

Implementing Role Efficacy through a Multidimensional Organizational Design

Dr. Joel Bigley

California Baptist University

Abstract: - Customers of multinational enterprises (MNEs) exist almost everywhere. Cross border B2C e-commerce is expected to double by 2022 according to Forrester Research. How do MNE's efficiently leverage their talent or adapt to changing business environments across products and geographic markets? Leadership efficacy is critical in a global multidimensional organization due to the complexities inherent in the design. Embedding leadership in an organization is a strategic priority that must be implemented with rigor. In this case study an MNE utilized a multidimensional organization design to reach global markets. The author presents empirical findings from this case and ultimately extracts nineteen propositions to show how leadership can be embedded across a global supply chain. Absent this understanding, risk of revenue loss is enhanced significantly.

Keywords: - global markets; leadership efficacy; change leadership; capacity management; standardization; synergy

Dimensional Designs

The most common form of multidimensional design is a matrix. Other designs with more dimensions are viewed as novel, with very little coverage in the literature. The idea of the matrix organization surfaced in the 1970's and 1980's. Some who have experienced this design have had difficulties due to the ambiguity in roles resulting in a stifling of leadership emergence (Acton, Foti, Lord, & Gladfelder, 2018). Multinational enterprises (MNEs) have taken this a step further with multi-dimensional organizational designs. While the organizational chart may not indicate this, functionally it is how many of them actually work. Workers may report to one boss, but they are expected to network to be successful in the company. Consequently, when product managers are uncomfortable with the challenges associated with a matrix design, the situation is amplified and more complex in a multidimensional context.

Consideration needs to be given to the inadequacies of a matrix design so that similar risks of failure are not experienced in a multi-dimensional approach (Galbraith, 1977, 2009). The matrix design should be thought of as a two-dimensional construct that typically is separated functionally and geographically, for the operation, and non-

geographically, for support functions. Other construct variations exist. Some inadequacies with a two dimensional design include unclear responsibilities, a lack of accountability, political battles over resources, a risk-averse behavioral pattern, keeping the big picture in mind, alignment to goals, transparency challenges, prioritization of pain, technical deficits, motivation, innovation, continuous learning, collaboration, difficulty managing the needs of upper management, proximity and distantiation, and loss of market share due to a lack of focus (Galbraith, 1971; Gupta, Singh, & Singh, 2018, "Life in a matrix," 1980; Strikwerda & Stoelhorst, 2009). On the other hand, business units are not completely self-contained as they depend, to some extent, on external resources for achieving their objectives (Barney, 1991; Bower, 1986; Gupta & Govindarajan, 1986). While the M-form (hierarchical design) still dominates thought processes, the actual tendency is for firms to move away from the underlying logic of the M-form to realize growth synergies (Strikwerda & Stoelhorst, 2009). While mental anchoring on the M-form can render an MNE obsolete, or make a transition difficult, an effective multidimensional structure can enhance a MNEs growth synergy exploitation

capability and preserve product managers' status, power, autonomy, and self-interest (Caughron & Mumford, 2012). With this in mind, and considering that most MNEs are actually multidimensional, how then can an MNE scale horizontally?

People can say that they are matrixed. The transition in reality has occurred from matrixed to networked. Many large companies have abandoned the former for the latter. These scenarios are different. To succeed in a multidimensional business, company stakeholders (those who contribute to and benefit from an employer) need to know how to help their organization succeed. An employee's boss may be influenced by another leader in the organization with regard to performance reviews and promotions of employees that report to them. Similarly, taking into consideration that employees are the most important asset in a company, companies need to scale quickly to harvest revenue from dynamic markets. This dynamic makes resource sharing critical and is a challenge in a multidimensional design. The effectiveness of resources directly relates to the ability of the firm to grow profitability.

Current demands and complex work environments mandate that leaders perform in their roles. Role efficacy is an individual's potential effectiveness in their role (Pareek, 1993). Katz and Kahn (Katz & Kahn, 1966) discussed role efficacy in terms of role ambiguity and role conflict, both of which are prevalent in the matrix environment. Furthermore, aspect that diminish role efficacy may be mediated by self-efficacy (Srinivasan & Jomon, 2018). The linkage between role efficacy, and ultimately leadership efficacy, is clear. A mediocre leader will likely hire a mediocre worker. Consequently the impact on an organization must be dynamic to increase market share is significant.

Organizational design changes have also been market driven. Customers have multiple channels in which to purchase the same product from the same company. Companies are giving consumers multiple ways to buy from them. Companies are also offering vertically integrated solutions (a full kitchen) or bundles of product from warehouse stores (pallets of tile for kitchen and bathrooms). Either way, complexity has increased as products

are more technical and multiple items must integrate or be regressively compatible with other parts. Additionally, the customer experience has taken on a new meaning, further adding to the complexity of a purchase. Additional revenue streams and market penetration opportunities come from warrantees and the ability to service the product sold.

Generational expectations have also changed. Younger workers expect that the boundaries in the organizational design and functional silos are easily penetrated. Consistent with the networking idea, new workers performance is linked to their ability to get feedback on their work and gain knowledge from colleagues in neighboring departments. If their work is dependent on multiple functions in a company, access is expected. While employees span functional silos, shared services do the same thing. Larger companies leverage economies of scale by centralizing certain functions and cost sharing. These functional areas must become centers of excellence for the benefit to be realized and allocation formulas need to be fair to understand performance. Examples may include inventory management, research and development, billing, facilities maintenance, human resources, finance, etc. Automation and connectivity are enablers of a multidimensional design.

A definition of a multidimensional organization is required for us to proceed. According to Strikwerda and Stoelhorst (2009) a multidimensional organization has several characteristics.

- Responsibility for the success of the firm is distributed across the functions of the organization.
- Performance information is shared across the organization.
- There is one source of financial information.
- Resources are shared across the functions.

The multidimensional design (MDD) has a number of opportunities for competitive advantage. The design integrates both tasks and relationships to optimize results (Behrendt, Matz, & Göritz, 2017). With the sharing of these results, new business can be introduced and funded by the success of others. This allows the MNE to adapt to changing market conditions. Brand value can be exploited across an expanding portfolio of products. Bricolage can be exploited to combine technologies into new

products. And, customer information can be shared to increase revenue per customer and to enable vertical market penetration.

In the context of this article, an MDD is discussed that was deployed as an organizational design to meet scaling needs in an MNE. The difference between the matrix structure and an MDD can be illustrated as per the figure below. In a matrix organization, the node where the two dimensions meet represents the employee who reports to two bosses, potentially with individual objectives or agendas. Reporting structures may be in a conflicted dysfunctional relationship with each other. In the multidimensional model for the case organization, the node is put forward as a profitability enhancing opportunity, or growth synergy opportunity, where representatives who are associated with the lines from each dimension can meet and align the entrepreneurial energy around discovered opportunities. The difference then is that a matrix design has a person at the node, while the MDD has an opportunity at the node.

In this design, managers are stakeholders in the exploitation of discovered opportunities. They own the lines in the structure. The leader in each dimension reports in to the same person, allowing for alignment through a singular agenda. Furthermore, this is reinforced through the organizational design and a reward system based on collaboration. Another difference between the two structures is in the planning and control processes. While the profitability of the client oriented P&L is dominant, the P&Ls for products, the support functions, and for locations are also important as they contribute significantly to profitability. Profitability or cost is, therefore, measured and monitored in each of the four dimensions through dimension-specific P&Ls.

