LOCAL OPERATIONS OF GLOBAL SPORTSWEAR FIRMS IN THAILAND

Ms. Orawee Thongkam*
Graduate School of Business, Assumption University

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how global companies in the sportswear industry in Thailand g-localize their internal operations (which are part of the supply chain), to achieve a balance between global integration and national differentiation. Interviews were held with managers in four leading companies. The interview questions were directed at four business functions: coordination and control, research and development, marketing and sales, and production units.

It was found that the four companies have similar practices. The results show that in coordination and control, regional headquarters act as an intermediary between headquarters and subsidiaries and licensees. Regional HQs mainly act as decision makers and performance controllers. The coordination is vertically intense: the coordination is either from HQ to regional HQ, or regional HQ to subsidiaries/licensees, and not between subsidiaries and licensees.

The research and development function strategy has a global approach: there is no adaptation to fit each country. In marketing and sales units, regional strategy is implemented. Different companies have different practices; some have more autonomy in decision making. In production units, global strategy is also adopted. Sourcing decision-making is centralized. The production strategy is product specialization. Each company exports, worldwide or to a major area. Nevertheless, the strategic trend is different in the studied companies. Three are moving towards more centralization, but one company is moving to decentralization by giving more autonomy to subsidiaries. The marketing and sales function and production function are managed separately and registered as different companies, i.e. they are functional organizations. These companies obviously 'act global but think local'. However, regional teams must have diverse international experiences to understand how this can be done appropriately.

---

*This is a reduced version of a project report for the MBA degree of Assumption University, awarded in January 2012.

บทคัดย่อ

รายงานฉบับนี้แสดงวิธีการงดำเนินงานภายในแบบคลอบคลุม หรือเฉพาะส่วน (g-locaize) (ซึ่งนับได้ว่าเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของห่วงโซ่อุปทาน) ของบริษัทระดับโลกในอุตสาหกรรมเครื่องแต่งกายกีฬาที่ดำเนินงานในประเทศไทย โดยการดำเนินงานจะแสดงถึงการผสมผสานของการบริหารแบบบูรณาการระดับโลก (Global integration) และการบริหารด้านความแตกต่างของแต่ละท้องถิ่น (national differentiation) การศึกษาได้ทำการสัมภาษณ์ผู้จัดการของบริษัทในประเทศไทยทั้ง 4 บริษัท โดยคำถามที่ใช้ในการสัมภาษณ์เชื่อมโยงประเด็นในหน่วยธุรกิจหลัก 4 ฝ่าย ได้แก่ ฝ่ายการประสานงานและการควบคุม ฝ่ายการวิจัยและพัฒนา ฝ่ายการตลาดและการขาย และฝ่ายการผลิต

โดยการศึกษาพบว่า ใน 4 บริษัทมีลักษณะการดำเนินงานคล้ายคลึงกัน ในด้านฝ่ายประสานงานและการควบคุม ผลการศึกษาพบว่า สำนักงานใหญ่แต่ในละภาคพื้นจะทำหน้าที่เป็นตัวกลาง ระหว่างสำนักงานใหญ่และบริษัทสาขาและบริษัทที่ได้รับใบอนุญาต โดยที่สำนักงานใหญ่ในแต่ละภาคพื้นจะทำหน้าที่เป็นผู้ตัดสินใจและควบคุมผลการดำเนินงานของสาขาย่อย การประสานงานจะเป็นลักษณะแนวตรงที่เข้มข้น โดยเกิดขึ้นระหว่างสำนักงานใหญ่และสำนักงานใหญ่ในแต่ละภาคพื้น หรือระหว่างสำนักงานใหญ่ในแต่ละภาคพื้นและบริษัทสาขาหรือบริษัทที่ได้รับใบอนุญาต แต่ไม่ใช่การประสานงานระหว่างบริษัทสาขาหรือบริษัทที่ได้รับใบอนุญาตด้วย กันเอง

