in the countries*
6 *where company wants to develop business the role of the subsidiary should be more*
7 *innovative and flexible... according to the managing director all deals had to be*
8 *approved by headquarters, and this in many cases has slowed down the operational*
9 *processes... the managing director was in our subsidiary an owner of the key business*
10 *processes and provided cooperation between sales department (contacts with customers)*
11 *and project management department (contacts with local subcontractors and employees).*
12 *In absence of such manager in the subsidiary and operational management and*
13 *motivation in the subsidiary, the successful project delivery is not possible... Here there*
14 *is a conflict of interests – sales team tries to achieve sale plan targets and sign the*
15 *contract at the conditions that project delivery team cannot fulfil”.*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 This quotation illustrates that after the second acquisition headquarters was not flexible
32 enough in terms of their ability to combine firm-specific capabilities with local
33 knowledge in order to co-create value on particular developing market. The
34 embeddedness in the MNE network increased, whereas embeddedness in inter-
35 organizational context with subcontractors and customers has decreased. This had
36 negative influence on subsidiary outcomes (See Table 1 links 2, 3 and 4). Factors such as
37 bureaucratic procedures, changes in subsidiary role and resignation of the managing
38 director slowed down the operational processes and unbalanced the coordination of
39 customers' and subcontractors' expectations from projects.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 *Knowledge exchange between actors in the network*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Data show that in the post-acquisition integration phase it is important to maintain
4 knowledge exchange as this may influence the process of value co-creation in
5 knowledge-intensive industries. Knowledge about the market accumulated at
6 headquarters level had a significant impact on the success of its activities in Russia, and
7 therefore knowledge transfer from the subsidiary to the headquarters plays a crucial role
8 in the performance of the subsidiary. The results of the interviews show, that important
9 knowledge in the form of expert opinion, skills and experience, was lost at headquarters
10 with the change of the whole headquarters' management team, as the new headquarters
11 team had no relevant experience of business activities in Russia.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In the following quotation, a subsidiary employee comments on the importance of
25 knowledge of the local market:
26
27
28
29

30 *“Unfortunately, the HQ had nearly no knowledge about the business in Russia. For two*
31 *years we tried to share it, but the head office just didn't take any notice. It queried all*
32 *decisions and justifications, such as the fact that it makes no sense to dictate conditions*
33 *to key customers. In order to keep this customer, we need to accept their conditions. The*
34 *question of discounts: discounts weren't provided, which led to loss of customers. In*
35 *every case, HQ dictated conditions which were not applicable to the Russian situation».*
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 However, an opinion of the HQ executive on the question of why knowledge of the local
44 market is extremely important for good subsidiary performance which is expressed in the
45 following quotation was quite different from those at the subsidiary side:
46
47
48
49
50

51 *“When HQ decide that more of this or that products should be sold through the*
52 *subsidiary without knowledge of the market, it becomes very difficult, especially in the*
53 *Russian market. Suddenly revenues fall and you do not know why. The customers expect*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *always complex and completed solutions. It is necessary to know many details and here it*
4 *is important to cooperate with the managing director. Trusting relationships with the*
5 *managing director and important sales managers should be developed in order to be able*
6 *to discuss everything and not only to give orders”*
7
8
9
10

11
12 The two quotations give an overview of how the relationships between headquarters and
13 the subsidiary were organized before and after the acquisition. In quotation 1 a subsidiary
14 employee is talking about subsidiary-headquarters relationships after the second
15 acquisition and in quotation 2 – before. So, we can see how the approach has changed
16 and more tight relationships has influenced a process of value co-creation (See the Figure
17 1). Factors such as understanding of the local market and particularly customers’
18 expectations and trusting relationships between headquarters and local management can
19 improve interactions between actors and therefore facilitate development of the new
20 business opportunities.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Finding in this study are summarised in the Table 1 below.
35
36