A final difference between the structures relates to the influence of management information systems (MIS) in an MNE. The MIS reports performance in each of the dimensions at all levels of the organization. This eliminates information asymmetries and transfer pricing, as examples, thereby turning the MNE into a truly integrated dyadic relationship between a customer-centric focus and operational synergy realization. In many matrix organizations the emphasis is on authority and power (Galbraith 1971, 1973; Goold &

Campbell, 2003; Ruigok, Achtenhagen, Wagner, & Ruegg-Sturm, 2000). The management in multidimensional firms focus on the firm's joint customer-centric goals by leveraging MIS or enterprise resource planning (ERP) supplied business intelligence which point to opportunity rather than the disparate and conflicted agendas of two bosses who may be misaligned and unequally capable (Strikwerda & Stoelhorst, 2009).

The critical result that will emerge from the empirical data in this study is theory about the realization of sustainable growth synergies in a multi-unit firm with a multidimensional organizational structure. Specifically, this study explores horizontal scaling within the MDD. This entails scaling using product managers who span geographic locations and support functions needed to service client in an MNE. Only a few studies have been accomplished that explore the implementation of these designs to exploit synergies across physical locations along multiple dimensions (Strikwerda & Stoelhorst, 2009). Some firms studied were organized along the lines of key accounts, professional services, support functions, or facility management (Strikwerda & Stoelhorst, 2009).

Managers are responsible for profits, market position, and customer retention, but they control very few resources. Often, resources are controlled by facility managers who are responsible for the bottom line. This creates tension between sales, as they develop new market opportunities, and facility managers, who are accountable for the efficient utilization of resources (Galbraith, 2009; Goold & Campbell, 2003; Ruigok et al., 2000). Risk-averse behavior of resource managers must be confronted by market opportunities identified by account managers. Concurrently, market managers cannot be overly optimistic in their judgments about market opportunities (Galbraith, 2009; Goold & Campbell, 2003; Ruigok et al., 2000). It is therefore essential that an MDD simultaneously reports performance on two or more dimensions. Managers need to be held accountable for their dimension as it contributes to overall firm performance and the execution of growth synergies. Unique challenges for implementation are present in a globally integrated enterprise with globally integrated products and services such as in this case study.

The author believes that the organizational design of a firm is a critical factor with regard to the success or failure with regard to the realization of growth opportunity. The most successful form of an MNE is the M-form, named by Williamson (1975), in which activities are organized into separate business units (Roberts, 2004; Williamson, 1985). Resources are delegated to managers charged with creating economic value for the firm. These resources are controlled within business structures that are measured for financial performance. The boundaries of the units are reinforced by financial systems. To illustrate, organizational design has been influenced by corporate agendas driven by synergistic savings evident in the form of corporate account management, shared service centers, and matrix organizations. Consequently, most businesses now depend on some resources that are controlled by other units (Strikwerda & Stoelhorst, 2009).

The MDD is illustrated below. To explain how it works in the context of scaling consider the following. A client (C6) could want more of the company's products or services. A location (L7) could expand its product or service portfolio due to a local market unmet need. An enterprise resource planning (ERP) system (S1) could be used by other divisions to leverage profitability, whereupon they would share the cost of the system, improving profitability at the company. Lastly, a product (Prod 4) could be sold to other clients, possibly external to the company. Selling products at additional locations is horizontal scaling. The scalability of the MDD, exogenous to its existing domain, points to profitability as all of these instances exploit existing skills, infrastructure, and resources. This figure illustrates the scalability of the MDD products and services across business units that have an unmet need regardless of where they are




Figure1. MDD scalability. This figure shows how the MDD lines can scale depending on the need and the dimension.

A business unit in an MNE is given both autonomy and self-interest when it is given the opportunity to identify growth synergy opportunities, when it can define their value-based attributes, when it can determine deployment timelines and the scope of coverage, and when it can determine the task rollout sequence as represented in an operational deployment plan. The author has found that business unit autonomy is augmented in at least three ways. The first is through a suitable culture, as defined in part by its organizational design and its reward system. The second is through administration and control, which includes financial review, secondary structures, and a centralized

workflow management system that provides organization-wide data and analysis. The third augmentation area is related to strategy. The strategy must have structure in order for it to be focused and executed. The framework for the strategy provides this. It is also selective in that it is prioritized based on contribution to the desired outcome as measured by business modelling, such as through a pro forma P&L and a business plan where applicable. Strategy also includes the sequence of the execution of tasks, ordered due to environmental conditions and dependency. Outcomes of exploiting self-interest include profitability in the form of social impact,

organizational efficacy, team efficacy, and personal leadership efficacy (Lovas & Ghoshal, 2000).

To be specific, a critical success driver in an MDD is an integrated management information system (MIS) (Pankratz, 1991), assuming that it keeps current with firm adaptations to market dynamics and corporate advantage life-cycles (D'Aveni, Dagnino, & Smith, 2010). An MIS is a lateral integration mechanism because it makes critical information and intelligence available to leaders in all of the dimensions of an MDD, thereby enabling action and mitigation. The MNE must evolve from unique local business systems geared to local needs to a networked social construct that drives transparency throughout the MNE across all dimensions (Hirschheim & Klein, 1994). A single set of common data definitions is necessary so that every transaction can be captured with suitable data density. This data can then be exploited along multiple dimensions, including reporting and analytics, across business units in a worldwide value chain. The information it contains is simultaneously available, providing for real-time sharing, change management, workflow adaptation, capacity manipulation, and production tracking. Additionally, for business intelligence it is also necessary that the MIS include customer relationship management (CRM) capability so that account managers can mine the database for order information and leads. This enhances the MNE's ability to maximize market share by exploiting customer spend budgets within applicable product categories across customers. It also fosters cooperation between managers, as performance accountability is shared across dimensions.

The multidimensional structure deployed in the case company, that is being evaluated in this article, includes the client as the primary profit center (diagonal) (Galbraith, 2005), the products and services as the secondary dimension (horizontal), the locations as the third dimension (vertical), and the performance of support services as a fourth and final dimension (diagonal). The MIS makes it possible for all stakeholders to obtain the same information in real-time, eliminating information asymmetries between and across dimensions. Cases are also used across and within all dimensions for monetizing opportunities made visible through business intelligence provided by the MIS or an enterprise resource planning (ERP) and CRM

systems. The goal of all efforts is profits through the exploitation of growth synergies.

The dimensions in a multidimensional organizational design are important to the market. Business should be conducted with customers in the way that they prefer so that there is sustainable value in the relationship (Galbraith, 2005). The MDD deployed in this case study included a primary dimension that related to client management (C#). A P&L was provided to each account manager with regard to the client's overall global financial performance. This P&L was support function, location, and product agnostic. It allowed the managers to understand the profitability of working with all clients as well as each individual client. It also allowed for an understanding of profitability from the client, as it related to product type and the location where the work is done. The customer-centric nature of multidimensional firms is enhanced by treating clients as profit centers (Galbraith, 2005) and by listening to them for the purpose of discovering service opportunities (Wiessmeier, Axel, & Christoph, 2012). Economic gain is created by pursuing unique location-specific market strategies, by integrating product and service offerings for maximizing customer profitability (Amit & Livnat, 1988; Armour & Teece, 1978), and by making the relationship sticky through optimized complexity and interdependency.