ด้านกุลยุทธ์การวิจัยและพัฒนามีลักษณะแบบโดยรวมเหมือนกันทั้งบริษัท (Global approach) โดยไม่มีการปรับเปลี่ยนเพื่อให้เข้ากับในแต่ละประเทศ ในด้านการตลาดและการขาย กลยุทธ์ในระดับภูมิภาคได้ถูกใช้ ซึ่งในแต่ละบริษัทได้ปรับใช้กลยุทธ์ที่ไม่เหมือนกัน โดยบางบริษัทจะให้อิสระในการตัดสินใจที่มากกว่า ในส่วนของการผลิต กลยุทธ์ระดับโลก (global strategy) ได้ถูกนำมาใช้ การตัดสินใจด้านการจัดหา ทำในลักษณะรวมอำนาจ (centralized) ในฝ่ายการผลิตดำเนินงานแบบใช้ลักษณะของสินค้าที่อาศัยความเชี่ยวชาญเฉพาะทาง (product specialization) โดยในแต่ละประเทศส่งออกไปทั่วโลกหรือจำกัดเฉพาะบางพื้นที่ แต่อย่างไรก็ตามแนวทางกลยุทธ์ด้านการผลิตในแต่ละบริษัทได้ถูกปรับเปลี่ยนไปในทิศทางที่ต่างกัน โดย 3 บริษัทใน 4 บริษัท มีแนวโน้มที่จะไปสู่การรวมอำนาจ โดย 1 ใน 4 บริษัทไปในทิศทางแบบกระจายอำนาจโดยการให้อำนาจบริษัทสาขาในการตัดสินใจ ในด้านฝ่ายการตลาดและการขายได้ถูกแยกออกมาต่างหากจากส่วนฝ่ายการผลิต โดยต่างแยกจดทะเบียนบริษัท ทั้งนี้ 4 บริษัทในกรณีศึกษาได้แสดงอย่างชัดเจนถึงการบริหารงาน โดยทำแบบข้ามชาติและคิดแบบท้องถิ่น (act global and think local) แต่อย่างไรก็ตาม คณะทำงานระดับภูมิภาคต้องมีความเข้าใจเรื่องของความหลากหลายของประสบการณ์ระหว่างประเทศ เพื่อที่จะเข้าใจและปรับใช้ได้อย่างเหมาะสม

INTRODUCTION

Globalization is a familiar topic (Parker, 1998). It has advantages and disadvantages (Levitt, 1983; Yip, 2003). Unfortunately, there is little published research on how globalization is practiced in particular companies. Outcomes depend on the extent to which such firms respond to obstacles in the global business environment (Svennson, 2001). Obstacles can be encountered in markets, competition, and governments; and some products may not be appropriate for a global approach (Johansson, 2000). Also, there is increasing awareness of the key strategic challenge to balance standardization and local adaptation (Shi, 2007).

Three of the four sportswear companies studied here are big corporations with more than 30,000 employees, while the fourth is smaller with around 10,000 employees. Three companies are wholly owned Thai subsidiaries, while the other is a licensee. All operate in Asia, Europe, USA, and Africa. Three operate in more than 130 countries, while the other operates in 100 countries.

This research aims to understand these companies' internal operations in Thailand, specifically how they use global and local strategies in four functions: coordination and control, research and development, marketing and sales, and production. It examines how they operate across geographical boundaries as they attempt to coordinate and configure their production activities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term 'Globalization' has been given many definitions. It is the interconnection between overlapping interesting of business and society (Parker, 1998). It is regarded as boundarylessness by Rhiensmith (1992) and Ohmae (1995). Levitt (1983) sees it as the global market for standardization, which is driven by the powerful force of technology. Shi (2007) says that globalization has a variety of connotations in the business and corporate management literature. Globalization may also have uniformity of global business activities without local adaptations (Svensson, 2001).

