



Economia Aziendale Online

Economia Aziendale Online

Business and Management Sciences
International Quarterly Review

Global Sourcing and Offshoring Strategies

Michela Pellicelli

Pavia, September 30, 2021
Volume 12 - N. 3/2021

www.ea2000.it
www.economiaaziendale.it



PaviaUniversityPress

Electronic ISSN 2038-5498
Reg. Trib. Pavia n. 685/2007 R.S.P.

Global Sourcing and Offshoring Strategies

Michela Pellicelli

Assistant Professor in Business Administration and Management, Department in Economics and Management, University of Pavia

Corresponding Author:

Michela Pellicelli, Department of Economics and Management, University of Pavia, via San Felice, 5, 27100, Pavia, Italy
michela.pellicelli@unipv.it

Cite as:

Pellicelli, M. (2021). Global Sourcing and Offshoring Strategies. *Economia Aziendale Online*, 12(3), 295-311.

ABSTRACT

In recent years *outsourcing* strategies have undergone a profound evolution: from simple forms of production contracts made with third parties to agreements that involve functions and activities which, requiring “core competencies”, or being part of the “core business”, have until now been considered inseparable from the company. In many industries, only companies that manage to be competitive globally can aspire to attain sustainable competitive advantages. The tendency today is to attain *global sourcing* and *offshoring*. This tendency has become extremely important for companies that compete worldwide and lead to outsource most of the functions and processes, achieving, can take on an extreme form defined as “extreme *outsourcing*”, and lead to the formation of a virtual organization, a company characterized by the pure business coordination of its businesses, where all the productive and economic processes have been outsourced through the formation of a stable but flexible network (Mella, 2019; Pellicelli, 2018).

Negli ultimi anni le strategie di outsourcing hanno subito una profonda evoluzione: da semplici forme di contratti di produzione stipulati con terzi ad accordi che coinvolgono funzioni e attività che, richiedendo “core competence” o, rientrando nel “core business”, sono state fino ad oggi considerato inseparabile dall'impresa. In molti settori, solo le aziende che riescono a essere competitive a livello globale possono aspirare a ottenere vantaggi competitivi sostenibili. La tendenza odierna è quella di arrivare a forme di approvvigionamento e di offshoring globali. Questa tendenza è diventata estremamente importante per le aziende che competono a livello mondiale e che puntino ad esternalizzare la maggior parte delle funzioni e dei processi, raggiungendo una forma estrema definita “extreme *outsourcing*”, che può portare alla formazione di un'*organizzazione virtuale*, un'entità caratterizzata dal puro coordinamento aziendale delle proprie imprese, dove tutti i processi produttivi ed economici sono stati esternalizzati attraverso la formazione di una rete stabile tuttavia anche flessibile (Mella, 2019; Pellicelli 2018a; Pellicelli 2018b).

Section: *Refereed paper*

Keywords: global sourcing, offshoring, *shareholder value*, *business process outsourcing*, *business transformation outsourcing*, *concurrent sourcing*, real outsourcing, intra-firm sourcing.

1 – Shareholder value creation and corporate rationality as leading objectives

Management is constantly looking for new capital to finance further investment," say Copeland, Koller and Murrin (2000), management consultants in a McKinsey study. This leads to the continuous pressure to formulate strategies that give value to the invested capital.

Received: June 2021
Published: 30/09/2021

As capital is competing and is directed towards investment projects that provide the highest return, in order to ensure satisfactory profitability, the management of growing companies must enter sectors with high profitability, abandon those that do not have the prospects to satisfy select strategies and each investment project on the basis of the gap between return and cost of capital. In a highly dynamic, interconnected and competitive capitalist environment the only truly general principle, firms must abide by is that of *corporate rationality*, according to which every managerial action must be decided on by choosing the alternative that maximizes both *economic efficiency* (ratio of revenues to costs) and *profitability* (Mella, 2008), conditions which guarantee the maximum production of *shareholder value* (Mella, 2005; Mella and Gazzola, 2004; Pellicelli 2007). The criterion of *corporate rationality* is applied to both the business level and the organizational functions and production processes.

At the *business level*, this criterion is valid for the business *portfolio* for the entirety as well as for the *individual* businesses that make up the former; the *corporate rationality* criterion can be translated into the following rules that specify how to select the businesses to include or remove from the portfolio in order to maximize the production of *shareholder value* (Pellicelli, 2007; Mella, Pellicelli, 2008):

a) in deciding whether to start up or continue businesses attention must be paid to their economic efficiency, to the capital invested in starting them up, and to the sources of available financing;

b) when choosing between two businesses, choose the one which has had the largest average ROE over its lifetime (best operating results and/or lower volume of invested capital and/or lower WACC, understood as the average weighted cost of capital raised at the rate of return expected by financial backers;

c) when average ROE is equal, choose the business with the shortest *pay-back* period;

d) a business with an average negative ROE for its remaining existence must be eliminated from the portfolio.

At the *organizational functions level*, assuming that these functions do not involve the production of services necessary for the functioning and maintenance of the firm's integrity, the corporate rationality criterion can be translated into the following rule: carry out internally only those functions that provide services at lower costs with respect to similar services available from outside firms, assuming equal reliability (quality and timeliness) and risk regarding uninterrupted supply, and externalize those functions which are "losers" with regard to the market.

"Literature has identified a range of predictor variables of outsourcing, which can broadly be seen to operate at the activity (transaction), firm, industry and institutional environment levels" (Kotabe and Mol, 2009).

Finally, the corporate rationality function is applied to those business processes necessary for production based on this rule: to maximize economic efficiency and corporate profitability, any activity not necessary for production should not be undertaken; any process whose costs are greater than those for similar results from outside suppliers must be outsourced. The corporate rationality criterion is the logical basis that justifies the increasingly widespread recourse to outsourcing.

Considering the assumptions previously discussed (par. 1), this paper aims to highlight the significant development of outsourcing strategies. After having examined the main definitions provided in the literature (par. 2), its evolution over time will be analysed.

In recent years outsourcing has moved from being a pure make or buy tactical decision (par. 3-4) to becoming part of a strategy for changing the way business is done (par. 5). In fact, by tradition firms originally considered outsourcing as a solution to short-term problems, such as

a sudden or unexpected increase in demand, an interruption in plant or equipment functioning, or the launch of a new product. The continuing industrialisation in some emerging countries, China and India in particular, has led outsourcing to take on new forms and in many companies to become the focus of their choices on competing better. *Global outsourcing* and *offshoring* are processes that best illustrate this tendency (par. 6-7).

