

**Managing institutional differences for international outsourcing success: a case study of  
New Zealand manufacturing SME**

Sharma, R. R., Lindsay, V., & Everton, N. (2015). Managing institutional differences for international outsourcing success: the case of a small New Zealand manufacturing firm. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 22(3), 590-607. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-06-2012-0071>

**This article is (c) Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (<http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/>). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.**

## **Managing institutional differences for international outsourcing success: a case study of New Zealand manufacturing SME**

### **Abstract**

**Purpose** - Most of the research on international outsourcing of value chain activities focuses on larger firms. This study fills an important research gap by exploring how small and medium enterprises (SMEs) manage institutional differences to enhance their international outsourcing success.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The paper uses data from interviews conducted with two managers of a New Zealand apparel manufacturing SME who have over 35 years of combined experience with international outsourcing. The case study SME had both failed and successful experiences in their international outsourcing ventures. Findings are discussed in the context of the extant literature on international outsourcing.

**Findings** – SMEs overcome institutional constraints they face in offshore locations by leveraging from their entrepreneurial skills, learning from failures and using a relational governance mode. This results in these firms achieving performance targets and sustaining long term relationships with suppliers, defined as international outsourcing success in this study.

**Research limitations/implications** – The findings may not be generalised as they are based on a single case study and cover only the client perspective.

**Practical implications** – With the rise of international outsourcing of value chain activities, the findings are useful to SMEs aiming to achieving success in their outsourcing ventures in offshore locations.

**Originality/value** –This study is one of only a few studies investigating SME international outsourcing that examines both failure and success.

**Key words** – Outsourcing, SMEs, New Zealand, China, India

**Paper type** – Case Study

## 1. Introduction

International outsourcing has become a norm in the current globalised business environment (Hätönen and Eriksson, 2009). International outsourcing occurs when some of the value chain activities are sourced from external suppliers located abroad (Chadee and Raman, 2009). Firms outsource to offshore locations to reduce costs, seek growth opportunities, address competitive pressures, access human resources and follow industry practices (Lewin and Peeters, 2006). With the increasing globalisation of business activity, international outsourcing allows firms to leverage disintegration, location and externalisation advantages (Kedia and Mukherjee, 2009). Disintegration advantages include increased focus on core competencies and modularity benefits. A focus on core competencies allows firms to develop superior capabilities by appropriate reallocation of resources. Modularity, on the other hand, allows flexibility, speed and cost savings. By outsourcing to offshore locations, firms leverage from infrastructure, government policies and human resources available in those locations. Externalisation adds value by providing opportunities for co-specialisation and co-learning. While attempting to reap benefits of international outsourcing, firms face certain challenges such as transportation and logistic costs, quality of logistics infrastructure, local logistics industry competence, quality and delivery performance, supplier capabilities, and host and home country institutional differences (Ruamsook *et al.*, 2009). Given the perceived advantages and challenges of international outsourcing, the question arises as to how firms can gain from their international outsourcing ventures.

There is still limited research on the relationship between international outsourcing and firm performance, as well as mixed findings. International outsourcing is found to enhance the productivity of exporters (Görg *et al.*, 2008). A reason for this is that outsourcing firms are able to focus on their core competencies and use outsourcing to gain access to globally competitive products in which they, themselves, are not competitive. On the other hand, Mol *et.al.* (2005) find no performance effects of international outsourcing. Gilley and Rasheed (2000) find no direct impact of outsourcing on the performance of MNEs, arguing that the relationship between outsourcing and firm performance is moderated by firm strategy and environmental dynamism. In other words, in their study, outsourcing contributed to the performance of firms which followed a cost leadership strategy and operated in relatively stable environments. In uncertain and dynamic environments, transaction costs become higher and may offset benefits of cheap factors of production available at those locations. Also, firms having an outsourcing strategy that guides their outsourcing decisions gain

significant cost savings from international outsourcing (Massini *et al.*, 2010). The mixed findings on the outsourcing-performance relationship suggest the likelihood of the influence of contextual factors on firms undertaking international outsourcing. This paper focuses on the context of institutional differences between client and supplier countries in the outsourcing performance of SMEs. As outsourcing is a strategic decision not to manufacture at home, outsourcing failures are likely to have serious implications on a firm's performance. Outsourcing failures can be more drastic for SMEs relative to larger firms, since they have limited knowledge and experience, and are usually resource-constrained. By drawing on a case study of a failed and a successful international outsourcing experience of a New Zealand SME, this paper explores how SMEs manage institutional challenges for succeeding in international outsourcing ventures. In so doing, the study addresses an important research gap in the international outsourcing literature.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. The next section discusses the relevant literature underpinning the theoretical rationale for the proposed conceptual model. The third section discusses the methodology. The next section presents the case study results, followed by the discussion and implications of the findings. Finally, conclusions, limitations and future research areas are discussed.