Global refers to types of worldwide strategy that integrate approaches across countries and regions (Yip, 2003). 'Global market' implies a strategic approach for competing in the worldwide marketplace. Dahringer and Muehlbacher (1991) say that the global market is a market for similar products regardless of the geographic areas in which they are located. Similarly, 'global market' implies the shift towards global products and global brands (Svensson, 2001). All these perspectives are brought together in Table 1

Table 1: Global market key characteristics

Market boundaries	Markets transcend country borders, customers and/ or competitors, crossing frontiers to buy and sell.
Customers	Significant similarities exist among customers from different countries: segments cut across geographic frontiers.
Competition	Competitors are few and present in every major market. Rivalry takes on regional or global scope.
Strategies	Strategies are regional or global in scope. Great advantage exists in coordinating activities within regions or worldwide.
Interdependence	Local markets operate interdependently. Competitive actions in one market impact other markets.

Source: Johansson, 2000

Many professionals have recognized that the global context for studying industries, strategies and organization is the norm. 'Global strategy' is defined as the way a business competes in the global market as well as playing an essential role in determining the performance of a business in the global market (Zou, 1996). Global strategy views the world as one market in which the company with such a global focus formulates long-term strategy for the whole organization and directs it to the local subsidiaries. The corporations geared to this strategy benefit from enormous economies of scale in production, distribution, marketing and management (Levitt, 1983). As a consequence, global strategy seeks to integrate a response to the interdependent nature of the global market, incorporate a broad strategic direction, and specify how activities (sourcing, R&D, manufacturing and marketing) should be coordinated worldwide (Zou, 1996).

In general, it is said that global strategy is to emphasize similarities, standardization, homogenization, concentration, and coordination, on a worldwide basis (Shi, 2007). In pure global strategy: there is a significant share in a major market in which the company participates; the product is a standardized offering worldwide; locations of value-added activities are concentrated; the marketing approach is worldwide-uniform; and competitive moves are integrated from country to country (Svensson, 2001).

The many advantages and benefits of globalization include cost saving/cost reduction, optimal combination of marketing mix, growth and expansion opportunity, market access improvement, economies of scale, economies of scope, and sourcing advantages. Dahringer and Meuhlbacher (1991) argue that adopting global strategy allows a company to achieve concentration and coordination of activities. However, Yip (2003) points that the benefits of global strategy can be grouped into the four major categories: reduced costs, improved quality, enhanced customer preference, and combined global resources. Nevertheless, the ultimate outcome of implementing global strategy or being globalized depends on the extent of theoretical potential and obstacles in the global business environment (Svennson, 2001).

However, there are disadvantages, such as reduction of responsiveness to local needs, distance of activities from the customers, increased currency risk, reduction of adaptation to local customer behavior and marketing environment, as well as local competitiveness (Svensson, 2001). The challenge for management in a centralized organization is to closely coordinate the activities of a large number of widely dispersed international operations. Ongoing communication between headquarters and subsidiaries must be maintained as well as communication among the subsidiaries. Yip (2003) mentioned that significant costs can be incurred by becoming globalized: these costs are due to increased coordination, reporting requirements, and staffing. Also, product standardization and uniform marketing can have significant disadvantages by not fully satisfying customers elsewhere, by reducing adaptation to local customer behavior and the marketing environment, and by reducing flexibility and responsiveness (Yip, 2003).

Even though becoming globalized is a temptation, Johansson (2000) agues that it is not always approporiate. It depends on the degree of four important factors: industry factors, internal resources, different mixes, and global turmoil. In contrast, Jeannet and Hennessey (1992) mention that there are various factors that limit the global strategy approach and global business activities, such as market characteristics, conditions of each different industry, and legal restrictions. Yip (2003) proposes four key organization and management factors which will determine a business's ability to develop and implement a global strategy: organization structure, culture, people, and management processes. Each factor directly affects the others and the use of global strategy. Ignoring even one of these factors will inhibit the business from developing its ability to think and behave globally.

Localization has been regarded as the trading pattern that goes beyond the commercial, into the cultural and symbolic (Johansson, 2000). Others regard it as an alternative to the globalization business function process and some regard it as local processes, services and resources. While Bartlett and Ghoshal (1990) regard it as tailoring operation to local needs, Yip (2003) sees it is a strategy which treats competition in each country on a stand-alone basis.

