ISSN No:-2456-2165

No Firm is an Island: Producers and Resource Holders in the Vortex of Inconsistencies

Symeon Mandrinos
Swinburne University of Technology, Sarawak

Abstract:- This study offers insights in relation to the fast-moving consumer goods product of origin context, and it describes some boundary conditions. Due to the interplay between resources, main recipients and home rivalry it is hereby proposed that a firm producing products of origin is not necessarily resource dependent; thereby sideling the robust relationship of farmers producing product of origin vis-à-vis the final producers. This study proposes that in the case of firms producing products of origin, the interaction of raw material, production and the final product per se will throw the farmers and final producers alike into the vortex of inconsistencies in addition to the international market environment may cause extra alterations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Resource dependence is an essential component to illustrate how firms seize control of vital resources (Hessels and Terjesen, 2010, Ulrich and Barney, 1984). Numerous studies have been conducted under the banner of the resource dependence theory (RDT), however, the theory shows a weakness to produce consistent results (Casciaro and Piskorski, 2005, Drees and Heugens, 2013). Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) explain the reason to efficiently manage resource dependence managerial actions are merely used. Other scholarly outcomes show how resources as raw material competition and shortage become determinant forces (Davis and Cobb, 2010) and how access and shortage to resources drives the usage of alternative raw material (Aldrich and Pfeffer, 1976, Drees and Heugens, 2013). Wilkinson et al (2000) explain firms are dependent together for continued existence. Firms are not islands, they are not self-efficient (Wilkinson et al., 2000: 276) and thus their pressure for expansion precipitates the accessibility to external resources (Drees and Heugens, 2013). From this lens, to harvest the required resources firms not only depend on alternative resources (Hessels and Terjesen, 2010, Zigan, 2013) but also seek to avoid uncertainty rising from interdependence and the presence of expansion (Davis and Cobb, 2010, Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978).

This paper sheds light on the unexplored Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCGs) context. According to scholars, the role of context received a generous attention in various academic fields (Johns, 2006, Zahra, 2007) showing a meaningful concentration in international business literature (Poulis et al., 2013). This significance lies in the notion of the multidimensional nature of RDT and firms' export development. In particular, from an FMCG firms export development perspective, the literature attempts to highlight the presence of specific practices, nevertheless, few of the FMCG multidimensional practices have been empirically explored (Francis, 2006, Sakellariou et al., 2014).

In choosing an industry context to study the RDT, this research focuses on FMCG Protected Designation of firms with product of origin (PDO). There are a number of reasons for this condition. First, PDO firms play a critical role within the European Union economic market. Second, the FMCG industry exert impact on firms' export economic growth, employment and social integration (Alonso and Bressan, 2014, E.C., 2014). Because products of origin are under the auspice of standard production procedure and origin regulations, then firms are orchestrated mainly by domestic natural raw material and therefore these firms cannot utilize foreign natural resources. Thus, in their effort to control resources (E.C., 2006, E.C, 2012) the decision of managers is guided by institutional constraints (Katsikeas and Piercy, 1993, Judge et al., 2011). Third, the significance of the protection of designation of raw material is stressed on diverse geographical locations. Similar to the European protected designation FMCG rationale the same logic builds its presence within the ASEAN boundaries. For instance, the product with origin in an FMCG industry is important for the export practices of the Indian economy (Rameshan, 2008). Darjeeling tea offers India a high quality FMCG product visibility in the world market as the product is legally protected under the Geographical Indication Registry of India preventing any tea grown outside India from being called Darjeeling (IntellectualPropertyIndia, 2004, Srivastava, 2005). This policy was made to maintain both the domestic and export competitiveness of the product.

Thailand shares complementarities with Indian example as one of the leading markets on the packaging of FMCG food products scenario. The country is the number one rice exporter in the world with its products of origin, in particular the Jasmine rice, having a well-built international presence (FAO, 2010, NSO, 2013). Rice production of origin plays a vital role in Thailand's socio-economic development, making the country the world's largest rice exporter (TMoA, 2015). According to FAO (2010), the country's export policy is to maintain the focal and foreign competitiveness of the product; yet, the country's public policy appears to be erratic. Captured by special interests, Thailand's socio-economic development become instable with local firms' private expectations also be destabilized.

