

**AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTS OF GLOBALISATION ON
THE PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE OF OPERATORS IN THE BANKING
SECTOR IN NIGERIA**

by

Owoseni, Omosolape Olakitan

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,
Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, P.m.b. 1066, Oyo State, Nigeria.
E-mail: soolakitan@yahoo.com

Abstract

Globalization has caused dramatic changes to business practices around the world. Globalization is an interesting phenomenon since it is obvious that the world has been going through this process of change towards increasing economic, financial, social, cultural, political, market, and environmental interdependence among nations. Virtually, everyone is affected by this process because globalization brings about a borderless world. This study investigated how sustainable global market uncertainty, global market opportunities and global competitive threat affect the performance of bankers in Nigeria which can lead to a competitive advantage and an enhancement of industrial development that can bring about global partnership for development which is one of the pivotal goals of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Participants for this study were three hundred and one bankers in Lagos, Nigeria. Two hypotheses were tested and the findings of the study revealed that there was a significant relationship between performance of operators and global market opportunities. The result also revealed that global market uncertainty, global market opportunities and global competitive threat significantly and jointly predicted performance of operators. Conclusively, the findings from this study support the argument that globalization not only benefits firms in terms of increasing opportunities, but also hurts business performance due to higher competitive threats. This study also confirms that globalization is a universal phenomenon and that firms are inevitably affected either positively or negatively. While global market opportunities are likely to enhance firm performance, global competitive threats tend to worsen it. Therefore, managers must be aware of such double-edged effects, and try to capitalize on opportunities while converting threats into opportunities. Appropriate strategies, such as developing networking relationships with other firms, must be carefully designed and implemented in order to take advantage of global market opportunities and minimize the threats from increasing competitive intensity.

Keywords: Globalization, global market opportunities, global competitive threats, global market uncertainty, Millennium Development Goals, operators' performance, Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has caused dramatic changes to business practices around the world. Globalization is an interesting phenomenon since it is obvious that the world has been going through this process of change towards increasing economic, financial, social, cultural, political, market, and environmental interdependence among nations. Virtually, everyone is affected by this process because globalization brings about a borderless world (Eden & Lenway, 2001; Ohmae, 1989a). Globalization drives people to change their ways of living, prompts firms to change their ways of conducting business, and, spurs nations to establish new national policies. Events transpiring in different parts of the world now have dramatic consequences to other parts of the world at a faster pace than anyone could imagine in the past.

This study investigated how sustainable global market uncertainty, global market opportunities and global competitive threat affect the performance of bankers in Nigeria which can lead to a competitive advantage and an enhancement of industrial development that can bring about global partnership for development which is one of the pivotal goals of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Globalization also enables firms to outsource and find customers around the world, for example, the auto and electronics industries. The globalization of production

and operations benefits firms through the realization of economies of scales and scope (Corswant, 2002; Reyes, Raisinghani, & Singh, 2002). Hence, no one can deny that globalization has changed the way business is conducted in Nigeria.

Although globalization is a worldwide phenomenon, the extent to which each country is globalized is not identical. Thus, it is clear that globalization is an important phenomenon, one that cannot be simply ignored, because every nation—regardless of size or level of development—is globalized and affected by globalization. With the prevalence of this worldwide phenomenon, it is not surprising that businesses are inevitably affected.

The process of globalization creates new challenges and opportunities for firms (Bradley, Hausman & Nolan, 1993). The opportunities include access to new markets that were previously closed due to cost, regulation, or indirect barriers, the ability to tap resources such as labor, capital, and knowledge on a worldwide basis, and the opportunity to participate in global production networks that are becoming prevalent in many industries such as automotive, electronics, toys and textiles. Challenges come from foreign competitors entering firms' domestic markets, and from domestic competitors reducing their costs through global sourcing, moving production offshore or gaining economies of scale by expanding into new markets.

Globalization challenges firms to become more streamlined and efficient while simultaneously extending the geographic reach of their operations.

Responding to these opportunities and challenges increasingly requires a fundamental restructuring of organizational strategy and processes (Bradley et al., 1993). Due to increased competitive pressure, companies are using new technologies to extend their products and operations into the international marketplace (Snow, Snell, Davison & Hambrick, 1996). They are also using these technologies to achieve new innovative transnational organizational forms (Boudreau, Loch, Robey & Straud, 1998; Sturgeon, 2002).

