

E X A M

Course code:	ORG409
Course:	International Management
Date:	10 December 2009
Duration:	0900 - 1400
Total number of pages including this	7
Aids:	Students may use a dictionary (English or Norwegian) or to/from English or Norwegian and the student's native language.
Note:	You may answer in English and/or Norwegian. The exam consists of two parts. The first part is based on a short case in which students will answer three questions. Each answer will be weighted 20%. The second part is based on the group projects. This will be weighted 40%. You will answer the questions (2 or 3 questions) for your project case.

The exam has two parts; the first part has three questions (each worth 20%) based on the attached case. The second part has a set questions (40%) based on the group project. Please start a new page for each question that you answer and indicate the number or letter of the question you are answering.

PART I: QUESTIONS BASED ON CASE "SMART BOARDS" (20% x 3 = 60%)

Read the attached case about "Smart boards". Then answer **three** of the following questions. Be sure your answer shows that you both know the theory and use it in the analysis. Make (and state) logical assumptions where necessary.

1. A) Present and discuss the **diamond** framework for analyzing the competitive advantage of nations.
B) Use the framework to analyze the case about "Smart board". (If you do not know enough about Canada, then assume that it is in your home country. Please state what country this is.)
2. Present and discuss **globalization drivers and five forces framework** and an integrated framework drawing on the globalization drivers and five forces.
B) Use the integrated framework to analyze the case about "Smart boards".
3. A) Present and discuss the **international strategies**.
B) Given these strategies, what would you recommend for the international strategy for Smart Technologies? Draw on theory to justify your recommendation.
4. A) Present and discuss a framework for analyzing strategic **resources** for international firm.
B) Use theory to analyze relevant *international* resources for Smart Technologies.
5. A) Present and discuss **strategies for internationalization**, including when, where and how.
B) Use theory to make recommendations to Smart Technologies.
6. A) Discuss theories regarding **implementation issues** (structure, etc.).
B) Given the international strategy for Smart Technologies, discuss recommendations for implementation?
7. A) Present and discuss frameworks for fit (strategic, competence, organizational) for **strategic alliances**.
B) To finance its growth, Smart Technologies is considering a **strategic alliance** with Google. Google is interested in getting its name in the classroom. Analyze the potential alliance relationship in terms of fit.
8. The firm wishes to be **socially responsible** as they increase their international activities.
A) Define and discuss corporate social responsibility.
B) Although Smart Technologies has been profitable, it is being affected by the financial crisis as schools no longer have the budget to invest in smart technology. Argue for whether and how this should impact Smart Technologies' CSR activities.

PART II QUESTIONS BASED ON GROUP PROJECT (40%)

Answer the questions for one project case. Be sure your answer shows both that you know the theory and that you can use the theory to analyze your PROJECT CASE.

AKSO

- A) Discuss the relationship among the value chain, resource perspective (VRIO) and OLI. Can these be integrated? Please explain how or discuss why they cannot be integrated.
- B) Drawing on the frameworks above, analyze AKSO.
- C) What are the implications (conclusions) for AKSO and for theory?

BILABONG

- A) In which ways is the industry for Bilabong global? (Support your answer with evidence from analysis)
- B) What are the implications of the ways in which the industry is global for Bilabong's strategy?

ELKEM

- A) Why do firm resources lead to sustainable competitive advantage?
- B) For Elkem, analyze resources with regard to international activities.

FUGRO

- A) You have stated that Fugro is a service organization. What are the implications of this for the international strategy?
- B) Discuss the coordination/configuration of each of the activities in the value chain for Fugro.

FUNCOM

- A) In which ways is the industry for Funcom global? (Support with evidence from an analysis)
- B) What are the implications of ways in which industry is global for Funcom's strategy?

GRINDEX

- A) What is the relationship among the different types of fit and success?
- B) Analyze strategic fit and culture fit for merger that created Grindex.
- C) What conclusions can you draw?

JOTUN

- A) What is the purpose of the diamond framework? Why are related and supporting industries important?
- B) Drawing on your case, analyze the demand condition determinant.
- C) Draw conclusions based on your analysis.

JKH

- A) Discuss how service organizations can gain competitive advantage in their international strategy.
- B) You have stated that JKH has a replication strategy and you have focused on one country; will this work if the firm wishes to grow internationally? Justify your answer based on theory.

LEGO

- A) LEGO is an international company. Analyze the international resources and draw conclusions.
- B) You claim, in the introduction, that there is a large difference between theory and practice; discuss the ways in which the theory was useful in explaining the activities of LEGO; and what theory development is needed for what the theory did not explain.

LEVI

- A) What is the relationship among the value chain, resources and OLI? What decisions can be made based on the combination of these frameworks?
- B) Should Levi's resources for an international advantage be analyzed differently than for domestic advantage? Justify your answer.

MARINE HARVEST GROUP:

- A) What role do supporting and related industries play in the diamond framework? Why is this important?
- B) Drawing on your MHG case, and given the analysis of the diamond framework, what conclusions can you draw?

PILSNER URQUELL

- A) How does Dunning's OLI framework explain a firm's decision on where to enter?
- B) If Pilsner U is on its way to a global strategy, where do you expect to find efficiencies? Discuss in terms of activities.

RIEBER

- A) Drawing on the information in your Rieber case, analyze the international industry.
- B) Draw conclusions, based on the analysis, for how Rieber should compete.

VOSS

- A) Drawing on theory, analyze the international strategy for VOSS VANN.
- B) Discuss, based on theory, whether a small firm can have a global strategy.

WWILHEMSEN

- A) What is a useful structure for a transnational strategy? Why?
- B) In which ways was the theory useful in explaining the structure of WW; what theory development would you suggest based on your analysis?