Another example of a south east Asian countries, Malaysia, is a palm oil producer. The country's palm oil industry offers an oil commodity with high valued products of origin (Anuar, 2012) has become one of the Malaysia's key socioeconomic drivers (Kamalrudin and Abdullah., 2014).

ISSN No:-2456-2165

Palm oil product appears in supermarkets with global brands consisting among others cooking oils, margarine, detergents and cosmetics (Cheng, 2009). However, different socio-economic determinants create instability with a direct effect on local firms' expectations also be destabilized.

The objective of this study is to investigate the interaction between resource dependence and FMCG products under the protected designation example has attracted limited scholarly attention. Grounded on the significance of the protection of designation of raw material is stressed on diverse geographical locations, this study encourages an FMCG cross dialogue between RDT and PDO in different environments. The findings of this study focused on a European Union market exhibit a diverse relationship between resource dependence and protected designation institutional constraints. Despite the fact the PDO institutional constraints of the European Agriculture and Rural Development Policy, a whirlpool of inconsistency between the PDO producers and resource actors is created. This inconsistency contradicts to legitimacy, rural development and the desire for economic growth and the firms to preserve domestic and export competitiveness.

This study makes a new contribution in resource dependence settings. In this regard, the study proposes, for an FMCG firm producing products of origin, a robust relationship between farmers and final producers is sidelined. Similarly, this study proposes, for an FMCG firm producing products of origin, cost is positively related to producers' financial distress and impediments in their export processes. Finally, this study proposes, an FMCG firm producing products of origin is not necessarily resource dependent on specialized farmers due to the interplay between resources, main recipients and home competition.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows; first introduction and the theoretical background, followed by the method of investigation, analysis and the discussion section. In the discussion section, the findings are integrated with existing literature to increase the potential insight and theoretical contribution of this research. Finally, in the last section, the limits of the study are discussed alongside the implications for future research.

II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

For different reasons, the resource dependence as a theory concentrates on how firms can access resources; otherwise, firms with the most resources have the least dependence on others. Drees and Heugens (2013) found that the formation of resource dependence is linked to firms' autonomy whilst Davis and Cobb (2010) and Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) found that firms not being autonomously dependent, conditions arise which led those firms to uncertainty concerning their survival. To avoid risk and manage dependency on resources, firms develop new platforms of reliance affecting their behaviour. This mechanism of dependence is set not only on employing a sole-source supplier, but also in engaging alternative solutions such as interdependencies, which is one of the standard practices in manufacturing (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003).

But as firms exhibit dependence, they engage in solutions maintaining a kind of individuality in holding resources. Firms utilize collaborative agreements contributing to their resources (Gulati et al., 2000) to keep bilateral dependencies (Casciaro and Piskorski, 2005) via legitimate, and appropriate actions within proper constructed systems (Suchman, 1995). This enables them to preserve and become flexible to utilize the exit option legally termed as the 'exit clause' or 'escape clause', in any collaborative agreements, in case resource suppliers may hold an unconventional logic (Durand and Jourdan, 2012).

Availability of resources is relevant to the location and the nature of the suppliers (i.e., raw material). The location of suppliers, stimulate management to build robust export relationships (Wilkinson et al., 2000) wherein firms have access to competitive focal resources, and those resources will propel them to exceed competition (Snowdon and Stonehouse, 2006). Where financial and raw material resources are easily accessible and available, recipient firms benefit from favourable resources within the domestic industry (Porter, 1998, Porter, 1990). Yet, firms, in the zeal of wrestling off dependence held over them, they struggle to increase bargaining power over others (Elg, 2000). Merely it is the firm that operates within the industry wielding strong impact on specific external resources that affect not only the industry's attractiveness (Kamasak, 2011) but also shaping of the firm's export propensity and growth (Porter, 2004, Porter, 2008).