The case MNE operates in an industry that is networked. Consequently the center of innovation has shifted from the company to the network in which it operates. The network flourishes when it exists in a state of deep collaboration, cross-pollination, and concurrent engineering. This network develops value-based solutions in parallel exceeding time to market requirements (Grossman, 2005). Additionally, growth synergies can be achieved through alumni relationships within the industry-wide network. The exploitation of available market knowledge then becomes more critical than creating personal knowledge. Knowledge can be easily obtained from the network if it is not locally available. Organizational constructs must align with this environmental constraint and facilitates the exploitation of network-based knowledge resources (Drucker, 1992; Goold & Campbell, 2003). Collaborative knowledge workers are increasingly valuable due to

their collective influence on profitability opportunities in a multidimensional firm (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1993; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990), and especially in a firm with a structure that requires collaborative arrangements (Contractor & Ra, 2002; Inkpen, 1997). The case company desires that knowledge workers are attracted to their firm, as they see that it is an opportunity to increase their personal market potential within the industry network (Drucker, 1992; Florida, 2004; Rosen, 2004). Managing the chaos found in these networks is the current opportunity for competitive advantage in an MNE.

Quality of the Research

Creswell (2014) describes validity in qualitative research as being the determination of whether the findings are accurate from the standpoint of the author, the participant, and the readers of an account. In this case, language and meaning are the data. Creswell (2014), in parallel with Lincoln and Guba's (1985) approach, offers qualitative researchers eight possible strategies for checking the accuracy of findings; triangulation, member-checking, rich descriptions, clarification of bias, the use of negative or discrepant information, prolonged time in the field, peer debriefing, and the use of an external auditor. The author selectively used these strategies to ensure data validity with a focus on triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checking.

Endogenous validity refers to the validity of established causal relationships (Yin, 1994; Lamnek, 1995) or internal logic of the research (Punch, 1998). This was achieved by establishing a clear thematic focus that guided the case selection, abstracting and comparing, conducting peer reviews of causal relationships, and by having an open and comprehensive explanation building. A thematic focus was evident in a clear definition of an overarching research theme (cross-unit synergies), a narrowing research focus (operative synergies), and a specific research question (the sustainable realization of growth synergies) along with a compatible case selection in which the constructs of interest could be discovered. Continuous abstracting and comparing (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1996) occurred as the author continuously compared data sets to build higher order constructs, preliminary results to emerging

data to confirm or refine results, and observed causal patterns within the existing literature. This improved the validity of causal relations (Yin, 1994). Peer reviews of causal relationships were discussed with research colleagues for the purpose of capturing and testing additional perspectives based on experience in the field. Additionally, it enabled the validation of internal consistency and theoretical relevance of the author's arguments. The final technique for internal validity was through open and comprehensible building of explanations and causal relationships. The results were documented in such a way that the reader could reconstruct the causal relationship (Mayring, 1996). Openly, the author indicated initial ideas, deduced assumptions, and challenged potential inconsistencies.

Exogenous validity refers to the generalizability of research results critical for robust theory development (Sutton & Straw, 1995; Weick, 1995) and depends on the research approach (Yin, 1994). Single case study empirical findings are difficult to generalize. Yin (1994) emphasizes that case studies do not allow for statistical generalization. More specifically, it is difficult to make inferences about a population based on empirical data collected in a sample. While issues of generalizability from case studies is severe (Denzin, 1989; Yin, 1994), single-case studies are recognized to be substantial from an evolutionary perspective (Stake, 1995). Single case studies can also provide new ideas and new thinking paradigms. They can help modify existing theories by exposing gaps and helping to fill them. There are several facts about this study that support the author's conclusions that the findings and propositions will be at least somewhat generalizable. Several of the constructs can be confirmed as being present in existing literature, indicating general theoretical relevance of the research (Eisenhardt, 1989). The findings were confirmed through consultation with participants, who are operationally capable with varied experience in the industry, suggesting the potential transferability of the claims. Finally, the findings were somewhat generalizable due to the continuous comparison of similarities and differences within case items across different levels of analysis.

Reliability refers to the possibility that researchers can replicate the research activity and produce the same findings (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 1994). A

challenge for this replication is the attribute of qualitative research, in that it is bound to the context in which it is conducted (Lamnek, 1995), including time. Reliability in qualitative studies is best served by presenting sufficient information so that the reader can draw his/her own conclusions (Yin, 1994). The author attempted to ensure reliability through the explicit disclosure of the research design, including a detailed description of the research process, case selection criteria, interview guide, and methods for collecting and analyzing empirical data.

Data and Analysis

The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological research study, using Moustakas, (1994) modified van Kaam method, was to explore the real-time experiences of stakeholders, or co-researchers, as they lived and influenced events occurring around them. A phenomenological approach is appropriate as awareness is a transient experience (Freeman, 2000) that may involve exerting influence, letting go, and redirecting energy and attention (Depraz, Varela, & Vermersch, 2003). Making sense of phenomena also involves being present physically and mentally in daily life. Stakeholders have to anticipate events, make sense of existing environments, and exert influence over future trends. Weick (1995) suggests that sense-making is a retrospective cognitive process that explains unanticipated events. He also suggests that events in a socially-created world both support and constrain action. Weick, Sutcliffe, and Obstfeld (2005) later suggest that individuals form both assumptions and conscious anticipations of future events. By examining sense-making and the development of mental models through actual lived, shared experiences, this study captures the subjective processes that have been largely ignored in the context of the connection between organizational design and growth in a multi-unit firm. Using the experience of stakeholders, the author presents a conceptualization of how individual participants in this study made sense of their lived experience. This was an ongoing process for participants as they refined their understanding of lived experiences and established new equilibriums.

Each section includes individual textual descriptions as well as composite descriptions

concisely oriented and illustrated in a theme map structure. Moustakas (1994) suggested that the integration of textual and structural descriptions into a composite description, such as a relational table, is a path for understanding the essence of an experience. The composite description is an intuitive and reflective integrative description of the meanings and essences of a phenomenon, of which the entire group of individuals is making sense. The participants create meaning through their awareness of the environment, reflection on their experiences, consultation with others, focused response to an enquiry, and iterative refinement to these enquiries.

Coding

Data collection was facilitated by an interview protocol with specific questions oriented in a sequenced schema. Participants were solicited as volunteers from a pool of leaders based on a willingness to share information about the transformation of the case company division. Each volunteer co-researcher participated in the changes personally. Following each question, the participants' response was determined to be linked to the question asked and was determined to be meaningful prior to continuing. An answer could trigger a clarifying question, or a question formed to solicit a more fulsome answer, if needed. The additional information modified the answer and once again was determined to be fulsome or not. The data was added then to the data sheet and coded. Sub-code themes were also determined and grouped by code and sub-code. The data was surveyed by the author, who, due to personal experience, was able to apply an analysis for good (ANOG). Slight modifications were made as needed to reduce the noise in the data and ensure completeness and clarity. This was accomplished by consolidating like data points and simplifying others by stripping out noise and redundancy in the answers. The data was then re-sorted and generalized through categorizing. A pivot-table was used to extract themes in the wording. The curated raw data was then posted in a table. In some cases most of the themes were unique, in which case a table was not used. From this data, dependencies, relationship, and the sequence of events were determined and organized into a theme relationship map. In some cases the data collected appeared as though the participant was confused about the question. In these cases the Author followed up

with the participant and then added the newly acquired information to the raw data previously collected.

