38

A DECADE AFTER LIBERALIZATION

An institutional perspective on development of Indonesia's retail industry

GEORGE MARTIN SIRAIT
Dept. of Indonesian Studies University of Sydney
Faculty of Business Administration Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Jakarta

martin.sirait@atmajaya.ac.id
gsir6186@uni.sydney.edu.au

Introduction

The existence of modern retailing in Indonesia can be traced back to the 1970s when retailers served mostly upper class consumers and expatriates in urban areas.1 Among those are *Hero*, *KemChick*, *Gelael*, *Ramayana* and *Matahari* which were owned by locals. While Matahari and Ramayana focused on fashion retailing, the rest involved in food business. Some foreign indirect investment, such as *Circle-K* and *7Eleven*, had been also in place during the 1980s through franchising arrangement. Foreign direct investment commenced entering market of this fourth most populous country in the world in the next decade.

Dutch retailer SHV Holdings N.V, for instance, opened its first grocery store *Makro* in 1991, the US-based giant retailer *Wal-Mart* in 1996 (but then shortly exited the market following series of social unrest in the country), or Belgium retailer Delhaize started its operation in 1997 with brand name *Superindo*. Although there was an increasing trend during 1980s—which Natawidjaja et al. (2007) called it as 'pre-take off period'—a significant expansion of modern outlets have just emerged since the end of 1990s.

Following the 1997/98 Asian financial crisis Government of Indonesia took off restrictions of foreign direct investment, including in retail trade, as part of the IMF structural adjustment programs (Indonesia 1998). Shortly after this deregulation policy, France-based Carrefour and Hong Kong-based Dairy Farm are among the first overseas investors entered the Indonesian retail market. Liberalization of retail trade not only has drawn foreign direct investment but also re-energized domestic capital in retail sector.

Borrowing framework developed by Reardon et al. (2003) on 'supermarket revolution', Indonesia includes in the second wave of the rapid diffusion of supermarkets in developing countries occurred from mid to late 1990s along with some countries in Central America and Southern-Central Europe; (2) the expansion of modern retailing comes side by (1) 'Modern retailing' refers to a self-service trading with fixed prices in the forms of minimarkets, supermarkets, department stores or grocery stores while 'traditional retailing' considers trading through bargaining run by small or medium traders or co-operatives with small capital.

Te first wave (from early to mid-1990s) countries include those in South America and East Asia outside China and Japan. The third wave (from late 1990s to early 2000s) occurred in parts of Africa, Central and side with multi-nationalization of retailers and diversification of retailing formats. Although demand—such as the huge size of population, high urbanization and rising per capita income—and supply factors—that there are still few players in modern trade—may explain this expansion, as some observers (for example, Natawidjaja, Reardon, and Shetty 2007) argue, transformation of Indonesia's retail industry was largely driven by liberalization policy in this sector, particularly in the beginning stage.

This paper discusses development of Indonesia's retail industry after ten years of trade liberalization. Without ignoring roles of other types of retailing, this paper focuses on food and general merchandising as this type has been showing the most rapid expansion in internationalization (Dicken 2003; Coe 2004; Dawson 2007). Wrigley (2000) even locates food retailers as elite group among retail TNCs, in terms of scale of their real growth as well as their significant roles in the contemporary global supply chains system. In Indonesia context modern food retailers are considered to be important player in transforming the country's retail industry (Walker 1996; Natawidjaja, Reardon, and Shetty 2007; Kanjaya and Susilo 2010).

An institutional perspective is used to examine recent development. First part of the paper shows some main outcomes as results of market opening in the industry. Second part explains briefly theoretical framework applied in the examination while the methods used is describe in the third part. The next part discusses four institutional issues emerging in the development of contemporary Indonesian retail business. The last part concludes.

Outcomes of Liberalization in the Retail Sector

Liberalization in the retail sector has altered structure of the Indonesian retail industry. Modern retailing has been growing rapidly at the expense of traditional trades which are predominantly operated and owned by families or independent small enterprises. As shown in the figure 1 below, although traditional stores still constitute the largest in Indonesia's retail market, their markets share decreased steadily while modern trade grew from some 22 per cent in 2000 to 37 per cent of total markets in 2008. The large formats of modern retailing, such as supermarket and hypermarket, took the largest share of modern trade but proportion of minimarkets grew faster by 11 percent from 2000 to 2008 compared to 4 percent achieved by supermarket and hypermarket combined.

