

# Governance In Multi-National Firms: The Strategic Managerial Approaches

DAMIAN CHIBUIKEM ABRAHAM

*Abstract- Multi-national corporations aren't just navigating one environment, they operate across a whole spectrum of different countries, laws, cultures, and stakeholders. Getting governance right in these settings means leaders need to think beyond old school, top-down systems. This journal, dives into practical leadership strategies, that push Multi-National Corporations, toward better governance, pulling ideas from strategic management, international business, corporate governance, and leadership studies. The core argument? Real multi-national corporations, governance is set on four key leadership strategies which are ethical pluralism, network orchestration, institutional entrepreneurship, and contextual ambidexterity. The ability of leaders handling conflicting moral and legal norms, without falling into the traps of pushing their own ethics or just accepting everything is as a result of ethical pluralism. Network orchestration sees leaders building semi-autonomous subsidiaries, teaming up with outside partners, and rallying everyone around shared governance standards. Institutional entrepreneurship puts leaders in the role of shaping, and not just following the rules or the norms, in their new environments. The paper pushes the idea that leadership is not just about who sits where, it is a strategic force, built into the fabric of multinational corporations. In the end, the paper lays out what these approaches mean, for things like board structure, executive training, and future studies on governance, treating leadership as a hands-on process, and not just a structural formality.*

**Keywords:** *Multi-National Corporations, Corporate Governance, Leadership Strategy, Contextual Ambidexterity, Ethical Pluralism, Network Orchestration, Institutional Entrepreneurship, Global Local Tension*

## I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of governing multi-national corporations, is at the heart of today's global capitalism. Multi-national corporations, face governance environments that are both fractured and connected. Laws change from country to country, while cultural expectations about accountability vary, who matters and who is in charge, depends on the

host country. In this setting, just having formal boards, audit committees, and codes of conduct, is not enough. What works for regulators in one country, might clash with another's values, and hard and fast rules can stifle local legitimacy and flexibility.

Historically, governance and leadership were seen as separate fields. But in MNCs, that line blurs completely. Assets, autonomy, and accountability, are scattered across continents. Governance outcomes get shaped by what leaders actually do, not just what boards dictate from afar. Boards can't micromanage subsidiaries in Lagos, Jakarta, or São Paulo. They depend on executives, to translate and adapt principles, often in messy, and ambiguous conditions.

This paper makes a conceptual case, that good multinational firms, governance flows from leadership strategy. While leadership strategy is about the deliberate mix of philosophy, practice, and skill that managers use to hit governance targets across borders, the main focus here, is theory and not empirical proof. There is no methodology or empirical results section.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The Governance Challenge in Multi National Firms.

Agency theory still matters, but it falls short for multi-national corporations. Recent reviews show that multiple layers of agency, institutional distance, and geographic spread, makes it tough to monitor and control (Aguilera et al., 2019). The liability of foreignness, is especially tough in places with institutional gaps, and political risk (Crilly et al., 2016).

Institutional theory, frames how multinational firms, struggle for legitimacy. Marano et al., (2017),

highlights the institutional complexity, that comes from juggling pressures at home, host, and global levels. Kostova et al., (2016), underline that governance practices need real translation, and not just copying, across different contexts. If you standardize too much, you wreck local legitimacy. If you localize too much, you lose global accountability (Meyer et al., 2020).

Resource dependence, and stakeholder theory, are catching on, in the multi-national corporation governance world. Sun et al., (2021), argue that effective governance, depends on how multinational firms, manage relationships with local communities, governments, and transnational non-government organisations. Stakeholder legitimacy shifts, based on context so multi-national corporations, need governance systems, rooted in local, social and political realities (Tashman et al., 2019).

Overall, recent scholarship says multinational firms' governance, is a moving target always adjusting, multi-layered, and wrestling with contradictions. Formal rules can't cover every possible situation. Leadership takes the centre stage.

## 2. Leadership in Global Contexts: From Traits to Systems

Leadership research has shifted focus from traits to real world processes and systems. Reiche et al., (2017), define global leadership as influencing stakeholders across tangled systems. They stress boundary spanning, handling paradoxes, and strong ethical reasoning.

Cross cultural studies keep finding differences in leadership expectations, across regions. The GLOBE 2020 project showed that qualities like integrity and decisiveness aren't valued the same everywhere, contradicting the idea, that governance norms are universal (Dorfman et al., 2022). Vogel et al. (2021) highlight transnational competencies. These are things like global mindset, cultural agility, and cross-border collaboration, are all essentials for Multi National Corporation executives.

Leadership as practiced is now front and centre in multinational firms' research. Raelin (2016) and Denis et al., (2020), sees leadership, as something

that is spread out, enacted through everyday routines and interactions. In MNCs, governance plays out through a web of leaders' headquarters executives, regional managers, subsidiary boards, and compliance officers, who all help in interpreting and applying standards.

## III. FOUR LEADERSHIP STRATEGIES FOR MNC GOVERNANCE

### 3.1 Contextual Ambidexterity

Building on Bartlett and Ghoshal's transnational model, newer studies cast ambidexterity as a behavioural governance skill. Luo et al., (2020), shows that, leaders pull off governance ambidexterity, by holding onto global control, while encouraging local adaptability. Birkinshaw et al., (2016), focus on leaders creating routines that balance alignment and flexibility. Psychological safety is vital. People need to raise governance dilemmas, without fear (Frazier et al., 2017).