Firms perform better when resources fit to the inner and outer competitive environment. In this regard, firms to accord market value, they develop an economic value in relation to their rivals, due to the impact of resources in managing production and exports. Because of its conditions of specifications relating to FMCG product of origin; resources employed in products of origin such as PDOs, share a range of characteristics that is its intrinsic value, rarity and undisputed originality. The conditions of specifications protect against substitute products running counter to the incompetency of competitors who may try to acquire the same resources, but in the end competitors will act as counterfeiters (El-Shafeey and Trott, 2014, Porter, 2004). According to PDO regulation, resource as raw material is the foundation of products of origin. Essentially, raw material is preserved in international business literature, wherein it is deemed as the primary factor in designating whether a country's production will excel over other foreign destinations at both the national and international level (Porter, 1990).

III. METHODOLOGY

This investigation follows a qualitative approach (Crotty, 2003, Creswell, 2009) within the realism paradigm and case study research. From the outset, this study investigates six cases for preliminary studies (Saunders et al., 2007, Welch et al., 2002). It cross examines those cases via

ISSN No:-2456-2165

semi-structure in-depth interviews, documents and direct observations. Two types of firms were decided to be used from the Hellenic Milk Organisation database; three medium and three small, on account of the large majority of European Union product of origin firms are SMEs. The unit of analysis, are the firms where the key representatives provide the make and selection of export decisions (Hackett and Dilts, 2008, Yin, 2009). Two Owners, two Export Managers, one Export Agent and one Sales Director were interviewed. Through this study the researcher determined two main reasons not to use small firms for the core investigation. Firstly, small firms highly influenced by the domestic environment became secretive and reluctant due to fear of leaking proprietary information. Secondly these firms did not have export department, and consequently were not directly engaged with exporting. Contrariwise, these firms internationalise via market agents, in sharp contrast to medium and larger firms in the field. The main objective in this research is to opt for information rich cases (Gerring, 2004) and to search for disparities across cases with an intention of replication logic on how these they internationalise. Therefore, the sampling reasoning of small and medium enterprises, changed into medium and large units of analysis.

For the core study, two types of firms from the Hellenic Milk Organisation database are chosen. Thirteen firms showed interest to participate in this investigation but finally only nine cases decided respondents' sample list. The firms decided the chosen list, and the perception of managers' selection was not random but purposeful (Patton, 1990). Interviews were conducted from one Owner, three country's General Managers (USA-Bulgaria-Romania), eleven Export Managers/Directors, six Export Area Managers, three Export Assistants and one Marketing Manager.

Data is analysed by using a cross-case comparison to explain what the cases involve and increase generalisability (Gerring, 2004, Miles and Huberman, 1994, Ragin, 1987). The primary step was to group cases inside phases and reduce comprehensibly the inclusive amount of interview information. To increase trustworthiness and validate the results, a pilot study is used and multiple sources of evidence wherein internal validity is supported with data triangulation (interviews, secondary data and data analysis process). For example, interviews are triangulated with other sources, such as, documents (annual reports, press releases, published newspaper articles) and direct observations, essential for a case study (Gerring, 2004). The researcher maintained a chain of evidence from the case study protocol in various rounds of data analysis to conclusions. The case study protocol (entrant cases, interviewees selection, interview guide) is designed and discussed jointly with the researcher participated in the research design, data collection, analysis and interpretation. This credibility through case study protocol, and case study database is carried out according to the principles of good practice to minimize the error and bias in a study (Yin, 2009).

