ASIA PACIFIC MULTINATIONALS

Name

Course

Professor

University

City and State

Date

Asia Pacific Multinationals

Innovation is recognized as a factor to the realization of any progressive company's goals. In the U.S, the achievement of corporations such as IBM, Intel, Apple, and General Electric are proof to the conviction of unceasing innovation. Apple attributes 70% of its profits from exclusively four brands that were inventions of previous years (Sengupta, 2013). Again, multinational organizations such as Samsung, Mitsubishi, Hitachi, Huawei, and SECOM derive their success from their revolutionary products and structured methodologies to applying R&D (research and development) for the improvement of their creations. For instance, the software success story of Microsoft is based on the practice of continuous innovation. High competition in most of these sectors compels corporations to utilize change as a way of presenting excellent and unique brands in the market.

Research has demonstrated that innovation is a prerequisite for the current corporate culture. Contrasted with the large number of inventions in big multinational organizations of Europe and the U.S, the extent of innovation that results from Asian corporations (except China, Japan, and Korea), for a long time, has been insignificant (Sengupta, 2013). The primary explanation for this was a nonexistence of research programs and a shortage of resources required for innovation. However, there has been a positive change in this trend with Asian multinationals being at the lead of innovation instead of being followers in the launch of new brands. Therefore, it is essential to analyze and compare these multinationals concerning strategy, management structure, core capabilities, and government support to have an understanding of this change.

Strategy

Samsung

Business Testing Strategy (1938-1960)

Samsung started its operations in 1938 as a grocery store with its founder being Lee Byung-chul. However, the young company left this industry a few years after because of intense competition. They started producing and vending ramen noodles in 1940 and ten years after abandoned this business to venture into sugar manufacturing (Vij, 2016). Four years after, it left the sugar industry to enter the clothing business which was momentary. Samsung planned to establish a profitable insurance company in 1956 but left four years later to found an analog television manufacturing firm.

Discovering Company Role and Expansion Plan (1960-1990)

The company realized a strategic position in the TV production enterprise. It maintained developing segmental and adjacent competencies in this industry for 20 years. However, in 1980, the firms identified prospects for growth in the telecommunication industry and shifted to the manufacturing of telephone circuits (Vij, 2016). Moreover, within this period, the organization began transforming its operations. To this effect, Samsung ventured into the real estate sector in 1990 and constructed the tallest structures in Taiwan and Malaysia.

Merging and Integration Strategy (1990-present)

As a result of the massive downturn that the company experienced in 1993, it decided to begin the amalgamation process of downscaling and uniting corresponding segments. This assisted Samsung in becoming a determined enterprise. In the same year, Samsung established itself as the leading manufacturer of semiconductors in the world (Vij, 2016). In 1995, the business concentrated on LCD (liquid crystal display) screens becoming a global leader in the production of flat-screen TVs. Still, in 2010, the flat screen business was characterized by

intense rivalry. Samsung explored its next phase of development by tactically entering the smartphone enterprise.

Future Escalation Plans

Currently, Samsung is entering into other lucrative sectors that will lead to its next stage of intensification (Vij, 2016). The multinational has developed essential potentials in numerous industries, and its present strategy is to capitalize on bioengineering, renewable energy, and medical care to finance its next phase of growth.

Huawei

Huawei's current strategy for growth is based on client-centered innovation and cooperation with other firms. The company provides solutions for sectors such as energy, finance, SME (small and medium-sized enterprises), transportation, and MSOs (management services organization). Huawei concentrates on collaborative partnerships and the execution of secure channel policies (Huawei Technologies, 2014). Huawei cooperates with other telecommunication companies eventually becoming their longstanding affiliates and clients. The firm and its associated telecom organizations work together to grow the telecom market and benefit equally.