Although, no conclusion can yet be drawn on how these aspects of globalization effects relate to organisational performance. Hence, this study is a step to investigating the magnitude and directions of the relationships between these globalization effects and organisational performance. This will help gain a better understanding about the directions of the effects, and determine appropriate strategies to better manage these effects and help organisations stay competitive in a globalized era.

The most apparent effects of globalisation in literature are global market opportunities and global market threats (e.g., Fawcett,

Calantone, & Smith, 1997; Fawcett & Closs, 1993; Hafsi, 2002; Jones, 2002; Molle, 2002). Global market opportunities refer to the increases in market potential, trade and investment potential and resource accessibility (Contractor & Lorange, 1988; Fawcett & Closs, 1993; Jones, 2002; Levitt, 1983; Shocker, Srivastava, & Ruekert, 1994). Global market threats refer to the increases in the number and level of competition, and the level of uncertainty (Burgers, Hill, & Kim, 1993; Fawcett and Closs, 1993; Jones, 2002; Ohmae, 1989a; Perlmutter & Heenan, 1986).

Globalization and Business

The opportunities and threats evoked by globalization have caused firms to adapt their organizational structures and strategies accordingly (Jones, 2002; Knight, 2000). Firms that respond to these trends have been found to improve their performance (Knight, 2000). Therefore, this study is interested in analyzing the effects of global market opportunities and threats on the performance of operators in Nigerian banks.

One apparent demonstration of globalisation is the introduction and adoption of Information and Communication Technology (ICT). The adoption of ICTs such as the Internet makes it cheaper and easier for firms to extend their markets, manage their operations and coordinate value chains across borders (Cavusgil, 2002; Williams, Dale, Visser &

Wiele, 2001; Globerman, Roehl & Standifird, 2001). As Alan Greenspan (2001) has said, "By lowering the costs of transactions and information, technology has reduced market frictions and provided significant impetus to the process of broadening world markets". ICT adoption fosters globalization by reducing transaction and coordination costs and creating new and expanded markets with economies of scale (Mann, Eckert & Knight, 2000; Steinfield & Klein, 1999).

Globalization and Organisational Performance

Global market opportunities enable firms to access worldwide resources and expand into many new overseas markets; thus, enhancing firm performance (Hafsi, 2002; Jones, 2002; Levitt, 1983; Shocker, Srivastava, & Ruekert, 1994 include recent source here); while on the other hand, global market threats can be destructive to firm performance due to an increasing number of competitors and an increase in intensity of competition coupled with higher market uncertainty (Eng, 2001; Fawcett & Closs, 1993; Hafsi, 2002; Jones, 2002; Levitt, 1983; Sanchez, 1997, Thoumarungroje, 2004).

In the wake of 1990s, the world has gone through the process of globalization, one that causes increasing economic, financial, social, cultural, political, market, and environmental interdependence among nations. Business, as well, is inevitably

affected by this process of change towards more interdependence. Many forms of organizational restructuring (such as downsizing, reengineering, implementation of cooperative strategies) have been witnessed as responses to globalization (Jones, 2002).

Effects of Globalization

Since the 1980s, dramatic changes have been witnessed in the international and global market place. Liberalization of world trade and capital markets led by globalization has created a new and challenging competitive arena for all firms (Nolan & Zhang, 2003). With the trend towards more interdependence among nations, several changes in the business environment have emerged. There has been an emergence of global markets for goods, services, labor and financial capital (Deardorff & Stern, 2002; Hansen, 2002). Consumers' demands around the world have converged (Fram & Ajami, 1994; Levitt, 1983; Ohmae, 1989a). Increasing trade and investment liberalization evoked by advances in transportation and communication technologies has resulted in larger volumes of international business transactions (Deardorff & Stern, 2002; Fawcett, Calantone, and Smith, 1997; Fawcett & Closs, 1993).

