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Semiosis of Control and Surveillance

Work in a capitalistic society is inherently precarious and so workers need to be aligned to promote stability (Hardy, 2017). The interest in control and surveillance comes from both internal and external threats (Ball, 2010). We cannot trust ourselves to perform perfectly and we cannot trust others to always have our best interests in mind. How can we be protected from ourselves and from others? With this in mind, it is clear that control is required for organizations so that they can be focused and aligned. Surveillance is needed to understand the controls to be applied. To better understand the context of this topic, control and surveillance will be defined.

First, according to the Cambridge Dictionary (N.D.), managerial control is ‘the systems that managers use to make sure that a company or an organization is run in an effective way’. Technology has allowed for performance data collection and can easily be linked to actions that recalibrate skills or the replacement of talent required to achieve organizational efficacy. The ritual of performance quantification fosters motivation to act and drive growth (Mazmanian & Beckman, 2018). Control may be more prescient in emerging organizations, however, interdependence may promote self-management out of necessity (Bechky & Chung, 2018). Controls may be ubiquitous and invisible to those being surveilled but once discovered, especially if ethical boundaries have been breached (Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2017; Vieira da Cunha, Carugati, & Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2015), these controls produce resistance that is entrenched and difficult to overcome. The trust between worker and manager is broken, and resistance is born.

Surveillance is defined as ‘any collection and processing of personal data, whether identifiable or not, for the purposes of influencing or managing those whose data have been garnered’ (Lyon, 2001, p.2). According to Ball and Margulis (2011, p.90), ‘surveillance is the practice of gathering and sorting data with the explicit purpose of influencing and managing the data target.’ Ball (2002) divides surveillance practice into three contexts; surveillance as knowledge; surveillance as information; and surveillance as protection from threat. While there are many ways to monitor, and there are many types of data, the intent of surveillance is to monitor for the purpose of influence or manipulation.

The action that comes from monitoring promotes a reactionary position. Taking this further, the ability to predict behaviors continues to evolve based on collected data, however, accuracy is still elusive and can have severe consequences if erroneous. And so, the ability to monitor has been the current emphasis of efforts. With this said, the immense amount of data that can be obtained from a person,
generally the surveillance target, has now become more manageable due to processing power, algorithm efficiency and bandwidth. For example, facial recognition software can now be used to detect gender and disposition (Levin, 2018). This information can be used in a number of ways.

The challenge for organizations is that the pervasiveness of control and surveillance leads to resistance from their human targets (Stanton, 2000; Martin, Wellen, & Grimmer, 2016). The ontology of the resistance may include an emotional response, a patterned behavior, intellectual assumptions and reasoned decisions (Prasad & Prasad, 2001). When resistance wins, the potential agency of the intentions to control or influence are lost. When resistance is challenged, it grows in intensity until something of value breaks, making control and surveillance a difficult strategy to implement.

The lines are then drawn between the power to resist and the ability to control and surveil. With this competing efforts in mind, the author asks, to what extent can control and surveillance be minimized such that resistance is not a force to be reckoned with and conquered? To what extent can agency and benefit be achieved by the organization through the use of motivation-based controls that, in their nature, achieve the goals of control and surveillance? This paper attempts to address these two questions by describing how self-interest and collaboration in an organizational design that is inherently interdependent can impact the need for control and surveillance. If the need is minimized then the correlating resistance is also minimized.

The paper is organized as follows: First, the concepts of control and surveillance have been introduced. Then the case study is described along with the data analysis and methods. Next, self-interest and awareness are discussed in the context of the case and the goal of achieving control and surveillance. Finally, conclusions and limitations will be discussed. Through the paper the author posits the following three principles:

1. Resistance to change requires enhanced controls and surveillance.
2. Enhanced controls and surveillance may increase resistance.
3. The capacity to control and surveil can be minimized, reducing overhead.
4. Resistance mitigators reduce the necessity for controls and surveillance.

The risk mitigators that influence the need for controls and surveillance are self-interest, alignment, focused action, collaboration, awareness and standardization.

Many organizations, such as the case discussed in this study, have taken an approach to control and surveil that is sophisticated and pervasive but also liberating and enlightening. There appears to be an optimal balance between the two such that organizational goals are achieved with minimal overhead. One of the goals in a balanced and liberating co-working environment would potentially be the retention of valuable talent. Talent is more mobile than ever, with opportunities both within and external to the organization they contribute to. In order for talent to be invigorated to innovate an organization to success they need to have horizontal and vertical reach, they need the opportunity to ideate and create, they need access to information and external stakeholders, they need liminal space that conforms to a use need, they want to achieve and be visible, they want to use technology to eliminate distation from needed resources, and they want autonomy and feedback.

While this list is not exhaustive in a dynamic needs environment, it does point to the retention of the most valuable resource an organization has, its employees.

**Mitigating the resistance**

The author intends to show through this case study that a significant part of control and surveillance can be achieved indirectly by other means. Resistance, as an obstacle, can be significantly reduced by motivational tactics and new work tactics. Beyond this, the residual need for control and surveillance should be assessed and appropriate actions taken to mitigate risks. No capability is panoptic or perfectly predictive (Botan, 1996). This concept could be the subject of further research. The author will discuss the former opportunity rather than the latter, as the intent is to minimize the impact of the residual.
organizations (Robichaud & Cooren, 2013) are the beginning of this mitigation. The ontological vantage point of the author is that traditional control and surveillance techniques are further mitigated by leadership practices, collaboration, untethered dispersed auto-organization, self-interest, and epistemic communities (Dambrin, 2004), among other integrative mechanisms. These mitigating forces are material, corporeal, physical, and temporal, and will be revealed as emergent data from the case study.

Precipitating event

The organization that was studied transitioned from a traditional M-form organizational structure to a multidimensional organizational structure in the interest of realizing growth synergies. This affected the performance of the global value chain created by the corporation generally, and by the business division specifically, creating a significant control and surveillance requirement. The organizational structure was augmented and stabilized through the addition of lateral integrative mechanisms (LIMs) (Persson, 2006). Concurrently a designed relationship with corporate was applied to the overall design. This organizational event is the object of the study. The event selected had gravitas with the participants, as their employment future relied on its success. The impact of the event was not well known in advance of the action as the structure is novel. The precipitating event followed the realization that a structural change could enhance profitability of the corporation. This organization was operating in an extremely competitive and complex environment and, as such, client satisfaction was critical to gaining and maintaining market share. The need to make a substantial change was recognized by the leadership of the enterprise and is the subject of the study.