In the initial phase the growth of modern retail industry was triggered by liberalization of the sector but then it is being sustained by high rate of consumption that has become the main engine of Indonesia economic growth since post-economic crisis. Private consumption where retail sector serves constitutes more than half of the country's GDP. In addition, this continuing growth is also contributed by an increasing per capita income and rising rate of the Indonesian middle-class as a result of the country's better economic performance during the last five years.

South America, Southeast Asia, China, India and Russia. The emerging fourth wave is still in the beginning phase covering South Asia outside India, Sub-Saharan Africa and the poorer countries in Southeast Asia and South America.

The changing structure of the retail industry is also characterized by alteration of its main players. Before liberalization main retailers in the industry were mostly local firms, such as Goro, Gelael, Hero, Alfa Gudang Rabat and Matahari. There were only few retail multi-national firms (Delhaize and SHV

Holdings N.V) operating in the market. After liberalization major retailers tend to be multi-nationals in ownership through process of providing technical assistance, joint venture, merger or acquisition.

Dairy Farm International, for example, initially entered Indonesian market by providing technical assistance to Hero, but then secured gradually share of the local retailer until becoming the majority holder. Delhaize Group bought majority stake of *Superindo* from local retailer PT. Lion Super Indo. Lotte Group acquired totally *Makro* owned by Dutch SHV Holdings N.V. Carrefour moves in opposite way. This second largest retailer on the planet started its operation with 'green-field' setting. To strengthen its economies of scale and scope, it acquired one of major local retailers, PT. Alfa Retailindo. But then it sold nearly half of its stake to local player, PT. Trans Corp.

That consolidation among retailers, both local and foreigners, has put the power of retail market in the hand of few players. Carrefour, Giant, Superindo and Hypermart control majority of market share in large formats of retailing while Indomaret and Alfamart dominate in small formats. Whether this situation potentially led to oligopoly, as Fels (2009) predicts, need further examination.

Another outcome of retail liberalization is diversification of retail formats. Almost all retailers apply more than single format of retailing. As demonstrated in Table 2, Dairy Farm/Hero, for instance, run their chains through formats of hypermarket, supermarket, minimarket, and specialty. A similar pattern is applied by Matahari except in minimarket format. Lotte diversifies its chains primarily within large format of retailing due to legal constraint. Leading retailer in hypermarket format, Carrefour, lately attempts to operate a kind of convenience store format named *Carrefour Express*.

Diversification occurs not only among large, medium and mini formats of retailing but also within single one. For example, Sumber Alfaria Trijaya that focuses on small retailing trade diversifies its chains based on different economic levels of targeted consumers. *Alfamart* serves middle and lower income while *Alfamart Express* is aimed to serve middle and upper class. In addition, it introduces a format between minimarket and supermarket size called *Alfamidi*.3 Consistent with Mukoyama's (2004) assessment in some emerging economies, this wide diversification of retail formats takes only 10 years to introduce in Indonesia, compared to about 90 years in the US.

Distribution of modern retailing is still considerably uneven throughout Indonesia. It concentrates in main cities in Java and Bali Islands. Some 85 percent of total outlets spread out across these islands alone. The rest can be found in Sumatera (10 percent), Kalimantan (1.4 percent), Sulawesi (1.3 percent) while modern market in Papua still very few. With regard to targeted consumers, there is a change being underway. Prior to liberalization, modern retailers served primarily middle to upper income Indonesians (A and B segments) and expatriates. Nowadays modern outlets, led by food and general merchandising, have become point of interest of the lower-middle and working poor families (C and D segments) as these outlets offer competitive prices and shopping convenience in response to change in consumer preferences. The gap in territorial distribution of modern trade and the expansion of targeted consumers imply huge opportunity for modern retailing to diffuse in the future.

Rapid development of modern retail business has implication in providing job opportunity for Indonesians. According to data from Central Bureau of Statistics, in 2010 retail (along with wholesale, hotel and restaurant) is the second largest source of employment after agriculture. About 20.8 per cent (22,5 million workforce) involved in retail, hotel and restaurant compared to 38.3 per cent in agriculture and 12.8 per cent in manufacturing. It is estimated 1.2 million (5.3 per cent) of 22,5 million workers involved in this modern retailing industry alone.4 This number is nearly the same as total workers in mining and quarrying sector combined. In other words, retail is important sector for Indonesia's economy.