Furthermore, Huawei liaises with global strategic companies that possess experience of the business and market. Consequently, this allows the two companies to supplement each other and accept leadership positions in the global markets. Huawei is increasing its supply and cooperation partnerships expansively in the global business (Huawei Technologies, 2014). Moreover, it is assisting these associates to develop while establishing an inclusive and cordial business environment. Additionally, by exploring a whole perception of clientele demands in several businesses, the company is improving and supplying aggressive, incorporated answers

for the corresponding segments. Sustaining its strategy of close collaboration and consolidation with partners, Huawei is dedicated to developing a productive and affable environment in the corporate IT market.

SECOM

SECOM's strategy includes performing installations, protection and supervising electronic security systems in compliance with standard enterprise and specialized procedures (SECOM, 2013). The company intends to maintain quality targets and an ecosystem that assists its staff to undertake routine developments in efficiency and quality.

SECOM plans to ensure changes in some primary areas of its operation. These core areas are indicators of performance, and they are comprised of preemptive maintenance and client satisfaction (SECOM, 2013). The firm's quality system strategy is intended to avert low quality and provide a structure where quality development is monitored on a regular basis. This method has become an essential feature of SECOM's training program that ensures the communication, conception, and implementation of the policy at every level of the company.

Management Structure

Hitachi

The enterprise's governance structure is centered on a method guided by market trends and founded on customer expectations. The goal of this structure is to promote innovation in the social business and maintain its competitiveness in the global market (Hitachi Group, 2012). Hitachi has arranged its management sections into five units allied with customer demands enabling improved concentration on expanding areas and quick decision making (Hofstede, 2007). Moreover, the organization will augment its value propositions in Asia by devising strategies and creating enterprises inflexibly established in domestic markets.

Hitachi's CEO (Chief Executive Officer) is responsible for leading business growth throughout the company and preparing regional approaches and market analysis from a local viewpoint. Also, the CEO is accountable for suggesting opinions to the headquarters, determining the course for local management strategy, and procuring supervisory roles.

Hitachi improves management effectiveness by organizing its extensive variety of companies into five segments: the High Functional Materials & Components Group, the Information & Telecommunication Systems Group, the Power Systems Group, the Construction Machinery Group, and the Infrastructure Systems Group (Hitachi Group, 2012). Through the incorporation of the management of its closely related business groups, Hitachi shortens the process of policymaking, founds an internationally competitive corporate structure, and elevates the enterprise portfolio of each group.

Hitachi's Infrastructure Systems Group is composed of three groups: Components, Smart Infrastructure, and System Engineering (Hitachi Group, 2012). With this framework, the Infrastructure Systems Group avails vertically integrated brands through liaising with its Social Innovation Business Project Division that directs new enterprise development programs.

SECOM

SECOM's management structure is based on a corporate governance system. In this structure, the Board of Directors (three of them are external directors) determines matters regarding business implementation (SECOM Japan, 2016). The Representative Director and the President assume the role of business implementation. The directorial and audit board members (three are external) together with the board of directors synchronize with internal audit divisions, to inspect and supervise executive officers and directors in the performance of their obligations.

SECOM has implemented this form of system to help support the company's groups and improve customer service operations by accelerating enforcement and accountabilities. Supervisory and audit board members are chosen to accomplish SECOM's answerability of effecting a nonpartisan supervision of management performance that respects the concerns of investors (SECOM Japan, 2016). Furthermore, the three outside directors are selected to guarantee the culpability and impartiality of the executive depending on external perceptions in the event of decision-making.

Samsung

Samsung has three Chief Executive Officers that individually head the IT & Mobile Communications and Device Solutions Divisions and Consumer Electronics. This structure is aimed at consolidating and augmenting the efficacy of the firm's processes. The Global B2B Center and the Media Solution Center are joined into linked companies for the purpose of enhancing the rapidity of their policymaking process and market response (Korea Newswire, 2014). Parts of the Media Solution Center related with mobile products are incorporated into the Mobile Communications Business.