Quality of the Research

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

Data and Analysis

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

The participants went through the precipitating event that led to the subsequent organizational transformation of a division. The chaos associated with this change was very conducive to traditional measures to enhance control and surveillance. The purpose of this study was to explore a single case study of a multi-unit firm by examining how LIMs
and a designed relationship with the corporate center contributed to the realization of growth synergies. The constructs that emerged from the data identify key elements and organizational designs that contribute to continuous synergistic growth.

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

Coding

Data collection was facilitated by an interview protocol with specific questions oriented in a sequenced schema. Participants were solicited as volunteers from a pool of leaders based on a willingness to share information about the transformation of the sub-division. Each volunteer co-researcher participated in the changes personally. Following each question, the twenty participants’ responses were determined to be linked to the question asked and was determined to be meaningful prior to continuing. Some of the quotes are used directly in the paper to illustrate the nature of the responses and to provide context. Each quote is given a code with four digits. The first two are the initials of the co-researcher and the second two are the statement number from the same co-researcher (for example, SI34). In some cases, an answer could trigger a clarifying question, or a question formed to solicit a more fulsome answer, if needed. The additional information modified the answer and once again was determined to be complete or not. The data was added then to the data sheet and coded. Sub-code themes were also determined and grouped by code and sub-code. The data was surveyed by the author, who, due to personal experience, was able to validate the comments by applying an analysis for good (ANOG). Slight modifications were made as needed to reduce the noise in the data to ensure completeness and clarity. This curation was accomplished by consolidating like data points and simplifying others by stripping out noise and redundancy in the answers. The data was then re-sorted and generalized through categorizing. A pivot-table was used to extract themes in the wording. The raw data was then posted in a table. In some cases most of the themes were unique in which case a table was not used. From this data, dependencies, relationship, and the sequence of events were determined and organized into a theme relationship map. In some cases the data collected appeared as though the participant was confused about the question. In these cases the author followed up with the participant and then added the newly acquired information to the raw data previously collected.

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

**Self interest**

Organizational control and surveillance is minimized when self-interest is leveraged as a motivator. Business unit self-interest describes the autonomy of financially accountable organizational units whose success is dependent on collaborative entrepreneurship. Humans are self-organizing, autonomous systems that sustain and generate their own activities based on rational assumptions (Maturana & Varela, 1987; Varela, Thompson, & Roach, 1993; Thompson, 2007). Self-interest is therefore a primary engine for synergy realization and a mitigator for the need of control and surveillance. A productive and rewarded self-interest drives behaviors that minimize collaborative inertia because they are aligned. Additionally, self-interest encourages business units to seek out growth opportunities that are based on synergies to optimize profitability. Controls and guidance keep business units from pursuing low quality opportunities that abuse their autonomy and destroy corporate value (dis-synergies) through the wasteful consumption of resources. Furthermore, guidance is needed such that self-interest does not create destructive self-interest behaviors that breed distrust, opportunism, and destroy collaborative interest on the part of stakeholders.

Guidance and balance are provided by the business unit leadership and by corporate oversight. This guidance needs to breed trust while exerting social controls that mitigate opportunistic behavior. The corporate role includes the provision of an overall strategic framework, lateral integrative mechanisms, and a cultural context. The overall strategic framework reflects the preferred future state of the firm, or a vision, that provides strategic intent (Lovas & Ghoshal, 2000; Prahalad & Doz, 1987). Synergistic growth realization needs to be guided to follow a strategic theme linked to corporate advantage. The strategic scope and targets given to business units provide focus and accountability within the appropriate product and market arenas in which a business unit actively participates (Galunic & Eisenhardt, 1996).

While corporate may provide guidance, they also provide an administrative context to promote the realization of strategic targets. Financial controls, combined with rewards for performance achievement, stimulate productive self-interest (Eisenhardt & Galunic, 2000; Martin, 2002). The promotion of constructive behaviors helps to motivate businesses to overcome collaborative inertia that surveillance and control would need to discover. These behaviors also help business leaders to not abuse their autonomy through the pursuit of dis-synergies. Additionally, an administrative context stimulates and enables efficient collaboration mechanisms across businesses and between the business unit and the corporate entity. These LIMs help to establish trust, impose social control, motivate productive behaviors, reduce transaction costs, promote focus, align participants, promote nimbleness, preserve knowledge, and help to build up experience in the relevant domain. Appropriate operational norms reduce the need for coordination controls and reduce the occurrence of conflict. Shared information systems increase information-processing capacity and the ability for stakeholders to control operational complexities.

With self-interest comes growth-oriented behavior from entrepreneurial employees. This is necessary for the realization of growth synergies because behavior increases action velocity by reducing or eliminating inertial forces. The implementation of accurate revenue recognition feedback can be provided to stakeholders. The mechanisms in reward systems can then remunerate self-interest in accordance with the systems design, all of which is expected. Promoting self-interest has a number of aspects to be considered including autonomy, strategy, administration, culture, outcomes, and the revenue recognition algorithm. Some of these will now be discussed.

**Deployed algorithms.** The product leaders
assembled and created rules around revenue recognition to preserve the self-interest of the business units. The rule included an algorithm with regard to the allocation of off-load costs, regardless of where it was done, that allocated the whole cost of off-load to the business units based on the revenue that they achieved by each line of business (LOB).

“All revenues will be realized at local facilities initiating the off-load and costs will be allocated based on the rules below:” (SI34) “Corresponding LOB cost will be split between all LOB facilities based on revenue share of the product. Revenue will be used as a proxy for effort.” (SI35) “Off-load to non-off-load hubs – the off-load should be discussed/coordinated on job by job basis with LOB leaders, for the most cost effective allocation and one-off discussion on revenue/cost allocation.” (SI66)

As a result, if a business unit did not off-load, they received their allocation regardless. If they aggressively off-loaded because they acquired revenue beyond their capacity and they reduced costs aggressively, they achieved a super-additive cost benefit as they may have exploited off-load capacity more than other business units. The algorithm created a healthy competition for purposes of self-interest advantage. The algorithm energized behaviors that encouraged the realization of growth synergy reducing the need for control and surveillance.