Barker (1996) said that a multi-domestic strategy (as an alternative to globalization) views the competitive challenge independently, from market to market. Multi-domestic strategy has been defined widely (Svensson, 2001). It is defined mostly as having independent strategies in each foreign market, adjusting its products and practices in each operating country. Furthermore, a multi-domestic strategy gives top priority to local responsiveness, it benefits from increased managerial autonomy and maximizes worldwide performance by maximizing local competitive advantage, revenues, or profits. The differences between pure global strategy and pure multi-domestic strategy are summarized in Table 2.

Since consumers demand locally differentiated products, it is essential to adapt the managerial practices to fit local cultural and legally mandated expectations. Also, attempts to implement standardized policies and procedures across all international operating units may actually disregard the individual needs of subsidiaries or the roles it plays for the benefit of the whole organization in a global context. Consequently, to deal with those differences effectively, it is recommended that a multi domestic strategy be adopted. However, a pure multi-domestic strategy may turn out to be costly and difficult to implement in a global value chain that attempts to maximize efficiency in manufacturing and marketing operations (Torres, 2002).

Table 2: Differences between pure global strategy and pure multi-domestic strategy

Dimension	Pure Global Strategy	Pure Multi-Domestic strategy
Market Participate	Significant share in major markets	No particular pattern
Product Offering	Fully standardized worldwide	Fully customized in each country
Location of Value-Added Activities	Concentrated one activity in each country	All activities in each country
Marketing Approach	Uniform worldwide	Local
Competitive Moves	Integrated across countries	Stand-alone by country

Source: Jeffus, 2008, p.19

Other than the dilemma stated above, changes in the local business environment and the setbacks experienced in globalization, increase the awareness of key strategic challenge to balance how much to standardize products, practices or strategies across countries and how much to adapt them to local differences. This balancing describes whether to have globalization or localization, which suggests the term "glocalization" (Shi, 2007). Thus, glocal strategy is introduced due to the global-local dilemma which reflects the aspirations of the global strategy approach, but also reflects the necessity to adapt to local and business activities. (Svensson, 2001). Moreover, glocalization has been labeled as the synthesis that allows the co-presence of a high level of global integration and local adaption. It provides a more appropriate usage of the global strategy approach, with participation and homogenization in the tailoring of business activities (Svensson, 2001).

As an alternative to balancing the tradeoff between global strategy and local strategy, there is 'transnational organization', introduced by Bartlett and Ghoshal (1995). The three characteristics are: multi-dimensional perspectives, distributed and interdependent capabilities, and flexibility of the integrative process. This kind of organization is an alternative to balance the tradeoff between globalization and localization. There are three characteristics of transnational management: global integration of activities, global strategic co-ordination, and local responsiveness.

A fundamental strategic dilemma faced by transnational companies is how to compete internationally; this problem is known as the global-local dilemma. Transnational corporations have become the primary shaper of the contemporary global economy and a major threat to the economic autonomy of the nation-state (Dicken, 2007). However, Stonehouse et al (2000) regard the transnational strategy as one which combines global configuration and co-ordination of business activities with local responsiveness. It consists of a global core competence giving access to global markets, extensive participation in major markets worldwide, global configuration of value-adding activities which grant both national similarities and differences, global co-ordination and integration of activities, local responsiveness where required, and differentiated structure and organization. Stonehouse et al (2000) also mention that some components of the strategy would be global or local due to the pressures for globalization and localization. Therefore, to observe or find out how glocalized one organization is, it is important to examine how that organization geographically configures its internalized operations. Wherefore, Dicken (2007) introduces four relevant and distinctive major business functions to assess the extent of glocalization: coordination and control, research and development, marketing and sales, and production.

In summary, the review literature has identified the important issue of how internal operation is a balanced tradeoff between global integration and local differences. Moreover, the four distinctive major business functions have been identified as those needing to be assessed in the four companies studied in this present research.

METHODOLOGY

This research used a qualitative approach to develop insights into internal operations, especially the coordination and control between headquarters and subsidiaries /licensees. This research method is suitable to describe details of the situation, to understand the reality or the reality working behind them (Remenyi et al, 2000). Grant et al. (2010) are practitioners of qualitative research, as a useful technique for studying processes in companies and also for explanatory purposes. The qualitative methodology is research in depth which allows the interviewees to give rich textual answers to question as well as valuable insights, which cannot be achieved through quantitative methodology.