These trends have brought about two key effects of globalization, namely, global market opportunities and global market threats (Contractor & Lorange, 1988; Fawcett & Closs, 1993; Hitt, Keats, &

DeMarie, 1998; Molle, 2002; Perlmutter & Heenan, 1986; Sanchez, 1997). It is obvious that globalization not only presents more opportunities to firms, but also higher levels of threats (D'Aveni, 1994; Eng, 2001; Jones, 2002; Oxley & Yeung, 1998; Shocker, Srivastava, & Ruekert, 1994). While opportunities can arise from globalization, competition and uncertainty are inevitable.

Global Market Opportunities and Organisational Performance

Global market opportunities can be defined as increases in market potential, trade and investment potential and resource accessibility resulting from globalization (Contractor & Lorange, 1988; Fawcett & Closs, 1993; Jones, 2002; Levitt, 1983; Shocker, Srivastava, & Ruekert, 1994). Developments in information technology, removal of trade and investment barriers, privatization, and deregulation of trade and investment policies have provided firms seeking international markets with tremendous opportunities (Scully & Fawcett, 1994). Such changes in the business environment enable firms to not only access new markets but also lower costs by relocating their operations and exploiting cheap resources around the world (Czuchry & Yasin, 2001). Firms can out source their production in various locations to lower their costs (Chimerine, 1997). Market transactions have also become more efficient due to globalization of technology (Peterson, Welch, & Liesch,

2002). These new market opportunities have eventually fostered rapid growth in various economic sectors in many regions around the world (Graham, 1996).

Global Market Threats and Organisational Performance

Global market threats can be further categorized into 1) global competitive threats and 2) global market uncertainty. Global competitive threats are defined as the intensified competition in global markets resulting from larger numbers of competitors in the global marketplace (D'Aveni, 1994; Hafsi, 2002). Along with higher competition, another threat posed by globalization is global market uncertainty, which refers to the increasing complexity and demand uncertainty in the market (Burgers, Hill, & Kim, 1993; Chimerine, 1997; Courtney, 2001; Oxelheim & Wihlborg, 1991).

Global Competitive Threats

Although globalization enhances a firm's market opportunities, it also increases the amount and level of competition faced by such firms. Trade liberalization, technological developments, and convergence of governmental macroeconomic policies associated with globalization have made it easy for firms around the globe to enter different geographic markets, and thus, intensify the competitive atmosphere for firms around the world (Hafsi, 2002; Harvey & Novicevic, 2002). Globalization has

dramatically changed the competitive terrain faced by firms from both developed and emerging economies (Nolan & Zhang, 2003; Scully and Fawcett, 1994). Firms operating at different levels—domestic, regional, international and global—are now competing against one another. Hence, it is obvious that globalization has brought about a new competitive landscape referred to as “hypercompetitive markets” (Hitt, Keats, and DeMarie, 1998), one that presents enormous threats to firms in every economic sector since it makes a firm's relative competitive advantage very time-sensitive (Harvey & Novicevic, 2002).

In addition, globalization also enables consumers to gather information easier, faster, and at lower costs. Thus, they become well aware of alternative products, and are ready to switch.

Given a growing number of competitors, resources are becoming increasingly scarce (Castrogiovanni, 1991; Dess & Beard, 1984; Porter, 1980). Such hypercompetitive situations coupled with scarce resources is harmful to firm performance (Beard & Dess, 1981; Singh, House & Tucker, 1986). Firms are now faced with less pricing flexibility due to intensified competition and buyers' resistance, which have led to a lower rate of return (Chimerine, 1997).

Global Market Uncertainty

Global market uncertainty, which refers to

the increasing complexity and demand uncertainty in the market (Burgers, Hill, & Kim, 1993; Courtney, 2001; Oxelheim & Wihlborg, 1991) is another threat confronted by firms operating in the global marketplace. Firms are faced with increasing difficulties in planning and making decisions (Chimerine, 1997; Hitt, Keats, & DeMarie, 1998). Demand has become hard to forecast for various reasons. Since a growing number of firms now participate in the global marketplace, forecasting demand and/or competitors' responses has become increasingly difficult. Moreover, technology is changing at a rapid pace and information about new products is easily accessible by consumers. This has enabled consumers to shift between producers, making demand become less predictable and uncertain (Chimerine, 1997)

Since operating in the global marketplace increases the level of uncertainty encountered by firms, their performance is affected. In addition, past studies performance (Downey and Slocum, 1982; Gerloff, Muir, and Bodensteiner, 1991; Waddock and Isabella, 1989) found a negative relationship between perceived uncertainty and firm.