In response to recent development of retail industry, the Government of Indonesia has made some attempts in regulating the sector. Presidential Regulation No. 11 Year 2007 restricts foreign capital to penetrate smaller formats of retailing. As shown in Table 3, minimarkets having size of sale floor less than 400 meter square are totally devoted to domestic capital. Although Presidential Regulation No. 112 Year 2007 concerning organizations and directions of traditional markets, shopping centres, and modern stores does not define convenience store, in fact foreign capital is not allowed to invest in this chain although some confusing implementations exist in the cases of Starmart (Dairy Farm) and Carrefour Express (Carrefour).

In addition, foreign capital is restricted to operate in smaller size of supermarket and department store. Conversely, foreign capital has wide room to invest in the large format of modern retailing. This partly explains fragmentation of Indonesia's contemporary retail industry characterized by division of large and small formats in which foreign capital predominantly controls the former and domestic capital the latter.

Along with directing movement of foreign capital, the existing policies put special emphasis on regulating location of store (zoning), revitalization of traditional markets, and partnerships between modern and traditional stores.5 Regulations on zoning set that the establishment of particular modern format should be situated in a certain type of road system while considering distance to traditional markets already existed in the area. Hypermarkets and shopping centres, for instance, are allowed only to be located along arterial or collector road networks.

In implementation this arrangement often does not work. Revitalization of traditional, wet markets becomes one of policy agenda in the Indonesian contemporary retail industry as there is an increasing awareness uncovering that the decline of these markets is not primarily due to the rise of modern stores but considerably because of their bad management. Partnerships between modern and traditional retailers as well as modern retailers and suppliers are set to protect small and medium local enterprises that constitute the vast majority in the country's retail market. Five years ago the authority to set these arrangements has been shifted from central to local government as a consequence of decentralization policy. This shift of power, to some extent, has engendered some institutional concerns. Along with partnerships, this point will be examined further in the discussion section of institutional issues below.

Institution as Framework

Institutional theory puts attention to social aspects of economic action. Emanating from seminal work of Polanyi's *The Great Transformation* (1944) and of Granovetter (1985), this theory views organizations as embedded in social networks and relationships. Hess (2004) defines three major categories of embeddedness of an organization.

First, societal embeddedness that refers to historical and cultural backgrounds of actors which influence and shape their perception, strategies, and actions at home and outside. It can be understood as a 'genetic code' or social and cultural heritage of actors that in some degrees determinates ideas of their business system and their economic behaviour.

Second, network embeddedness that reflects connectivity and relationships among actors which are built on trust. This includes relational aspect (actor's relationships with other agents in the business-relational context) and structural aspect (actor's relationships in broader institutional networks including non-business agents, such as government and NGOs) regardless of their locations.

Third, territorial embeddedness signifies spatial networks, the extent to which an actor is anchored in particular territories or locations and as a consequence, can take advantage or be constraint by the economic activities, social dynamics, and local policies that already exist in those places. Retailing is one of economic activity that demand high level of this multi-dimensional embededdness (Wrigley, Coe, and Currah 2005; Coe and Wrigley 2007) and the success or failure of a retailer in certain market depends largely on their capacity to adapt this embedded (see for instance, Burt, Dawson, and Sparks 2003; Bianchi and Arnold 2004).

Institutional framework considers that an organization's environment contains institutions exerting normative pressures for the structures as well as practices of social actors (Zukin and DiMaggio, 1990). The actors include not only competing corporations, employees, suppliers or consumers but also government, unions, trade associations, politicians, non-governmental and community-based organizations. The involvement and coordination of relevant social actors is crucial not only in shaping institutional norms in the organization's environment but also in responding to them by conforming to these norms in order to gaining legitimacy. Existing institutions may change when actors attempt to improve their positions as developments shift the material situation, power and self-understanding of the actors (Hall and Thelen, 2009).

Institutions can range from mores, customs or social norms in certain society that are taken voluntarily by social actors to rules with formalized norms and sanctions enforced to the actors. In addition, institutions can be in the forms of norm, policy, or specific category of actor (Streeck and Thelen 2005). This paper, however, following Hall and Thelen's conceptualization (2009), focuses on ‘institutions as sets of regularized practices with rule-like quality in the sense that the actors expect the practices to be observed; and which, in some but not all, cases are supported by formal sanctions’.