The strategy role and sales operations of the Global B2B Center are fused with the Global Marketing Office and the Mobile Communications Business for the purpose of propelling its mobile B2B business to the industry's forefront (Korea Newswire, 2014). The mobile B2B market is filled with incredibly able staff from the Mobile Communications Business, whereas the company recruits globally for B2B talent. In the U.S, Samsung's subdivisions, Samsung Telecommunications America and Samsung Electronics America are unified into a single organization with the aim of increasing cooperation and efficiency.

Core Capabilities

Mitsubishi Trading Company

Mitsubishi trading company has expanded from the Asian region to the global stage leading to significant domestic and international market shares (Mitsubishi, 2016). The reasons for this achievement are its core capabilities: Pioneering development, broad product selection, excellent service and support systems, direct communication with clients, massive sales channel, and inventive attitudes towards solutions through an extensive partnership system created to position the customer at the enterprise's core.

Pioneering Development

Through collaborating with its network of plants and foreign manufacturing units, its head factory in Japan designs solutions and structures that are aimed at improving and reinforcing production methods through amplified machine operation, improved quality, and intensified system visibility.

Broad Product Selection

Mitsubishi trading company provides an extensive product listing that incorporates industrial mechatronics, power distribution apparatus, drive tools, and energy efficiency support equipment.

Delivering Cohesive Solutions

Associated with an assortment of partners, Mitsubishi offers solutions with the purpose of reforming production.

Broad Partnership Network

By closely cooperating with retail stores, sales firms, and branches globally, Mitsubishi can provide services that fulfill customer anticipations.

Hitachi

The core competencies of Hitachi are its manufacturing equipment and industrial machinery that are the foundation of the company's core enterprises. Hitachi provides manufacturing equipment that satisfies the expectations of its environmentally mindful clients (Kimbara, 2012). Furthermore, the company offers industrial machinery that meets the diverse customer needs such as high performance, energy efficiency, variation, and environmental awareness.

Samsung

Samsung has six core capabilities: research and development (R&D), human resources, capital expenditure, marketing, mergers and acquisitions (M&A), patents. The company possesses an R&D center is California that is focused on the enhancement of underlying technologies (Samsung Electronics, 2014). Samsung heavily invests in R&D for the purpose of safeguarding sustainable development. Moreover, Samsung has doubled its endeavors in reducing global dispute dangers in patents. The firm found its IP (Intellectual Property) center and tasked it with integrating its patent capacity efforts.

It also instituted regional IP centers globally to moderate threats. Samsung attained global brand power by continually investing in its marketing strategies (Samsung Electronics, 2014). The organization intends to heavily garner the profits of its current brand assets to accomplish profit growth and revenue without expanding marketing costs consistently.

The Role of the Government

Samsung

Indeed, Samsung has received substantial government support. For instance, in 2012, the South Korean government provided the company with over US$155 million in direct subsidies (Wan, 2014). The financing which excluded tax breaks, established Samsung as the leading

corporation in South Korea. Moreover, according to the National Assembly Budget Office (NABO), in 2012, Samsung and Hyundai received US$673.9 million in direct subsidies from the central government of South Korea (Wan, 2014). Samsung was at the top of companies that received the greatest amounts in subsidizations. The firm's defense industry partners obtained US$109.2 million for R&D while Samsung Thales was awarded US$166,000 for its vital technology growth programs

Huawei

Similarly, Huawei's rapid growth is attributed to the increased government financing it has received. Although Huawei has consistently denied any association with the Government, The Government of China has labeled the company as a national champion.