METHOD

Design

The design for the study is a survey design which measured two variables, independent

variable and dependent variable. The independent variable is globalisation effects which comprise global market opportunities, global competitive threat, and global market uncertainty and the dependent variable is perceived performance of operators.

Participants

This study is based on a sample of 301 staff of commercial banks in Lagos State. The respondents were selected conveniently. The participants comprised 199(66.1%) males, and their female counterparts were 102(33.9%). 173(57.5%) of the respondents were single, while 128(42.5%) were married. 157 (52.2%) were young and the older participants were 144 (47.8%). The educational qualification of the respondents ranged from B.Sc/B.Ed/B.A 279 (92.7%), to 12 (4.0%) NCE/OND holders, 6 (2.0%) M.A/M.Eddegree holders and lastly by those with Ph.Ddegree who were 4 (1.3%).

Instrument

The study made use of questionnaire for data gathering which was divided into three sections. The first section measured demographic information of the respondents; second section measured globalisation effects which is a 24 item

scale developed by Thoumarungroje (2004) with a 7-point Likert type response format ranging from strongly disagree” (1) to “Strongly Agree (7) and the third section measures firm performance which was adopted for the study. The scale is a four self-reported items which reflect the level of a manager's satisfaction in terms of return on investment, sales goals, profit goals, and growth. These items were adopted from Grewal and Tansuhaj (2001) and was rated on a seven-point scale (1= very unsatisfactory, neutral, and 7= very satisfactory). The author reported Cronbach alpha of 0.92 for global market opportunities; 0.92 for global competitive threat; 0.81 for global market uncertainty; and 0.91 for firm performance. But for the present study, the researcher reported Cronbach reliability of 0.95, 0.91, 0.92, and 0.96 respectively.

Statistical Analyses

The demographic information was analysed using frequency counts and simple percentages. Also, the hypotheses for the study were analysed using regression analysis and Pearson correlation. Hypothesis 1 was tested using regression analysis and hypothesis 2 was tested using Pearson correlation.

RESULTS

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis one: There will be a joint effect of global market opportunities, global competitive threat, and global market uncertainty on perceived performance of operators.

Table 1a: Summary of regression table showing the joint effect of global market opportunities, global competitive threat, and global market uncertainty on the performance of operators.

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Regression	16096.836	3	5365.612	73.570	.000
Residual	21660.965	297	72.933		
Total	37757.801	300			

R = .653, R² = .426, Adj R² = .421

It was shown in table 1a that the joint effect of global market opportunities, global competitive threat, and global market uncertainty on the performance of operators was significant (F(3,297) = 73.570; R = .653, R² = .426, Adj. R² = 0.421; p < .05). About 43% of the variation was accounted for by the independent variables while the remaining 57% was due to chance. The hypothesis is therefore accepted.

Table 1b: Summary table showing the independent effects of the variables on the performance of operators

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficient	t	p
(Constant)		2.486		6.477	.000
Global Market opportunities	.401	16.106	.291	4.270	.000
Global Competitive threat	.297	.218	.101	1.358	.175
Global Market Uncertainty	.555	.111	.333	5.024	.000

The result in table 1b shows the relative contribution of each of the independent variables on the dependent variable Global Market opportunities (β = .291, p < .05), Global Competitive threat (β = .101, p > .05), Global Market Uncertainty (β = .333, p < .05), respectively. Hence, Global Market Opportunities and Global market Uncertainty were found significant while Global Competitive threat was not.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant relationship between global market opportunities and perceived performance of operators.

Table 2: Summary of correlation table showing the relationship between market opportunities and the performance of operators

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	r	p
Global Market Opportunities	38.8505	8.1380	301	.586**	.000
Performance of Operators	51.3654	11.2187			

It was shown in table 2 that there was a significant relationship between global market opportunities and performance of operators ($r = .586$, $N = 301$, $p < .05$). The hypothesis is therefore accepted.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGERS

The result of this study shows that there was a joint effect of global market opportunities, global competitive threat, and global market uncertainty on the performance of operators. This finding substantiates the argument that globalization brings about both opportunities and competition. The opportunities and threats evoked by globalization have caused firms to adapt their organizational structures and strategies accordingly (Jones, 2002; Knight, 2000). Firms that respond to these trends have been found to improve their performance (Knight, 2000).