37 **Table 1. Comparison of acquisition 1 versus acquisition 2. Actors in the value co-**
38 **creation process and their roles.**
39
40
41

Link	Actors relationships	Activities, Acquisition 1	Activities, Acquisition 2
Intra-organizational context			
1	Subsidiary - Employees	Close relationships with the local management, high intensity and speed of value co-creation: local management coordinates department activities	Distant relationship with customers, low speed of the value co-creation: department activities are not well coordinated, conflict of interests between sales and delivery departments

2	Subsidiary - Headquarters	Distant relationships, high autonomy, the intensity of interactions for development of new business opportunities high, headquarters is represented at the regional level, global headquarters does not participate in the value co-creation process	Close relationships directly with global headquarters, however, the development of new business opportunities is low, global headquarters does not participate in the value co-creation, the relationships with the subsidiary have more control function
Inter-organizational context			
3	Subsidiary - Customers	Close relationships with customers, local management maintain resource exchange with customers on projects and resolve disputes on quality of services delivered	Distant relationships with customers, local management is excluded from value co-creation process, however headquarters did not replace this function of local management, development of the new business opportunities is slow
4	Subsidiary - Subcontractors	Close relationships with subcontractors, local management together with delivery team ensure that all necessary resources are subcontracted if the subsidiary and headquarters have no resources available	Distant relationships with subcontractors, headquarter fill the knowledge gap with their own resources that are too expensive, projects run out of budget, development of new business opportunities is limited

Discussion

1
2
3 This study set out to investigate the value-co-creation in knowledge-intensive business
4 services. The framework presented in Figure 1 was useful to organise a case study and
5 therefore served its purpose. The research outcomes indicated that understanding and
6 interpretation of theorising was credible. As findings shows, the main actors –
7 Headquarters, Subsidiary management, Employees, Customers and Subcontractors
8 interact in order to meet the requirements and expectations of Customers with regards to
9 the quality of services delivered. This is achieved through the different levels of
10 interactions in network of relationships of multiple stakeholders. Interactions between
11 actors are managed by the Subsidiary management to which a Headquarters delegates
12 responsibility. Although a value is added at each stage of resource exchange, however
13 the value is created only if it will be transferred to the next actor. In these conditions the
14 subsidiary could co-create a value and improve performance if destructive processes
15 would not affect the resources. These effects depend on the intellectual capacity of the
16 network and related to the personnel as an owner and user of knowledge capital. The
17 knowledge flows define the performance of the subsidiary in the knowledge-intensive
18 environment.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Based on the findings in this case study we propose a framework explaining how value
42 co-creation may be affected in the post-acquisition integration phase in the networks of
43 the MNE (Figure 4 below). This model explains how changes in ownership at the
44 headquarters level can lead to changes in the system of management control, the
45 subsidiary role and the knowledge sharing process between *the headquarters,*
46 *subsidiaries, employees, local market (suppliers) and customers.* This may negatively
47 affect performance of the subsidiary.




Figure 4. Value co-creation in post-acquisition integration phase in the networks of MNEs.

As a resource-based view of the firm observed, every firm constitutes a bundle of knowledge. Of all possible resources that a firm might possess, its knowledge base is probably the greatest source of sustainable differentiation, competitive advantage and therefore high performance. In the context of MNEs, the effective and efficient transfer of knowledge within intra-corporate networks (vis-a-vis markets) is the primary reason why MNEs exist.

Unfortunately, this *raison d'être* does not imply that such knowledge transfers actually take place effectively and efficiently on a routine basis, due to the barriers which impede this transfer, such as tacitness, motivational reasons or absorptive capacity. For example, knowledge flow depends on headquarters-subsidary centralisation (Gupta and Govindarajan 2000). In this context, the MNE must be flexible to be able to combine firm-specific capabilities with local knowledge in order to create the value propositions which might be required in a particular market.