Today firms consider outsourcing as a *network of stable agreements* with specialized suppliers as part of a long-term *strategic perspective*. In this panorama firms are taking on a nuanced form in a series of new “network” structures that widen and make more fluid the boundary of the firm’s economic activities, at the same time making it increasingly difficult to circumscribe its boundaries (par. 8-9). The typical structure of a networked firm involves a group of companies linked by outsourcing or offshoring contracts, which allow them to be autonomous while at the same time to cooperate and coordinate operations through the network, which makes them similar to a single economic enterprise (Mella, 2020; Pellicelli, 2017).

2 – The definition of outsourcing

The term *outsourcing* was used in 1982 (Van Mieghem, 1999) to identify the decision by which one or more processes or activities necessary to obtain a product or a component, even an organizational function – originally undertaken in-house by a certain organization – are regularly entrusted by a firm – the *outsourcee* – to an outside organization, the *outsourcer* (supplier or provider), who carries out the activity and sells the results to the former.

The *first feature of outsourcing*, from the production point of view, is that the outsourcee “takes outside” the firm processes and functions already carried out internally and does *not* only acquire – “brings inside” the firm – factors or services that were until then produced by outside firms.

Outsourcing is defined as:

... “the procurement of products or services from sources that are external to the organization” (Lankford and Parsa, 1999).

This feature is not always clearly explicit. For example, the *Dictionary of Business* (Collins, 2005) defines *outsourcing* as:

... “the purchase of components, finished products or services from outside suppliers rather than their production within the firm” ... “In some cases this is done because turning to outside suppliers lowers costs, because the outside suppliers have greater technical competencies, or because they offer a greater variety of products”.

The *outsourcing* process can occur physically outside the premises of the outsourcing organization or inside the organization. In the first case, *outsourcing* can be viewed as *service contracting-out*: that is, as the outsourcing of services necessary for production (Domberger, 1998). In the latter case it is *service contracting-in* – or *co-sourcing*: that is, the carrying out within the organization of processes with capital and know-how resources owned by others.

Oxford English Dictionary defines [the verb] *outsource* as:

... “to obtain ... by contract from a source outside the organization or area; to contract (work) out”,

and it specifies that:

“An outsourced process can be performed by a supplier that is totally independent from the organization, or which is part of the same parent organization (e.g. a separate department or division that is not subject to the same quality management system). It may be provided within the physical premises or work environment of the organization, at an independent site, or in some other manner” (Secretariat ISO/TC 176/SC 2/N 630R – ISO 9000, 2008).

The outsourcing can be *domestic* or carried out in another country; in the latter case it becomes *offshoring* (a term that is a mixture of *offshore* and *outsourcing*) if the country of the *outsourcer* is on another continent, or in any event a considerable distance away from the *outsourcee*. Outsourcing allows us to also examine the inverse process of *insourcing* that originates from the decision to internally carry out processes, phases or activities originally carried out by outside suppliers.

A *second feature* of outsourcing is the creation of a lasting and continuous supply relationship between the *outsourcee* and the *outsourcer*. This feature allows us to distinguish outsourcing from apparently similar operations such as subcontracting (Van Mieghem, 1999), which can take the form of an outside commission, a sub-supply contract or a subcontract.

Outsourcing is a flexible phenomenon; in theory everything can be outsourced, with the exclusion only of business or managerial activity. Regarding the logic behind the definition of outsourced processes, we can distinguish between:

a) *Business Process Outsourcing*, which indicates the *outsourcing* of the different phases of industrial production, distribution, R&D, maintenance, etc.

b) *Business Transformation Outsourcing*, which indicates a broad outsourcing process involving all the corporate functions, a true program of transformation of the business process that uses *outsourcing* as a resource to increase the firm's performance level.

In general, the more that processes and functions are easily replicable and standardizable, the greater the advantages of outsourcing. In fact, more frequently outsourcing involves: a) the production of parts, components and finished products; b) the production of industrial services such as maintenance, quality control, and the manufacture of accessories; c) research and development of new products and services; planning and design; d) administrative services such as accounting, managerial control, auditing, personnel management; e) the information system sector, which represents one of the focal points of the *outsourcing* process; f) managerial consulting services; g) logistical and transport services; h) canteen and cleaning services; i) the distribution network, promotions, advertising, and other marketing services; l) the management of liquid assets and the corporate treasury; receipts and payments services; m) the search for sources of financing.

3 – Managing complexity by outsourcing

Technical innovation and competition have made products increasingly complex. The Model FORD T was composed of 700 parts, while there are thousands of components in modern-day cars. Given this context, car manufacturers tend to manage the complexity of their products by *outsourcing* part of their production.

The outsourcing does not involve only acquiring components – through normal supply relationships – but externally acquiring *systems* of components that before were assembled in-house. This allows the firm with complex production activities to specialize in only a single part of its overall activity, outsourcing the other parts to specialized suppliers. For example, in car manufacturing several firms specialize in fuel injection (Bosch), others in electrical systems or brake systems (Brembo).

Thanks to production specialization, at each production level outsourcing can divide a growing complexity into more easily manageable parts. With the decline in transport costs and the development of the merchant marine and container ships, globalization has begun to separate the “geography of production” from the “geography of consumption” (Mella, 2019).

However, with the continued industrialization in some emerging countries, China and India in particular, outsourcing has taken on new forms – with the delocalization of entire production processes – and in many firms is at the center of choices regarding how best to compete. *Global*

outsourcing and *offshoring* are processes that best illustrate this tendency. Even the object of *outsourcing* is changing, with the birth of firms capable of stipulating contracts for the supply of outsourcing services on a global scale.

Indian firms such as TCS, WIPRO and Infosys have eroded the position gained by major firms such as EDS, Accenture and IBM. Whereas in the past they supplied only low-cost services such as software maintenance, they now offer complex functions, often in their customer's country of origin, dealing with innovation, value added, and the analysis of the needs of the final users of their customers' products or services.