The Chinese government has defended and supported Huawei by demanding it to favor local equipment suppliers and technology. This is because, as financing to grow local telecom infrastructure increases, the bigger the benefits experienced by local equipment suppliers (McCarthy, 2012). With the possession of a firm basis in the domestic market, the Chinese administration is aimed at funding the corporation (through export credits and export credit insurance) to enables its global expansion (Che, 2013). Huawei also has a broad range of government subsidies in the form of grants and preferential tax treatment

Enjoying an active domestic clientele that was facilitated through biased procurement procedures, Huawei has developed a foundation that allows it to enter telecom markets globally. This global expansion is intensively bankrolled through the provision of economic funding from the Chinese government. Huawei received 433 million Yuan in unconditional government grants and 545 million Yuan in conditional grants in 2010 (McCarthy, 2012). However, the company refused to reveal the amount of financing it obtained in 2011.

Mitsubishi

Also, in 2002, Mitsubishi trading received $35 million in assistance from the Australian government. The company was given this funding with the aim of keeping it running despite its desire to move from the Australian Market (O'Loughlin, 2002). The Mitsubishi Corporation has previously obtained financial support from the government through Mitsubishi Motors Australia. However, this is because the federal government has an interest in Mitsubishi Australia and the parent company.

Conclusion

It is important to investigate the aspects such as strategy, management structure, core capabilities and government support to comprehend the growth of these multinationals. Gradually, Asian multinationals strive to establish their presence beyond their regional borders, and they do not confine the extent of their partnerships to the local market (Williamson, 2010). The implication is that American and European corporations will regularly experience the problem of choosing an Asian firm to partner with in several nations. Instead of handling some subsidiary domestic partners, these Asian businesses have understood the importance of developing a strong global relationship with one Asian conglomerate.

The structural and strategic revolutions coming from new entrants and late entrants in the global economy have a greater credibility. These changes are not once-in-a-lifetime kinds characterized by temporary appeal (Mathews, 2006). As a matter of fact, they are firmly based on the trends in the world's economy. The Asian multinationals that have been discussed, whose management structures and strategies seem to be very inventive, are in reality the first adapters of the modified status of the global networked economy (Williamson, 2010). These are corporations that have exploited the new prospects for investments, partnerships, and dominance

(Mathews, 2006). Moreover, these global companies receive subsidies from their home government or from the governments present in their overseas divisions (Shie, 2010). Still, there are those such as Huawei that refuse to be associated with federal support due to unknown reasons.

The reason why these Asian companies are perceived as global leaders is that they develop from the sidelines. They are endowed with geocentric approaches and an international scope exemplifying global partnerships and economies (Mathews, 2006). However, they also have plans and organizational structures that are strengthened and made effective by their interdependence with the networked nature of the global economy (Williamson, 2010). They have the capability of utilizing the new openings provided by the inter-linkages of the world's economy. Conversely, global giants such as General Motors are not internationalized but remain bound to their local base. Also, their global activities are a small percentage of their aggregate operations.

Although the strategies of Asian multinationals such as SECOM and Huawei are focused on sustaining quality service and partnerships, the strategy of established corporations such as Samsung is to expand into other segments that may present growth opportunities in their revenues. This is evident in the venturing of Samsung into fields such as clean energy and biotechnology (Williamson, 2010). However, the management structures of these firms are based on market trends, and they are indeed able to adapt to any tendency in the market quickly. More importantly, is the difference between the core competencies of each multinational where it is seen that some boast of an excellent R&D program while some have high confidence in the industrial machinery and manufacturing equipment.

But still, many of the Asian corporations face the challenge of keeping pace with the dynamic global economy where they are quickly becoming outsmarted by more agile entrants (Williamson, 2010). Therefore, it cannot be argued that the factors determining the status of the world's economy in this period cannot be compared to those that were documented for the previous century (Collinson, 2007). International growth in this century is probable to be distinguished by the escalating amalgamation of a range of subsidiary firms in global networks of information, goods supply, and production.

All in all, these aspects of internationalization will consistently present opportunities for participation of pioneering subordinate companies that will initiate continuous pressure on global firms. Therefore, the world economy is liable to become a fountain of constant innovation, availing new prospects but again urging leading global corporations to adjust or close business (Nelson, 2002). The threat of multinational companies becoming boastful domineering firms could, therefore, be seen as a reaction to the short period of dominance enjoyed by a few European and American multinationals. Still, they are responsible for formulating the global trends that have created prospects for the new entrants, and these newcomers are currently assisting in influencing tendencies that will enable more opportunities for others.