## **2. Relevant literature and conceptual model**

Traditionally, the outsourcing literature has focused on the environmental and organizational antecedents of outsourcing, as well as the performance influences and consequences of outsourcing in relation to MNEs, with little focus on the SME perspective (Barrar and Gervais, 2006; Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2009). However, SMEs are not smaller versions of MNEs; they have distinct characteristics and capabilities as compared to MNEs (Brouthers & Hennart, 2007). For instance, SMEs face knowledge and resource constraints, but are considered more entrepreneurial than MNEs (Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2009). SMEs are quicker in decision making, leveraging the benefits of small size and relatively flat organisational structures, where owners and managers are in direct contact with each other. SMEs face more complex problems compared to their larger counterparts, as their small size, structure and lack of resources, make it difficult for them to facilitate growth and remain competitive in the growing international economy (Coviello and Munro, 1995). In order to deal with these problems, SMEs are increasingly opting to cut costs and gain access to resources by outsourcing the manufacturing and service components of their businesses abroad (Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2009). A recent study of New Zealand manufacturing SMEs finds that those

that outsource their value chain activities internationally perform significantly better than non-outsourcing SMEs (Raman and Ahmed, 2011). The possible explanations include SMEs using international outsourcing as a tool to manage their scarce resources, enabling them to focus on their core competencies (Prahalad and Hamel, 1990; Raman and Ahmed, 2011) and leverage location specific advantages (Dunning, 2001). These include those relating to offshore suppliers, such as low labour costs, access to local markets, low costs of manufacturing abroad, and existence of production and supply networks in those countries. On the other hand, Solakivi *et al.* (2011) find no significant relationship between the performance of SMEs and outsourcing, but argues that it is the fit between the company context and outsourcing that enhances performance. This aligns with much of the outsourcing-performance research on MNEs.

SMEs also face the dilemma of sourcing supply chain activities from nearby locations (near-shoring) or distant locations (off-shoring). Antonio and Martines (2010) find that relatively larger and more internationalised SMEs and SMEs with institutional contacts outsource to develop value added activities from distant locations. Smaller SMEs, on the other hand, face challenges in establishing supply chain linkages in remote markets. This implies that SMEs with relatively larger resources and which have experience in operating in overseas countries are more comfortable outsourcing business activities from distant locations. This helps them leverage location specific advantages, such as the availability of relevant labour skills, raw materials and potential market size.

The mixed findings on the impact of outsourcing on firm performance suggest more complex influences and relationships between variables. These include relatively under-researched aspects, including contextual factors, such as the business environment, and firm's resources and capabilities that may influence outsourcing-performance relationships. Furthermore, there is scant research on the international outsourcing-performance relationship in the context of SMEs, since most of the research has tended to focus on MNEs and larger firms in general (Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2009). This research addresses this gap by examining how the business environment, in particular the institutional differences between the home and host countries, influences the international outsourcing success of SMEs and how these differences could be managed to enhance success.

Institutions are “humanly devised constraints that structure human interaction” (North, 1990 p. 3) and are commonly known as ‘rules of the game’ (Peng, 2009). Such ‘rules of the game’ can be classified into two broad categories: formal and informal. Formal ‘rules of the game’, or institutions, consist of laws, regulations and rules, while norms, cultures and ethics

constitute informal institutions. As firms operate globally in different environments, they face different ‘rules of the game’, as regulations and cultures vary across countries. Firms outsourcing their business activities to offshore suppliers, with the aim of enhancing their business performance face challenges of environmental dynamism (Gilley and Rasheed, 2000) and cultural differences (Jia and Rutherford, 2010; Winkler *et al.*, 2008) associated with the institutional make-up in the offshore market.

Firms from Western developed economies generally enjoy strong institutions in their home countries. However, emerging economies from where these firms often outsource their supply chain activities are usually characterised as having weak institutions or institutional voids. Identifying institutional voids and appropriately responding to them is essential for succeeding in emerging economies (Khanna and Palepu, 2011). Thus, the management of institutional differences between the home country clients and host country suppliers in an outsourcing arrangement is likely to play an important role in deciding the fate of the outsourcing venture. Accordingly, our base proposition is that well-managed institutional differences enhance the outsourcing venture success, while ineffective management of institutional differences is more likely to result in a failed outsourcing venture. But the question arises, if institutional differences exist, how do firms manage them? Based on institutional-based view of strategy (Peng *et al.*, 2009), we propose that SMEs manage institutional differences by using a relational governance mode. The institutional based view of strategy proposes that managers are rational people and they make their decisions based on institutional constraints they face; and that when formal institutions are weak, informal institutions play a greater role in achieving outcomes (Peng *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, the choice of relational governance makes sense when formal institutions are weak and informal institutions differ (see figure 1).

*Figure 1 about here*

However, the question of whether the outsourcing venture should be governed through formal mechanisms (contractual governance) or informal mechanisms (relational governance) also depends upon other factors, such as the nature of the goods or services outsourced (Kedia and Lahiri, 2007) and firm characteristics, such as availability of resources and the entrepreneurial nature of the SME (Chetty and Holm, 2000). If the product being outsourced is of a ‘commoditised’ nature (e.g. standard garments), one can argue for more emphasis on contractual governance (Poppo and Zenger, 2002). As SMEs are small in size, and are resource and knowledge constrained, it might be difficult for them to engage in

contractual enforcements in countries which are known for relatively weak regulatory institutions. Larger firms have been found to be successful in gaining benefits from international outsourcing because of their resources and synergy effects (Antonio and Martines, 2010; Gorg and Hanley, 2004). However, it might be too expensive for smaller firms to engage in contract enforcement mechanisms, which might cost a lot of time and money. At the same time, as SMEs have relatively flat organisational structures and enjoy faster decision making, they are more likely to leverage their entrepreneurial capabilities to move to other suppliers or locations if they are let down by their existing suppliers. Enhanced competition in supplier markets and increased globalisation opens opportunities to outsourcing firms to move between suppliers or locations. Thus, SMEs are likely to utilise their entrepreneurial skills in managing their scarce resources and move to other suppliers or locations, if necessary. Thus, our second proposition is that an SME's entrepreneurial nature enables its managers to make strategic decisions quickly, thus helping in the management of institutional differences.