Unlike quantitative methodology, qualitative research does not need many respondents. Purposive sampling, with a small sample size, was used (Saunders et al, 2003), by choosing the four leading sportswear companies in Thailand, based on revenue and product categories. (The companies' names will be pseudonyms because of a promise of confidential anonymity). The interviewees were from management level who would be best suited to answer the questions through their specialist knowledge and experience.

The semi-structured interview was used because although it involves a pre-set list of themes and questions that needed to be covered, it also leaves much room for appropriate variation as each interview progresses. It gives the researcher the important freedom to probe answers during the interview, to enable the interviewee to explain, or make additional comments (Saunders et al, 2003).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Coordination and control

All the studied companies have regional headquarters which act as intermediaries between headquarters and subsidiaries. However, company B has no official regional headquarters – zone directors are responsible only for a specific function. The coordination methods vary from company to company. From the interview results, the reporting lines are different among the companies. Companies A, C and D have a reporting line through a country manager for all functions, while company B has a reporting line through functional managers and leaves some functions to report directly to the country manager. Vision, mission and strategies are common mechanisms used to coordinate headquarters and subsidiaries.

Company A regards information sharing as most important for coordination between regional headquarters and subsidiaries. An IT system is necessary and increasingly used to facilitate information sharing and strategy transfer. It is also regarded as a substitute for face-to-face discussions.

Company B focuses on strategy and general information sharing. Strategy is presented for short-, medium- and long-term. General information (e.g. sales figures, business expansion) is shared, to encourage individual motivation.

Company C also focuses on information sharing as a mean to coordinate with regional headquarters. 'Share point' is a tool used to share information that everyone can access and through which can update his or her status and progress. 'Fiscal year goal' and balanced scorecard are also used to allocate responsibilities.

Company D, as a licensee, coordinates with regional headquarters for the international brands concepts and marketing guidelines. There is no formal system used to coordinate with regional headquarters as subsidiaries do in the other companies. Regional headquarters controls its performance and process of knowledge transfer. Regarding decision-making, all four companies have autonomy in decision making but exhibit varying degrees of combined controls. The decision making is a "top-down" approach for all four companies, in which the corporate headquarters make decisions in a global context, such as overall vision, mission and broad strategies. Those strategies, vision and mission are then transferred to regional headquarters.

On the other hand, these regional headquarters are able to make decisions within regional contexts, and to allocate responsibilities and goals to subsidiaries under their control. Subsidiaries then can make decisions on related issues such as day-to-day operations and the issues within the country or areas. Companies A and C are more rigid in their decision making and regarded it as being 'centralized'. On the other hand, company

B leaves some more space for subsidiaries by offering alternative solutions from which to choose, and focuses on 'autonomy' for individuals. Nevertheless, feedback and comments, which reflect local constraints and conditions, are welcomed by corporate headquarter via regional headquarters.

In company D, decision-making is also centralized. Headquarters set the standards and policies and pass them through regional headquarters. These become international guidelines and licensees must adopt them. Other than the marketing concept, licensees have sole autonomy in deciding their own strategies, such as business targets and goals, budget, and business plans.

Regarding performance control, company A has a performance meeting about every week between country managers and regional headquarters. There is no kick-off meeting, launching, or year-end meeting. Unlike company A, in companies B and C, the control of performance is conducted for individuals, teams and subsidiaries twice a year, called the mid-year and year-end annual review. Company C also uses an external party to audit the performance of their subsidiaries. Companies A, B and C use KPI (key performance indicators) to measure performances. Additionally, company C has balanced scorecard and fiscal year goal to be followed and reviewed. In company D, reports have to be submitted monthly to corporate headquarters and regional headquarters. Regarding knowledge transfer, the policy is heavily practiced and emphasized from regional headquarter to subsidiaries but rarely between subsidiaries for companies A, B and C.