Outsourcing is transforming production from a relationship involving the supply of materials, components and services into a network of competencies involving research and development and planning. Outsourcing has entered into new fields, from customer service to R&D to the study of new business models, even health care services. For example, a few minutes after admittance to a hospital in Philadelphia the x-rays of a patient are sent to a specialist in South Africa, who examines them and draws up a report which the physician in Philadelphia, through his own computer-aided tomography (CAT), uses to recommend the proper intervention. The pharmaceutical industry provides another example of the rapid evolution of the concept of outsourcing and its entry into new fields (Van Arnum, 2008).

Along these lines Champy writes, in his introduction to Koulopoulos and Roloff's (2006) book:

The forces of globalization have finally kicked in. ... Material and product sourcing move between multiple countries as a function of price, quality, and speed. And customers are everywhere expecting to be served with consistent quality and price, independent of location. The Internet has made markets global, even for the smallest company. In fact, information technology is the great enabler of those changes (Koulopoulos and Roloff's, 2006).

4 – Make or buy or strategic choice

As Williamson (1989), Chalos (1995), and Roodhooft and Warlop (1999) indicate, from a theoretical point of view the *propensity* of firms to adopt outsourcing is a function of the difference between the price of the external producer (the marginal cost of the external service market) and the marginal cost of in-house production. Along with this general motivation, other drivers spur on the decision to adopt outsourcing, with various studies attempting to indicate the most important.

Based on a survey of over 1,200 firms, Deavers (1997) identified five principal factors:

- 1) the need to increase the firm's focus on the core competencies;
- 2) guaranteeing access to world-class capacities and competencies;
- 3) accelerating the benefits from re-engineering, going so far as to rewrite the firm's processes from scratch;
- 4) sharing the risks between the outsourcee and the outsourcer;
- 5) the possibility of freeing up the firm's resources to focus attention on the management of the core competencies.

According to other authors, outsourcing can be viewed as the answer to the competition from imports from countries with low unskilled labor costs, which forces firms to shift unskilled labor activities abroad. According to Sharpe (1997), outsourcing arises to reduce the costs the firm deals, in order to respond to economic change, and concurrently create flexibility. Abraham and Taylor (1996), on the other hand, believe firms adopt outsourcing for manufacturing and service transformations in order to give stability to production cycles and to benefit from the specialization of other firms.

Heshmati (2003) instead notes that the outsourcing decision is complex due to sunk costs, stating unequivocally: "The choice to continue production in-house or to undertake it externally through outsourcing involves considerations other than just the difference between production cost and supply cost", going on to claim that outsourcing should not be considered as simply a make-or-buy decision, based solely on a comparison of *explicit costs*, but also refer to previous investments that give rise to "sunk costs" for the firm. Without their total amortization, sunk costs can have a negative effect on the decision to adopt outsourcing for production.

In recent years outsourcing has moved from being a pure make or buy tactical decision to becoming part of a strategy for changing the way business is done. In fact, by tradition firms originally considered outsourcing as a solution to short-term problems, such as a sudden or unexpected increase in demand, an interruption in plant or equipment functioning, or the launch of a new product. Today firms consider outsourcing as a *network of stable agreements* with specialized suppliers as part of a long-term *strategic perspective*.

According to Quinn and Hilmer (1994), from a *strategic perspective* outsourcing allows management to optimize the firm's resources in four principal ways:

1) by maximizing the output from internal resources by concentrating investment and effort on what the firm "does best";

2) by developing the core competencies by setting up barriers against present or future competitors who might try to enter the firm's areas of interest, thereby protecting its competitive advantages;

3) by utilizing the investments of outside firms, as well as their innovations, skills and specializations, which could be maintained in-house only through continuous investments and innovation;

4) by reducing the risks from rapidly changing markets and fast-evolving technology; an outsourcing strategy shifts the risks involving technological updating and R&D costs outside the firm, thereby shortening the production cycles, and making responses to customer needs more flexible and rapid.

It has never been easy to develop long-lasting competitive advantages, but in a competitive and technological environment that is vaster and more dynamic than in the past, firms must deal with complexity – from globalization, new technologies, and the emergence of new competitors – by turning to new strategies. Companies, both large and small, are increasingly outsourcing their activities by shifting what they traditionally handled in-house to external suppliers (Kotabe and Mol, 2009).

Prahalad and Hamel (1994) identified the core competencies – or fundamental competencies of the firm – as pertaining to a particular capacity: one or more specialistic functions, a particular technology, product design, and know-how. They also identified the requirements of a core competence: allowing access to several markets or segments; providing benefits for the customer; being difficult to imitate; acting across all the functions; being rooted in the organization and thus persisting even when certain individuals leave the firm.

In the new *millennium* outsourcing and offshoring have by now become the standard for firms constantly in search of new frontiers to compete worldwide. In reality several firms that already have a defined outlet market – especially in the agri-food sector, and for goods for which, in addition to their functions, the brand is also prevalent – produce partly in-house and partly by acquiring goods from outside producers in order to market them under their own brand. This policy is usually defined as "concurrent sourcing".

Concurrent sourcing refers only to the partial vertical integration of many homogeneous products or services by a single firm. In the literature partial integration indicates:

... “either backward or forward integration or some combination of these” ... “concurrent sourcing emphasizes that firms are making and buying the same good (Porter, 1980; Harrigan, 1985).

5 – Outsourcing as a strategic factor

Without claiming to be complete, we indicate below several strategies that consider outsourcing or offshoring as policies for achieving or consolidating competitive advantages.

An initial strategy favored by outsourcing is that which allows firms, by adopting the opposite approach to mass production as a means of reducing unit production costs, to segment the vertical production chain into a lean production process (Mella, 2020), thereby allowing the firm:

- 1) to reduce the preparation times of machines and complex systems;
- 2) to increase the use of machines and plants through better planning;
- 3) to facilitate quality control over all the stages in the production process.

Even in marketing decisions we note a symbiosis between production and marketing efficiency. On the one hand, the reduction of costs is facilitated by increases in the market share, and thus by aggressive policies regarding pricing, promotions and distribution. On the other hand, such policies are possible only if the firm can produce products customers perceive as having high value but at lower production costs.

This interaction is perceived through the ratio between “customer defection rate” and unit costs. Customer defection is an indirect indicator of the loyalty of customers, which in turn depends on the firm’s ability to satisfy its clientele with production that exhibits the maximum ratio between utility and cost for the customer. This means that the reduction of the customer defection rate is fundamental for acquiring significant cost economies.