1
2
3 From the network theory point of view, the subsidiary is embedded in the MNE network
4 as well as in the local business network. This provides the basis of the integration-
5 responsiveness framework: MNEs adapting their strategies and organizational practices
6 to the local context. However, it is not about creating homogeneity but about how to
7 manage all these differences (Meyer, Mudambi and Narula 2011). It has been shown that
8 embeddedness depends on the degree of subsidiary's control by headquarters. For
9 example, Anderson and Forsgren (1996) demonstrated that the more embedded the
10 subsidiary was within its external relationships, the lower the control from headquarters
11 was. A stronger embeddedness within corporate relationships suggested greater MNE
12 control over the subsidiary.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Given the new ideas about how value co-creation process and subsidiary performance can
28 be affected in the post-acquisition phase, the findings in this paper have managerial and
29 academic relevance. From a *theoretical perspective*, it gives insight into post-acquisitions
30 processes and the process of value co-creation between the headquarters, subsidiary,
31 employees, local market (suppliers) and customers. It shows the applicability of the
32 theory of value co-creation to the circumstances of the high technological service
33 industry in international business settings. From a *managerial perspective*, the current
34 research helps to understand how to effectively manage the subsidiary and to improve
35 business performance in the post-acquisition phase. We recommend managers when
36 taking strategic decisions on acquisitions to consider how their choices affect interaction
37 between actors when creating new business opportunities.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 In this paper, the development of the subsidiary in Russia was analysed, in order to
54 explain its performance before and after post-acquisition integration. It was found that the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reasons for negative development were caused by the changes within the MNE: poor
4 cooperation between the headquarters and the subsidiary, an increase in centralization
5 and control, less autonomy for the subsidiary, increasing embeddedness in the corporate
6 network and a decrease in responsiveness to local demands. We demonstrated that lack of
7 balance between the extent and type of control, within a given environment and business
8 context, impacted the subsidiary performance and led to an imbalance in the process of
9 value co-creation between the headquarters, subsidiary, employees, local market
10 (suppliers) and customers. Contextual variations are particularly relevant for MNEs
11 entering large countries such as Russia. Knowledge about local context refers here to the
12 understanding of customers' expectations and the mentality of employees, i.e. their
13 knowledge of how to sell more and how to motivate people. Our findings show also that
14 in the new local context the knowledge transfer from the subsidiary to the headquarters
15 plays a crucial role in the existing and future performance of the subsidiary. Balancing
16 conflicting forces of local responsiveness and global integration was a major challenge
17 for the headquarters in our case study. Change in the system of management control as a
18 result of change in the ownership in headquarters destroyed value co-creation process at
19 the subsidiary, and this led to the poor performance as outlined in our case study (see
20 Figure 4 above).

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The empirical findings of this case study analysis can be summarized as follows. Since
2005, headquarters implemented its gradual expansion strategy in the Russian market by
combining local and global know-how in the consulting and software business at the
subsidiary level. This strategy implementation, however, changed radically when
Company 1 was acquired by another German-headquartered IT company. The key global