Company C uses internal benchmarking and shares best practices. Many methods are practiced. Mostly, training is conducted at headquarters, regional headquarters or at selected subsidiaries. Training is done either face-to-face or via videoconferencing. E-learning is used by companies A, B and C but only for lower professional issues. Companies B and C mentioned job transfers and expatriates as means to share knowledge between headquarters and subsidiaries. Company D has knowledge transfer from regional headquarters to licensee, mainly concerning product knowledge. Meetings are commonly at regional headquarters.

Research and development
All four companies have technology developed at the center and not in separate organizations. Companies A and B use a decentralized approach, in which product R&D covers every category of sports. Company B has only one R&D for all categories. There is no information for Company D. Companies A and B have local laboratories which act as communicators

between headquarters and subsidiaries for standards and policies. Company C has standards and policies communicated directly to suppliers, and subsidiaries only monitor whether or not they are conforming. For new process technology on process, an IT department in each subsidiary is responsible for in-house training for companies A, B and C.

Subsidiaries in three companies (A, B and C) have little contribution in exploiting new development except for providing feedback, which eventually helps to bring about improvements and adjustments to make the new development fit all markets or customers. However, new technologies for product development can be proposed by subsidiaries by collaborating with suppliers in those countries.

Companies A, B, C and D mentioned that as the technology is transferred in the form of a global approach, there is no adaptation to each subsidiary. Therefore, it can be said that every subsidiary uses the same technology and practices the same technological process. The information and details are uploaded on intranet. However, in the development stages, feedback is encouraged and welcomed by headquarters.

There is no technology transfer between subsidiaries/licensee for all four companies. However, company B employs cross-checks to identify common problems faced by different subsidiaries.

Marketing and sales

Company A coordinates mainly with regional headquarters, which sets targets and goals for each subsidiary under its control by arranging a meeting. Most of the meetings are conducted through conference calls, videoconferencing and email. Face-to-face meetings are considered special and only happen for big events such as annual budgeting. Company B has a responsible marketing unit to coordinate directly with the central marketing unit at headquarters. The methods used are usually monthly emails and a system for data mining. Company C also coordinates with regional headquarters, through videoconferencing, conferences calls and emails. In company D, its regional headquarters is responsible for transferring the international marketing concepts and guidelines to licensees, which must be strictly respected. The methods are email and conference calls and face-to-face discussions. In companies A and C there is no coordination between subsidiaries, because coordination is done between regional headquarters and subsidiaries.

There is no coordination for company D, as it works independently and have its own strategy. The decision making in marketing units varies from company to company.

Company A has centralized decision-making concerning its marketing function (price, product and promotion). Every subsidiary within the same region has similar prices, products and promotions. Regional guidelines and marketing schemes are practiced separately in each region. Companies B and C have autonomy to choose their products and set their own prices within ceiling margins. Promotions depend on each subsidiary, as dictated by local conditions. Company D has to follow international guidelines for marketing and branding. Other than that, company D has full autonomy in decision-making.

Production units

The coordination is made through strategies, targets, and goals for companies A, B and C. SAP and R3 are common tools that are used to coordinate between production units and sourcing headquarters. Different functions of production have different tools and software, such as STP for pricing. Company A's reporting line is through the country manager who updates results on Intranet. Company B, on the other hand, coordinates directly to products managers at headquarters. Also, personal relationships develop between subsidiaries' individuals and headquarters.

Company C mainly coordinates a sourcing plan that defines the responsibility of each production unit in advance. It also has an Internet portal that is used to permit suppliers to communicate directly with central sourcing. Company D orders products from a global sourcing company in Hong Kong. However, it has its own production for supplying within its area. There is less coordination between production units in companies A, B and C, most of their coordination is information sharing when there is production duplication, and is limited to within the same region. The methods used are videoconferencing and emails. In addition, cross-training is used by companies A and B, but they are not much emphasized.

Some criteria are similar among the four companies: price, capacity and capability. In companies A, B and C, capability is most important to remain competitive. Companies B and C also say that personal relationships are also important in order to work and coordinate with headquarters. Company D said that production is allowed only for local demand and if other countries within the same region benefit from cost saving such as reduced tax.