If a function or phase of the *vertical chain* is outsourced, it is indispensable for the firm to closely control the quality of the production of components, even more so if this involves finished products (Mella, 2018). If outsourcing involves *outgoing logistics*, from packaging to shipping, it is fundamental for the firm to maintain direct control over customer deliveries. In general, if the objective is to maintain a low customer defection rate, then the key marketing functions should not be outsourced, and the firm must always maintain regular contact with the customer.

The R&D function contributes in various ways to productive efficiency by studying new products and designing processes which are increasingly efficient and simple to realize through a reduction in the number of component parts and, as a result, in production times, necessary manpower, machine times, and high-potency energy as well. Outsourcing R&D is a difficult choice, but in recent years this policy has spread widely through international agreements or participation in joint ventures for the research and design of products, parts or components. Against such advantages is the risk entailed by the outsourcing not only of R&D activities but also of the most innovative and reserved business ideas, thereby clearly revealing to the outsourcer the present and planned productive strategies of the business transformation. Thus for many firms the R&D function represents an essential function for the core business, and outsourcing this function should be undertaken with extreme care and caution.

Particularly interesting findings from recent empirical research are those by A.T. Kearney, who, in three main studies, investigated a sample of firms worldwide who have adopted outsourcing. Among the different results from the studies, one that is useful to point out is that the outsourcing drivers can be grouped into three large categories, each of which includes four significant drivers:

- 1) cost reduction (reduction in operating costs, reduction in investments, variabilization of costs, managing downsizing);
- 2) access to competencies (focusing on the core business, access to technologies, access to skills, integration of competencies);
- 3) increase in revenues (improved reactivity, speed to market, quality improvement, customer response time).

6 – Outsourcing and offshoring redefine corporate boundaries

As discussed in the preceding section, the spur toward outsourcing and offshoring has brought out two fundamental concepts regarding the choice of corporate boundaries: the “tactical” concept, according to which the boundaries of the firm’s processes are defined by short-term “tactical” planning, and the “strategic” one, which defines the boundaries using long-term strategic planning.

According to the “tactical” concept, the firm’s economic boundaries extend, in an “economically natural” way, only to those processes whose in-house cost is lower than that obtainable by outsourcing the processes. The make or buy decisions would guarantee the proper extension of the boundaries. The boundaries are also tactically defined by the possibility of transforming part of the fixed costs – by reducing investments in machinery and equipment (Bettis et al, 1992) for in-house processes that cease after outsourcing – into variable costs, represented by the prices paid to the outsourcer, thereby gaining greater productive flexibility with the additional advantage of having access to the most recent technologies without any additional investment burden (Lei and Hitt, 1993). In short, the *tactical view* considers outsourcing as a way of solving a specific problem, which could be the lack of in-house competencies or of financial resources, or the need to reduce the management workload and to leave room for the choice of core businesses.

The “strategic” concept focuses, on the other hand, on analyzing the ability to compete, the competitive advantages, and the competitive position with respect to competitors. Ford and Farmer (1986) and Welch and Nayak (1992) explicitly accuse firms of being nearsighted regarding past decisions, when outsourcing was viewed as a “tactical” instrument *par excellence*, as well as an instrument for cost reduction; these authors conclude that a “strategic” vision can give better results than could be obtained if only the cost factor is considered. Considering outsourcing from a strategic point of view means also considering a set of key factors – such as the use of strategic alliances (Prahalad and Hamel, 1990; Reich and Manking, 1986), the concentration of resources on the core competencies, the analysis of activities that are part of the value chain, and the relations with suppliers and customers within the value chain itself – thereby evaluating and producing stable competitive advantages that can be sustained in the long run.

The most important reason for evaluating outsourcing from a strictly “strategic” point of view is linked to the need for the firm to redefine the boundaries of its business portfolio, concentrating resources not only on the core competencies – thereby allowing more time for management to deal with strategic activities (Blumberg, 1998) – but also, and above all, on the core businesses (Dess et al, 1995; Kotabe and Murray, 1990, 2008; Quinn, 1992). Concentrating resources on those market/sectoral businesses the firm knows best and can develop more efficiently in-house allows the outsourcer to search for the factors of efficiency in the production activities of the outsourced businesses.

Quinn and Hilmer (1994) have pointed out that, in order to make rational decisions regarding outsourcing from a “strategic” point of view, firms must above all identify the sources of their competitive advantages in order to:

- 1) concentrate resources on those core competencies that create value for the customer in a distinct and inimitable way;
- 2) outsource those processes and activities for which the firm has neither any strategic needs nor particular competencies, often including many which in the past were traditionally considered an integral part of any strategy.

Kedia et al (2005) refer to Porter's (1985) generic strategies concept to assess the advantages and risks of outsourcing production, affirming that outsourcing – though their reasoning is even more pertinent to offshoring – can allow the firm to combine and obtain advantages from all three areas of generic strategies: cost leadership, product differentiation and focus.

The authors deal with the problem of how to select the functions, processes and, in general, the activities that can be outsourced, noting that this selection requires management to undertake a detailed analysis to: 1) clearly specify the firm's value chain; 2) distinguish the core and non-core competencies; 3) define the value chain of the core competencies; 4) distinguish the essential from the non-essential activities; 5) separate the core or quasi-core activities from the non-core ones.

7 – Toward global sourcing and offshoring

Since for each outsourcee the strategic intent is always to increase economic efficiency and profitability, outsourcing and offshore activities are based on a single strategy, called offshoring, whereby national firms that outsource become multinational ones.

Offshoring is introduced as:

... "an organizational reconfiguration in which originally co-located activities are relocated across distances in captive or outsourced arrangements, which must subsequently be reintegrated" (Mudambi and Venzin, 2010).

"Offshoring connotes sourcing products or services from either a foreign-based supplier that is independent of the domestic firm (outsourced operation) or a foreign-based subsidiary of the firm whose home country is where the headquarter is located (captive operation)" (Lo et al, 2015).

Recent theoretical research exclusively focuses on internationally outsourced activities (offshore outsourcing) (Bunyaratavej et al, 2007; Kedia and Lahiri, 2007). Offshoring is configured if the entrust of activities occurs in another continent or in another country at a great distance from the outsourcer. Forrester Research considers offshoring productions made at a distance of more than 500 miles from the final assembly site (Pellicelli, 2009a).