IV. FINDINGS AND CRITICAL VIEWS

This study demonstrates that raw material as resources in the PDO industry is a vital production component. Clearly raw material advanced payments and the maturation period of product inventories, increases firms' production cost but at the same time cause disturbance in the relationship between producers and farmers. Furthermore, risk adversity creates favourable conditions, where many FMCG producers deploy practices outside the control of the product of origin regulations by using alternative raw material to minimise production costs thereby improving export competitiveness against the national competition. According to the respondent, these practices are "not justified […] as there are firms using cow's milk, and inappropriate practices" (USA Market Director). In a similar manner, raw material and cash-flow lead farmers to reduce production or abandon profession "…raw material will tend to decrease and when it is not well paid it cannot provide employment incentives" (General Director/ Export Consultant). In that "I ask you that. Do we protect the product? No, we actually destroy the product. What we do now, we push primary production to extinction […] what does this mean? Final product will be reduced and final product's quantity. Is this what we want?" (General Director/Export Consultant).

The last few years, PDO firms gradually delay payments to farmers for raw material, on the ground that foreign retailers, market payments and financial institutions suppress the borrowing of capital. The export prices and payments to product of origin firms are predominantly set at the discretion of retailers. Producers therefore, ask banks to subsidize time lags, to safeguard previously negotiated contracts and other factors influencing prices. This is due to the fact that only four months out of the annual year is utilized for production purposes and the balance is used for storage and finishing off stocks before executing payment, thereby raising the cost of logistics. However, for the rest of the year, payment on contractual materials is normally delayed by some errant firms. As a respondent highlights This moment (as we speak), there are unpaid milk producers from July, and today is December […] Product produced in four months has to be paid. Similarly, the raw material you collect in four months has to be paid […] Since you produce only for four months you take all your raw material in four months and make it a product. Then you try to store it […] and use your cash flow to pay your producer" (General Director/Export Consultant). Similarly, "…a firm to be economically viable first need to have good cash flow and efficiency to produce feta needs to become slightly a 'bank' as a company, because the milk you use for feta production which is sheep's and goat's milk must be pre-paid to farmers in advance […] To have financial capacity make sure you can perform well all the way through the process. Otherwise, it cannot happen" (Export Manager).

Following the above findings, although the study shows that firms costs is now on the increase, more time is needed by the firms to recover since a reduction in domestic and foreign consumption in turn serves to decrease cash flow renewal. Firms store the product in their repositories and wait to sell their stocks and renew their cash flows to pay farmers for the next season. However, if firms do not internationalise, raw material tends to decrease and the producers' insolvency with regards to payments leads to the decrease employment incentives for farmers consequently causing them to withdraw from their businesses. This situation decreases demand and boosts prices which are then retained at a level where both the producers and farmers cannot endure. In a similar view, foreign recognition is linked with signed contracts and quantities exported; therefore, it can be said that where there is insufficient raw material, firms suffer as backlash from market flaws and forced to sign in new commercial contracts.

V. DISCUSSION REMARKS

The findings propose that due to the regulation, product specification and origin although dependency level between producers and resource holders is high, this dependency reveals a core discrepancy where a burgeoning business tie-ups are sidelined on the account of raw materials, and production of final products. Thus, it can be deduced from this study that firms fall victim not only to foreign competition but also to domestic rivalry practices. According to respondents, where a robust relationship is being sidelined, FMCG product of origin firms will therefore adopt 'half-hearted' production practices, leaving ground for unclear economic and moral consequences between farmers and final producers. In this regard, this study proposes:

Proposition 1: For an FMCG firm producing products of origin, a robust relationship between farmers and final producers is sidelined.

Market transactions moreover impose cost pressures on firms' exports since practices equally push them towards the exploitation of farmers' raw material (Pinto et al., 2008). On this premise, firms' payment costs to farmers have emerged as a core inhibitory component. Cost is always permanently present and it plays a prominent role in international business. Firms exist because the cost of organising certain activities is lower in comparison to other competitors; their very survival being a direct causal relationship to minimising transaction costs (Chen, 2010, Pan et al., 2014). For the firms of FMCG product of origin, rising cost is a result of production and expensive raw material which according to scholars exhibit both negative consequences on financial resources and trade efficacy (Mechemache and Chaaban, 2010). This finding goes on to show that among others, firms' production is equally vulnerable to financial support. Financial institutions (banks) are the recipients of liability and as such they influence the retention of payments to farmers. It appears that financial institutions increase producers' financial distress; inhibit export processes; making both parties, farmer and producer victims of retrograde actions. Thus:

Proposition 2: For an FMCG firm producing products of origin, cost is positively related to producers' financial distress and impediments in their export processes.