Overall, we propose that the impact of institutional differences on international outsourcing success is moderated by a relational governance mode and entrepreneurial skills of the SME (Figure 1). International outsourcing success from the client perspective implies the realisation of expected cost savings with respect to the quality of the products/services being outsourced, satisfaction with the outsourcing venture, and longevity of outsourcing relationship.

### **3. Methodology**

The main research question this paper investigates is how SMEs manage institutional differences in achieving success while outsourcing to locations with strikingly different institutional environments. Because of the exploratory nature of the research question, a qualitative, interview-based case study approach was taken to provide deep insights and rich empirical data to test and advance the conceptual framework. A qualitative approach is "appropriate for studying phenomena that are not well understood" (Edmondson and McManus, 2007). This approach was adopted for this study because empirical research to date on the management of institutional differences by SMEs engaged in international outsourcing is lacking. Qualitative research also enables access to exploratory data, which may not be accessible in quantitative research (Cavana *et al.*, 2001).

A single case study approach, drawing on multiple informants, was used. While there is debate on whether single or multiple cases studies provide the most useful insights (Chetty,

1996; Flyvbjerg, 2006), Eisenhardt (1989) argues that it depends on the topic and the degree to which additional cases can add further information. By using a single case, we follow the advice of Dyer and Wilkins (1991) in seeking to gain rich insights relevant to theory building. Also, in accordance with Llewelyn and Northcote's (2007) 'singular view' of case study research, we believe that the single case study can provide greater understanding of the sense and significance of the situation.

The case study is conducted on a New Zealand apparel firm, an SME that has outsourcing operations in the offshore locations of Indonesia, China and Thailand. Thus, the unit of analysis is the firm. The firm in question has about 25 years of experience in international manufacturing outsourcing. The case was selected on the basis of its long experience in offshore outsourcing, and its different outsourcing performance outcomes – both failure and success. Contact was established with the case study firm via phone, and subsequent email relays resulted in a meeting being arranged between one of the researchers and two senior executives at their Head Office in Auckland, New Zealand.

The interview guide (Table 1) consisted of a range of semi-structured and open-ended questions relating to both the decision and implementation phases of the offshore outsourcing projects, as well as an evaluation of the success of the projects to date. The interviewees were also given the opportunity to discuss specific issues and provide examples of instances where they had to handle institutional differences.

*Table 1 about here*

A single face-to-face, semi-structured interview was conducted with the two senior executives from the SME, both being present in the interview. The interview lasted approximately two hours. Executive One had been working for the firm for thirty years, in a variety of roles, and was present during the transition from local manufacturing to offshore manufacturing via an outsourcing vendor. Executive Two had been at the firm for over ten years and was the project manager for their offshoring projects. With their combined experience of over 35 years with the firm, the two Executives were able to provide a great deal of insight into both the history of offshore outsourcing of the firm, and into the current outsourcing projects that the firm is currently undertaking.

In order to ensure verification of the information obtained and subsequent accurate reporting, researcher-subject corroboration was undertaken, where the meaning of the data gathered was cross-checked with the executives during the interview (Cavana *et al.*, 2001). This accords with the need to ensure that qualitative research is trustworthy, having



credibility, dependability, transferability and conformability (Sinkovics *et al.*, 2009). The interview was conducted in English. It was tape-recorded, and the audio files were subsequently transcribed.

Following Miles and Huberman (1994), the transcript was then manually coded, according to broad themes which arose from the literature review, notably those presented in the conceptual framework (project success, relationship management and other governance mechanisms, cultural differences and institutional factors). The coding process underwent a number of iterations resulting in sub-coding, recoding and clustering into these themes before the analysis was considered to be complete, as suggested by Bazely (2007). The analysis revealed some rich insights into the factors and relationships proposed in the conceptual model.

#### **4. Case study results**

The case SME did not succeed in its initial international outsourcing venture, but had a series of successful ventures afterwards. The international outsourcing journey from failure to success is summarised in Figure 2 and the explanation follows. The failed experience happened in India in the early 1990s and that was the company's first outsourcing venture. As a result of this failure, the SME terminated its outsourcing arrangement in India and moved to a supplier in China where the company was successful. Both China and India have different and weaker formal institutions as compared to New Zealand. Thus, it is interesting to explore how the SME failed in one environment and succeeded in another similar environment.

##### *4.1 International outsourcing to institutionally different countries*

The SME first outsourced to India and then later to China. Both China and India have strikingly different formal and informal institutions as compared to New Zealand (Table 2). It is evident from Table 2 that formal institutions are stronger in New Zealand and weaker in the other two countries. For example, contract enforcement is very hard in India and easy in New Zealand; China ranks in between New Zealand and India. Similarly, the ease of doing business index and global corruption indices indicate that New Zealand firms are likely to face significantly adverse regulatory environments in China and India.

*Table 2 about here*

The literature generally uses Hofstede's cultural dimensions and Hall's cultural factors to operationalize informal institutions (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 1980), on the basis that

these are largely reflected by the culture of the surrounding society. New Zealand differs substantially from China and India on Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Table 2). While China and India are similar on a number of these dimensions, New Zealand is in contrast. It is a relatively individualistic society with more risk taking propensity, less power distance, and more short term orientation, as compared to China and India. This implies that New Zealand SMEs operating in India and China need to consider and manage these cultural differences in order to succeed. Existence of cultural differences creates higher risk in managing supply chains and needs some risk mitigation strategies (Jia and Rutherford, 2010). Given these kinds of institutional differences, relational governance makes sense, as firms from collectivist countries with weak institutions tend to rely more on relationships to achieve their business outcomes (Peng et al, 2009).