The raw data was collected from each participant for each data domain and sub-domain in the sequence in which it is presented in this chapter to promote a progression of thought. The data is separated into exogenous and endogenous domains as well with selected focus in both areas. In some cases, like roles, the participants offered information on themselves while commenting on data provided by their peers. Patterns that emerged in the data are presented as textural responses (what happened), structural responses (how did it happen), or composite descriptions (what the group experienced). Data responses that occurred most frequently within the theme category were given more significance and were typically mentioned first. Data was interpreted into theme patterns. These were broken into themes and then concisely into propositions, or findings of the study. Data items that referred to individuals, functions, line of business, locations, systems, or company names were obfuscated, eliminated, or given a pseudonym. The propositions, or findings, were formed and listed numerically. Within each proposition, a two-word summary was formed along with a statement that sums up the finding. For example, a central theme, norm strategy, or trigger may have emerged from the data as a result of coding. This data could then be categorized or filtered through the constructs being discussed that may include the strategic frame, horizontal strategies, or a narrowed scope as examples. This was the beginning of the theme map, or the outermost layer. The layers could then be elaborated on by breaking the outermost layer into sub-layers until it was reasonable to stop. This theme map was created to better describe the themes in the data and to show

relationships and sequences between unique data items.

Leadership Role

Leaders in this case study are defined as leaders with responsibility for any aspect of a product or service category, location, or support function through direct contact with an asset or a deliverable (Van Wart & Kapucu, 2011). The functions within this scope were all production areas, asset handling, configuration enhancement, and invoicing. The table below illustrates the critical themes in the coded data collected from participants who provided 17 themes and 267 rich data descriptions with regard to their role and the roles of their peers. This data explains what the participant leaders learned as a result of the transition to an MDD about what they would need to focus on in order to successfully execute their responsibilities as an effective leader. Following the table, a description of the role is discussed based on the raw data in order of frequency of occurrence. To manage complexity, the line items are not weighted and so the frequency of occurrence should not imply significance as each item could be weighted differently depending on the situation at the time. Additionally, it could be argued that some of the delineations between themes are not exact. Furthermore, given the dynamic nature of the market and the organization, a broad range of themes needs to be considered by the organization due to the influence of trends. The researcher, based on his knowledge of the operation and his experience, made these judgments. Moreover, there are some items in the raw data in one category that may link to an item in another category. With these realities in mind, the researcher attempted to organize the data in such a way as to convey, in a most accurate and concise way, the findings generally inferred from the data.

Table1. Leadership role attributes by category.

Theme Category	Count
ERP	40
Capacity	33
Cost	31
Standardization	26
Communication	24
Revenue	21
Performance	17
Leadership	14

Strategy	11
Financial	10
Problem solving	8
Knowledge	7
Security	7
Best practices	6
Asset	5
Transparency	4
Culture	3
Total	267

ERP System. Williamson (1975) suggests that corporate management needs to control the opportunism of business level managers who would otherwise neglect their contribution to cross-business issues and shared resources. The transparency of an organization-wide business system enables a decentralized approach. It is then no surprise that the data suggests that MDD leaders can contribute to profitability. They need to be accountable for results. This accountability is augmented and encouraged by the transparency provided by an ERP system. Consequently, the first category in the theme data table relates to the ERP system. It is no surprise that leaders in an MDD who influence multiple facilities in different areas of the world value an ERP system that enables them to see what is happening at all locations simultaneously. Without such a system, change management becomes very difficult. The raw data suggests that the overall concern is the ability to use the system consistently. This is critical such that data is entered correctly with the consequent benefit of the exploitation of that data. The raw data suggests that MDD leaders have six areas of concern; (a) that existing departments are using the system correctly, (b) that new modules become available for critical workflows that exist or may be deployed, (c) that other departments in the supply chain are brought into the system, (d) that other disparate systems are supported or integrated, (e) that development efforts are optimized, and (f) that tools are developed as appropriate and timely. Further detail in the data suggests that for (a) existing departments may need training before they use the system. Leadership’s commitment to the system is also necessary for the transition to an MDD.

“[We need to] partner with local teams to coordinate deployments and enhancements of [the] ERP for [product] pipeline services.” (RH25)

I will be joined at the hip on security / chain of custody issues. This area is getting more significant all the time and we need to make sure the worldwide (WW) facilities are unified in terms of compliance and process. We also need to work together on making the ERP [Line of Business] management functions so they properly track assets for all our facilities. (RH144)

Additional data for (b) suggests that there is the need for several specific modules within functional areas that were called out by the stakeholders, in this case billing and ingesting source materials. With these new modules there is connectivity between functions within a business unit that results in data entry efficiency, supply chain visibility, and the ability to extract business intelligence from the data.

“[MDD leaders need to] be a hub to communicate with each facility and prioritize internal/ external client enhancement request. When [a] global enhancement is being deployed, communicate with the each facility beforehand to incorporate requests from individual facilities.” (RH52)

Additional data for (c) suggests that there are other businesses that could be brought into the system that have not yet been introduced. This would create connectivity with other parts of the supply chain, enhancing data visibility and trends.

“[MDD leaders need to] assist in rolling [the ERP] out to our other locations.” (RH57)

Additional data for (d) suggests that there is the need, prior to their integration, for the support of other existing systems. This is necessary for business continuity and data exploitation. Further efficiencies are gained by repurposing existing synergistic modules in new areas. Where systems already exist, the code can be imported and leveraged, eliminating development efforts.

“[The] coordination and influence of ERP development will be more effective and efficient if we stay aligned with our priorities.” (RH131)

“Migration to the ERP will also be a big area for [LOB] and it needs to be done as a coordinated effort and leveraging [name] experience with business systems.” (RH136)

Finally, additional data for (e) suggests that there is the need for development that is collaborative, locally sensitive, sensitive to client requests, and sensitive to internal enhancement requests. The purpose of system development efforts is to promote consistent usage that makes the system agile, scalable, and attracts new business. The system optimizes workflows that evolve and so constant updates are needed.

[MDD leaders can] help me push projects like the implementation of a physical source retention policy for all sites so vaults do not fill up with material and increase storage needs/costs. [This] could include helping push the ERP enhancement to include ‘source return date’, implementation of new policy in Client Services. (RH62)

To conclude, it is clear that a system, continuously in the improvement-deployment cycle, is necessary for the role of a horizontal leader in an MDD with responsibility over multiple facilities. The figure below illustrates the theme dependencies in the data. The coding path for the data map starts with the theme category, then goes to the theme attribute, and then to the raw data theme.




Figure 2. ERP: Consistent usage theme map. This figure maps the consistent usage of the ERP as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that ERP systems are critical for the realization of synergistic growth in a multi-unit firm. An ERP system is an asset to be used. The utilization of the system is dependent on functional capability, the consistent usage of the capability, and the extent of coverage that the system has on the supply chain. This capability must be location agnostic in a fast-paced global supply chain. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 1 (system usage): The consistent accurate use of an ERP is an aligning platform that enables accountability for performance and synergistic growth through transparency.

Proposition 2 (deployment rate): The rate at which enhancements, called out by stakeholders, are

developed and deployed broadly relates to the growth rate of an enterprise in a moderately dynamic marketplace.

Proposition 3 (system consolidation): The transparency of relevant data is enabled by the consolidation of disparate systems that hold valuable data otherwise not easily made available.