The findings also promote contradictory insights to RDT conventional wisdom which states that for firms to survive, they need to obtain resources and increase dependence with cooperative players. In this study, however, there is an out of the ordinary business relationship wherein strong links can be forged with raw material farmers and firms in an ambiguous and unorthodox set up.

Building on the resource dependence logic it could be expected both parties to benefit from the country's favourable production environment. To clarify, as raw materials are important to the production processes, a country with abundant resources has strong export propensity opportunities and therefore the success of the same can effectively be determined by the number (amount) of resources the country has within its own borders. The country studied in this research is Greece; the biggest producer of raw material in Europe, and one of the world's largest (Eurostat, 2012). From the study, an inference is drawn that firms may perform additional transactions inside the industry. The exchange of resources and dependence between firms and resource holders could boost exports and improve the industry's future perspectives. A geographical barrier remains in that there is no alternative to source authentic resources from foreign locations since the product's characteristics are directly linked with its geographical origin. Notwithstanding this however, it seems that while firms are trying to get financial results from the cost of raw material; in fact, they are actually contributing to the narrowing of the farmers and firms export boundaries. In this regard, we propose.

Proposition 3: An FMCG firm producing products of origin is not necessarily resource dependent on specialised farmers due to the interplay between resources, main recipients and home competition.

VI. CONTRIBUTION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study offers insights in relation to the FMCG product of origin context, and it describes some boundary conditions. Due to the interplay between resources, main recipients and home rivalry it is hereby proposed that an FMCG firm producing products of origin is not necessarily resource dependent; thereby sideling the robust relationship of farmers producing product of origin vis-à-vis the final producers. Thus, it is proposed that in the case of firms producing products of origin, the interaction of raw material, production and the final product per se will throw the farmers and final producers alike into the vortex of inconsistencies in addition to the international market environment that may cause further market modifications.

The current investigation has some limitations. Firstly, it is the relatively small sample size and whether the outcomes of the paper could be applied to other countries. Secondly, the findings focus on a specific context and it was not feasible to address all gaps within the case of investigation. Finally, the case study approach was set within a realism paradigm and it has provided an analytical and not statistical generalisation. An applied deduction approach is hereby suggested to expand research validity therein.

ISSN No:-2456-2165

REFERENCES

[1]. ALDRICH, E., HOWARD; & PFEFFER, J. 1976. Environments of Organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 2**,** 79-105.

[2]. ALONSO, A., DUARTE; & BRESSAN, A. 2014. Collaboration in the context of micro businesses The case of Terracotta artisans in Impruneta (Italy). *European Business Review,* 26**,** 254-270.

[3]. ANUAR, M., NOR. 2012. Internationalisation of Malaysian Palm Oil-based Multinationals. *Oil Palm Industry Economic Journal,* 12**,** 8-13.

[4]. CASCIARO, T. & PISKORSKI, M., J.. 2005. Power imbalance, mutual dependence, and constraint absorption: A closer look at resource dependence theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 50**,** 167-199.

[5]. CHEN, S.-F. 2010. A general TCE model of international business institutions: Market failure and reciprocity. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 41**,** 935–959.

[6]. CHENG, H., TEOH. 2009. Key Sustainability Issues in the Palm Oil Sector: A Discussion Paper for Multi-Stakeholders Consultations. Washington DC: International Finance Cooperation.

[7]. CRESWELL, W., JOHN. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches.,* Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.