#### *4.2 The failed experience: lack of experience and appropriate governance mode*

The company's outsourcing venture into India occurred early in its experience of internationally outsourcing its manufacturing. The Indian economy was just opening during early 1990s and the decision by the SME to outsource to India could be considered as an entrepreneurial decision to seek early mover advantages. However, the project failed within a year, causing the company to make the decision to terminate its contract with the outsourcing supplier in India. The SME did not envisage that the challenges of moving out to an institutionally different country, would be much more than originally anticipated.

*4.2.1 Cultural differences poorly managed.* The main reason for the failure highlighted by Executive Two was poor management of the cultural differences with their supplier. Executive Two stated that *"a lot of it probably was, in that instance, a cultural thing."* However, both Executives were unable to identify exactly what cultural aspects may have led to the breakdown of the relationship. Executive Two suggested that the failed Indian project resulted from the Indians' tendency to produce high-quality samples, yet produce low-quality bulk products for the contract. This occurrence may be explained by the differences between India and New Zealand that led to a failure in communication and expectations - namely context, activity/passivity, power distance and individualism/collectivism (Table2). Specifically, the differing contexts in which the two societies operate may explain the behaviour experienced; New Zealand is a low-context society, where people explicitly expresses their expectations, whereas India is a high-context nation where people tend to send implicit signals. As a firm which operates in a low-context

culture, the SME did not pick up on these implicit signals, and, as a result, had unrealistic expectations as to what the Indian vendor was able or willing to provide them.

The contextual differences between the New Zealand and Indian cultures appears to have also resulted in inappropriate governance being undertaken by the SME, as Indian culture places a great deal of emphasis on building strong business relationships (Winkler *et al.*, 2008). The New Zealand SME, being from a country which relies predominantly on hard contracts when conducting business, seems not to have recognised this. The concept of activity/passivity could also be used to explain this behaviour, as India is generally found to be a relatively passive culture, while New Zealand is generally considered to be an active culture. Furthermore, differences in power distance may also be a contributing factor to this failed project, as India's high level of power distance means that employees may feel unable to voice a lack of understanding to their superiors; consequently the products manufactured were not as required. Finally, the cultural value of individualism /collectivism may also have influenced the SME and been a factor in the failed Indian project. New Zealand is a highly individualist culture, whereas India is a collectivist culture. The data suggest that the case study firm did not take this into account when conducting negotiations with the Indian vendor, and as a result, may have offered inappropriate incentives to the Indian vendor.

*4.2.2 Regulatory environment and entrepreneurial decision.* The early 1990s was a period of transition for India, moving from a relatively closed, to a relatively open economy. The SME endeavoured to leverage the more open economic environment but the Executives realised that the vendor did not respect the contract. As it takes time and resources to pursue legal cases, and the regulatory environment in India is relatively weak, the SME opted to terminate the outsourcing arrangement in India, rather than try to pursue legal proceedings. This aligns with the entrepreneurial nature of SMEs, characterised by a less formal structure and faster decision-making.

#### *4.3 The successful experience: learning and relational governance*

For the SME, trust in its Indian supplier was broken because the goods supplied were different from the approved samples. Such lack of trust, communication and cooperation was a factor in the fallout between the SME and the Indian vendor, which led to the case study firm moving away from India to China. The immediate cancellation of the Indian contract that occurred when the apparel was not manufactured according to agreed expectations indicates that the SME did not have measures in place to rectify and improve the relationship; instead, it simply contracted with offshore vendors elsewhere. However, the SME was able to

manage its next outsourcing deal with a Chinese vendor more effectively. This proved to be a successful venture and was still in place at the time that the interviews took place.

The level of satisfaction of the SME with outsourcing to China indicates that the outsourcing projects in this location have been successful. After learning from the failed experience, it appears that the SME utilised a number of strategies and control and coordination mechanisms to successfully manage its outsourcing relationship. The company's satisfaction with the China outsourcing project was evident from the Executive's responses when questioned about whether or not they were satisfied with the quality and performance of their offshore vendors - Executive One stated "*Absolutely!*" Furthermore, Executive Two stated that the cost savings met their expectations, and that they "*...wouldn't be with the same suppliers if the quality wasn't up to scratch*". In respect of vendor performance and their satisfaction with the final product, the two Executives again indicated that their initial expectations were met. Furthermore, they felt that their long-term relationship with their suppliers was strong and highly satisfactory.

*4.3.1 Institutional differences and relational governance.* Notwithstanding some differences, China and India have similar cultural and regulatory differences with New Zealand (Table 2). In respect of cultural differences, Executive Two asserted that cultural differences did not have a significant impact on their operations with their current outsourcing vendors, and joked that the only time he experienced cultural or language barriers was when he was "*...ordering food sometimes!*" This implies that the executives have been able to manage cultural differences in China well. They have used a relational governance mode effectively, developing good relations with their suppliers by using appropriate mechanisms. The literature also provides evidence that good partnership quality between client and vendor contributes to achieving organisational outcomes (Lee 2001; Chadee *et al.*, 2011).