The validity of corporate guidance and oversight in the realization of growth synergies is present in the literature. Like any organizational construct, corporate leaders can promote dis-synergies; however, corporate leaders are in a position to promote efficient structures, processes, and systems (Anand, 2005; Collins & Montgomery, 2005; Goold & Campbell, 2003; Hill & Jones, 2007). In large firms with a diversified portfolio, corporate managers may lack the detailed knowledge of local markets and the resources needed to implement strategies (Eisenhardt & Galunic, 2000; Martin, 2002). In contrast, business unit leaders may not have the medium or long term corporate perspective (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989; Eisenhardt & Galunic, 2000). An evolutionary corporate management approach of guided and balanced self-interest combines local knowledge and capability with corporate oversight and a long-term perspective to create both stability and flexibility. This collaborative balance also helps the MNE to navigate the complexities involved through a decentralized design (Baum, 1999; Kauffman, 1995; Lovas & Ghoshal, 2000). The themes that emerged from the data regarding the role of self-interests in the creation of profitable growth are summarized in the figure below.

As a result, if a business unit did not off-load, they received their allocation regardless. If they aggressively off-loaded because they acquired revenue beyond their capacity and they reduced costs aggressively, they achieved a super-additive cost benefit as they may have exploited off-load capacity more than other business units. The algorithm created a healthy competition for purposes of self-interest advantage. The algorithm energized behaviors that encouraged the realization of growth synergy reducing the need for control and surveillance.
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**Figure 1. Exploiting self-interest for profitability.**

This figure illustrates how strategy, culture, administration, and control contribute to desirable outcomes.

In summary, the data suggests that self-interest is a critical driver for the realization of synergistic growth. Self-interest has a number of critical aspects. At the core of self-interest is business unit autonomy that reduces the need for controls by supporting behaviors instead. Autonomy is driven by strategy, an incented culture, and a minimized administrative burden. The outcome of a focused and aligned autonomy is profitability, predictability, and an effective entrepreneurial culture. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

**Proposition 1** (collaborative relationship): A collaborative corporate relationship with a multidimensional organizational structure
(MOS) encourages guided and balanced self-interest that is positively related to growth synergy realization.

**Proposition 2** (selected involvement): The selective involvement of the corporate center can promote autonomous growth in locally addressable markets.

**Proposition 3** (service center): The corporate center is a service center that can contribute to continuous growth by temporarily incubating growth opportunities, by sharing related resources between businesses, and by helping business units to select initiatives based on the long term strategic plan for the firm.

**Proposition 4** (guided autonomy): A guided autonomy driven by self-interest and augmented by resource complementarity in a network-based production environment accelerates the process of achieving profitable growth.

**Proposition 5** (administrative burden): A business unit self-interest policy is negatively influenced, and may be compromised by, the administration needed to manage it.

**Proposition 6** (collaborative intent): An effective self-interest policy is a LIM that encourages a collaborative social environment necessary for profitable growth realization.

**Proposition 7** (allocation algorithm): An effective revenue recognition algorithm will accommodate critical concerns from stakeholders and drive behaviors that lead to profitable growth.

**Alignment**

A business leader must make sure that their location is in alignment with other facilities and to the division strategic plan as a whole. With alignment comes a reduction in the requirement to control and surveil as resistance is minimized.

[Vertical leaders] partner with WW [product] leaders to develop strategic plans for specific product lines or services; with timeframes and measurements of improvement. The strategic plans should support the business goals of local facilities and be developed in coordination of each group and in alignment with the strategies/operations of the broader global team. (RV9)

The raw data produced 10 themes through 17 rich data descriptions as displayed in the table below. The theme map is displayed subsequently in the figure below. In order for a location leader to participate in the network of facilities, there has to be standardization. This is a platform enabling work shifting based on collaboration and continuous improvement. This refers to the ability to know what is expected within various products and services, as well as having compatible infrastructure to perform the work so that it can be moved to the optimal location. Standardization makes it possible for location leaders to unify processes and exploit centralization. To ensure the best performance, best practices need to be the standard across all facilities involved. To achieve alignment, the vision and mission of the facility needs to be compatible with the goals of the organization. The compatibility extends to workflows, as well as to exploit synergistic capacity. A barrier to entry, however, is conformance to security standards. Each of the physical configurations is optimized within the overall organization to achieve optimal profitability. This profitability is facilitated by a method for cost and revenue allocation to which all locations subscribe. This allows for performance metrics to be compatible and exploitable for analysis simulating and internal surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2015). Furthermore, support functions need to be engaged and helpful or goal achievement is compromised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Alignment themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-load methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align with other facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align workflows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comply with security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conform to standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The alignment theme map in the figure below indicates the logical sequence and the dependencies of the themes that emerged from the data. It...
suggests that in order for alignment to begin, there needs to be consensus on the vision, mission, and goals of the organization. These goals include an understanding and the recognition of the existence of synergies, the ability to centralize or pool resources for capacity management, the enablement that comes from standardization, and the ability and willingness to share. A level of transparency in measurements and conversation allow for the discovery of synergistic opportunity. A location that does not have the capability to perform a task, may benefit by exploiting another location’s capability. This solves capacity issues that occur when order quantity exceeds local capacity or when capacity demand is low. In some cases, alignment allows for centralization of resources. This increases reliability, as focus is increased on continuous work, but can be fragmented with intermittent work. Centralization also promotes standardization through capacity consolidation; however, capacity sharing is also enabled by standardization. Capacity sharing across facilities is enabled by a method to determine revenue and cost sharing, a unified approach to measurement that can be used for ratio analysis, common policies and methods based on best practices, and common workflows that are similarly secure. Gaining consensus in these areas is not easy; however, it is more difficult to attain if there is a lack of alignment around a common vision.

“[Facility leaders] work closely with facility leaders worldwide, to establish effective load balancing and off-load methods to eliminate capacity constraints in local offices.” (RV15)

“[I will] contribute and support the technology roadmaps and provide input on strategies with trending market developments.” (RV254)

“[I will] cultivate a manufacturing/supply-chain paradigm to ensure consistent service levels and product offerings for [line of business] services in all worldwide regions.” (RV258)

“[I will] work with other location leaders to drive unification, standardization, centralization, and operational efficiencies across WW locations.” (RV265)

In summary, the data suggests that alignment is relevant to the success of a multidimensional organization. While goals are being achievement the need for additional controls or surveillance may not be needed. The achievement of goals is not likely without consensus around a defined vision and mission. Themes that emerged from the data indicated that the ability to share in a network-based production environment is enabled by adopted norms. The norms include financial, technical, security, measurement, and workflow design norms. While having these norms is important, self-interest needs to be considered with an accurate financial allocation to P&Ls. With this consideration, correct behaviors are encouraged and surveillance to see them when they occur are minimized. Furthermore, these norms are not applicable to growth synergy unless they are deployed across all locations and are business-favorable best practices.