[8]. CROTTY, M. 2003. *The foundations of Social Research: Meaning and perspectives in the research process,* London, Sage

[9]. DAVIS, G., F.; & COBB, J., A.. 2010. Resource dependence theory: Past and future. *In:* DOBBIN, F. & SCHOONHOVEN, C., B.. (eds.) *Stanford's organization theory renaissance, 1970-2000.* Bingley, NY: Emerald Group.

[10]. DREES, M., JOHANNES; & HEUGENS, P., PURSEY 2013. Synthesizing and Extending Resource Dependence Theory: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management,* 39**,** 1666-1698.

[11]. DURAND, R. & JOURDAN, J. 2012. Jules or Jim: Alternative Conformity to Minority Logics. *Academy of Management Journal,* 55**,** 1295-1315.

[12]. E.C 2012. Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs *343/1*. European Union.

[13]. E.C. 2006. Commission Regulation No 1898/2006 of 14 December 2006 laying down detailed rules of implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs. Brussels: Commission Regulation.

[14]. E.C. 2014. Fact and figures about the EU´s Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) Brussels: European Commission.

[15]. EL-SHAFEEY, T. & TROTT, P. 2014. Resource-based competition: three schools of thought and thirteen criticisms. *European Business Review,* 26**,** 122-148.

[16]. ELG, U. 2000. Firms' Home-market Relationships: Their Role when Selecting International Alliance Partners. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 31**,** 169-177.

[17]. EUROSTAT 2012. Sheep and Goat population annual data. December 2011 ed.: European Commission.

[18]. FAO 2010. Commodity Market Review 2009-2010. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.

[19]. FRANCIS, M. 2006. Stage gate model research in the UK fast moving consumer goods industry'. *International Journal of Logistics: Research and Applications,* 9**,** 351-368.

[20]. GERRING, J. 2004. What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review,* 98**,** 341-354.

[21]. GULATI, R., NOHRIA, N. & ZAHEER, A. 2000. Strategic Networks. *Strategic Management Journal,* 21**,** 203-215.

[22]. HACKETT, M., SEAN; & DILTS, M., DAVID. 2008. Inside the black box of business incubation: Study B—scale assessment, model refinement, and incubation outcomes. *Journal of Technology Transfer,* 33**,** 439-471.

[23]. HESSELS, J. & TERJESEN, S. 2010. Resource dependency and institutional theory perspectives on direct and indirect export choices. *Small Business Economics,* 34**,** 203-220,.

[24]. INTELLECTUALPROPERTYINDIA 2004. Enforcment of Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection), Act 1999, (48 of 1999) (w.e.f. 15-09-2003). *Geographical Indication Journal,* 1**,** 3.

[25]. JOHNS, G. 2006. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review,* 31**,** 386-408.

[26]. JUDGE, Q., WILLIAM;, MCNATT, D., BRIAN; & XU, W. 2011. The antecedents and effects of national corruption: A meta-analysis. *Journal of World Business,* 46**,** 93–103.

[27]. KAMALRUDIN, M., S.; & ABDULLAH., R. 2014. Malaysian Palm Oil – Moving Ahead to Sustainable Production Growth. *Oil Palm Industry Economic Journal,* 14**,** 24-33.

[28]. KAMASAK, R. 2011. Firm-specific versus industry structure factors in explaining performance variation. Empirical evidence from Turkey. *Management Research Review,* 34**,** 1125-1146.

[29]. KATSIKEAS, S., CONSTANTINE; & PIERCY, F., NIGEL. 1993. Long-Term Export Stimuli and Firm Characteristics in a European LDC. *Journal of International Marketing,* 1**,** 23-47.

[30]. MECHEMACHE, B., ZOHRA; & CHAABAN, J. 2010. Determinants of Adoption of Protected Designation of Origin Label: Evidence from the French Brie Cheese Industry. *Journal of Agricultural Economics,* 61**,** 225-239.

[31]. MILES, B., MATTHEW; & HUBERMAN, A., MICHAEL. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis An expanded sourcebook,* California, London, Greater Kailash., Sage Publications Inc.