Capacity Management. Leaders in an MDD indicated, by way of the second most frequently cited category, that management of capacity is critical to their role. The need for coordination of capacity on a global scale is critical to the success of business units that are constrained by resources being allocated to a business with extreme swings in capacity demand as illustrated in the figure below. This business phenomenon relates to

profitability as local markets often offer up revenue opportunities that are beyond the capacity of the local facility, either by volume or type, which may be followed by times of very low volume. A significant concern of the businesses is the ability to sell any product to any market size using the strength of the MDD. The raw data suggests that the overriding concern here relates to the ability to utilize capacity on-demand in accordance with the work load.

“[MDD leaders] enable [the company]...facilities WW to leverage one another as a ‘globalized’ capacity to enable load balancing, service flexibility, [and the] capture of ‘limitless’ customer demand.” (RH98)

The desirable attributes of capacity availability are (a) scalability, (b) local availability, (c) strategic planning, and (d) the appropriate allocation of capacity. Capacity management is directly linked to meeting client expectations and profitability. Additional data for (a) includes the ability to give the impression to clients and location leaders that the production network has infinite capacity. This encourages a willingness to take on bulk orders and rush orders. This has become a market expectation trend.

The MDD leaders also need to encourage locations to scale back capacity when the demand shrinks. This may depend on the ability to move work from location to location. Additional data for (b) suggests that capacity planning needs to be local, cross-business, and external to the division. Additional data for (c) suggests that capacity strategy needs to include an off-load methodology that includes the financial aspect of site-based revenue recognition and embraces the idea of functional centralization. Finally, additional data for (d) suggests that the allocation of capacity is driven by visibility into available resources, especially any latent capacity. A leader’s success in the MDD relates to the ability to manage capacity effectively across the network of facilities; however, resources expended need to match the work that is being run.

“[MDD leaders] determine the needs of each local facility in ... production and level of support required.” (RH14)

“[MDD leaders] work closely with facility leaders worldwide, to establish effective load balancing and off-load methods to eliminate capacity constraints in local offices.” (RH16)




Figure 3. Capacity utilization theme map. This figure maps capacity utilization as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that capacity is critical to the network-based production (NBP) model. MDD leaders are able to scale capacity within the network, regardless of volume trends. This includes the ability to take spikes in a pooled capacity construct. This capability is dependent on the ability to shift work anywhere in the network

and is subject to planning, a methodology for work shifting, and transparency about capabilities and resources. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 4 (allocated capacity): Clients will allocate volume work to vendors perceived to have both the technical ability to meet their

specifications and the availability of more than sufficient capacity to process the volume.

Proposition 5 (local markets): As local markets originate orders, local facilities need to leverage known available network capacity to meet client expectations.

Cost Mitigation. The third category within the leadership role attributes relates to cost management. Profitability relates directly to cost efficiencies and mitigations in a dynamic environment. Existing and growth-oriented revenue needs to be fulfilled in the most efficient way possible. These efficiencies have the follow-on effect that leads to the ability to take on more work and increase market share. An MDD leader needs to understand and manage cost in order to help the organization experience growth synergies as illustrated in the figure below.

“[I] drive various cost savings initiatives, locally and globally, in regard to stock purchasing, courier and freight services, and off-site media storage.” (RH235)

The desirable attributes of cost mitigation are (a) measurement, (b) waste reduction, (c) workflow efficiency, (d) centralization, or pooling resources,

and (e) workflow alignment. Additional data for (a) suggests that measurement should include accurate cost allocations, financial performance measurements, and the application of key performance indicators that accurately reflect the performance of the business unit. Additional data for (b) suggests that there is a need for waste reduction that includes streamlining, lean sigma projects, and a zero defect mentality. Additional data for (c) suggests that focus needs to be placed on workflow efficiency in two focus areas: core workflows and profitability by line of business. Additional data for (d) suggests that there is opportunity for centralization, specifically for ingest, but also for other functional areas. Finally, additional data for (e) suggests that workflow synergistic alignment can help to negate redundancy, but an MDD leader should also look outwards to discover opportunities for other business consolidations. In conclusion, the MDD leaders indicated that cost management was critical to MDD leadership.

“[I] increase LOB profits by creating efficiencies and lowering costs within the operation.” (RH178)




Figure 4. Cost mapping and management theme map. This figure maps cost mapping and specifically cost management as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that cost mapping is critical to the measurement of business unit performance. This cannot be achieved without transparency, accuracy, and timely reporting. Cost performance is enhanced by waste discovery and reduction. This is further enhanced by opportunities for alignment that provide for compatibility within

workflows. Core workflows experience most of the volume and should be given significant cost-performance attention. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 6 (cost measurement): Accurate cost measurement for each line of business (LOB)

creates awareness of workflow profitability variation that may lead to targeted cost mitigations.

Proposition 7 (workflow design): Workflow synergistic alignment and capacity pooling, where there is demand variability, improve utilization and increase profitability.

Standardization. The fourth category relates to activities concerning unity and consensus. The MDD leaders brought up standardization as it ensured performance through the reduction of complexity. In a chaotic environment, the enhancement of predictability is desirable for financial and capacity forecasting accuracy.

“[I will] establish [location] as a center of excellence for... workflows through bi-directional visibility, process alignment, and procedural standardization.” (RH74)

The beneficial attributes of capacity availability are (a) unification, (b) workflows, (c) scalability, (d) data efficacy, and (e) predictability. Additional data for (a) suggests that unification enables the

capability to update a system, to audit a system, to take a system to another facility, and to describe the system with common semantics. Additional data for (b) suggests that standardization as illustrated in the figure below is made possible in workflows through the deployment of work instructions and procedures that guide the activities in the operation. Standardization is also possible with inputs and outputs that have meaningful specifications that are universally known. Additional data for (c) suggests that scalability is important for, and a constraint for, growth. Additional data for (d) suggests that standardization enables the use of metrics. Without metrics, an operation cannot assess its performance status. Additional data for (e) suggests that predictability is a benefit of standardization that enables accurate and profit bearing pricing, the creation of tools, and consistency.

“[I will] partner with local leaders to drive unification, standardization, centralization, and operational efficiencies across key WW locations.” (RH264)




Figure 5. Standardization theme map. This figure maps standardization as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that creating commonality and compatibility between workflows in all locations is desirable. Standardization, guided by documentation, can achieve scalability. Performance predictability is encouraged by tools, automation, and performance monitoring. Unification of practice and semantic unity enable both monitoring and the discovery of enhancements. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 8 (chaos reduction): Standardization is a complexity reduction technique that enhances scalability, capability, predictability, updatability, and transportability in a chaotic environment.

Proposition 9 (best practice): Standardizing on best practice includes both deploying a common language needed for more accurate profitability measurement and creating a platform for efficient organizational evolution.

Communication. The fifth category of interest within the horizontal roles of an MDD relates to communication. While communication is often cited as a reason for issues, its significance is typically underestimated. Unbelievable communication may create cognitive dissonance and frustration. Dissonance could occur when logic, opinions, and environmental knowledge are inconsistent (Festinger, Riecken, & Schachter, 2008). MDD leaders need to exchange information that would result in dissonance reduction. Furthermore, there is an optimal level of communication that, when exceeded, is ignored and when minimized, creates an information vacuum that breeds insecurity and frustration. AN MDD leader needs to understand the optimal way to communicate, recognizing that execution is situational.