**Proposition 8** (network unity): Capacity is more easily shared when there is consensus on how the production network should function.

**Proposition 9** (geographic diversity): Alignment enhances profitability through the exploitation of geographically diverse but synergistic workflows based on best practice.

**Proposition 10** (mission-vision): Measurable goals must to be directionally aligned with the firm’s mission and vision.

**Focused action**

Taking steps to significantly reduce noise in the environment aided the stakeholders in redirecting
and focusing mental attention on the purpose of executing focused action (Fiol & O’Connor, 2004). Action needs to be selective and intense in an environment where the results would clearly be visible. By focusing an aligned energy, leadership would not have to control or surveil as much as they would without an aligned focus. The MOS had to be nimble to capture opportunities before competitors were able to pull them away. In order for the case company to achieve sustained corporate advantage, it had to execute a sequence of steps for each opportunity including: the identification of opportunities, the selection or prioritization of the opportunities, and the subsequent exploitation of the opportunity. The exploitation would need to include energy optimization through prioritization, resource allocation, value creation, plan clarity, and purpose clarity. Energy is strategically allocated to accomplish tasks that optimize profitability. The strategy was directional leveraging strategic complementarity as it was focused on profitable opportunity. Four organizational themes are patterns in the data that emerge as critical roles in profitable growth including the MOS, finance, LIMs, and corporate, as shown in the table below. Theme categories within each of the four organizational categories are listed within the table. They are listed in order of frequency of occurrence. Preexisting data was retrieved from action trackers during the timeframe around the precipitating event. The list of selected and focused actions included 325 items that were coded into 358 rich data descriptions divided into the four organizational categories mentioned above.

**Table 2. Focused action by category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>LIM</th>
<th>MOS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Description</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MOS Action.** In a MOS, selective task identification is possible as local opportunities are the focus of local business unit leaders. These leaders can self-manage to establish the scope of the opportunity as they are in direct contact with the prospective client. As they are local, they can give focused attention to the client in order to benefit from the discovery. The MOS achieves the local market benefit through the selection of the opportunity. MOS leaders in the know can control corporate perceptions and bias about complexity and infrastructure, as examples, around the opportunity. As local and product leaders understand the market, they can also control self-cannibalization through the opportunity selection, or even the sequence. The MOS leader can exploit the opportunity by creating local capability to meet expectations with regard to requirements, timeliness, and capacity. They need to minimize the internal and external induced inertia so that the opportunity does not disappear. The team needs to be aligned to expedite the achievement of profitable revenue streams when they present themselves.

Focused MOS-related actions are illustrated in the figures below. Focused action in the MOS includes actions in eight theme categories. The first is the use of trackers to assist with expansions. The second is actions regarding assets that include the proliferation of best practices, the improvement in utilization of assets, profitability enhancement by charging for asset-related billing line items, and the reduction of the cost of storing assets. The third is focused action related to the client. This includes a tracker that lists client actions, as an example. With the outward facing dimensions of the MOS, a rate card design can be exploited. There are also opportunities for increased profitability. The MOS dimensions are helpful in horizontalizing best practices. The LOB dimension of the MOS experienced focused action related to consolidation of disparate organizations and the integration of new organizations into the existing structure. Within each LOB there are opportunities for performance review and cost reduction activities. In general MOS leaders pursue cost mitigations while scaling to increase revenue. Strategy is a focused action driver that included the one supply chain initiative (1MC), drift mitigation, exploiting locations and roles, and improving on profitability.

---

**Figure 3. MOS focused action:** This figure maps an MOS to descriptors that contribute to focused action.

The second illustration below, shows the synergy aspect of focused action in a MOS. There were 74 rich descriptions that emerged from the data that were synergistic. Synergy enables the addition of other business units, the consolidation of business units, the expansion of existing business units, the off-load to other business units, and the better utilization of existing locations, workflows, and hardware.

“[I] lead UK and European efforts of getting equipment into [system] using [location] standard to help leverage existing inventory in the region for cost reductions.” (SF283)

Synergy helps with the spreading of best practices to establish performance parity. It also helps with cost reductions and overall profitability.

---

**Figure 4. MOS synergy:** This figure illustrates synergy elements that can be leveraged by an
MOS.
Focused action in the MOS includes supporting synergistic profitability. There were 64 rich data descriptions that emerged from the data as illustrated in the figure below. The MOS had focused action that supported alignment. Alignment included supporting best practices, industry certifications, knowledge exchange, training materials, and strategic plans. The MOS also supports getting approvals for resources, for automation needs, for technology, systems, new roles, performance information for reviews, and accurate accounting mapping. Focused actions in the MOS occasionally involved corporate approval. Scaling was supported by the MOS as leaders put forward ideas regarding consolidations, expansions, integrations, and better utilization of resources through synergistic tasks.

“[I] outlined a plan for integrating [LOB] capabilities so they can be leveraged more effectively by US operations particularly in support of [location LOB] workflows done by [division].” (SF290)

Ultimately, the goal was improved profitability through the realization of synergistic growth.

![Diagram of MOS Support](image)

**Figure 5.** MOS support. This figure shows MOS support elements that contribute to focused action.

**Corporate Action.** Lastly, Corporate assists with focused action. Corporate makes sure that business units understand their targets for financial performance and sets the strategic plan. The plan focuses business units on opportunity discovery and minimizes the need for controls and surveillance as actions are made relative to targets. Corporate provides information about where the business unit is relative to goals, and where they need to be. They may provide guidance and reference information regarding discovery opportunity and connect local business units with critical contacts. Corporate assists the MOS by providing information about the value of the benefit hoped to be achieved from the opportunity. They alert the MOS about negative impacts that are about to surface. For example, an opportunity may consume a large amount of infrastructure that would be needed for other growth opportunities. The ratio between cost and benefit help local leaders to understand the differences between opportunities and aid in the selection or prioritization of them. Corporate accelerates the exploitation of opportunities through motivation. The self-interest of MOS leaders is achieved through the reward system that corporate puts in place. If the recipients of the reward do not value the elements of the reward system it will not be influential. The outcomes from objectives need to be connected meaningfully to the reward system. This helps with the alignment of MOS leaders and encourages them to contribute to the production networks’ capability to exploit growth opportunities.

