



## HOW WE FACILITATE CONVERSATIONS IN GLOBAL STRATEGY—AND THE LOCATION OF MNE HQS

TORBEN PEDERSEN<sup>1\*</sup> and STEPHEN TALLMAN<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Management and Technology, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Robins School of Business, University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia, U.S.A*

### INTRODUCTION

We have previously introduced ‘Research Platforms’ as a complement to more traditional (double-blind peer-reviewed) articles (Tallman and Pedersen, 2012). We see research platform content as important to fueling relevant conversations in the field of global strategy, as not all contributions and extensions of our knowledge can be captured in the traditional article format. Therefore, we see it as our duty as editors to create space for research platform content that lives up to our high quality norms and opens doors to new or underdeveloped areas of study...not at the expense of traditional articles, but as a supplement! We see this effort as treating our customers—mainly scholars in strategy and international business—seriously by proactively instigating conversations among scholars on the many open issues in the field. Previous issues of *Global Strategy Journal* include many examples of such research platform content, e.g., point-counterpoint discussions, perspective papers, and commentaries. This issue of *GSJ* features another example of research platform content with the perspective paper by Coeurderoy and Verbeke (2016, this issue) and the commentary by Meyer and Benito (2016, this issue). It also serves as an illustration of how we try to promote these conversations.

---

Keywords: research platform papers; location of MNE HQs; institutions; global cities and clusters

\*Correspondence to: Torben Pedersen, Department of Management and Technology, Bocconi University, Via Roentgen 1, 20136, Milan, Italy. E-mail: torben.pedersen@unibocconi.it

### THE HISTORY OF A PERSPECTIVE PAPER AND A COMMENTARY

The article by Coeurderoy and Verbeke (2016, this issue) was submitted to *GSJ* as a competitive paper. After the initial screening, it was (like 75% of all submissions) sent out for review. The manuscript went back and forth between the reviewers who commented on the manuscript and the authors who revised it, with the editor orchestrating this process of challenging and further improving the manuscript. Although the manuscript had many good qualities and touched on an important and underdeveloped issue, it became clear during the review process that there was considerable divergence in the underlying assumptions (for location of MNE headquarters, in this case) between the authors and the reviewers. Several rounds of revision and reviewing clarified the different views, and both views offered some attraction.

As editors, the safe decision would have been to reject the paper, as the reviewers were making a convincing case for this action. However, this would have meant that the fruitful discussions on the different views in the review process would be gone. So, in order to fuel the conversation, we decided to reorient the original paper into a perspective paper. We invited two other top scholars working in this area—Klaus Meyer and Gabriel Benito—to write a commentary presenting their somewhat different view, as a supplement to the original paper. Thereby, we hope to bring this interesting and relevant discussion out in the open instead of leaving it as a closed, and ultimately lost, discussion among authors, reviewers, and editors.

## THE THEME: LOCATION OF MNE HEADQUARTERS

The question of where the largest multinational enterprises (MNEs) have located their headquarters (HQs) around the world is intriguing to business managers and policy makers, and the implications for the company as well as for society are significant. However, the question has received little scholarly attention to date. HQ relocation merits attention by strategy scholars because of the potentially profound implications both for MNEs and for their old and new HQs countries. The two contributions in this issue by Coeurderoy and Verbeke (2016, this issue) and Meyer and Benito (2016, this issue), respectively, open up this conversation.

The opening question is to what extent do MNEs actually make deliberate decisions on where to locate their HQs? Or put differently: how footloose are HQs in reality? Coeurderoy and Verbeke (2016, this issue) argue ‘that head offices are footloose for three reasons. First, the cost of a large MNE head office is typically low as compared to the company’s overall cost structure...Second, the benefits of head office activities to the MNE would appear to be at least partly location independent...Third, in line with internalization theory thinking, most of the world’s largest firms now operate as ‘global factories,’ wherein both the ownership status and the location of fine-sliced value chain activities are reassessed on a continuous basis’ (2016, this issue). Meyer and Benito’s alternative view is that although MNEs sometimes do change the location of their HQs, still ‘inertial forces are strong, making this a rare event. As a result, most MNEs’ HQs are where the MNEs were born, even many decades later. In other words, most HQs are where the MNEs are at home!’ (2016, this issue). In fact, Coeurderoy and Verbeke (2016, this issue) themselves show that by 2008–09, only 1.46% of the (2,367) large MNEs they followed had relocated their HQs since company inception.

The point is that relocation of HQs does take place, but not very often. If this is so, then how can the location issue be studied adequately when by far the best predictor of today’s location of the HQ is yesterday’s location? The rarity of relocation events creates methodological challenges that need to be addressed carefully. History and ties to the location seem to matter a lot, but how can that be built into the analysis of the location? Coeurderoy and Verbeke (2016, this issue) draw on institutional theory and Porter-type arguments to formulate hypotheses about which countries might be most suitable as locations for MNE HQs, while

Meyer and Benito (2016, this issue) insist that such arguments are valid only in explaining the growth of MNEs and not HQs relocation (as this is really not a choice considered at a regular basis). They acknowledge that the choice of HQ location is more prevalent in specific cases, like at the birth of the company or at the time of mergers and acquisitions. However, it is only in these cases that the HQ is really more footloose and a real choice of location is taking place.

Another key point discussed in the two contributions is the issue of what the HQ is as a unit of study. What kind of activities typically take place in HQs? How should we define HQs when we know they vary dramatically in size and in their responsibilities for activities? In fact, the exact conceptualization of the HQ very much depends on the purpose of the study. Taken together, the two contributions offer new insights on this underdeveloped area of study and insights on the divergence in assumptions and perspectives when studying the location of MNE HQs.

## EDITORS’ DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We offer a few additional points about the conversation on global cities and clusters. The reality is that most corporate HQs are located in major global cities, likely because the infrastructures—such as investment banking, consulting, legal, audit and tax, and other professional services—that support their critical decision responsibilities are concentrated in these locations. These cities are transportation and communication hubs. Supporting industries and other institutions such as universities are in these cities. If one considers HQs to be in the ‘business of corporate management,’ global cities offer the benefits of industrial clusters for these units that are in the same business—that of running things.

The other likely locations for company HQs would seem to be in the clusters that support their value-adding activities. For a single, or limitedly differentiated, business firm, the HQ functions less as a corporate unit deciding in what industries to compete and more like a value chain coordinator within an industry or sector. This role is most likely to find support and skills in the center of an industry cluster. Of course, many industry clusters are within the metropolitan areas of the same global cities, so studies looking at geographical location, as opposed to the drivers of location decisions, are likely to miss the strategic perspective on HQ location.

Lastly, one point that is made in both contributions, but left unconsolidated, is the tendency for HQ activities to be fine sliced, both in practice and in scholarship. This implies that the proper level of analysis is not the HQ as such, but rather the location of the individual activities, some of which are likely to be more 'footloose' than others.

We hope that the article and commentary that follow inspire at least some of our readers to think seriously about the meaning and importance of HQs locations for MNCs and about the forces and strategies that lead to initial choices of location and any subsequent relocation, whether of the HQ as a whole or some of its component activities.

## REFERENCES

- Coeurderoy R, Verbeke A. 2016. The unbalanced geography of the world's largest MNEs: institutional quality and head office distribution across countries. *Global Strategy Journal* 6(2): this issue.
- Meyer K, Benito G. 2016. Where do MNEs locate their headquarters? At home! *Global Strategy Journal* 6(2): this issue.
- Tallman S, Pedersen T. 2012. Editors' comment on research platforms: point-counterpoint on multinationalization and performance. *Global Strategy Journal* 2(4): 313–317.