“[I] establish cohesion and strategy of inter-facility operations, and unify best practices among ... WW ... facilities through free-flowing communication.” (RH95)

“[I] establish lines of communication between [support functions] encouraging cooperation and streamlining intercompany transactions.” (RH193)

The data suggests that the desirable attributes of communication relate to (a) plans, (b) transparency, and (c) the method used. Additional data for (a) suggests that communication plans need to include a deployed escalation plan, a single point of contact, periodic communication, and a flow of information.

There is also an optimal level of transparency that should be achieved through the communication strategy. MDD leaders required that there was the ability to be transparent about policies and capabilities. They wanted a common terminology to enhance communication efficacy. Additional data for (b) suggests that, like (a) above, communication needs to be routed to a business unit, across business units, to a client, or to a vendor. While routing is important, transparency provides information about policies, capabilities, and includes terminology that is understandable both internally and external to the business unit. Additional data for (c) suggests that the method chosen is relevant. MDD leaders need to be able to hold a presence and communicate clearly one-on-one and in a video conference event, as applicable. The importance of one-on-one communication should not be underestimated. The ability to read and react to body language may be critical to both maintaining attention and guiding thought patterns. The rate at which an organization or individual is influenced may depend significantly on face-time. To be successful in achieving growth synergies an MDD leader needs to be an effective communicator both internal and external to their assigned organization as illustrated in the figure below.

“[I] work closely with facility leaders worldwide, to develop and implement organizational communication plans for effective communication between all key [operational] groups in WW [LOB] operations.” (RH269)




Figure 6. Communication theme map. This figure maps communication as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that an MDD leader needs to be able to create and execute communication strategies both internal to the business unit and external. Clients have commented in surveys about their desires regarding the case company’s ability to communicate.

“[I will do a] better job of interacting across all company departments in communicating difficulties in working with certain formats and/or advising easiest way to proceed with [workflows] when multiple options exist.” (CS52)

The complexity of these strategies should not be underestimated. Not only does the strategy include content, but it also includes frequency, audience, volume, method, and consideration for the local market “climate.” AN MDD leader needs to be able to correctly plan for each of these variables. In addition, the MDD leader needs to determine the optimal method for delivery of the content. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 10 (structured communication): Communication is situationally routed and structured to include escalation paths, optimal timing, and a focused scope.

Proposition 11 (communication strategy): Communication should be optimally frequent, transparent, correctly routed, and timely executed to reduce ambiguity driven waste.

Revenue Growth. The sixth aspect of horizontalization relates to revenue, specifically as it relates to profitable growth. Growth synergies, when experienced, will improve financial performance depending on the revenue opportunity. With cost controls, this will turn into an enhanced

contribution margin. To ensure profitability, revenue must be pursued with a margin in mind. An MDD leader needs to be able to stimulate revenue locally and globally.

“[I will] partner with both inter-divisional and extra-divisional resources ... to capitalize on synergistic opportunities and coordination of business strategy to motivate revenue capturing opportunities along the ... supply chain.” (RH102)

The desirable attributes of capacity revenue growth potential relate to (a) adjacent markets, (b) a growth strategy, (c) portfolio diversification, and (d) profitability enhancement activities. Additional data for (a) suggests that it could be possible to transform existing products, services, and infrastructure to penetrate adjacent markets with products that are synergistic to the existing portfolio, infrastructure, and workflows. Additional data for (b) suggests that growth should be considered in the context of local markets, across geographic boundaries, with the goal to increase market share, and in regards to new business opportunities. Additional data for (c) suggests that diversification should be pursued with two interests in mind: expanding the product and service offering and creating next-generation products to stay ahead of the industry and penetrate or create new markets. Additional data for (d) includes the ability to pursue profitability enhancement by billing for line items that are not being used and also through consistency and integrity in the rate card itself. Pricing schemes may not be appropriate. Billable items that were previously given away for free may need to be considered for invoicing to enhance profitability as illustrated in the figure below.




Figure 7. Revenue theme map. This figure maps revenue as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that an MNE will need to transform their services and mindsets to capture revenue in other sectors. Addressable markets need to be understood, especially with regard to profitability opportunity. The product portfolio may need to be expanded to include products that will be needed by clients. Getting in on the beginning of the product or service life-cycle provides the opportunity for enhanced profits. This, however, needs to be balanced against development costs. During a billable life-cycle a billing strategy must be optimized to harvest as much profit from the associated LOB as is possible. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 12 (adjacent revenue): When existing workflows and infrastructure can be used to deliver new products and services to an adjacent, new, or similar market in a different geography, there may be an opportunity for synergistic profitability.

Proposition 13 (structured pricing): Pricing structures applied after the jump-off point in the life-cycle of a product or service may need to be reviewed to include line items that previously were discounted or given away as loss leaders.

Operational Performance. This section combines six sections that fall under operational performance. The data suggests that the MDD leader must understand operational performance to be an effective contributor to company growth.

"[I] work closely with facility leaders worldwide, to improve business metrics and operational data (lowering costs, increasing throughput, higher quality, etc.) on ... [LOB] by transforming the way we perform various ... services." (RH1)

"[I] provide global operations support to local office leaders for the expansion of ... services, with a focus on scalability and reliability." (RH22)

According to the MDD leaders, the desirable attributes of operational performance are (a) security, (b) transparency, (c) problem solving, (d) financial aspects, (e) best practices, and (f) asset management. Additional data for (a) suggests that security is directly related to compliance with controls already in place. Even so, the business unit

is continually taking advantage of the opportunity to enhance controls proactively in light of the dynamic threat-scape. Additional data for (b) suggests that transparency is bi-directional; the role of listener and speaker may alternate. This information exchange includes requirements or specifications, a performance scorecard that reflects quality and reliability, and the deployment and exposure of effective productivity metrics. Additional data for (c) suggests that problem solving is critical to revenue growth and includes resolving new workflow deployment issues, corrective actions when errors are made, the ability to discover opportunities, the ability to innovate, and the introduction of value-added products that solve customer problems. This is important to clients' perception of the case company's abilities, as reflected in a client survey response.

"...the gap has now been plugged and was dealt with swiftly and professionally." (CS34)

Additional data for (d) includes financial aspects of business unit performance, including fair and acceptable revenue allocations, billing velocity that does not tie up cash, and standard financial reporting through a worldwide P&L that is timely and meaningful. Additional data for (e) suggests that best practices are important to capture, create, model, and propagate horizontally across locations. MDD leaders help unify operations around excellence, produce skills, and lead continuous process improvement. The data specifically suggests an appropriate methodology, lean sigma, as an example. Additional data for (f) suggests that assets are important to clients and must be tracked while they are in the custody of the case company. Additionally they have to be purged or immediately returned once they have been used. Otherwise, they are a security risk and a burden to the vault. Best practices apply to a variety of operational functions, all of which are the responsibility of horizontal leaders who push policy across locations to improve operational performance as illustrated in the figure below.

"[I] partner with local leaders to drive unification, standardization, centralization and operational efficiencies across key WW ... locations." (RH7)




Figure 8. Operational performance theme map. This figure maps operational performance as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that operational performance is associated with practice compliance, transparency, and the ability to solve problems. The ability for an MDD leader to be aware is enhanced by transparency of information that is relevant. Compliance allows for control and entropy mitigation. Controls and practices need to be optimized, effective, thoroughly deployed, and continuously evolving. Awareness and compliance provide a platform from which the organization can evolve. Organizations should be seen as organic or complex adaptive systems (Burns & Stalker, 1992). Similarly, Eisenhardt and Bhatia (2002) through complex adaptive systems theory, describe a naturalistic approach to organizing through the actions of a change agent. The gap between a competitive advantage and the current state is found through transparency and gap closure by the change agent. The ability of an organization to learn from issues and close these gaps promotes performance that stimulates profits and growth. As Freeman (2000) suggests, organizations propagate intentional action at the rate that the organization can absorb it. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 14 (liability prevention): Compliance with liability prevention controls must be at least as dynamic as the evolving threat-scape.