Offshoring has had a strong and rapid evolution since the 2008-2009 financial crisis. The main phases of an offshoring project are the same as in the recent past, but both the context in which offshoring evolves and the conditions that impact its execution have dramatically changed. Management was forced to continuously revise the boundaries of core competences and seek the highest level of flexibility because of a further acceleration of change in the first part of the 2010s. Thanks to their presence in several countries, multinationals can undertake a quite vast array of decision-making policies: producing internally or externally, as well as decisions regarding the countries whose firms are to serve as outsourcers. For such firms offshoring widens their field of application and evolves into a global sourcing strategy according to which the multinationals must develop a global view of the international supply of outsourcers in order to be able to rapidly shift offshoring from one country to another.

Offshoring and *global sourcing* may seem like strategies and problems of the modern globalized economy, however according to Kotabe and Helsen (1998), the shifting of production from one geographical area to another in the search for comparative advantages from location is not really that recent. Over the last two decades several trends have further spurred

outsourcing, making the links between firms located in different countries more widespread and stable, thereby favoring stable cooperation among them in an ever-wider production network.

As far back as 1990 Chandler stated that:

... "the cooperation among firms...represents one of the most fruitful and viable development paths for modern day capitalism. The use of cooperative relations among firms is a phenomenon that aims to deeply modify the governing mechanisms of the firm and the economic sectors, markets in particular, by redefining their operational boundaries" (Chandler, 1990, p. 175).

After pointing out how, in the '70s, the main currencies had strong oscillations, Kotabe and Helsen observe that in those years it was the changes in exchange rates that guided the sourcing strategies, together with differences in economic efficiency and labor costs among countries, especially in the Third World. Price was the main criterion – though not the only one – that guided the choice between in-house and domestic production, on the one hand, and outsourcing and offshoring on the other.

Toward the middle of the '80s the situation changed; variations in exchange rates lost some of their weight in the decisions to outsource abroad, and the focus shifted to quality and technology. Given that time is needed to prepare a supplier that will guarantee given levels of quality and technology, from a "strategic" perspective offshoring must move to develop long-term relations with the outsourcer or foreign suppliers, and in this regard fluctuating exchange rates are never considered a decisive factor in the decision to outsource to a certain country.

Innovations and changes in the infrastructures of international exchanges, progress in communications and transport, and new financial instruments have made the move to offshoring simpler. This tendency has made it easier for firms that utilize components to obtain products from foreign suppliers on more favorable terms than those in-house production would allow (Pellicelli, 2006).

The spread of just-in-time has strengthened the long-term relations between suppliers and customers and handed over more responsibility to management for purchases, shifting decision-making toward the top of the organization. In this context, outsourcing and offshoring have evolved: from a "tactical" decision they have increasingly become a "strategic" one, opening to global markets and favoring the development of global sourcing.

A growing number of firms have outsourced entire production processes by building production plants in various parts of the world which are closely controlled through various partnership forms. The increase in the demand for components in new geographical areas has favored the birth of component producing firms that initially were local and then became global. The long-term relations with these producers have, in turn, favored the transfer of R&D to the most disparate geographical areas, giving rise to what is tantamount to a "world" of firms without borders.

8 – The new form of outsourcing to achieve sustainable advantage

When the center of the global sourcing is a multinational company with several operational units in different countries, then the concepts of outsourcing and offshoring take on a specific meaning regarding both the way outsourcing occurs and the choice of country of origin of the outsourcers (Kotabe, Mol and Murray, 2009).

As regards the outsourcing decisions, multinational firms adopt various forms of sourcing which can be divided into two main areas:

a) "intra-firm sourcing", when the outsourcing of a unit belonging to the international group involves an outsourcer which is also inside the parent company or subsidiaries; in fact, at the group level there is no true outsourcing since, though the production occurs in different

units with respect to the parent company, it is still a question of in-house production for the group; this form is typical of banks and insurance companies that outsource their accounting, auditing, oversight, liquidation activities, to name but a few, entrusting these companies which, though autonomous, are entirely controlled by the parent company;

b) “real outsourcing”, when some of the group’s units outsource by turning to independent companies outside the group by means of contracts or various forms of alliance.

As far as “where” is concerned, from the point of view of the geographical location of production, “intra-firm sourcing” and “real outsourcing” can be considered from two different perspectives depending on whether the suppliers are domestic or foreign producers with respect to the outsourcee’s nationality.

The multinationals that choose the strategy of favoring their own group of operational units can acquire components, final products and services in the parent company’s country of origin (domestic in-house sourcing) or the foreign subsidiaries’ country (offshore subsidiary sourcing); in either case, within the group. If they instead opt for “real outsourcing”, the parent company or individual subsidiaries can either turn to producers in countries they operate in (domestic purchase arrangement) or to suppliers from other nations (offshoring). The choice among the various types of sourcing is particularly complex for a multinational company since, in terms of convenience, it is necessary to consider not only the drivers of production costs but also the trends in exchange rates, the efficiency of transport and communications infrastructures in the various countries, economic transparency, safety, the economic and cultural environment, and the attitude of governments toward foreign investment in order to prevent against risks from the movement of goods and capital.

Beginning in the ’80s, and parallel to the emergence of large companies based in low-cost-labor countries, offshoring gradually reduced its weight in production in many multinational companies regarding R&D, marketing and financing activities. According to Cohen and Zysmann (1987), many companies became convinced, wrongly in the opinion of many, that production could easily be transferred to other independent companies based on the differentials between internal and external production costs, without any loss of control over the capacity to compete. Precisely with reference to the cost of production as the sole, or prevalent decision-making criterion, many observers view offshoring and outsourcing as a genial solution to the cost differentials with emerging countries. Nevertheless, this opinion is not unanimously shared since the outsourcing of the industrial base means a true weakening in the capacity to compete. Maintaining for a while competitive advantage through R&D and marketing is possible, but over the short run firms in emerging countries manage to acquire distinctive skills even in these areas.

Some defenses exist to avoid strategic weakening from the outsourcing of the production functions:

1) marketing the brand in such a way that where it is produced and who produces it becomes irrelevant. In the area of sports clothing, Nike and Adidas are examples of success in this regard;

2) concentrating activities on quality niches, image and high prices so as to reduce outsourcing to the necessary minimum, erecting barriers to competition through a high-profile product use function;

3) aiming at the emerging markets by offering products at mid-range prices while bolstering the firm’s capacity for innovation. For several years Nokia has maintained high growth rates for revenues thanks to the growth in sales of mid-priced cell phones in emerging countries.