Corporate helps with knowledge distribution by providing performance reports that relate to profitability as illustrated in the figure below. They deal with physical property. This included the consolidation of properties and the expansion of properties. Additionally, properties were set up and run based on best practices. Corporate reports were set up for performance analysis. These reports indicated if strategic actions were successful. Corporate assisted with strategic plans that improved utilization. Corporate tasks included support for space, information, and trend mapping. And lastly, corporate assists with training that improves efficiency and so profitability.
Figure 6. Corporate theme map. This figure shows how corporate can contribute to focused action.

The purpose of focused action, as illustrated in the figure below, was to realize synergistic growth incurring minimal resistance. Generally, opportunities were identified, selected, and then exploited. As per the mapping described above, focused action was divided into four categories: MOS related, finance related, LIM related, and corporate related. Opportunities were identified through a discovery process. For MOS items, discovery occurred through creating an optimal scope and disallowing scope creep. Discovery originated in local markets and was given focused attention. Financial discovery happened through financial ratios and trends after the correct allocations were made. LIM discovery happened through the collective attention of MOS leaders. The impact of actions needed to be controlled. For example, a communication plan helped to reduce the negative impact of an information vacuum. Corporate discovery occurred with the awareness of goals, the knowledge of a baseline, and what it would take to close the gap.

The selection of tasks helped to create focus and impact. Selection in the MOS was oriented around local markets and sustained corporate advantage from these opportunities. The exploiting of local markets can cause cannibalization for other locations and this had to be controlled. Additionally, corporate bias needed to be checked as expectations from corporate on profitability and the support needed to achieve margin were oversimplified. Financial selection was driven by value-stream mapping. This focused action on the items that created value for customers. They paid more for this, enabling enhanced profitability potential. If achieving customer expectations was questionable, finance could assist with a feasibility study. Furthermore, they could help with the capital investment needed to achieve workflows that could meet expectations. LIMs assisted with selection as they were able to optimize impact. This might happen through the sharing of information that could lead to the exploitation of synergistic capacity. The mutual gain and potential achievement of cross-unit objectives of multiple functions or business units brought more entities, expertise, and capacity to the opportunity. Corporate enabled focused selection by minimizing any negative impact of capital investment on the P&L, for example. Analysis of the cost and reward ratio assisted with the selection of the opportunities with the best profitability. Having this prioritization methodology pushed the profitability of ventures pursued higher. With these analyses in hand, outcome values could be predicted and support granted to realize the profitability opportunity.

The exploitation of synergistic opportunities resulted in higher sustained corporate advantage in relation to the resources applied. The alignment of the MOS structure within an entrepreneurial culture minimized organizational inertia. The structure and capability of the MOS was brought to bear on the opportunity. Local leaders were then very capable to exploit the opportunity.

"[I] provide commentary on monthly financial reporting to help more effectively understand market changes and workflow trends from a local perspective." (SF296)

Financial review by looking at workflow components and throughput metrics made it easier to establish price points. Typically each deliverable at the case company was unique. The incoming assets were of different component types and different material. A workflow may have been used repeatedly, but with the asset uniqueness, simple automation was not possible. This presented pricing challenges. The pricing typically was “situational”
and this discretion had to be monitored. Metrics from similar workflow or component sub-assemblies could be used to determine optimal pricing strategies that resulted in optimal profitability.

“[I] identify items that are not charged for or items in package pricing not charged for, to recover some historical ‘giveaways’ on low priced items.” (SF291)

LIMs aided with transparency by providing system-based intelligence. Problem solving teams reduced waste and cost in workflows, thereby increasing the competitiveness of the company. Other LIMs were employed, usually systemic, to monitor work through workflows designed for requested deliverables.

“[I] participate in projects to align [system] work order entries to one-another in the three major WW locations to get data points into parity.” (SF297)

Corporate assisted with profitability by aligned reward systems with achievement. An entrepreneurial culture is significantly energized by the opportunity to be rewarded for profitability achievement. Reward systems also motivate alignment of purpose and encourage leaders to collaborate in order to achieve desirable outcomes.

In summary, the data suggests that action, when selected and focused, can reduce the need for monitoring and achieve high levels of profitability for multi-unit firms. The organization design that is described by the MOS is ideal for the discovery, prioritization, and exploitation of profitable opportunities. Mutual accountability and the potential for a discovery from multiple viewpoints allows for a high level of scrutiny. Financial support encourages action through measurement, monitoring, and rewarding achievement. Finance also provides analysis that supports capital investment, appropriate pricing, and profitability monitoring. LIMs add to the structure of the MOS and support profitable growth. LIMs help with the sharing of knowledge, gain across the organization, and transparency. Corporate provides strategic awareness and the gap between current reality and expectations. Corporate can also assist with reward systems that guide the right behavior. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

**Proposition 11** (nimble construct): The MOS is a nimble organizational construct that can effectively exploit focused action to realize synergistic profitability.

**Proposition 12** (mutual profitability): A sequence of tasks, quickly discovered and effectively executed, can lead to mutual benefit between business units that collaborate.

**Proposition 13** (economized energy): Energy consumption, aligned to realize a local synergistic opportunity, is minimized in an MOS augmented by LIMs and supported by the corporate center.

**Proposition 14** (intrinsically aligned): An MOS is intrinsically aligned as the structure that is connected and through which tasks are shared by relevant functions needed to achieve growth synergies.

**Proposition 15** (scalable synergy): An MOS can drive synergistic focused action that, when exploited, can realize scaling that includes expansion, consolidation, and the integration of business units.

**Proposition 16** (inspiring finance): Finance, as a supporting function, augments the self-interest in a MOS by promoting performance.

---

**Figure 7.** Focused action. This figure illustrates the progression from identification of an opportunity to the exploitation of the opportunity within four domains.
transparency and inspirational reward systems.

**Proposition 17** (monitoring mechanisms): LIMs augment the MOS’s ability to realize synergistic growth by focusing action execution through collaborative task monitoring mechanisms.

**Proposition 18** (super system): The ERP system, a significantly influential LIM, is a super-additive, as it enables scalable organizational efficacy by promoting cost effectiveness, transparency, and workflow control.

**Proposition 19** (corporate resource): The corporate center provides relevant information needed to exploit resources effectively in fulfillment of MNE strategic objectives.