References

Che, Yi, 2013. Multinationals, institutions and economic growth in china. *Asian Economic Journal*, 27(1), pp. 1-16.

Collinson, Simon, 2007. The regional character of Asian multinational enterprises. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 24(4), pp. 429-446.

Hitachi Group, 2012. *Hitachi announces new management structure*. [Online] (updated 3 Feb. 2012) Available at: <www.hitachi.eu/en/press/hitachi-announces-new-management-structure> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Hofstede, Geert, 2007. Asian management in the 21st century. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 24 (4), pp. 411-420.

Huawei Technologies, 2014. *Strategy & business development*. [Online] (updated 8 Jan. 2014) Available at: <enterprise.huawei.com/en/about/about-intro/about-enterprise-idevelop/index.htm> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Kimbara, Nobuhide, 2012. *Symbolic core competence of japanese strength in "monozukuri"* [Online] (updated 5 Mar. 2011) Available at: <www.hitachi.com/rev/pdf/2011/r2011_05_pref.pdf> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Korea Newswire, 2014. *Samsung electronics announces annual reorganization for 2015*. [Online] (updated 10 Dec. 2014) Available at: <www.koreanewswire.co.kr/newsRead.php?no=776830&ected=> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Mathews, John A, 2006. Dragon multinationals: New players in 21st century globalization. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 23(1), pp. 5-27.

McCarthy, Michael O, 2012. *Background material for US-China economic and security review commission*. [Online] (updated 4 Mar. 2013) Available at: <www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/6.14.12McCarthy.pdf> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Mitsubishi, 2016. *Core competencies about us*. [Online] (updated 19 Nov. 2016) Available at: <www.mitsubishielectric.com/fa/business/core/> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Nelson, Patricia A, 2002. The force of business: are multinationals policymakers? *Japanese Economy*, 30(2), pp. 79-104.

O'Loughlin, Toni, 2002. *$35m for Mitsubishi in nation's interest*. [Online] (updated 27 Apr. 2002) Available at: <www.smh.com.au/articles/2002/04/26/1019441303724.html> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Samsung Electronics, 2014. *Global harmony with people, society and environment*. [Online] (updated 5 Feb. 2015) Available at: <www.samsung.com/us/aboutsamsung/sustainability/sustainabilityreports/sustainabilityreports2014.pdf> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

SECOM, 2013. *Protecting what matters*. [Online] (updated 4 Dec. 2014) Available at: <www.secom.plc.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/ink10257_oft_sec_prospect_brochure-online.pdf> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

SECOM Japan, 2016. *Corporate governance*. [Online] (updated 15 Nov. 2016) Available at: <www.secom.co.jp/english/ir/mi04_cg.html> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Sengupta, Kaushik, 2013. Entrepreneurship and innovation initiatives among Asian multinationals: A cross-country analysis. *Asian Institute of Management*.

Shie, Vincent H., 2010. Is this the Asian century? China, India, South Korea and Taiwan in the age of intellectual capitalism. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 40(1), pp. 1-21.

Vij, Ravl, 2016. *Evolving business strategy of Samsung*. [Online] (updated 11 July 2016) Available at: <revenuesandprofits.com/evolving-business-strategy-of-samsung/> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Wan, Lee, 2014. *Samsung receives more than US$155 million in government subsidies*. [Online] (updated 4 Feb. 2014) Available at: <www.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_business/622549.html> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].

Williamson, Peter J, 2010. Asia's new competitive game. [Online] (updated 28 Spet. 2010) Available at: <hbr.org/1997/09/asias-new-competitive-game> [Accessed 1 Dec. 2016].