There are at least three approaches to institutions: (1) institutions as logic of appropriateness consider that institutions may influence action of relevant actors as they define appropriate behavior in a particular socio-cultural context; (2) institutions as equilibrium observe that the stability of a particular pattern of strategic interaction often lies on the absence of Pareto-improving alternatives apparent to the actors; (3) institutions as resources consider that institutions involve omnipresent processes of search and negotiation whereby relevant actors seek for alternative ways to advance their interests (Hall and Thelen, 2009).

Methodology

As part of work-in-progress, this paper is based primarily on secondary data in the forms of policy documents, relevant firm publications and media data. All data is reviewed using institutional framework. While primary data collecting is still underway, this working paper takes benefits from some of interview data that have been collected. Informants of the interview include management of retail firms, association of retailers, workers, trade unions, and relevant government officials. These interviews are used to recheck secondary data and analysis.

Preliminary Findings and Discussion

This part will discuss four institutional issues among some other preliminary findings. They are about multi-embeddedness of retailing, partnerships between modern retailers and small-medium producers/traders, coordination among actors, and power shift from central to local government.

Embeddedness

The significance of multi-embeddedness of retailing can be traced in the modes of entry and expansion a retailer applies. Excluding Carrefour, all retail MNCs take advantage from the already existing establishments and their networks through joint venture or acquisition when they enter Indonesia's market. This strategy would facilitate foreign retailers to more effectively manage their territorial and network embeddedness while simultaneously transferring their societal embeddedness.

By now, except for newcomer, Lotte, all retail TNCs operating in Indonesia develop strategic partnerships with local players as their expansion strategy. Dairy Farm which now holds the vast majority of share in Giant does not freeze partnership with its long time local partner, Hero. Even Carrefour which used to be confident to stand alone, later established a strategic partnership with Trans Corp, a local company owned by native businessman who posses not only economic power but also political influence.7 This strategy is not only used to strengthen economies of scale and scope of retailers but also—as Durand and Wrigley (2009) argue, to enable them to connect to social, political, and economic networks in the host country.

Table 4. Modes of entry and expansion of major retailers.

Partnerships

Partnerships between large, modern retailers and small-medium enterprises are core theme in all retailing policies since the outset of liberalization in the sector to present. For example, Presidential Decree No. 99 Year 1998 allowed foreign retailers to operate in medium and larger formats of modern retailing with conditions of partnerships with smaller enterprises. Such partnerships can be in the forms of capital sharing, subcontracting, franchising, or trading agency. In terms of capital ownerships the decree regulated that small partners should secure at least 20 percent of total capital and be enhanced gradually; but there is no explicit requirements for the rest forms of the stated partnerships. Ministerial Trade Regulation No. 53 Year 2008 then details the partnerships

7 Trans Retail is part of Para Group owned by Chairul Tanjung. In addition to retail, the group runs several other businesses, such as property, finance, insurance and media. In 2010 Tanjung was appointed by President Yudhoyono to lead National Economic Committee. with small producers in the

forms of marketing cooperation and goods supplying while with small traders in the forms of space sharing.

From institutional perspective retailers take this condition as norm to do modern retailing in Indonesia and to get legitimacy as consequences of their territorial and network embeddedness. Carrefour, for instance, provides *Bazaar Rakyat* (people bazaar) and *Pojok Rakyat* (people corner) to observe this institutional obligation. These programs are aimed to provide paths for small producers to test their products before being displayed and traded at Carrefour's shelves (Darmawan, 2011).

Although being perceived as norm, partnerships between modern retailers and small-medium firms are being undertaken without enforcement from third party and shaped by large retailer strategy with patron-client model. As Reardon and Hopkins (2006) suggest, they should address a comprehensive commercial regulations which include public or private codes, contract compliance by both retailers and suppliers, payment periods by retailers, and competition-based pricing. With these suggested institutional arrangements, partnerships may move from a patron-client relationship toward an equal partnership.