**Collaboration**

This section exposes data regarding the aspects of collaboration needed to make a MOS successful. Collaboration is a control and a form of surveillance through accountability between members and as a cultural norm. The table below indicates that there are challenges when it comes to collaboration and there are success drivers depending on how the transformation is executed. Change leaders were asked about what went well and what did not go well, with regard to collaboration, during the transformation that contributed to the realization of growth synergies. A variety of information emerged from the data. The ability to forecast and provide revenue performance went well. The remapping of products and services into production and sales channels helped to remove ambiguity about accountability and the ownership of tasks. The MOS strategy was perceived as a good strategy for growth and collaboration. The leaders were able to merge action trackers, aiding transparency and enhancing the execution pace. The organization was more nimble such that it could adapt to industry trends. The support for production needs was enhanced through collaboration. Sales opportunities became apparent and a unified pricing strategy could be deployed. Cost mitigation strategies were coordinated and benefited from shared information, early adopters, and knowledge transfer. What was successful in one area could be exploited in another, maximizing impact, and saving deployment time. Collaboration enabled the sharing of capacity, tools, and checklists. Metrics reporting took on a similar look as dashboards were assembled to measure and track performance trends. Standardization energized collaborative activities and became a platform for evolutionary change. Standards were created and deployed collaboratively for reliability performance. Consequently, the effort needed for change management was optimized through collaboration.

There were several areas where collaboration was challenging according to the data. Operational leaders felt that they could have been better supported from finance for business modelling and for financial performance awareness. The effort around the creation of the new strategies was challenging and the time given to document the plan was short. Sharing talent between businesses was difficult for a variety of reasons, including an inability to shift work, load balance, and unwillingness to physically move if required. Cultural differences were significant. Talent development was a challenge due to a lack of training resources. The global purchasing initiative, for example, was difficult to get approved through finance due to capacity constraints in finance and local relationships. Maturing the position of account coordination was a significant transformation and required a significant effort to complete. Leveraging the resources or the facility at other sites was challenging as they were entrenched in their routines and work pace. It was determined that it would be easier to move the work than to move the people; however, there were nuances regarding client expectations at each location that had to be achieved. Cost mitigation again was difficult due to support function approval procedures. Exploiting synergies for cost improvement was challenging due to an unwillingness of the process owners to release control of redundant workflows. Cross-training helped with the scalability of functions, but with the operations being lean, the ability to allocate capacity to cross-train was challenging. Sales strategies were determined external to the influence of the operation that would execute the workflows leading to margin deterioration as billable items were overlooked. Communication strategies were difficult to determine due to the structure and the rate of change. Untimely access to
P&Ls made it difficult to see the financial impact of actions. Pro-forma P&Ls were used to predict outcomes; however, these had an accuracy tolerance that led to ambiguity about results. Equipment sharing was challenged as it had not been inventoried or located, and its condition was not known. The ability to get key leaders together was difficult due to workloads in a lean staffing environment. Co-researchers also indicated that forecast information from clients was not reliable or even available and so difficulties with staffing and capacity planning were enhanced. Costs allocated to business units were ambiguous leading to incorrect inference about performance remedies. Leaders did not have the ability to know if assets could be purged, making way for other assets coming in, due to a lack of knowledge transfer about existing or new projects. This resulted in a need for additional storage, creating a bottleneck. When collaboration is compromised, change inertia is enhanced, thereby increasing the effort needed to achieve desirable outcomes.

**Table 3. Collaboration Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-researcher 1</th>
<th>Co-researcher 2</th>
<th>Co-researcher 3</th>
<th>Co-researcher 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flash reports</td>
<td>Production support</td>
<td>Operations off-load</td>
<td>When we standardize it works easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue forecasting</td>
<td>Pricing strategy</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Security standards are good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product remapping</td>
<td>Sales opportunities</td>
<td>Checklists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure strategy</td>
<td>Cost mitigation</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merging trackers</td>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>Capturing metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry trends and changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going well</td>
<td>Better support out of finance</td>
<td>Resource sharing</td>
<td>Non-operations areas (finance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of 2015 strategies</td>
<td>Facility utilization</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global purchasing</td>
<td>Cost mitigation</td>
<td>Sales strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talent sharing and development</td>
<td>Improvement synergies</td>
<td>Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer coordination with account coordinator</td>
<td>Cross training</td>
<td>Visual communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WW</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;Ls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not going as it could</td>
<td>Non-operations areas (finance)</td>
<td>Forecasts information</td>
<td>Concern with P&amp;L costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purging effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication on upcoming projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the data suggests that collaboration is critical to change management efficacy. Change leader behavior is typically at the core of this inertia which requires surveillance to discover. The change leader often is ignorant to their contribution to the imminent failure of the change initiative. With a better understanding of how collaboration influences social dynamics, a change leader can alter tactics and achieve better business outcomes. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

**Proposition 20** (mature duplication): Isolated actions do not benefit from super-additives that would otherwise be gained by exploiting matured initiatives through duplication.

**Proposition 21** (advanced start): When existing knowledge is aggregated and made available, it can be used as an advanced starting point, or platform, for new discoveries.

**Proposition 22** (fluid sharing): Fluid resource sharing without boundaries attracts the right resources quickly to issues whose resolution
contributes to profitability potential.

**Awareness**

The conscious experience of co-researchers is a continuously changing or flowing process of awareness (Cosmelli, Lachaux, & Thompson, 2007; Thompson, 2007; Varela et al., 1993). Participants were, to a varied degree, aware of their environment and how it was changing. Surveillance produces awareness that is the impetus for controls. In this case there was a tipping point, or the confluence of awareness and intentionality, that triggered action planning and subsequent execution. According to Thompson (2007), intentionality can emerge anonymously, involuntarily, spontaneously, and receptively. These specifically emerged in the data. A leader needs to be aware of many factors regarding their operation, including off-load methods, needs, cost, customer expectations, available reports, local policies, product requirements, deliverable specifications, and understanding the value of support functions. Metrics are critical to monitoring profitability that will show up in the financials. Performance evaluation and optimization results are influenced by a minimized cost structure; however, actions regarding this cannot be known unless current financial performance is known. Available operational data seen through the lens of mature and defined metrics allows the business leader to monitor work product and deal with operational issues and inefficiencies. This may relate to scheduling inefficiency in a global supply chain that shares capacity, keeps up with the security threat-scape, and has a quality system that is capable of catching issues before they are shipped. A culture of transparency enables progress monitoring and issue resolution. Access to reports and the ability to analyze data can lead to better understanding of underlying themes in the environment. In some cases, support services may need to help mitigate inefficiencies. The table below lists 19 themes that emerged from 37 rich data descriptions. This awareness begins with the ability to have data about operational and financial performance. In the absence of this data, awareness is challenged. Knowing internal and external needs is also the beginning of awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor operational performance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide data</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand needs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer expectation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client specification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze cost structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up on security changes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor progress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor reports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational data</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other facility cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity measurements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot errors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand support needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theme map for awareness in the figure below includes six dependencies: metrics, operational data, customer expectations, financials, and culture. It also indicates that growth outcomes are dependent on these six areas. The growth enablers include work shifting, issue resolution, support needs, scheduling methods, and capacity utilization. Each of these has a relationship with the critical awareness themes. These critical themes are broken down further into several sub-areas. For example, financial awareness includes an understanding of awareness, financial measurements, and analysis. Work shifting has a dependency on the sub-items. For example, work shifting should be the product of financial analysis, measurement of usage and performance, and subject to allocations for overhead and coordination cost. Work shifting is also dependent on mature performance-oriented metrics that have been standardized horizontally across all locations. These must be available timely. Work cannot be shifted unless specifications and requirements are known. Deliverable creation is guided by policy and methods. Performance is displayed through an appropriate set of results. Work cannot shift until customer expectations are understood. These expectations are specific to local