With regard to the mechanisms used to manage the outsourcing project with the Chinese vendor, Executive One stated that the business transactions with their outsourcing vendors are primarily based on trust. The Executives indicated that more emphasis is placed on informal 'soft' aspects reflecting relational governance, than formal 'hard' mechanisms associated with contractual governance. As Executive One stated, "*it is trust-related at the end of the day that going to make it work*". Executive One further identified one of the problems associated with 'hard mechanisms', such as formal contracts, as being a lack of legal ramifications, as "*you virtually have no recourse at all with regard to quality*".

Both Executive One and Executive Two indicated that their relationships with their outsourcing vendors were of high quality. They identified an exceptionally high level of trust as one of the main factors underpinning their successful relationships. When asked to identify on a scale of 1-10 (10 being excellent) the level of trust prevalent in their relationship with their offshore vendors, Executive Two stated that *“purely based on longevity it would have to be right up to 8 or 9 out of 10”*. Furthermore, the Executives indicated that the high level of trust in the relationship meant that cooperation between the SME and its vendors was largely problem-free, and that minimal conflict had occurred between themselves and their outsourcing vendors. However, Executive One identified one situation where trust in their outsourcing vendors was questionable. He noted the increasing tendency for outsourcing vendors to sub-contract manufacturing work without consulting with the SME, because they were unable to cope with demand. This issue was highlighted by Executive One, who stated that *“I think they subcontract the [garments] out. I know they did with some [garments], they subcontracted them out,...you think you might be dealing with XXX up there, and it might be another company who actually does the work for them.”* However, since the SME was happy with the outsourcing outcomes, this did not concern them too much. Rather, the focus was on strengthening good relationships. Executive One stated that recently, due to the economic downturn and subsequent closing of manufacturing plants in Asia, the SME has dropped down the priority list of some of their outsourcing vendors, due to their small size; as Executive One noted, *“and it’s only our good relationship with them that’s holding us in”*.

In respect of language barriers, Executive Two stated that no problems had occurred as a result of language differences because their Chinese outsourcing vendor contacts either spoke English, or had access to competent translators who were able to relay information between the client and vendor - *“I was lucky that the contact that I have got in China...was quite young, so she had a good university education so her English was good... If someone’s not there that speaks English, they’ve always got an option of bringing someone along that can translate”*. However, the Executives brought to attention an instance where language differences could possibly be associated with some specific problems that arose. The instance was in regards to an order that was sent from the client to the vendor being misinterpreted, resulting in apparel being manufactured according to an incorrect design. Words used on the order form may have been misunderstood or misinterpreted by the Chinese vendor, and the resulting outcome could be explained by the power distance associated with Chinese culture. More specifically, employees working for the outsourcing vendor may not have fully

understood instructions from their superiors, but felt they were unable to ask superiors to clarify the specifications of the design.

Both Executive One and Executive Two stated that they have encountered very few problems in respect of communication or information sharing to date, as they communicate with their outsourcing vendor frequently via telephone and email, and they visit their offshore vendors' site four times a year. The occasional instances when the Executives identified where communication was impeded and tasks were performed incorrectly by the offshore vendors, suggests that the firm benefitted from using a greater array of communication media. Using a variety of media meant that the client was able to reiterate its messages through different communication avenues to ensure that the message was correctly interpreted, as opposed to relying on one or two avenues (i.e. phone or email) where the message can be lost or misinterpreted as a result of cultural noise.

Although the case study firm's outsourcing experiences in China have been largely positive, the company has been reluctant to undertake formal contracts because of problems associated with getting contracts enforced in weaker institutional environments. To compensate, the SME executed relational governance mode to manage their China outsourcing venture. It focussed on enhancing communication quality by using multiple communication tools and use of translators, establishing trust, enhancing cooperation and avoiding conflict (e.g. vendor sub-contracting without permission) with the vendor. This has resulted in longevity in their outsourcing relationships in China.

*4.3.2 Learning and entrepreneurship.* It appears that the SME has learned from its previous failed outsourcing venture in India and put in place the mechanisms the literature suggests to succeed in institutionally different countries. Turning outsourcing failure to success supports the assertion that learning from failures is more effective and long lasting (Madsen and Desai, 2010). To quote Executive Two, "*we are very conscious of the things that can go wrong*". The company recognised the need to display a high level of sensitivity to institutional differences and a commitment to succeed in their outsourcing venture. The SME has also been undertaking additional successful outsourcing ventures in other Asian countries.

#### *4.4 Summary of the case findings*

Both the failed experience and successful experience, as discussed above, are summarised in Figure 3. As shown, the case study results support our propositions that institutional differences impact outsourcing success and SMEs leverage from their entrepreneurial

capabilities and use relational governance modes for enhancing success. In addition, we find that learning from failures is critical in enhancing success, as it enables SMEs to use appropriate outsourcing governance mechanisms.

*Figure 3 about here*

The SME outsourced its supply chain activities to locations with relatively weak regulatory environments – but failed at one location and succeeded at the other. Both the outsourcing countries are similar in a number of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, but differ markedly from New Zealand. The failed experience occurred primarily because trust was broken, when the goods supplied did not match the samples provided. The SME did not find it worth engaging in contractual enforcements, considering its own scarce resources and the weak regulatory environment of India. Its decision to move to India during the early 1990s was a deliberate entrepreneurial act, as the country was opening at that time and the SME saw India as offering potential advantages compared to China. Termination of the outsourcing relationship in India can also be seen as a deliberate entrepreneurial act on the part of the SME.