1
2
3 competences of the MNE included a strong brand and the fact that global organizational
4 practices and marketing strategies had been adequately implemented. After the second
5 acquisition, from our point of view, it was not necessary to transfer knowledge to the
6 subsidiary. However, it *was* necessary to provide knowledge transfer about local market
7 to the headquarters, but this did not in fact happen (see Figure 1, the outward link
8 between Subsidiary and Headquarters). As a consequence of poor understanding of the
9 local market circumstances, more attention was given to the sales of software products
10 than on consulting, as sale of software is a more profitable business. However, there was
11 no consideration of the fact that most customers buy certain types of software only
12 together with consulting (see Figure 1, the link between Subsidiary, Employees,
13 Customers and Subcontractors). This means that the software vendor needs to provide
14 such services itself, otherwise customers will buy a competitor's product (see Figure 1,
15 the links between Subsidiary and Customers and Headquarters and Customers). At the
16 same time, headquarters decreased the degree of subsidiary autonomy through limiting of
17 decisions taken by the subsidiary itself. Even operational decisions had to be taken at
18 headquarters level in each functional area. This led to the de-synchronization of decisions
19 which related to all functional areas, and an increase in bureaucratic procedures. In a
20 situation where knowledge about the peculiarities of the Russian business environment
21 was scarce, headquarters managers were not able to find reasonable solutions for dealing
22 with the increasing business challenges (Figure 1, the backward link between
23 Headquarters and Subsidiary). These factors put pressure on subsidiary revenues. Since
24 revenue was in decline, headquarters had to look for ways to reduce costs. As the main
25 portion of subsidiary costs were personal costs, this had led to pressure on subsidiary
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 resources. The scarcity of highly-qualified human resources on the Russian labour market
4 had allowed the key personnel of the subsidiary to find a job very quickly (Figure 1, the
5 links between Subsidiary and Employees and Headquarters and Employees). As a result,
6 the loss of experienced staff again put pressure on subsidiary revenue as this meant a loss
7 of local competencies which were highly personalised for the Russian subsidiary's CEO
8 and key employees. This included good personal relationships between customers and
9 subsidiary staff. These competencies were applied in order to manage and engage
10 subsidiary personnel and to maintain the contacts with customers. With the example of
11 subsidiary development over time, we have illustrated how the subsidiary's capabilities
12 declined over time and that this was due to headquarters managing the subsidiary
13 functions by trial and error. A decline of revenue in the subsidiary meant that the know-
14 how accumulated during the first three years of its operation in Russia was later lost.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Conclusions**

36
37
38 This case study shows the application of the value co-creation view, to the MNE network.
39 It is first of all an illustration of the concept of subsidiary evolution. According to this
40 model, the post-acquisition development of the subsidiary in Russia represents a
41 combination of all three factors: first, a head-office-driven process, second, local
42 environment response, and third, subsidiary choice. These factors led to imbalance in
43 value co-creation process and subsequently, atrophy of the subsidiary. The head-office
44 assignment perspective considers that the subsidiary is an instrument of the MNE and,
45 consequently, that it acts solely with regard to head-office-determined imperatives. The
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subsidiary choice perspective employs the network model, which allows the subsidiary to
4 be considered from the position of equality with headquarters or even leadership. The
5 network model recognizes that some ownership-specific advantages belong to the
6 subsidiary itself.
7
8
9
10

11
12
13 The value co-creation framework adds to this model by explaining how this network
14 works and how the value is co-created. The decline of the subsidiary from this point of
15 view is a process built along with the decline of the subsidiary's value co-creation. For
16 example, it was demonstrated how key human resources are critical for the subsidiary
17 development in Russia because the labour market is different from, for example,
18 European countries. It is not possible to find free resources; therefore, companies develop
19 and retain their own. Our case analysis reveals that the high capabilities held by the
20 subsidiary did not match with the loss in the subsidiary charter assigned by the
21 headquarters. This can be viewed as an example of subsidiary decline through parent-
22 driven de-investment (Birkinshaw and Hood 1998). In this case, the capabilities that were
23 associated with the old charter were drastically reduced, as a group of employees left the
24 subsidiary. The subsidiary had superior local capabilities which were not valued by the
25 headquarters. From this point of view, the declared growth strategy in Russia did not
26 match with the strategy implementation: the decision of headquarters to reduce the
27 subsidiary charter. The changes in the subsidiary's charter after the acquisition of its
28 mother company show that the capabilities developed in the subsidiary suddenly became
29 obsolete. Therefore, subsidiary decline was also partly driven by contextual host country
30 factors, including constriction of the local labour market and more personalized customer
31 relationships.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Emerging markets such as Russia remain attractive for foreign MNEs. In these markets,
4 the organization needs to develop local responsiveness by differentiating and increasing
5 the subsidiary's role. In order to achieve this, the subsidiary should be given a more
6 autonomous role and managed in a less centralized way. Subsidiary development should
7 include gradual charter establishment and capability enhancement. In this process the
8 subsidiary' management team should play an important role in building the local team,
9 and in local market knowledge transfer from the subsidiary to the headquarters. Trusting
10 relationships with the local management team and key local sales managers should be
11 developed. In the MNE's system of management control between headquarters and the
12 subsidiary, a shift towards social control rather than bureaucratic and personal control
13 should be the focus.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The MNE strategy determines the organizational design and control system. An effective
31 organization is one where structure, management practices, rewards and people fit its
32 strategy. Organizational design, strategy, organizational culture and control must also fit
33 the environment. The strategy to grow via acquisitions rather than by the gradual
34 development of operations meets the challenges of both integration and responsiveness. It
35 was necessary for the organization to re-conceptualise the strategy implementation in the
36 second post-acquisition period (after year 2009). In this regard, a view of MNE as a
37 network of partly autonomous subsidiaries, with links between each other and to external
38 actors, where participants share their resources in order to co-create value needs to be
39 developed within the organization.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Limitations