Although globalization enhances an

organisation's market opportunities, it also increases the amount and level of competition faced by such organisations. Trade liberalization, technological developments, and convergence of governmental macroeconomic policies associated with globalization have made it easy for firms around the globe to enter different geographic markets, and thus, intensify the competitive atmosphere for firms around the world (Hafsi, 2002; Harvey & Novicevic, 2002). Globalization has dramatically changed the competitive terrain faced by firms from both developed and emerging economies (Nolan & Zhang, 2003; Scully & Fawcett, 1994).

The findings of this study also confirmed that there was a significant relationship between global market opportunities and performance of operators. This confirmed previous studies in this area. According to literature (e.g. Hafsi, 2002; Jones, 2002; Levitt, 1983; Shocker, Srivastava, &

Ruekert, 1994), global market opportunities enable firms to access worldwide resources and expand into many new overseas markets which enhances firm performance. Developments in information technology, removal of trade and investment barriers, privatization, and deregulation of trade and investment policies have provided firms seeking international markets with tremendous opportunities (Scully & Fawcett, 1994). Such changes in the business environment enable firms to not only access new markets but also lower costs by relocating their operations and exploiting cheap resources around the world (Czuchry & Yasin, 2001). Organisations can outsource their production in various locations to lower their costs (Chimerine, 1997). Market transactions have also become more efficient due to globalization of technology (Peterson, Welch, & Liesch, 2002). These new market opportunities have eventually fostered rapid growth in various economic sectors in many regions around the world (Graham, 1996).

Also, global market opportunities leads to increase in market potential, trade and investment potential and resource accessibility resulting from globalization (Contractor & Lorange, 1988; Fawcett & Closs, 1993; Jones, 2002; Levitt, 1983; Shocker, Srivastava, & Ruekert, 1994).

The findings from this study nonetheless have some implications for managers. This

support the argument that globalization not only benefits firms in terms of increasing opportunities, but also hurts business performance due to higher competitive threats (e.g., Contractor & Lorange, 1999, D'Aveni, 1994, Jones, 2002, Shocker, Srivastava, & Ruekert, 1994). This study elaborated on the different effects that globalization has on business. This study also confirms that globalization is a universal phenomenon and that firms are inevitably affected.

Globalization can affect an organisation's performance positively and negatively. While global market opportunities are likely to enhance performance, global competitive threats tend to worsen it. Therefore, managers must be aware of such double-edged effects, and try to capitalize on opportunities while converting threats into opportunities. Appropriate strategies, such as developing networking relationships with other organisations, must be carefully designed and implemented in order to take advantage of global market opportunities and minimize the threats from increasing competitive intensity.

In the short run, intense global competition may be deemed harmful for organisational performance. However, in the long run, such competition will provide a healthier economy that benefits the overall society. Higher competition will eventually encourage organisations to aim for continual improvements, which are good

for both the organisations and society.

Conclusion

This study has advanced knowledge on globalization phenomenon by looking at the effects it has on business operations. This study has provided considerable support for literature arguing that globalization acts as a two-edged sword, one that can be beneficial and detrimental to business. Therefore, managers should be prepared to cope with such effects and try to capitalize on global market opportunities while carefully managing its inherent threats.