In their China experience, the SME managed the regulatory and cultural differences through a relational mode of governance, incorporating cooperation, coordination and communication mechanisms, and development of personal relationships. The SME learnt from the failed experience in India, using a difference governance mode to manage their next outsourcing venture. The Executives were satisfied with the outsourcing venture in China, as it delivered cost savings, appropriate quality, and overall outsourcing satisfaction, which have resulted in longevity in their outsourcing arrangement.

## **5. Discussion and implications**

While interpreting the case, it is important to note that India was opening its economy to foreign business during the early 1990s, so the SME’s decision to outsource manufacturing to India at that time was unquestionably entrepreneurial. India is now well regarded in manufacturing outsourcing and is ranked just after China in terms of manufacturing location attractiveness, based on a number of parameters (see Deloitte, 2010).

This case study illustrates how choosing an appropriate governance mechanism and applying a combination of entrepreneurial skills and organisational learning helps SMEs manage their resource constraints and institutional challenges in international outsourcing ventures. If not managed well, institutional differences are likely to have an adverse impact

on organisational outcomes (Peng *et al.*, 2009). The regulatory environment of most developing economies is relatively weak, and this poses difficulties in establishing productive outsourcing relationships. Cultural differences also exist between Western advanced economies and their outsourcing providers from developing Asian emerging economies. Such cultural differences have been found to adversely impact international outsourcing outcomes (Jia and Rutherford, 2010; Winkler *et al.*, 2008). This can be explained by the greater role played by informal institutions when formal institutions are weak or fail. The use of relational governance by the firm in managing the institutional challenges aligns with the institution based view of strategy (Peng *et al.*, 2009), and with the importance of cultural adaptation in reducing risks in global supply chains (Jia and Rutherford, 2010).

SMEs face resource and knowledge constraints because of their small size. Despite their scarce resources, SMEs engage in outsourcing in order to focus on their core competencies and leverage from the cheaper factors of production available in other locations (Prahalad and Hamel, 1990; Raman and Ahmed, 2011). SMEs tend to be entrepreneurial in nature, and are quick in decision-making; thus, they are likely to move from one vendor to another, if not happy with the outsourcing performance. The literature cautions that supplier selection has a critical impact on outsourcing outcomes, and suppliers must be selected carefully on the basis of their quality and capabilities (Hsu *et al.*, 2006). It is not clear from the current case study whether or not an appropriate supplier selection process was followed. It is more likely that the SME followed a random approach in the selection of its suppliers. However, the firm moved quickly to another supplier when its performance expectations were not met by the Indian company. The SME learned from the failed experience and managed its next supplier relationship successfully. Thus, in the process of moving to another vendor, the SME learnt from failure as to how an outsourcing relationship could be managed more effectively. Learning from failures is more effective and depreciates more slowly than learning from successes (Madsen and Desai, 2010). That the case study company had many successes in its international outsourcing ventures following its earlier failure is an illustration of this point.

The findings of the study suggest four main managerial implications. First, it highlights the importance of developing a high quality relationship when conducting outsourcing arrangements in countries with relatively weak regulatory environments. Relationships also help to overcome cultural barriers between Western individualistic and collectivist societies like China and India. Relational governance is particularly important for SMEs, as they face resource constraints and thus rely on relationships to access vital



resources. Managers need to use control and coordination mechanisms, such as multiple communication channels (e.g. phones, emails, personal visits) to avoid potential interpretation issues associated with single communication channels, to enhance mutual trust and strengthen relationships. This is especially important when two countries differ in terms of being high or low context societies. Second, SMEs can leverage from their unique entrepreneurial capabilities to recognise failures quickly and move to other vendors, thus reducing dependency. Third, learning from failures is very important. A failed experience might help generate subsequent multiple successful ventures, if lessons are learned and behaviour adapted accordingly, as evidenced in the case study firm. Last, it is critical to understand regulatory and cultural differences of outsourcing vendor countries, and adopt appropriate governance measures for the proposed outsourcing ventures.

However, the findings of this study may not be generalizable and care should be taken in their interpretation, as the study suffers from some limitations. The main limitation is arguably the use of a single case study firm, whereby the findings relate solely to this case and cannot be generalised to other firms. While such an approach is well-accepted in case study research (Sinkovics *et al.*, 2009), and can, in fact, provide deeper insights into the phenomenon being investigated, a multi-case approach would widen the application of the findings. In addition, a survey-based quantitative study would enable a better understanding of the relationships proposed in the conceptual model, and provide statistical generalisability. Further, the findings are based only on the clients' perspectives, rather than on the relationship dyads, which is a recommended approach where possible (Styles *et al.*, 2008). It would, therefore, be valuable to explore both the client and vendor perspectives to generate a more robust understanding of the phenomenon. Despite these limitations, the study contributes to knowledge on the international outsourcing success of SMEs. By exploring both failure and success of SME international outsourcing ventures, insights are gained on how SMEs can engage successfully in this rapidly expanding aspect of global supply chains.