Along with the advantages it brings, global sourcing also has important disadvantages that operators and researchers view in a different way. The most obvious disadvantages derive from

the complexity in the management of contracts and from the differences among the partners in terms of traditions, culture and values (Mella and Gazzola, 2018).

Some observers even think that the outsourcing of production processes is behind the lower weight of this function in the value chain. Responding to the challenges from global competition by forming alliances with suppliers can represent an effective response, but in the long run there is no guarantee this strategy can always be repeated with the same positive results.

There are two obvious risks in this regard. The first arises from the uncertainty of suppliers, who are trying to stabilize their relationships with other firms by improving their performance by seeking out new buyers and expanding their markets; in the long run this behavior stimulates, even favors, the birth of new competitors. In order to ensure orders, some outsourcers renounce long-run decisions and accept the "captive" position of sub suppliers. Others decide instead to react to the uncertainty, trying to attain a position of autonomy by selling to other clients as well, to achieve economies of scale. For the multinational the result may be to open the market to new competitors (who use the same supplier), thus losing a once-dominant position. The second risk comes from the loss in designing capabilities (Pellicelli 2009a; 2009b).

Outsourcing through outside suppliers "disseminates" technological innovations, thereby once again favoring the birth or strengthening of competitor firms and, in the long run, weakening the firm's ability to compete in terms of both costs and innovations to the production process. It would undoubtedly be preferable to maintain control of critical know-how within the firm, but technological innovation and the new needs of consumers shorten products' life cycles.

To decide whether to pursue an outsourcing strategy it is necessary to determine if this will lead to a long-term sustainable competitive advantage with respect to carrying out these activities internally. Management must focus attention on the core competencies and those areas in which the firm can develop a competitive advantage, transferring the other activities to several suppliers that are better able to carry these out. Thus, outsourcing becomes one of the most effective options.

Nevertheless, there are numerous risks to this strategy, and this creates resistance on the part of management. Moreover, some functions can be outsourced at considerably less risk to a company than others: for example, benefits administration, maintenance, and telemarketing are considered to be low risk. In contrast, customer service, accounting transactions and computer services are considered to be medium risk and such areas as investment analysis, cash flow forecasting, and product pricing are believed to be high-risk functions for outsourcing. So management must be able to identify those activities to outsource and manage the outsourcing strategy phases' without risking negative effects on its competitive capacity.

In many industries, only companies that manage to be competitive globally can aspire to attain sustainable competitive advantages over rivals. Rapidly shifting conditions in the marketplace have made offshoring a vital part of any search for sustainable competitive advantage and consequently for global strategies to lead the way to new business models, on the one hand by reducing costs, and therefore improving profitability, and on the other by reducing the investment needs of outsourcers, thereby increasing shareholder value.

In the last twenty-five years, the intensity of price competition in Western national markets has increased, prompting more and more companies to look for any way to lower costs. Many firms have looked offshore for their manufacturing and service needs, often keeping at the centre of their organization only design, R&D and marketing. For this reason, and under the pressure of technological and political change and global excess capacities, offshoring has gradually become an integral part of a broader business strategy.

Lowering costs and having access to new skills is the first motive for offshoring; however, a policy of giving priority to strategic factors such as increased flexibility, finding an engine for

innovation, gaining access to global markets, and inducing changes in the organization has gained hold (Yeo, Saboori-Deilami, 2017). The context for managerial decisions about offshoring has changed dramatically in recent years. Management is now confronted with a higher level of complexity and disruptions brought about in particular by the new waves of globalization and the irresistible march of technological disruption.

Globalization has spurred progress both in emerging countries and in developed ones, but its inherent nature has also created instability. We define "the new waves of globalization" as an abrupt change in the degree of internalization of production and in the scope of offshore transactions that have occurred in the recent past. Since the financial crisis in 2008, the environment of international trade and investment has changed dramatically. As consequence, most companies in industrialized countries that have looked abroad for manufacturing or services and invested at home in core competences were forced to rethink their offshoring strategy.

Over the last two decades, technological progress has had a strong effect on offshoring decisions and their execution. Modern methods have continued to tear apart traditional practices, with many supply chains facing challenging times, requiring in many instances rewriting the supplier network (Vervest, 2005; Young et al, 2012; Tamás, 2018). Technology may open segments to new competitors from industries far from those the firms were nearest to in the past. Those competitors are often cash rich and looking for new investments (i.e. Apple and Google). The consequences of these changes are the revival of reshoring and the frequent disequilibrium of power among players in the supply chain. Above all, there is an "unbeatable" uncertainty that can be faced only with more flexibility in designing the supply chain and in managing it.

The productions are increasingly complex due to technological innovation (Kang et al, 2012) and companies try to manage complexity by outsourcing. The progressive industrialization brought outsourcing to take new forms – entrusting to third parties entire production functions - and many companies are increasingly at the center of choices on how to achieve sustainable advantage. The creation of firms able to sign contracts for the provision of outsourcing services on a global scale as changed the object of outsourcing. Currently they compete in the field of innovation, value added and the analysis of consumer demand for goods and services. In this context, the best companies in emerging countries seek their own competitive advantages (Van Agtmael, 2007): paying adequate attention to quality and design; building a solid "brand image"; reacting before other companies to new market trends; acquiring Western companies to use patents, brands and know-how; maintain an advantage over rivals in Information Technology; choosing the best market niches; adopting unconventional marketing strategies. Some of these companies are able to compete with Western companies with a long tradition. For these reasons offshoring strategies are transforming the traditional firms functions in a network of competencies. It has also spread to new fields, from customer service to research and development, seeking for new business models, even in the compass of health care services. The pharmaceutical industry witnesses the great evolution of outsourcing towards new areas (Van Arnum, 2008).

However, there are strong concerns in the policy makers of the most advanced countries to stop the continuous bleeding of jobs. The weapon of protectionism could become ineffective because, in a global economy, prohibiting the use of outsourcing would make the domestic companies less competitive. The only effective defense is to focus and invest in innovation which, by requiring large investments in training and often large amounts of capital, is normally precluded by low-cost and low-tech companies.