[32]. NSO 2013. Statistical Yearbook Thailand 2013. Bangkok: Statistical Information Integrating Group: Statistical Forecoasting Bureau.
[33]. PAN, Y., TENG, L., SUPAPOL, B., ATIPOL;, LU, X., HANG, D. & WANG, Z. 2014. Firms' FDI ownership: The influence of government ownership and legislative connections. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 45**,** 1029-1043.
[34]. PATTON, Q., MICHAEL. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods,* California, US, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
[35]. PFEFFER, J. & SALANCIK, G., R.. 2003. *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective,* Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press.
[36]. PFEFFER, J. & SALANCIK, G., R.. 1978. *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective,* New York, NY, Harper & Row.
[37]. PINTO, J., LEANA, C. & PIL, K., FRITS. 2008. Corrupt Organizations or Organizations of Corrupt Individuals? Two Types of Organization-Level Corruption. *The Academy of Management Review,* 33**,** 685-709.
[38]. PORTER, E., MICHAEL 1998. *Competitive Advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance,* New York, The Free Press.
[39]. PORTER, E., MICHAEL 2004. *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for analysing industries and competitors,* New York, Free Press.
[40]. PORTER, E., MICHAEL 2008. The five competitive forces that shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review,* 86**,** 78-93.
[41]. PORTER, M. 1990. *The competitive advantage of nations,* New York; London; Toronto, Free Press.
[42]. POULIS, K., POULIS, E. & PLAKOYIANNAKI, E. 2013. The role of context in case study selection: An international business perspective. *International Business Review,* 22**,** 304-314.
[43]. RAGIN, C., CHARLES. 1987. *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies,* Berkeley, California University of California Press.
[44]. RAMESHAN, P. 2008. *WTO, India and Emerging Areas of Trade: Challenges and Strategies,* New Delhi, Excel Books.
[45]. SAKELLARIOU, E., KARANTINOU, K. & POULIS, K. 2014. Managing the global front end of NPD: lessons learned from the FMCG industry. *Journal of Generol Monogement,* 39**,** 61-81.
[46]. SAUNDERS, M., LEWIS, P. & THORNHILL, A. 2007. *Research Methods for Business Students,* Edinburgh Gate, Essex, England, Prentice Hall.
[47]. SNOWDON, B. & STONEHOUSE, G. 2006. Competitiveness in a globalised world: Michael Porter on the microeconomic foundations of the competitiveness of nations, regions, and firms. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 37**,** 163-175.
[48]. SRIVASTAVA, S., C.. 2005. Protecting the Geographical Indication for Darjeeling Tea. *Managing the Challenges of WFO participation: case study 16.* World Trade Organisation.
[49]. SUCHMAN, C., MARK. 1995. Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *Academy of Management Review,* 20**,** 571-610.
[50]. TMOA 2015. Thailand Ministry of Commerce Ministry of Agriculture: Government plans to treat rice. *In:* DEPARTMENT, R. (ed.). Bangkok.
[51]. ULRICH, D. & BARNEY, J., B.. 1984. Perspectives in organizations: Resource dependence, efficiency, and population. *Academy of Management Review,* 9**,** 471-481.
[52]. WELCH, C., MARSCHAN-PIEKKARI, R., PENTTINEN, H. & TAHVANAINEN, M. 2002. Corporate elites as informants in qualitative international business research. *International Business Review,* 11**,** 611-628.
[53]. WILKINSON, F., I.; , MATTSSON, G., L.; & EASTON, G. 2000. International competitiveness and trade promotion policy from a network perspective. *Journal of World Business,* 35**,** 275-299.
[54]. YIN, K., ROBERT. 2009. *Case study research: Design and methods,* Sage publication Inc.
[55]. ZAHRA, S., A.. 2007. Contextualizing theory building in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing,* 22**,** 443–452.
[56]. ZIGAN, K. 2013. A contingency approach to the strategic managennent of intangible resources. *Journal of General Management,* 38**,** 79-99.