## **6. Conclusion**

This study explored how SMEs that are normally characterised by having resource and knowledge constraints and entrepreneurial skills manage challenges posed by institutional differences with their outsourcing vendor countries. We conclude that SMEs address intuitional and resource challenges by adopting relational governance, leveraging their entrepreneurial skills, and through organisational learning. The current literature on international outsourcing highlights the role of relational governance in international

outsourcing success, but most of the studies relate to large multinationals (Chadee *et al.*, 2011; Di Gregorio *et al.*, 2009; Lahiri and Kedia, 2009; Lee, 2001; Raman and Ahmed, 2011). We contribute to the international outsourcing literature by examining the relationship between institutional differences and international outsourcing success from the perspective of SMEs. In particular, our study casts light on the mechanisms that SMEs use, particularly relational governance and entrepreneurial skills, to manage this relationship. The study is also one of few that examine both failure and success, following calls for such research (Peng, 2004.) As such, we provide insights into failure and success of international outsourcing ventures within the same organisation, and the role that learning from failure plays in subsequent outcomes. Future research should test and erudite the nature of the relationships between the impact of identified variables - namely, relational governance, entrepreneurship, and organisational learning - on the international outsourcing success of SMEs. In addition, a more broadly-based qualitative study would provide the opportunity for deeper reflection on the drivers of outsourcing success in SMEs and their responses to failure.


## References

- Antonio, J. and Martines, B. (2010), "International outsourcing and partner location in the Spanish footwear sector", *European Urban & Regional Studies*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 65-82.
- Barrar, P. and Gervais, R. (2006) *Global outsourcing strategies*, UK, Gower Publishing.
- Bazeley, P. (2007) *Qualitative Data Analysis with NVivo*, London, Sage Publications.
- Cavana, R. Y., Delahaye, B. L. and Sekaran, U. (2001) *Applied Business Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*, Milton, Wiley.
- Chadee, D. and Raman, R. (2009), "International outsourcing of information technology services: review and future directions", *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 26 No. 4/5, pp. 411-38.
- Chadee, D., Raman, R. and Michailova, S. (2011), "Sources of competitiveness of offshore IT service providers in India: towards a conceptual model", *Competition & Change*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 196-220.
- Chetty, S. (1996), "The case study method for research in small-and medium-sized firms", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 73-85.
- Chetty, S. and Holm, D. B. (2000), "Internationalisation of small to medium-sized manufacturing firms: a network approach", *International Business Review*, Vol. 9 No., pp. 77-93.
- Coviello, N. E., and Munro, H. J. (1995). "Growing the entrepreneurial firm: networking for international market development", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 7, pp. 49-61.
- Deloitte (2010) Global manufacturing competitive index. available at [http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-Global/Local%20Assets/Documents/Manufacturing/dtt\\_2010%20Global%20Manufacturing%20Competitiveness%20Index\\_06\\_28\\_10.pdf](http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-Global/Local%20Assets/Documents/Manufacturing/dtt_2010%20Global%20Manufacturing%20Competitiveness%20Index_06_28_10.pdf)
- Di Gregorio, D., Musteen, M. and Douglas, E. T. (2009), "Offshore outsourcing as a source of international competitiveness for SMEs", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 6, pp. 969-88.
- Dunning, J. H. (2001), "The eclectic (OLI) paradigm of international production: past, present and future", *International Journal of the Economics of Business*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 173-90.
- Dyer, W. G., Jr. and Wilkins, A. L. (1991), "Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: a rejoinder to Eisenhardt", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 613-19.
- Edmondson, A. C. and McManus, S. E. (2007), "Methodological fit in management field research", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 1155-79.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989), "Building theories from case study research", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 532-50.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006), "Five misunderstandings about case-study research", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 219-45.
- Gilley, K. M. and Rasheed, A. (2000), "Making more by doing less: an analysis of outsourcing and its effects on firm performance", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 763-90.
- Gorg, H. and Hanley, A. (2004), "Does outsourcing increase profitability?", *Economic and Social Review*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 267-87.

- Görg, H., Hanley, A. and Strobl, E. (2008), "Productivity effects of international outsourcing: evidence from plant-level data", *The Canadian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 670-87.
- Hall, E. T. (1976), *Beyond Culture*, New York, Doubleday.
- Hätönen, J. and Eriksson, T. (2009), "30+ years of research and practice of outsourcing - Exploring the past and anticipating the future", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 142-55.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's consequences: international differences in work related values*, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage Publications.
- Hsu, C.-C., Kannan, V. R., Leong, G. K. and Tan, K.-C. (2006), "Supplier selection construct: instrument development and validation", *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 213-39.
- Jia, F. and Rutherford, C. (2010), "Mitigation of supply chain relational risk caused by cultural differences between China and the West", *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 251-70.
- Kedia, B. L. and Lahiri, S. (2007), "International outsourcing of services: a partnership model", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 22-37.
- Kedia, B. L. and Mukherjee, D. (2009), "Understanding offshoring: A research framework based on disintegration, location and externalisation advantages", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 44 No., pp. 250-61.
- Khanna, Tarun, and Krishna G. Palepu. (2011) "Winning in Emerging Markets: Spotting and Responding to Institutional Voids", *The World Financial Review*, (May - June), pp. 18-20.
- Korac-Kakabadse, N., Kouzmin, A., Korac-Kakabadse, A. and Savery, L. (2001), "Low- and high-context communication: towards mapping cross-cultural encounters", *Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 3-24.
- Lahiri, S. and Kedia, B. (2009), "The effects of internal resources and partnership quality on firm performance: an examination of Indian BPO providers", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 15 No., pp. 209-24.
- Lee, J.-N. (2001), "The impact of knowledge sharing, organizational capability and partnership quality on IS outsourcing success", *Information & Management*, Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 323-35.
- Lee, J.-N., & Kim, Y.-G. (1999). "Effect of partnership quality on IS outsourcing: conceptual framework and empirical validation", *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 15, pp. 29-61.
- Lewin, A. Y., and Peeters, C. (2006). "The top-line allure of offshoring", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 84, pp. 22-25.
- Llewellyn, S. and Northcott, D. (2007), "The "singular view" in management case studies", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 194-207.
- Madsen, P. and Desai, V. (2010), "Failing to mearn? The effects of failure and success on organisational learning in the global orbital launch vehicle industry ", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 451-76.
- Massini, S., Perm-Ajchariyawong, N. and Lewin, A. (2010), "Role of Corporate-Wide Offshoring Strategy on Offshoring Drivers, Risks and Performance", *Industry and Innovation*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 337.
- Med (2010), "SMEs in New Zealand: structure and dynamics", *Ministry of Economic Development*, ISSN 1178-2811
- Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded Sourcebook*, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.