Coordination Among Actors

Coordination among actors can be traced in the latest policies regulating modern and traditional retailing, such as Presidential Regulation No. 112 Year 2007 and its technical guidance as detailed in Ministerial Trade Regulation No. 53 Year 2008. These regulations are fruit of interest battle and coordination of different actors. For example, suppliers through its association, AP3MI/*Asosiasi Pengusaha Pemasok Pasar Modern Indonesia* succeeded to negotiate reduction in trading terms which used to consist of 30 items unilaterally set by large retailers to 7 items agreed by actors.8 In the meantime association of wet market traders (APPSI/*Asosiasi Pedagang Pasar Seluruh Indonesia*) succeeded to limit the movement of modern retailers through imposing zoning provision based on types of road system. For instance, hypermarkets and shopping centres are allowed only to be located along arterial or collector road networks while minimarkets and traditional markets can be erected in any type of roads. These regularized practices are mostly related to product market.

Another provision stipulated in the present policy is on business hours that represent institutional equilibrium between modern and traditional retailers. This provision, however, relates not only with product market but also with working hours (Carré et al., 2010). 9 The existing provisions have enhanced business hours—and such, working hours but without engaging significant debates among stakeholders, including trade unions. Although retail industry has changed, there is no new institutional arrangement regarding the implications of the legally extended opening hours to labour relations arrangements in the retail sector.

Power Shift

By 2007 the authority to govern retail industry was in the hand of central government (ministry of trade). Following decentralization policy introduced in 2004, power to manage retail sector in the region has shifted to district/city level or province in the case of Jakarta Special Capital Region. Local authorities varies in response to the expansion of modern retailing from attempts to providing relevant local regulation to blocking movement of modern traders for the sake of protecting traditional traders (for instance, District of Sragen). But the vast majority of the regions have not had any regulation on retailing yet.

Unlike other regions, Jakarta posses more policies in retailing as modern trades concentrate in this capital city. In 2006 Governor of Jakarta issued an instruction to postpone the issuance of new license for minimarkets due to uncontrolled diffusion of this type of retailing. This shift of power location, to some extent, has engendered more complex problems in regard to development of modern retail.

Mutebi (2007) reckons that local authorities face two conflicting concerns: on the one hand, they are interested in enjoying possible tax revenues from retail stores but on the other hand, they are unsure of potential costs to local economies, employment, and surrounding communities. In addition, decision makers trap themselves in the dichotomy of traditional versus modern where modern retailing is identical to foreign and large player. This in turn may hamper modernization of traditional retailing.

Nevertheless the shift of power from central to local is not totally negative to players of modern retailing. As indicated by some observers (for instance, Appelbaum 2010; Carré et al. 2010), retailers are among other economic actors who creatively exploit loopholes in regulatory arrangements. Expansion of minimarkets outside Greater Jakarta, for example, is facilitated by gap of regulations between regions. Another example, because foreign capital is restricted to penetrate convenience store, global chains 7Eleven sought legal presence through regulation in restaurant business. In summary while retailers may find constraints in local institutions, they also actively utilize loopholes existing in the shift of power from central to local authority.

Conclusion

Although Indonesia has not implemented full liberalization in the retail sector, the policy has transformed structure of the country's retailing industry, particularly in the areas of main players, formats of retailing, firm strategies, spatial distribution and targeted consumers and attempts on regulations. As occurs in other developing countries, retail MNCs operating in Indonesia develop strategic partnerships with local partner to strengthen not only their economies of scale and scope but also their societal, territorial and network embeddedness. While modern retailers are constrained by the existing institutions, they also exploit loopholes in the institutional arrangements. Institutional change is needed toward equal partnerships with small-medium firms and coordination with other primary actors such as retail workers, in shaping better institutions.

Bibliography

Appelbaum, Eileen. 2010. "Institutions, firms, and the quality of jobs in low-wage labor market." In *Low-Wage Work in the Wealthy World.* J. Gautié and J. Schmitt (Eds.). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Baret, Christophe, Steffen Lehndorff, and Leigh Sparks (Eds.) 2000. *Flexible Working in Food Retailing: A comparison between France, Germany, the United Kingdom and Japan*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bianchi, Constanza C, and Stephen J Arnold. 2004. "An institutional perspective on retail internationalization success: Home Depot in Chile." *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* 14 (2) 149-169.

Burt, Steve, John Dawson, and Leigh Sparks. 2003. "Failure in international retailing: Research propositions." *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research,* 13 (4) 155-173.