REFERENCES

- Burgers, W. P., Hill, C. W. L. & Chan Kim, W. (1993). A Theory of Global Strategic Alliances: The Case of the Global Auto Industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14, 419-32.
- Boudreau, M., Loch, K. D., Robey, D. & Straud, D. (1998). Going Global: Using Information Technology to Advance the Competitiveness of the Virtual Transnational Organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(4), 120-128.
- Bradley, S. P., Hausman, J. A. & Nolan, R. L. (1993). *Globalization, Technology, and Competition*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Castrogiovanni, G. J. (1991). Environmental Munificence: A Theoretical Assessment, *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 542-65.
- Cavusgil, S. T. & Das, A. (1997). Methodological Issues in Empirical Cross-cultural Research: A Survey of the Management Literature and a Framework, *Management International Review*, 37(1), 71-96.
- Chimerine, L. (1997). The New Economic Realities in Business, *McKinsey Quarterly*, 86(1), 12-17.
- Clougherty, J. A. (2001). Globalization and the Autonomy of Domestic Competition Policy: An Empirical Test on the World Airline Industry, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 459-78.
- Contractor, F. J. & Lorange, P. (1988). *Why Should Firms Cooperate? The Strategy and Economics Basis for Cooperative Ventures*, in Lorange, Perter, ed., *Cooperative Strategies in International Business*, Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, pp. 1-29.
- Corswant, F.V. & Peter, F. (2002). Sourcing Trends in the Car Industry: A Survey of Car Manufacturers' and Suppliers' Strategies and Relations, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(7), 741-58.
- Courtney, H. (2001). Making the Most of Uncertainty, *McKinsey Quarterly*, 90(4), 38-47.
- Czuchry, A. J. & Yasin, M. M. (2001). Enhancing Global Competitiveness of Small and Mid-Sized Firms: A Rapid Assessment Methodology Approach', *Advances in*

- Competitiveness Research*, 9(1), 87-99.
- D'Aveni, R. A. (1994). *Hypercompetition*. New York: Harper Business.
- Deardorff, A. V. & Stern, R. M. (2002). What You Should Know about Globalization and the World Trade Organization, *Review of International Economics*, 10(3), 404-23.
- Dess, G. G. & Beard, D. W. (1984). Dimensions of Organizational Task Environments, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 71-93.
- Downey, H. K. & Slocum, J. W. (1982). Managerial Uncertainty and Performance, *Social Science Quarterly*, 63(2), 195-207.
- Eden, L. & Lenway, S. (2001). Introduction to the Symposium Multinational: The Janus Face of Globalization, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 383-400.
- Eng, H. E. R. (2001). Global Development Issues in a Changing World, *Journal of Macro marketing*, 21(2), 213-16.
- Fawcett, S. E., Calantone, R. & Smith, S. R. (1997). Delivery Capability and Firm Performance in International Operations', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 51, 191-204.
- Fawcett, S. E. & Closs, D. J. (1993). Coordinated Global Manufacturing, The Logistics/Manufacturing Interaction, and Firm Performance, *Journal of Business Logistics*, 14(1), 1-25.
- Fram, E. H. & Ajami, R. (1994). Globalization of Markets and Shopping Stress: Cross-Country Comparisons, *Business Horizons*, 37(1), 17-23.
- Gerloff, E. A., Muir, N. K. & Bodensteiner, W. D. (1991). Three Components of Perceived Environmental Uncertainty, *Journal of Management*, 17(4), 749-68.
- Globerman, S., Roehl, T. W. & Standifird, S. (2001). Globalization and Electronic Commerce: Inferences from Retail Brokering. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(4), 749-768.
- Greenspan, A. (2001). Remarks by Chairman Alan Greenspan on Globalization. Speech at George Washington University, the Robert P. Maxon Lecture, Washington, D.C., December 3, 2001.
- Graham, Peter G. (1996) 'Small Business Participation in the Global Economy', *European Journal of Marketing*, 33 (½), 88-102.
- Grewal, R. & Tansuhaj, P. (2001). Building Organizational Capabilities for Managing Economic Crisis: The Role of Market Orientation and Strategic Flexibility, *Journal of Marketing*, 65 (April): 2001.
- Hafsi, T. (2002). *Global Competition and the Peripheral Player: A Promising Future*, in Fawzy, Samiha, ed., *Globalization and Firm Competitiveness*, Washington DC: The International Bank of