Proposition 15 (resolution transparency): Transparency that leads to client and business problem resolution and innovation is multi-directional and speed sensitive.

Proposition 16 (process grading): Financial and asset management processes should be graded on their accuracy and speed.

Proposition 17 (propagation capacity): An appropriate methodology is needed to propagate best practices at the rate of absorptive capacity.

Leadership. The last horizontal MDD category is leadership. The researcher has confirmed five related areas covering the remainder of the data points. Ultimately the MDD leader is a stakeholder and must exhibit strong leadership skills to achieve the goals of the organization and the production network that supports it.

[I] partner with local leaders to develop strategic plans for ... services with timeframes and measurements of improvement. The strategic plans should support the business goals of local facilities and be developed in coordination of each group

and in alignment with the strategies/operations of the broader global ... team. (RH11)

The desirable attributes of leadership that emerged in the data from MDD stakeholders is illustrated in the figure below and includes (a) strategy, (b) learning management, (c) culture, and (d) alignment. Additional data for (a) suggests that horizontal leader strategy must include change momentum, deployment capability, and a global influence. Additional data for (b) suggests that learning management includes the creation of knowledge, curriculum development, and the execution of the training activities across all locations. Additional data for (c) suggests that alignment includes collaboration between leaders, with internal clients, and with external clients. Collaboration is also dependent on decision-making

skills. Leaders in an MDD need to be influential and effective in a network of dependent leaders. This requires well-honed leadership skills. Additional data for (d) suggests that a leader is responsible for the culture of the organization. This includes a culture that is attuned to meeting both client expectations and company goals (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). It is a culture of awareness so that effective decisions can be made. Alignment in the culture ensures a one-ness as experienced by the organization and the client. This culture is then both aligned and collaborative.

“[I provide] coordination... influence... [and] development [so we] will be more effective and efficient [as] we stay aligned with our priorities.” (RH131)




Figure 9. Leadership theme map. This figure maps leadership as a theme category into descriptive sub-groupings.

In summary, the data suggests that leadership is a strong component for MDD leadership success. Horizontal leaders have indicated from the data that they need to manage their business unit culture, exploit a managed body of knowledge, have alignment within their staff, and execute an effective strategy. The strategy that is deployed, along with the managed culture, need to be aligned with the values and norms of the MNE as a whole. Alignment facilitates speed with regard to decision making. The robustness of decisions and timing are enhanced through a culture of collaboration. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

Proposition 18 (strategy momentum): The strategy for a global deployment must include consideration

for change management momentum and the organization’s capability to effectively deploy.

Proposition 19 (augmented awareness): Leadership efficacy is dependent on environmental awareness augmented by a culture of purpose-driven learning.

Contributions to Theory

The primary contribution of this article is new empirical insights about the roles that enable growth realization in an MNE organized as an MDD. Nineteen propositions are offered up through the study to answer how leadership can be embedded across and MNE. These results are relevant to the achievement of embedded leadership, sustained profitability and competitive advantage by focusing a multi-unit firm on business unit relatedness and strategic complementarity.

These nineteen propositions were extracted from the participants instigated by a precipitated event that contribute to theory on the horizontalization of an MDD. These outcomes that influence change efficacy are described and useful for sustained corporate advantage. In fact, the issues with the matrix design described at the beginning of this article map closely to the propositions mentioned as shown in the figure below. Some mapping from the propositions could be linked to several challenges on the left. To simplify, only one challenge was

chosen for each proposition. The propositions represent a holistic multi-faceted approach to role success, this is the linkage between the propositions. An MDD can scale profitability when a holistic approach is taken. The social impact of personal and economic success are significant on society. Positive socio-economic influence, especially with lower income populations, is evidenced in GDP and employment metrics (Li & Forzati, 2018).




Figure 10. Challenge to proposition relations. This figure maps the role challenges to the propositions that emerged from the data regarding the deployment of an MDD.

The author anticipates that these propositions will stimulate further research as organizational behavior is significantly complex and situational. These observations are also meant to stimulate further thinking. By studying the distinctive features of role optimization in an MDD, the author hopes that interest has been sparked on researching the design and application of further more effective and efficient talent selection and management techniques. The author did not take the time to discuss the implementation of the propositions, leaving this for another researcher to study and describe.

This research attempts to contribute to organizational theory by exploring an innovative multidimensional organizational design with the advantage of collaborative opportunity exploitation in a dynamic market. In the company case, the design includes dimensions that relate to products and services, geographic locations, support functions, and clients. Each dimension is not flat, as

a layer might imply, but rather is intrinsically variable. For example, leaders have different styles and capabilities. Their influence will vary depending on capability and situation. Within the roles there is variability in team expertise and the nature of the support that is required further strengthening the idea of a dimension rather than a layer (Armstrong & Cole, 2002). This multidimensional organizational design is applied to a multi-unit business that includes a global value chain. The MNE must be competitively agile in its dynamic market while managing through an otherwise complex organizational construct.

The M-form has come into question with regard to its relevancy in modern MNEs (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1993; Berggren, 1996; Ruigok et al., 2000). Even Alfred Chandler (1962), the economic historian from Harvard who documented the emergence of multidimensional organizations in the first half of the 20th century, suggests that structure must follow strategy to avoid inefficient results. In the

1970s there was interest in organizing MNEs along several dimensions in a number of publications that were concerned with the dynamic markets in which multi-national corporations operated (Ackoff, 1977; Bartlett, 1982; Coggin, 1974; Prahalad, 1980; Prahalad & Doz, 1979). The M-form design drives high employee costs, internal battles over resources, the lack of standardization, the lack of collaboration, and the loss of market opportunities contributing to tension about synergy exploitation (Strikwerda & Stoelhorst, 2009). This tension needs to be resolved, at least partially, through an organization design that involves multiple dimensions without exacerbating issues around resources and market opportunities. Furthermore, the structure needs to drive clarity and accountability which is an inherent weakness in matrix structures due to the disparate interests of multiple bosses (Galbraith, 2009). Further organizational design evolution is needed along with role efficacy to move MNEs from a resource-centric industrial economy, focused on exploiting tangible physical resources, to a customer-centric, service-oriented economy that is focused on exploiting intangible knowledge-based resources (Davis & Thomas, 1993; Grant, 1996; Markides & Williamson, 1994).