9 – Conclusions

The spread of global sourcing through the growth in outsourcing and offshoring, and the formation of stable relations between the outsourcee and the outsourcers/suppliers, is changing the nature itself of firms. Companies can develop sustainable competitive advantages by focusing resources exclusively on the core competencies and the core business and transferring those activities, processes, or even entire functions, with fewer risks than others (Bragg, 2006). Management should be able to choose which activities and processes, or functions entrust to third parties in outsourcing.

In this panorama firms are taking on a nuanced form in a series of new “network” structures – also defined as a whole as holonic networks (Davidow and Malone, 1992) – that widen and make more fluid the boundary of the firm’s economic activities, at the same time making it increasingly difficult to circumscribe its boundaries.

The typical structure of a networked firm involves a group of companies linked by outsourcing or offshoring contracts, which allow them to be autonomous while at the same time to cooperate and coordinate operations through the network, which makes them similar to a single economic enterprise (Mella, 2020; Pellicelli, 2017). For this reason, networked firms are also called holonic firms, or virtual firms (Mella, 2019; Pellicelli 2018a; Pellicelli 2018b; Wang and Chan, 2010).

The most typical holonic networks are the interfirm networks – or manufacturing networks – which are made up of operating units which are relatively independent from a financial, economic, and organizational, though not legal, point of view, being similar in nature to autonomous organizations. Such networks are bolstered by participatory relationships, formal outsourcing contracts, alliances, or joint ventures. What characterizes the networks are the common interests of its members regarding the operation of the value chain of a single business. Even in groups that arise from the processes of intra-firm sourcing, with direct corporate control by the outsourcee, a network of firms can develop when stable production and economic relationships develop as a result of outsourcing. Often the outsourcing relationships for a well-identified business develop in a single geographically bounded area which houses both the outsourcees and the outsourcers, thereby forming an industrial district. Within these districts the inter-firm relations are not only of a productive nature but also concern knowledge creation, the passing on of knowledge, and training regarding competencies. In both cases new business models are developed which are carried out by outsourcees/suppliers that outsource to each other functions, processes, and competencies to develop a comakership system, thereby favoring the spread of knowledge among all the network’s units.

This tendency to outsource most of the firm’s functions and processes can take an “extreme” form – what can be defined as “extreme outsourcing” – leading to the creation of a virtual organization, a firm characterized by pure business coordination in which all the production and economic processes are externalized through the formation of a stable but flexible network.

10 – References

- Abraham, K. & Taylor, T. (1996). Firms’ use of outside contractors: theory and evidence. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 14, 394-424.
- Besanko, D., Dranove, D. & Shanley, M. (2005). *Economics of strategy*. Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.
- Bettis, R. A., Bradley, S. & Hamel, G. (1992). Outsourcing and industrial decline. *Academy of Management Executive*, 6(1), 7-22.
- Blumberg, D. F. (1998). Strategic assessment of outsourcing and downsizing in the service market. *Managing Service Quality*, 8(1), 5-8.
- Bragg, S. M. (2006). *Outsourcing: A guide to... Selecting the correct business unit... Negotiating the contract... Maintaining control of the process*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

- Brinkley, D. (2003). *Wheels for the world*. Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Bunyaratavej, K., Hahn, E. D. & Doh, J. P. (2007). International offshoring of services: A parity study. *Journal of International Management*, 13(1), 7-21.
- Chalos, P. (1995). Costing, control and strategic analysis in outsourcing decisions. *Journal of Cost Management*, Winter, 31-37.
- Deavers, K. (1997). Outsourcing: a corporate competitiveness strategy, not a search for low wages. *Journal of Labor Research*, 18(4), 503-519.
- Chandler, A. (1990). *Scale and Scope: the Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*. Balknap Press, Cambridge.
- Cohen, S. & Zysmann, J. (1987). *Manufacturing Matters*. Basic Books, Inc., New York.
- Copeland, T., Koller, T. & Murrin, J. (2000). *Valuation: Measuring and Managing the Value of Companies*, 3rd ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Davidow, W. H. & Malone, M. (1992). *The virtual corporation*. HarperBusiness, New York.
- Dess G. G., Rasheed A., Mclaughlin K & Priem R. (1995). The new corporate architecture. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9(3),7-20.
- Dipartimento della Funzione Pubblica (2003). Guida all'Esternalizzazione di servizi e attività strumentali nella Pubblica Amministrazione. Come, Quando e Perché Esternalizzare: http://www.cantieripa.it/allegati/Guida_Esternalizzazioni_FINALE.doc
- Domberger, S. (1998). *The Contracting Organization. A Strategic Guide to Outsourcing*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Espino-Rodríguez, T. F., Lai, P. C., & Baum, T. (2008). Asset specificity in make or buy decisions for service operations: An empirical application in the Scottish hotel sector. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 19(1), 111-133.
- Ford, D. & Farmer, D. (1986). Make or buy – a key strategic issue. *Long Range Planning*, 19(5), 54-62.
- Gartner (2004). *Dataquest Research: Outsourcing Worldwide*. Forecast Database, August 18/04.
- Harrigan, K. (1985). Vertical integration and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2(2), 397-425.
- Heshmati, A. (2003). Productivity growth, efficiency and outsourcing in manufacturing and service industries. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 17(1), 79-112.
- Jennings, D. (1997). Strategic guidelines for outsourcing decisions. *Strategic Changes*, 6, 85-96.
- Kang, M., Wu, X., Hong, P. & Park, Y. (2012). Aligning organizational control practices with competitive outsourcing performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(8), 1195-1201.
- Kearney, A. T. (2005). Outsourcing Strategically for Sustainable Competitive Advantage: http://www.atkearney.com/shared_res/pdf/Strat_Outsourcing_S.pdf
- Kedia, B., Lahiri, S. & Lovvorn, A. (2005). Seeking competitive advantage on distant shores. *EBF*, (21).
- Kotabe, M. & Helsen, K. (1998). *Global Marketing Management*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Kotabe, M., & Mol, M. J. (2009). Outsourcing and financial performance: A negative curvilinear effect. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 15(4), 205-213.
- Kotabe, M., Mol, M. J. & Murray J.Y. (2009). Global Sourcing Strategy in M. Kotabe, K. Helsen (2009). *International Marketing*, Sage Publications.
- Kedia, B., Lahiri, S. & Lovvorn, A. (2005). A. Seeking competitive advantage on distant shores. *European Business Forum*, 21, 37-40.
- Kotabe, M., Mol, M. J. & Murray, J. (2008). Outsourcing, performance, and the role of e-commerce: A dynamic perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, January, 37 (1), 37-45.
- Kotabe, M. & Murray, J. (1990). Linking product and process innovations and models of international sourcing in global competition: a case of foreign multinational firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21(3), 383-408.
- Koulopoulos, T. & Roloff, T. (2006). *Smartsourcing. Driving innovation and growth through outsourcing*. Platinum Press.