- Reconstruction and Development, pp. 47-62.
- Hansen, R. (2002). Globalization, Embedded Realism, and Path Dependence, *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(3), 259-83.
- Harvey, M. & Novicevic, M. M. (2002). The Hypercompetitive Global Marketplace: The Importance of Intuition and Creativity in Expatriate Managers, *Journal of World Business*, 37, 127-38.
- Hitt, M. A., Keats, B. W. & DeMarie, S. M. (1998). Navigating in the New Competitive Landscape: Building Strategic Flexibility and Competitive Advantage in the 21st Century, *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(4), 22-42.
- Jones, M. T. (2002). Globalization and Organizational Restructuring: A Strategic Perspective, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 44(3), 325-51.
- Knight, G. (2000). Entrepreneurship and Marketing Strategy: The SME under Globalization, *Journal of International Marketing*, 8 (2), 12-32.
- Kraemer, K. L., Gibbs, J. J. & Dedrick, J. (2002). Impacts of globalisation on E-Commerce adoption and firm performance. Globalization and E-Commerce Project of the *Center for Research on Information Technology and Organizations (CRITO)* at the University of California, Irvine.
- Levitt, T. (1983). The Globalization of Markets, *Harvard Business Review*, 61(3), 92-102.
- Mann, C. L., Eckert, S. E. & Knight, S. C. (2000). *Global Electronic Commerce: A Policy Primer*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Molle, W. (2002). Globalization, Regionalism and Labor Markets: Should We Recast the Foundations of the EU Regime in Matters of Regional (Rural and Urban) Development? *Regional studies*, 3(2), 161-72.
- Nolan, P. & Zhang, J. (2003). Globalization Challenge for Large Firms from Developing Countries: China's Oil and Aerospace Industries, *European Management Journal*, 21 (3), 285-99.
- Ohmae, K. (1989). Managing in a Borderless World, *Harvard Business Review*, 67(3), 152-61.
- Oxelheim, L. & Wihlborg, C. G. (1991). Corporate Strategies in a Turbulent World Economy, *Management International Review*, 31(4), 293-315.
- Oxley, J. E. & Schnietz, K. E. (2001). Globalization Derailed? Multinational Investors' Response to the 1997 Denial of Fast-Track Trade Negotiating Authority, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 479-96.
- Oxley, J. E. E. & dYeung, B. (1998). *Structural Change, Industrial*

- Location, and Competitiveness*. London, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Perlmutter, H. V. & Heenan, D. A. (1986). Cooperate to Compete Globally, *Harvard Business Review*, 64 (March-April), 136-52.
- Peterson, B., Welch, L. S. & Liesch, P. W. (2002). The Internet and Foreign Market Expansion, *Management International Review*, 42(2), 207-21.
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*. New York: Free Press.
- Reyes, P., Raisinghani, M. S. & Singh, M. (2002). Global Supply Chain Management in the Telecommunications Industry: The Role of Information Technology in Integration of Supply Chain Entities, *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*, 5(2), 48-61.
- Sanchez, R. (1997). Preparing for an Uncertain Future. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 27(2), 71-94.
- Scully, J. I. & Fawcett, S. E. (1994). International Procurement Strategies: Challenges and Opportunities for the Small Firm. *Production and Inventory Management Journal*, 35(2), 39-46.
- Shocker, A. D., Srivastava, R. K. & Ruekert, R. W. (1994). Challenges and Opportunities Facing Brand Management: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(May), 149-58.
- Singh, J. V., House, R. J. & Tucker, D. J. (1986). Organizational Change and Organizational Mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 587-611.
- Snow, C. C., Snell, S. A., Davison, S. E. & Hambrick, D. C. (1996). Use Transnational Teams to Globalize Your Company. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24, 50-66.
- Steinfeld, C. & Stefan, K. (1999). Local vs. Global Issues in Electronic Commerce. *Electronic Markets*, 9(½), 1-6.
- Sturgeon, T. J. (2002). Modular Production Networks: A New American Model of Industrial Organization. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(3), 451-496.
- Thoumrungroje, A. (2004). The effects of globalisation on marketing strategy and performance. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Washington State University, College of Business and Economics.
- Waddock, S. A. & Isabella, L. A. (1989). Strategy, Beliefs about The Environment, and Performance in a Banking Simulation. *Journal of Management*, 15(4), 617-32.
- Williams, A. R. T., Dale, B. G., Visser, R. L. & Wiele, T. V. (2001). B2B, Old Economy Businesses and the Role of Quality: Part 1- The Simple Alternative. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 5(2), 39-44.