---

*Joel Bigley / Achieving Organizational Control and Surveillance through Self-interest and Collaboration*
markets. The ability to perform tasks in other geographic locations, such as an off-load site, is not possible without closure of the gap analysis between what the location does and what the local market expects. Financial results, as it relates to revenue and profitability, should drive decision making that relates to work shifting. The location that receives the request for work must have a culture that enables great service. This includes an appropriate perspective on the sharing of resources, the fact that each location is a part of a global supply chain that is networked, and that there is a need for full transparency to guide effective decision making.

“I will] work closely with facility leaders worldwide, to establish effective load balancing and off-load methods to eliminate capacity constraints in local offices.” (RV272)

Issue resolution has a dependency on financial awareness. The local leader understands that profitability for the division is the goal. To that end, the local leader needs to understand how revenue and profits are experienced by the location that gets the work, as compared to the location that does the work. In the event that there is a delay or rework is required, the business leader needs to know the impact of the lack of issue resolution and the time needed to achieve a resolution. This drives the urgency around the problem resolution activity and may trigger the request for support services to help, as an example. In a complex system, issues are often discovered through metrics and associated trends. These metrics should not be misleading, creating a false positive, because the cost to resolve a false positive may be equally prohibitive.

If metrics are not horizontalized, the local situation cannot be effectively compared with similar situations at other locations. They must also be available when needed, otherwise the discovery time is elongated. Operational data in the form of specifications and requirements are a reference against which a deliverable can be compared. Without these, no level of controls can assure quality outputs. The gap between the deliverable and client expectation may determine the size of the issue. An issue in the deliverable points to an issue in the workflow or the incoming materials used in the process. Reports may point to inadequate or inappropriate methods or policies that may need to be modified. Culture has a bearing on issue resolution. A lack of transparency can obfuscate the root cause that may be anywhere in the supply chain. When resources are shared, dependencies on capabilities and culture emerge in the form of non-conformances and training disparities that must be resolved in order for the workflow to be reliable.

The need for support is part of the decision-making process for the vertical leader. Support may affect financial performance including profitability. Support functions may not have access to metrics or may interpret them incorrectly. Bias and assumptions may make support functions impotent.

“[I will] operate as the focal point in the company, supporting finance, sales and customer service for any requirement that interfaces directly with the products offered and/or managed by my [LOB].” (RV133)

They may not be aware of supply chain nuances or have access to the applicable information. Furthermore, they may not understand the disparity between the resources that are shared. Vertical leaders take this into consideration as it relates to decision making on whether to solicit support services and consequently, they may decide to use them in a limited and controlled context to be optimally effective.

“[I will] develop a relationship with finance to make sure you are reviewing and understanding the numbers.” (RV152)

Capacity availability and utilization is critical for vertical leaders to understand. This does not just apply to local capability but also to capability within the network of business units. Capacity cost is directly related to profitability. Carrying costs during slower times is a burden that can be mitigated by rightsizing and utilizing scalability in the event of a demand spike. Volume, specification, and complexity variability are a normal part of a vertical leader’s work environment. A suitable level of awareness and the ability for suitable and effective analysis allow for optimal decision making. Metrics and performance trends can inform these decisions in a timely way. These metrics need to be consistently used in all locations so that capacity at any location can exploited, as vertical leaders are expected to deliver large rush orders not
previously forecasted. Requirements and specifications drive workflow choices and available capacity.

“[I will] direct the planning and preparation of production schedules through subordinates and identify requirements for the business to improve efficiency.” (RV113)

Furthermore, scheduling methods may need to be modified to accommodate demand spikes and so must be understood and flexible. When customer expectations cannot be fulfilled, contingencies and negotiating tactics can still ensure a success. While a vertical leader must understand that the resources in the supply chain are available, they must also be compatible to be exploited. A lack of transparency may keep this knowledge from a local leader, resulting in an expensive decision that could lead to delays.

In summary, the data suggests that awareness promotes the ability to achieve profitable growth. Awareness is achieved by surveillance from which needed controls emerge. Awareness, then, enables work shifting, issue resolution, meeting the needs of support functions, and capacity utilization improvement. Financial information efficacy relates directly to business unit performance when revenue and cost are both aligned and accurate within a defined organizational structure. This alignment then allows for performance ratios and trend analysis that can drive decision making, investigations, and improvement. Augmenting these metrics, are workflow performance metrics related to delivery reliability and throughput rate. If another location does not have the capacity or speed needed to do a project, then work shifting cannot occur. These metrics together with operational data can lead to effective decision making regarding overall work performance. This information can also influence strategic planning. In some cases support functions such as finance, HR, facilities, etc. will contribute information to enable decision making and performance measurement. An example would be energy costs or tax structures. A vertical leader also owns the culture at the location where they lead. This culture should align with the culture at other sites so that capacity can be leveraged seamlessly. This culture includes a supply chain perspective that encourages resource sharing, an awareness of quality and security requirements, and transparency, so that fact based decisions can be made. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

**Proposition 23** (work assignment): Work can be profitably assigned when available, when capable capacity costs are understood, and when supply chain leaders aggressively share their resources.

**Proposition 24** (issue resolution): Problem resolution is accelerated by operational performance transparency and a clear awareness of expectations.