The limitations of our study provide opportunities for future research. Even taking into account that the objective of our qualitative research is to test a theory, our findings must be interpreted with caution as the analysis is based on a single comparative case study. Although, our study applied the theory of the value co-creation to the settings of one country and we identified the actors and, their roles and activities in the Russian context, we expect that identical relationships can be found in any subsidiary in the service industry independent on the national context, as in the knowledge intensive industries the industry specific prevail over country specific. However, in order to confirm it more studies on how value is co-created within the MNE network need to be conducted. This is a qualitative study of *one* industry in *one* country and future research may probably seek to explore cases in different industries and different countries in order to generate a solid theory.

Acknowledgments

We thank all reviewers of this paper and participants of the poster session at 43rd EIBA Annual Conference for their c useful comments and support.

References

1. Aarikka-Stenroos, L., and E. Jaakkola. 2012. Value co-creation in knowledge intensive business services: A dyadic perspective on the joint problem-solving process. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 41 (1):15-26.
2. Abrahamsen, M. H., Henneberg, S. C., and P. Naudé. 2012. Using actors' perceptions of network roles and positions to understand network dynamics. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 41 (2):259-269.
3. Andersson, U., and M. Forsgren, 1996. Subsidiary embeddedness and control in the multinational corporation. *International Business Review*, 5 (5):487–508.