References

1. Ackoff, R. L. (1977). Towards flexible organizations: A multidimensional design. *Omega*, 5(6), 649-662.
2. Acton, B. P., Foti, R. J., Lord, R. G., & Gladfelter, J. A. (2018). Putting emergence back in leadership emergence: A dynamic, multilevel, process-oriented framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
3. Amit, R. & Livnat, J. (1988). Diversification strategies, business cycles and economic performance. *Strategies Management Journal*, 9, 99-110.
4. Armour, H. & Teece, D. (1978). Organization structure and economic performance: A test of the multidivisional hypothesis. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 9, 106-122.
5. Armstrong, D. J., & Cole, P. (2002). Managing distances and differences in geographically distributed work groups. *Distributed Work*, 167-186.
6. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, 151-166.
7. Bartlett, C. A. (1982, Summer). How multinational organizations evolve. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 3(1), 20-32.
8. Bartlett, C. A. & Ghoshal, S. (1993). Beyond the M-form: Toward a managerial theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(1993, Special Winter Issue), 23-46.
9. Behrendt, P., Matz, S., & Göritz, A. S. (2017). An integrative model of leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 229-244.
10. Berggren, C. (1996). Building a truly global organization? ABB and the problems of integrating a multi-domestic enterprise. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 12(2), 123-137.
11. Bower, J. L. (1986). *Managing the Resource Allocation Process*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press Books.
12. Burns, T. & Stalker, G. M. (1992). Mechanistic and organic systems. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organizational theory* (3rd ed., pp. 207-211). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
13. Caughron, J. J., & Mumford, M. D. (2012). Embedded leadership: How do a leader's superiors impact middle-management performance?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 342-353.
14. Coggin, W. C. (1974). How the multinational structure works at Dow Corning. *Harvard Business Review*, 52(1), 54-65.
15. Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of American enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
16. Contractor, F. J. & Ra, W. (2002). How knowledge attributes influence alliances governance choices: A theory development note. *Journal of International Management*, 8, 11-27.
17. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
18. D'Aveni, R. A., Dagnino, G. B., & Smith, K. G. (2010). The age of temporary advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31, 1371-1385.
19. Davis, R. & Thomas, L. G. (1993). Direct estimation of synergy, a new approach to the

- diversity-performance debate. *Management Science*, 39(11), 1334-1346.
20. Denzin, N. (1989). *The research act*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
 21. Depraz, N., Varela, F., & Vermersch, P. (2003). *On becoming aware: A pragmatics of experiencing*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
 22. Drucker, P. F. (1992). The new society in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 70(5), 95-104.
 23. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 532-550.
 24. Eisenhardt, K. M. & Bharia, M. M. (2002). Organization computation and complexity. In J. A. C. Baum (Ed.), *Companion to Organizations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
 25. Festinger, L., Riecken, H. W., & Schachter, S. (2008). *When prophecy fails*. London, UK: Printer & Martin.
 26. Florida, R. (2004). *The rise of the creative class*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
 27. Freeman, W. J. (2000). *How brains make up their minds*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
 28. Galbraith, J. R. (1971). Matrix organizational designs. *Business Horizons*, 14(1), 29.
 29. Galbraith, J. R. (1973). *Designing complex organizations*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
 30. Galbraith, J. R. (1977). *Organization design*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
 31. Galbraith, J. R. (2005). *Designing the customer-centric organization: A guide to strategy, structure, and process*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
 32. Galbraith, J. R. (2009). *Designing matrix organizations that actually work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
 33. Goold, M. & Campbell, A. (2003). Structured networks: Towards the well-designed matrix. *Long Range Planning*, 36(5), 427-439.
 34. Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(S2), 109-122.
 35. Grossman, L. (2005). What's next? Innovation. How Apple does it? *Time Magazine*, November 14.
 36. Gupta, A. K. & Govindarajan, V. (1986). Resource sharing among SBUs: Strategic antecedents and administrative implications. *Academy of Management Journal*. 30, 477-500.
 37. Gupta, R. K., Singh, S. J. & Singh, B., Challenges in Scaling up a Globally Distributed Legacy Product: A Case Study of a Matrix Organization, 2018 IEEE/ACM 13th International Conference on Global Software Engineering (ICGSE), Gothenburg, 2018, pp. 72-76.
 38. Hirschheim, R. & Klein, H. K. (1994). Realizing emancipatory principles in information systems development: The case for ethics. *MIS quarterly*, 18(1), 83-109.
 39. Inkpen, A. C. (1997). An examination of knowledge management in international joint ventures. In: P. Beamish & J. Killings (Eds.). *Cooperative strategies, North America perspectives*. (pp. 337-369). San Francisco, CA: New Lexington Press.
 40. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*: John Wiley & Sons.
 41. Kotter, J. P. & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
 42. Lamnek, S. (1995). *Qualitative sozial/forschung*. (3rd ed.). Muenchen, Germany: Psychologie Verlags Union.
 43. Li, J. & Forzati, M. (2018). The Social-Economic Impact of Fiber Broadband: A Hype or a Reality? 2018 20th International Conference on Transparent Optical Networks (ICTON), Bucharest, pp. 1-7.
 44. Life in a matrix. (1980). *Management Review*, 69(7), 36.
 45. Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
 46. Lovas, B. & Ghoshal, S. (2000). Strategy as guided evolution. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 875-896.
 47. Markides, C. C. & Williamson, P. J. (1994). Related diversification, core competencies and corporate performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 149-165.
 48. Mayring, P. (1996). *Einfuehrung in die qualitative sozialforschung: Eine anleitung zu qualitativem denken*. Weinheim: Belz/PVU.
 49. Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

50. Pankratz, H. (1991). Strategic alignment: Managing for synergy. *Business Quarterly*, 55(3), 66-71.
51. Pareek, U. (1993). Making organizational roles effective. New Delhi, India: TataMcGraw-Hill.
52. Prahalad, C. K. & Doz, Y. L. (1979). Strategic reorientation in the multidimensional organization. (Working Paper No. 195). Retrieved from: <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/35980/b1375490.0001.001.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>.
53. Prahalad, C. K. (1980). The concept and potential of multidimensional organizations. In F. Stevens (Ed.). *Managing Managers*. (pp. 159-176). Eindhoven: NV Philips' Gloeilampenfabrieken.
54. Prahalad, C. K. & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3), 79-91.
55. Punch, K. F. (1998). Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches. London, UK: Sage Publications.
56. Roberts, J. (2004). The modern firm: Organizational design for performance and growth. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
57. Rosen, S. (2004). *Markets and diversity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
58. Ruigok, W., Achtenhagen, L., Wagner, M., & Ruegg-Sturm, J. (2000). ABB: Beyond the global matrix towards the network multidivisional organization. In A. Pettigrew & E. Fenton (Eds.), *Process and practices of new forms of organizing*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
59. Srinivasan, K., & Jomon, M. G. (2018). Personal Effectiveness and Self-efficacy as Predictors of Individual Role Efficacy: An Analysis Based on PLS Path Modeling. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 25(4), 28-53.
60. Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
61. Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. New York, NY: Sage Publications.
62. Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1996). *Grounded Theory: Grundlagen qualitative sozialforschung*. Weinheim, Germany: Beltz.
63. Strikwerda, J., & Stoelhorst, J. W. (2009). The emergence and evolution of the multidimensional organization. *California Management Review*, 51(4), 11-31.
- Sutton, R. T. & Straw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Studies Quarterly*, 40, 371-384.
64. Sutton, R. T. & Straw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Studies Quarterly*, 40, 371-384.
65. Van Wart, M. & Kapucu, N. (2011). Crisis management competencies: The case of emergency managers in the USA. *Public Management Review*, 13(4), 489-511.
66. Weick, K. (1995). What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 40, 385-391.
67. Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409-421.
68. Wiessmeier, G.F. L., Axel, T. & Christoph, S. (2012). Leveraging synergies between R&D and key account management to drive value creation. *Research Technology Management*, 55(3), 15-22.
69. Williamson, O.E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
70. Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
71. Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.