- Mol, M. J., Van Tulder, R. J. M. and Beije, P. R. (2005), "Antecedents and Performance Consequences of International Outsourcing", *International Business Review*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 599-617.
- North, D. C. (1990) *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Peng, M. W. (2004), Identifying the big question in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 99–108.
- Peng, M. W. (2009) *Global Strategy*, Mason, South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Peng, M. W., Sunny Li, S., Pinkham, B. and Hao, C. (2009), "The Institution-Based View as a Third Leg for a Strategy Tripod", *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol. 23 No., pp. 63-81.
- Poppo, L. and Zenger, T. (2002), "Do formal contracts and relational governance function as substitutes or complements?", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 8, pp. 707-25.
- Prahalad, C. K. and Hamel, G. (1990), "The core competence of the corporation", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 68 No. 3, pp. 79-91.
- Raman, R. and Ahmed, A. (2011), "International outsourcing decision, perceptions and firm performance: a study of New Zealand manufacturing SMEs." IN ZHU, C. J. (Ed.) *Australia and New Zealand International Business Academy Conference*. Melbourne, Australia.
- Raman, R. and Chadee, D. (2011), "A comparative assessment of the information technology services sector in India and China", *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 453-70.
- Ruamsook, K., Russel, D. M. and Thomchick, E. A. (2009), "Sourcing from low cost countries: Identifying sourcing issues and prioritising impacts on logistics performance", *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 79-96.
- Sinkovics, R. R., Penz, E. and Ghauri, P. N. (2009), "Enhancing the trustworthiness of qualitative research in international business", *Management International Review*, Vol. 48 No. 6, pp. 689-714.
- Solakivi, T., Töyli, J., Engblom, J. and Ojala, L. (2011), "Logistics outsourcing and company performance of SMEs", *Strategic Outsourcing: an International Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 131-51.
- Styles, C., Patterson, P. G. and Ahmed, F. (2008), "A relational model of export performance", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 880-900.
- Winkler, J., Dibbern, J. and Heinzl, A. (2008), "The impact of cultural differences in offshore outsourcing: case study results from German-Indian application development projects", *Information Systems Frontiers*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 243-58.
- Zhang, K. H. (2006) *China as the world factory*, New York, NY, Routledge.

**Figure 1:** Institutional differences and international outsourcing success: a conceptual model



**Table 1:** Interview guide

**Tell us briefly about your international outsourcing experiences**

Discussion Stimulators: Type of activities outsourcing, Size and duration of the outsourcing venture, Supplier country selection - reasons, Satisfaction with the outcome, Key reasons for be satisfied/dissatisfied

**Tell us about main challenges you faced in your outsourcing ventures**

Discussion Stimulators: Main challenges, Environmental differences in between New Zealand and China/India, Impact on outsourcing venture, How did you manage them – litigations, trust, personal visits, communication, training to staff.

**Do you prefer contractual or relational governance to manage outsourcing venture**

Discussion Stimulators: Reasons for choosing relational governance mode, Mechanisms adopted to make relational governance effective,

**How you rate your relationships with your suppliers?**

Discussion Stimulators: Any conflict situations you faced with your suppliers, – examples, How conflicts were managed? Were they resolved? Your reactions to the outcomes.

**How you perceive your outsourcing success rate?**

Discussion Stimulators: Met your expectations – cost, quality, supplier capabilities, relationship quality, Overall satisfaction with the outsourcing venture, Planning to continue with the supplier or move somewhere else.

**Would you like to share any related thoughts which I may have missed in the interview?**

**Table 2:** New Zealand, India, China institutional differences

	New Zealand	India	China
Ease of Doing Business Index (Global ranking) <sup>1</sup>	3	134	79
Contract Enforcements (Global Ranking) <sup>1</sup>	9	182	15
Corruption Perception Rank <sup>2</sup>	1	87	78
Corruption Perception Index <sup>2</sup>	9.3	3.3	3.5
Power Distance Index <sup>3</sup>	22	77	80
Individualism <sup>3</sup>	79	48	20
Masculinity <sup>3</sup>	58	56	68
Uncertainty avoidance Index <sup>3</sup>	49	40	30
Context <sup>4</sup>	Low	High	High

Sources:

<sup>1</sup>Ease of doing business and contract enforcements <http://www.doingbusiness.org/rankings>


<sup>2</sup> Global corruption indexes

<sup>3</sup>Hofstede cultural dimensions <http://www.geert-hofstede.com/>

<sup>4</sup> Halls cultural dimension (Hall, 1976) and [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High\\_context\\_culture](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_context_culture)



**Figure 2:** International outsourcing Journey: from failure to success



**Figure3:** Summary of the case study findings