Carré, Francoise, Chris Tilly, Maarten van Klaveren, and Dorothea Voss-Dahm. 2010. “Retail jobs in comparative perspective.” In *Low-Wage Work in the Wealthy World*, edited by J. Gautié and J. Schmitt. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Coe, Neil M. 2004. “The internationalisation/globalisation of retailing: Towards an economic - geographical research agenda.” *Environment and Planning - Part A,* 36 (9) 1571-1594.

Coe, Neil, M., and Neil Wrigley. 2007. “Host economy impacts of transnational retail: The research agenda.” *Journal of Economic Geography* 7 (4) 341-371.

Darmawan, Andri. 2011. “Capai efisiensi lewat optimalisasi teknologi.” *Marketing Magazine*, August, 60-61.

Dawson, John A. 2007. “Scoping and conceptualising retailer internationalisation.” *Journal of Economic Geography,* 7 (4) 373-397.

Dicken, Peter. 2003. *Global Shift: Reshaping the Global Economic Map in the 21st Century*. 4th edition. London: Sage Publications.

Durand, Cédric., and N. Wrigley. 2009. “Institutional and economic determinants of transnational retailer expansion and performance: a comparative analysis of Wal-Mart and

Carrefour.” *Environment and Planning A,* 41 (7) 1534-1555.

Fels, Allan. 2009. “The regulation of retailing - lessons for developing countries.” *Asia Pacific Business Review* 15 (1) 13.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. “Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 91 (3) 481-510.

Hall, Peter A., and Kathleen Thelen. 2009. “Institutional change in varieties of capitalism.” *Socio-Economic Review* 7 (1) 7-34.

Hess, Martin. 2004. ‘“Spatial’ relationships? Towards a reconceptualization of embeddedness.” *Progress in Human Geography* 28 (2) 165-186.

Indonesia, Government of. 1998. *Letter of Intent and Memorandum of Economic and Financial Policies of the Government of Indonesia.* International Monetary Fund.

Kanjaya, Meshvara, and Yongky Susilo. 2010. *Retail Rules: Melihat keunggulan dan potensi bisnis ritel makanan di masa depan*. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Mukoyama, Masao. 2004. “The characteristics of the new retail competition in Asia and the research agenda.” *Journal of Global Marketing* 18 (1/2) 187-198.

Mutebi, Alex, M. 2007. “Regulatory responses to large-format transnational retail in South-east Asian cities.” *Urban Studies,* 44 (2) 357-379.

Natawidjaja, Ronnie, Thomas Reardon, and Shobba Shetty. 2007. *Horticultural Producers and Supermarket Development in Indonesia*. Jakarta: The World Bank.

Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The political and economic origins of our time*. Reprint 1957 ed. Boston: Beacon Press.

Reardon, Thomas, and Rose Hopkins. 2006. "The Supermarket revolution in developing countries: Policies to address emerging tensions among supermarkets, suppliers and traditional retailers." *The European Journal of Development Research* 18 (4) 522-545.

Reardon, Thomas, C. Peter Timmer, Christopher B. Barrett, and Julio Berdegue. 2003. "The rise of supermarkets in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics,* 85 (5) 1140-1146.

Streeck, Wolfgang, and Kathleen Thelen. 2005. "Introduction: Institutional change in advanced political economies." In *Beyond Continuity: Institutional change in advanced political economies,*. W. Streeck and K. Thelen (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suryadarma, Daniel, Adri Poesoro, Sri Budiyati, Akhmadi, and Meuthia Rosfadhila. 2007. *Impact of Supermarkets on Traditional Markets and Retailers in Indonesia's Urban Centers.* SMERU Research Institute.

Walker, David. 1996. "Moment of truth for Indonesia's food retailers." *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management,* 24 (8) 25.

Wrigley, Neil. 2000. "The globalization of retail capital: Themes for Economic Geography." In *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography* M. P. F. a. M. S. G. Gordon L. Clark (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wrigley, Neil, Neil M. Coe, and Andrew Currah. 2005. "Globalizing retail: conceptualizing the distribution-based transnational corporation (TNC)." *Progress in Human Geography,* 29 (4) 437-457.

Zukin, Sharon, and Paul DiMaggio. 1990. "Introduction." In *Structures of Capital: The social organization of the economy.* S. Zukin and P. DiMaggio (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.