**Proposition 25** (measurement unification): The timely availability of data used similarly across all locations, offered up transparently, can accelerate strategic decision making and issue resolution.

**Proposition 26** (aligned culture): The constitution of the location culture must be appropriate and aligned with other locations to optimize capacity utilization in a network-based production schema.

**Standardization**

This category relates to activities concerning unity and consensus. With unity and consensus the surveillance overhead is minimized. The MOS leaders brought up standardization as surveillance overhead mitigator as it ensured performance through the reduction of complexity and promotes
consistency. In a chaotic environment, the enhancement of predictability is desirable for financial and capacity forecasting accuracy.

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

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

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

In summary, the data suggests that creating commonality and compatibility between workflows in all locations is desirable and minimizes the need for additional controls. Standardization, guided by documentation, can also allow for scalability without the typical chaos and complexity. Performance predictability is encouraged by tools, automation, and performance monitoring. Unification of practice and semantic unity enable both monitoring and the discovery of enhancements. The following propositions summarize the key findings of this section:

**Proposition 27** (chaos reduction): Standardization is a complexity reduction technique that enhances scalability, capability, predictability, updatability, and transportability in a chaotic environment.

**Proposition 28** (best practice): Standardizing on best practice includes both deploying a common language needed for more accurate profitability measurement and creating a platform for efficient organizational evolution.

**Conclusions**

The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological research study was to explore a single case study of a multi-unit firm by examining how a complex organizational design augmented by LIMs can achieve a minimum overhead for control and surveillance. For the purpose of this study the phenomenon or object of the analysis was the precipitating event that led to permanent cross-business collaboration within the MNE. The unit of analysis on which the phenomenon was studied is the strategy and the organizational design that leads to sustainable desired outcomes. These outcomes are described as sustained corporate advantage with control and surveillance accommodated.

A phenomenological case study is a means to the experiential reaction and sense-making of participants as they transform their own role and behavior to adapt to a new paradigm of leadership while achieving desirable outcomes. Much of the profitability optimization literature focuses on diversification and operative synergies, like cost optimization, rather than growth synergies as a phenomenon (Li & Greenwood, 2004). This perspective overlooks the profitability enhancements that can be experienced through the
unique combination of capabilities and strategy. By examining growth synergies within the company through a phenomenological single case study, the author was able to explore, discover, and capture findings that have previously been ignored. The data supporting these findings has a number of strengths including that the participants were stakeholders, that the participants were knowledgeable, that the timing of the study allowed for a holistic and reflective view, that the situation was real, that the observations were based in reality, that the author was a participant and stakeholder, that the author was knowledgeable in the subject matter, that the data was triangulated, that an iterative approach was used to established data clarity and fulsome, that the participants were willing to participate and contribute, and that the participants were able to speak freely to inform the data collected.

The key findings were centered on endogenous and exogenous factors as well as opportunities for wider influence within the corporation through an organizational structure that is scalable. These findings change the way we conceptualize the model of an organization and how it can contribute to growth. The author used the findings to create, or extend, mid-range theory regarding sustainable growth realization in multi-unit firms for the practical purpose of improving corporate performance. Many of the participants reported that the organizational structure was effective in reality and their excitement to participate in the transition was a source of motivation. In fact, the pursuit of synergistic opportunity reduced complexity thereby reducing the overhead for surveillance and controls. The resistance that would have accompanied a more intrusive approach would have added to the chaos and the effort that would have been needed to achieve the desired outcomes.

**Contributions to Theory**

The primary contribution of this article is new empirical insights about the effects of self-interest and collaboration on the need for control and surveillance. The author has shown through a case study that the achievement of organizational control and surveillance through self-interest and collaboration has been possible. The propositions that were extracted from the co-researchers, instigated by a precipitated event, list the contributions to theory regarding this achievement. Specifically, propositions emerged with regard to self-interest, deployed algorithms, alignment, focused action, collaboration, awareness, and standardization all of which add to theory regarding the achievement of surveillance and control in a multi-dimensional organization. By extension, these results are, therefore, generally also relevant to the achievement of sustained profitability and competitive advantage.

Returning to the research questions: To what extent can control and surveillance be minimized such that resistance is not a force to be reckoned with and conquered? To what extent can agency and benefit be achieved by the organization through the use of motivation-based controls that, in their nature, achieve the goals of control and surveillance? Through the study we have seen that the propositions associated with self-interest and collaborations lower resistance associated with controls and surveillance. In fact, control and surveillance can be achieved through willful, aligned and motivated efforts from participants that achieve organizational performance goals. Resistance is complex and difficult to counter. Participants typically engage in games of visibility, observation and secrecy (Brivot & Gendron, 2011). Alternatively, the power of the resistance effort against control and surveillance is minimized when a suitable environment is provided that enables relational efficacy and the opportunity for success.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The author attempted to develop generalizable theoretical findings based on the empirical results of a case study. Even so, this study encountered several limitations concerning theory and empirical study. For example, there are some weaknesses regarding the generalizability of the findings. The single case study approach was based on approximately twenty in-depth interviews. Given that the phenomenon under investigation is novel and complex, this methodological choice seems reasonable. The research method mandates that in-depth observation is required for collecting and analyzing the resultant holistic data (Eisenhardt, 1989; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Siggelkow 2007; Yin, 1994). Even so, a single case study approach
does not make it possible to determine the significance and weighting of drivers for the realization of sustainable growth while achieving control. The research was limited by subjective interpretations of the data. This led to various theoretical constructs from qualitative information provided by participants. Subjective biases are reduced through the review of the coding process (Yin, 1994), using key informants for validating results (Mayring, 1996), and by following data analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1996). Even so, this research still has associated risk due to potential subjective and invalid interpretations of quotations.

The nature of phenomena under investigation is complex as it includes strategic focused action, organizational design, and corporate management. As a result, the development of a complete and fulsome theory is constrained (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Given that reality based phenomena tends to be complicated, it follows that this study can only offer a mid-range theory of continuous growth realization while developing thought-provoking and new perspectives that may inspire creative theorizing in the future. Furthermore, the selection of variables may be incomplete. While the analysis is focused on MNE factors of growth realization, while meeting requirements for control and surveillance, other factors may have been neglected (Martin, 2002; Martin & Eisenhardt, 2010). As a result, the author suggests that further research is required for developing a more holistic theory on realizing sustainable growth synergies. The author anticipates that these propositions will stimulate further research as organizational behavior is significantly complex and situational. These observations are meant to stimulate further thinking.
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