YAHOO!

- A) Drawing on your information of Yahoo! and Microsoft, use the framework to determine the complementarities (complements), gaps, and co-investments.
- B) What determines the success of the alliance between Yahoo! and Microsoft? Do you expect this alliance to be successful? Support (drawing on analysis based on theory) your opinion.

Technology

Getting to the Top of the Class

FORBES, Elizabeth Corcoran, 10.05.09, 12:00 AM ET

Children who marched into their grade school classrooms this autumn found the usual assortment of crayons, glue sticks and light-up globes. Thousands found something else: large interactive screens affixed to a classroom wall, known in playground lingo as "Smart boards."

When attached to the Internet, these boards are a portal to the digital world. Students can manipulate what's on the screen with a finger or a stylus. Changes get saved to a laptop computer and then printed or sent home via e-mail. Teachers like the boards. They're cool and digital--but if you want to use them like a blackboard, you can do that, too.

Sales of wall screens, which cost between \$700 to \$4,500, have zoomed from 170,000 units in 2004 to 700,000 worldwide this year, mostly to schools. Almost a third of k--12 classes in the U.S.--and three-quarters of the schools in the U.K.--now have one. "This is the first tool that's transforming our classrooms and showing how they're different from the past hundred years," says Diane A. Garber, principal of Lincoln Elementary School in Burlingame, Calif.

The leader of this spurt of silicon is not in Silicon Valley. More than half of the world's interactive whiteboards (and 63% of those in the U.S.) are made by Smart Technologies, a 22-year-old privately held company in Calgary (in Canada) run by husband-and-wife cofounders David A. Martin, 60, and Nancy Knowlton. "We think these need to go into every classroom," says the soft-spoken Knowlton, 55, the company's chief executive. "There's no silver bullet in education, but we see these increasing student enjoyment and decreasing behavioral problems, and that translates into better student achievement."

Many of the past efforts to load classrooms with electronic gadgets have been bitter disappointments. U.S. school districts have spent billions on technology over the past two decades. Test scores haven't budged. Broken, dusty computers languishing in corners of classrooms and school libraries are as commonplace as skinned knees on the playground.

For many reasons, including the erratic budgets of school districts, selling educational technology is a treacherous business. No one knows that better than Knowlton, who jokes that she and Martin have been so intensely devoted to building Smart that if they had married anyone else, their spouses would have long ago quit on them.

Their story began 20 years ago. Martin, who has a bachelor's degree in applied

mathematics from Concordia University and had started an earlier company, got rights to LCD-panel technology developed by it. Knowlton, who earned an M.B.A. at St. Mary's University in Halifax, N.S., had been hankering to run a company. In 1987 they became the Canadian distributor for InFocus Systems, a digital projector maker, and started imagining what they could do with flat screens.

At the time that took some powerful imagination: LCD screens were expensive, clunky and limited to black-and-white. Research groups such as the Xerox Palo Alto Research Center were experimenting with interactive boards in meetings, but the devices were novelties.

In 1991 Martin and Knowlton built their first Smart board and hauled it to Comdex, the big tech trade show. Their demo caught the eye of a wandering executive from Intel, Les Vadesz. He wrote the couple a check from Intel-- "barely seven figures," recalls Knowlton--for an undisclosed stake in the company, but the timing and the endorsement were crucial. In the years that followed, Vadesz and Intel provided Martin and Knowlton with advice and guidance but no additional cash, even though Vadesz would go on to start Intel's venture arm.

Martin poured his efforts into the unglamorous underpinnings of interactive board technology. The screens were based on resistive technology: They used two conductive layers separated by a few thousandths of an inch of air. Applying pressure to the board--with a stylus or a finger--connects the layers and sends data or commands to a computer. Martin's most important patent involves software that registers the location of that pressure in an x-y grid and calibrates the image even if it's not neatly aligned. (Smart holds 29 U.S. patents and has 200 applications pending.)

Knowlton's and Martin's budget was gaunt. They had lost the right to sell InFocus supplies in 1991 after a reorganization--and without that, 97% of their revenue. Most of what they built they sold to schools. They scraped by on bank loans.

As they teetered on the edge of insolvency, Knowlton remembers their lawyer advising them to pack it in. The couple reflected on their motives. "One of us said: 'We want to change the way the world works and learns. And we're not done.'" Knowlton pauses. "It was such a preposterous statement that we both laughed out of control for 10 or 15 minutes." The next day they were back at it.

Other technologies were catching up. By the late 1990s the cost of flat-panel screens was plummeting. Screens grew thinner. The Web and wireless connectivity were both booming. Those changes made the boards not just fancy blackboards but interactive tools that students use even more than teachers. Smart racked up sales of \$21 million in 1999.

In 2004 the British government decided to spend \$90 million on interactive whiteboards for grade school classrooms. The main suppliers: Smart, Hitachi and Promethean, a U.K. company. Private equity firm Apax Partners became Smart's third minority stakeholder in August 2007. Smart revenue for the year ending Mar. 31 was \$430 million.

The future for digital suppliers to the classroom looks pretty bright right now.

"Technology is becoming so ubiquitous outside the schools that it's requiring us to rethink technology inside the schools," says Steven Hargadon, founder of a popular social networking group devoted to education, Classroom 2.0. "As digital tools permeate the classroom, kids get more actively involved with learning," adds Scott McLeod, a professor at Iowa State University. "They become doers."

Data from case:

Price of the wall screen: from \$700 to \$5400

Units sold: 170,000 in 2004

700,000 in 2009

Market: used in 1/3 of the **classrooms** (grade school and high school) in the US

70% of the **schools** in the UK have one