4. Ahlstrom, D. 2010. Innovation and growth: How business contributes to society. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24 (3):11-24.
5. Auh, S., Bell, S.J., McLeod, C.S. and E. Shih. 2007. Co-production and customer loyalty in financial services. *Journal of Retailing*, 83 (3):359–370.
6. Birkinshaw, J. M. and N. Hood. 1998. Multinational subsidiary evolution: capability and charter change in foreign-owned subsidiary companies. *Academy of Management Review*, 23 (4):773-795.
7. Birkinshaw, J. M., Hood, N., and S. Young. 2005. Subsidiary entrepreneurship, internal and external competitive forces and subsidiary performance. *International Business Review*, 14 (2):227-248.
8. Cantù, C., Corsaro, D., and I. Snehota. 2012. Roles of actors in combining resources into complex solutions. *Journal of Business Research*, 65 (2):139-150.
9. Doz, Y. 2011. Qualitative research for international business. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42 (5):582-590.
10. Eisenhardt, K.M. 1989. Building theory from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (4):532-550.
11. Ellet, W. 2007. *The case study handbook*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
12. Forsgren, M., and J. Johanson. 1992. *Managing internationalization in business networks*. Philadelphia, PA: Gordon and Breach.
13. Galvagno, M., and D. Dalli. 2014. Theory of value co-creation: a systematic literature review. *Managing Service Quality*, 24 (6):643-683.
14. Gammelgaard, J., McDonald, F., Stephan, A., Tüselmann, H., and C. Dörrenbacher. 2012. The impact of increases in subsidiary autonomy and network relationships on performance. *International Business Review*, 21 (6):1158-1172.
15. Ghoshal, S., and C. A. Bartlett. 1990. The multinational corporation as an inter-organizational network. *Academy of Management Review*, 15 (4):603-626.
16. Ghauri, P. 2004. Designing and conducting case studies in international business research. In Rebecca Marschan-Piekkari and Catherine Welch (Eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for International Business*. Ch. 5, pp.109-124. London, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
17. Ghauri, P., and K. Gronhaug. 2010. *Research methods in business studies*. 4th Edition. London, UK: FT Pearson.
18. Gummesson, E., and C. Mele. 2010. Marketing as value co-creation through network interaction and resource integration. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4 (4):181-198.
19. Gupta, A.K., and V. Govindarajan. 2000. Knowledge flows within the multinational corporation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21 (4):473-496.
20. Hedlund, G. 1986. The hypermodern MNC - a heterarchy? *Human Resource Management*, 25 (1):9-35.
21. Jaakkola, E., and T. Hakanen. 2013. Value co-creation in solution networks. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42 (1):47-58.
22. Lusch, R. F., and S.L. Vargo. 2006. Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing Theory*, 6 (3):281-288.
23. Mattson, L. G., and J. Johanson. 1992. Networks Positions and Strategic Action. In Axelsson, B. and G. Easton (Eds.) *Industrial Networks: A New View of Reality*. Ch. 11, pp.205-217. London, UK: Routledge.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
24. Meyer, K.E., Mudambi, R. and R. Narula. 2011. Multinational enterprises and local context: the opportunities and challenges of multiple embeddedness. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48 (2):235-252.
25. Michel, S., Vargo, S. and R. Lusch. 2008. Reconfiguration of the conceptual landscape; a tribute to the service logic of Richard Normann. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 36 (1):152-155.
26. Noria, N., and S. Ghosal. 1997. *The differentiated network: Organizing multinational corporations for value creation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
27. Ostrom, A. L., Bitner, M. J., Brown, S. W., Burkhard, K. A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., and E. Rabinovich. 2010. Moving forward and making a difference: research priorities for the science of service. *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (1):4-36.
28. Panibratov, A., and M. Latukha. 2014. Obtaining international results through partnerships: evidence from Russian MNEs in the IT sector. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, 19 (1):31-57.
29. Rugman, A. M., 1996a. *The theory of multinational enterprises: the selected scientific papers of Alan M. Rugman*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
30. Rugman, A. M., 1996b. *Multinational enterprises and trade policy: the selected scientific papers of Alan M. Rugman*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
31. Rugman, A. M., and A. Verbeke. 2003. Extending the theory of the multinational enterprise: Internalization and strategic management perspectives. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 34 (2):125-137.
32. Sekaran, U. and R. Bougie. 2013. *Research methods for business*. 7th Edition. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
33. Ulriksen, M.S. and N. Dadalauri. 2016. Single case studies and theory-testing: the knots and dots of the process-tracing method. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 19 (2):223-239.
34. Vargo, S. L., Maglio, P. P., and M. A. Akaka. 2008. On value and value co-creation: A service systems and service logic perspective. *European Management Journal*, 26 (3):145-152.
35. Vargo, S. L., and R.F. Lusch. 2008. Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36 (1): 1-10.
36. Welch, C., Piekkari, R. Plakoyiannaki, E. and E. Paavilainen-Mäntymäki. 2011. Theorising from case studies: Towards a pluralist future for international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42 (5):740-762.
37. Yin, R. 2009. *Case study research: design and methods*. 4th Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
38. Young, S., and A. T. Tavares. 2004. Centralization and autonomy: back to the future. *International Business Review*, 13 (2):215-237.