- Kumar, S., Aquino, E. & Anderson, E. (2007). Application of a process methodology and a strategic decision model for business process outsourcing. *Information Knowledge Systems Management*, 6(4), 323-342.
- Lankford, W. M. & Parsa, F. (1999). Outsourcing: a primer. *Management Decision*, 37(4), 310-316.
- Lei, D. & Hitt, M. (1995). "Strategic restructuring and outsourcing: the effect of mergers and acquisitions and LBOs on building skills and capabilities. *Journal of Management*, 21(5), 835-859.
- Lewin, A., Massini, S. & Peeters, C. (2009). Why are companies offshoring innovation? The emerging global race for talent. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(6), August.
- Lo, Y. J., & Hung, T. M. (2015). Structure offshoring and returns on offshoring. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 32(2), 443-479.
- Mella, P. (2005). Performance Indicators in Business Value-Creating Organizations. *Economia Aziendale 2000 web*, 2, 25-52.
- Mella, P. (2008). *Aziende 1*, Franco Angeli, Milano.
- Mella, P. (2018). Quality a Key Value Driver in Value Based Management. *Economia Aziendale Online*, 9(4), 439-462.
- Mella, P. (2019). The ghost in the production machine: The laws of production networks. *Kybernetes*, 48(6), 1301-1329.
- Mella, P. (2020, 2-nd ed). *The Magic Ring: Systems Thinking Approach to Control Systems*. Springer. New York, Dordrecht, London.
- Mella, P. & Gazzola, P. (2004). From values to "value" - From the creation of the value of firms to sustainable growth. *Economia Aziendale 2000 Web*, 3, 1-18.
- Mella, P. & Gazzola, P. (2018). The Capitalistic Firm as a System that Produces Economic and Social Values. In *Contemporary Trends and Challenges in Finance: Proceedings from the 3rd Wroclaw International Conference in Finance*. Springer International Publishing (183-190).
- Mella, P. & Pellicelli, M. (2008). The Origin of Value Based Management: Five Interpretative Models of an Unavoidable Evolution. *International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, VIII(2), 23-32.
- Mudambi, R., & Venzin, M. (2010). The strategic nexus of offshoring and outsourcing decisions. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(8), 1510-1533.
- Pellicelli, M. (2006). The New Economics of Outsourcing: Empirical Evidence from the Textile-Apparel Industry. *Economia Aziendale 2000 Web*, 4, 1-11.
- Pellicelli, M. (2007). *Creazione di valore e Value Based Management*. Giappichelli, Torino.
- Pellicelli, M. (2009a). *L'outsourcing e l'offshoring nell'economia dell'impresa*. Giappichelli, Torino.
- Pellicelli, M. (2009b). From outsourcing to offshoring and virtual organizations. How management is redefining corporate boundaries. *International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, IX(7), 77-88.
- Pellicelli, M. (2018a). Strategie di outsourcing e offshoring. Dal global sourcing all'impresa olonica. *Economia Aziendale Online*, 9(1), 47-70.
- Pellicelli, M. (2018b). Gaining flexibility and innovation through offshore outsourcing. *Sustainability*, 10(5), 1672, 1-12.
- Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage*. Free Press, New York.
- Prahalad, C. K. & Hamel G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3), 79-91.
- Quinn, J. B. (1992). *Intelligent Enterprise: a knowledge and service based paradigm for industry*. Free Press, New York.
- Quinn, J. B. & Hilmer, F.G. (1994). Strategic outsourcing. *Sloan Management Review*, Summer, 35(4), 43-55.
- Reich, R. & Manking, E. G. (1986). Joint venture with Japan gives away or future. *Harvard Business Review*, 64(2), 78-90.

- Roodhooft, F. & Warlop, L. (1999). On the role of sunk costs and asset specificity in outsourcing decisions: a research note. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 24, 363-369.
- Secretariat ISO/TC 176/SC 2/N 630R - ISO 9000 (2008). *Guidance on Outsourced Processes*, https://www.iso.org/files/live/sites/isoorg/files/archive/pdf/en/04_concept_and_use_of_the_process_approach_for_management_systems.pdf
- Sharpe, M. (1997). Outsourcing organizational competitiveness and work. *Journal of Labor Research*, 18(4), 535-549.
- Tamás, P. (2018). Innovative Business Model for Realization of Sustainable Supply Chain at the Outsourcing Examination of Logistics Services. *Sustainability*, 10, 210.
- Van Agtmael, A. (2007). *The emerging markets century: How a new breed of world-class companies is overtaking the world*. Simon and Schuster.
- Van Arnum, P. (2008). PHARMA INGREDIENTS-Outsourcing Strategies of Emerging Pharma-Lessons learned for successful customer-supplier relations. *Pharmaceutical Technology*, 32(10), 48.
- Van Mieghem, J. A., (1999). Coordinating investment, production and subcontracting. *Management Science*, 45 (7), 954-970.
- Vervest P., Heck E., Preiss K., & Pau F. (2005). *Smart Business Networks.*: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, Springer, 159–167.
- Yeo C., & Saboori-Deilami V. (2017). Strategic challenges of outsourcing innovation in global market. *Asia Pacific Journal Innovation Entrepreneurship*, 11, 5–16.
- Young D., & Hawkins T., Ingwersen W., Lee J., Ruiz-Mercado G., Sengupta D., Smith, R.L. (2012). Designing sustainable supply chains. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 29, 253–258.
- Wang, W.Y., & Chan, H.K. (2010). Virtual organization for supply chain integration: Two cases in the textile and fashion retailing industry. *International Journal Production Economy*, 127, 333–342.
- Welch, J. A. & Nayak, P. R. (1992). Strategic sourcing: a progressive approach to the make or buy decision. *Academy of Management Executive*, 6(1), 23-30.
- Williamson, O. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. Free Press, New York.
- Williamson, O. (1989). *Transaction cost economics*. In Schmalensee R., Willig R., (eds), *Handbook of Industrial Organization*. Elsevier, Volume 1, Amsterdam (pp. 136-181).