The sourcing decision is being centralized for companies A, B and C. In company A, the decision is jointly made between three parties: project manager, production manager and central planning unit. Company B has an industrial buyer to make decisions on production distribution. Company C has two parties who work together and make decisions: a sourcing team and a development team (the development team is more powerful). The autonomy in production units is the same for these three companies. Sourcing headquarter set the policies and standards for suppliers. Full autonomy is given fully for allocating production to each supplier. Each production unit manages suppliers according to the set policies. However, sourcing headquarters must validate suppliers before production commences.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study found that no studied company practices a purely global approach. All studied companies in this research maximize global coordination in managing all the geographically dispersed activities. Global vision, mission and broad strategies are communicated worldwide through the coordination of regional headquarters. All activities need coordination and can only work effectively as a network. Coordination from corporate headquarters or regional headquarters enables all four companies to have different business activities yet located in different geographical regions. Thus regional headquarters acts as a channel of communication, transmitting instructions from corporate headquarter to its subsidiaries. However, limited local information and knowledge from local are communicated to corporate headquarters. For decision making, all four companies have a combination of centralization and decentralization in coordination and control with their corporate or regional headquarters. In research and development, all four companies focus their R&D efforts on a global approach. In marketing and sales, the marketing strategy is normally centrally decided by the corporate headquarters.

Nevertheless, the marketing strategy is adapted to regions through coordination and control by regional marketing teams at regional headquarters. All production units in the four companies are located in many countries, mainly in Asia, according to positional advantage.

Products are standardized but have some local contribution. The production units' strategy is global. Thus, on basis of the results obtained from the four companies, glocalization of sportswear industry is practiced, as these companies combine elements of global and local. However, the national preferences and standards are still very much needed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barker, M. J. (1996), "Globalisation and Marketing Strategy", *Journal of the Textile Institute*, Vol. 87 (3), pp. 13-23.

Bartlett, C. and Ghoshal, S. (1991), *Managing across borders: the transnational solution*. Massachusetts, Harvard Business School Press.

Dahringer, L. and Muehlbacher, H. (1991), *International Marketing: a global perspective*, USA, Addison Wesley.

Dicken, P. (2007), *Global shift, mapping the changing contours of the world economy*, 5th edition, London , Paul Chapman.

Grant, David B.; Teller, Christopher; Kotzab, Herbert (2010), Qualitative Research in logistics theory and practice, *Journal of Supply Chain Management: Research and Practice*, Vol.4, pp1-23.

Jeannet, J-P. and Hennessey, H.D. (1992), *Global Marketing Strategies*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.

Johansson, J.K. (2000), *Global Marketing: Foreign Entry*, Local Marketing & Global Management, Boston, Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Levitt, Theodore (1983), The Globalization of Markets, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol 61 (3), pp. 92-102.

Ohmae, K. (1995), *The borderless world: Power and strategy in the interlinked economy*, London, Collins.

Parker, Barbara (1998), *Globalization and business practice: managing across boundaries*, London, Sage.

Remenyi, D.; Williams, B.; Money, A., and Ethne, S. (2000), *Doing research in business and Management: An introduction to Process and Method*, London, Sage.

Rhiensmith, Stephen H. (1992), *A manager's guide to globalization, Amer Society.*

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2003), *Research methods for business students*, 3rd edition, London, Prentice Hall.

Shi, Yuwei Ph.D. (2007), The organizational factors of globalization and localization :a "Travel of Ideas" approach, *GLOBE Management Review*, Vol 1, No 1/

Stonehouse, G.; Hamill, J.; Campbell, D.; and Purdie, T. (2000), *Global and transnational business*, New York, Wiley.

Svensson, G. (2001), "Glocalization" of business activities: a "glocal strategy", *Management Decision*, Vol 39 (1), pp. 6-18.

Torres, Oliver (2002), *Small firm, glocalization strategy and proximity*, available from www.oliviertorres.net/travaux/pdf/ot18barcelona02.pdf [accessed 29 June 2009]

Yip, George S. (2003), *Total global strategy II*, New Jersey, Upper Saddle River.

Zou, Shaoming (1996), "Global strategy: a review and an integrated conceptual framework", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 30 (1), pp. 52-69.