### 3.2 Ethical Pluralism

Donaldson and Dunfee's Integrative Social Contracts Theory is still relevant, but modern research tackles dilemmas like data governance, Artificial Intelligence ethics, and ESG standards. Schrempf Stirling et al., (2022), builds the case for ethical pluralism, where human rights are not negotiable, but other issues like gift giving, or labour rules, get room for local variation. Rhodes and Fleming (2020), show that when leaders open up deliberative forums, they solve ethical conflicts without heaving their own standards onto others.

### 3.3 Network Orchestration

Multinational firms, are now seen more as connected networks, than rigid hierarchies (Rugman et al., 2016). Hoenen and Kostova (2017), argue for boards to act as architects of governance networks, passing off some authority to subsidiary directors who bridge boundaries. Orchestration lets subsidiaries show initiative while sticking to shared standards.

### 3.4 Institutional Entrepreneurship

Multi-National Corporations, often land in places where institutions are fragile, or uncertain. Recent studies put MNC leaders in the role of institutional entrepreneurs, building and transforming rules,

norms, and beliefs (Saka-Helmhout et al., 2021). Doh et al., (2017), shows how MNCs can actually shape host country institutions, through collective action on labour, anti-corruption, and sustainability. This switches governance from purely reactive to proactive legitimacy building. Kwon et al., (2020), say this entrepreneurship needs political savvy and creative stakeholder diplomacy, with prime leadership skills.

#### IV. SYNTHESIS AND GAPS

Literature since 2016, proves that MNC governance depends on leadership. Yet governance codes still push structural fixes, like board composition or diversity metrics, without much focus on leadership itself (Filatotchev et al., 2020). Broad leadership studies, rarely track governance results like ESG performance, stakeholder trust, or compliance. The four strategies here bridge the divides.

#### CONCLUSION

Structural mechanisms alone cannot deliver real governance in MNCs. The four strategies, states how leadership can keep governance, strong across borders.

For research, it is time to dig into these strategies with empirical studies, see how they relate to ESG ratings, compliance, and subsidiary performance. Comparing how these firms, perform in emerging and developed markets, matters (Sun et al., 2021). The bottom line is that multinational corporation governance is a leadership strategy and it is the power to build systems, that work both globally and locally. In a world fractured by politics and shifting regulations, that skill is what keeps a global business running.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P. J., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. J. (2022). GLOBE: A twenty-year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *57(3)*, 101298.
- [2] Hanges, P. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty-year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JWB.2012.01.004>
- [3] Filatotchev, I., Poulsen, A., & Bell, G. (2018). Corporate governance of a multinational enterprise: Firm, industry, and institutional perspectives. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, *57*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2018.02.004>
- [4] Frazier, M., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2016). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, *70*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
- [5] Hoenen, A. K., & Kostova, T. (2017). The link between headquarters and subsidiaries in multinational corporations: A relational perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, *54(7)*, 1122–1153.
- [6] Miroshnik, V. (2013). *Relationship Between the Headquarters and Subsidiaries in Multinational Companies*. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137361639\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137361639_3)
- [7] Kostova, T., Marano, V., & Tallman, S. (2016). Headquarters–subsidiary relationships in MNCs: Fifty years of evolving research. *Journal of World Business*, *51(1)*, 176–184.
- [8] Kwon, W., Clarke, I., & Wodak, R. (2020). Multi-national corporations and institutional entrepreneurship: A discourse-historical approach. *Organization Studies*, *41(8)*, 1093–1116.
- [9] Luo, Y., Zhang, H., & Bu, J. (2020). Ambidexterity in multinational corporations: A multilevel analysis. *Global Strategy Journal*, *10(2)*, 319–347.
- [10] Marano, V., Tashman, P., & Kostova, T. (2017). Escaping the iron cage: Liabilities of origin and CSR reporting of emerging market multinational enterprises. *48(3)*, 386–408.
- [11] Meyer, K. E., Li, C., & Schotter, A. P. (2020). Managing the MNE subsidiary: Advancing a multi-level and dynamic research agenda. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *51(4)*, 538–576.

- [12] Raelin, J. (2016). *Leadership-as-Practice: Theory and Application*.
- [13] Reiche, B. S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M. E., & Osland, J. S. (2017). Contextualizing leadership: A typology of global leadership roles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(5), 552–572.
- [14] Rhodes, C., & Fleming, P. (2020). Forget political corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(4), 701–715.
- [15] Rugman, A., Verbeke, A., & Nguyen, Q. (2011). Fifty years of international business theory and beyond. *Management International Review*, 51, 755–786. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-011-0102-3>
- [16] Saka-Helmhout, A., Deeg, R., & Greenwood, R. (2021). The political role of corporate actors in institution building. *Organization Studies*, 42(8), 1207–1227.
- [17] Schrempf-Stirling, J., Palazzo, G., & Phillips, R. A. (2022). Ever-expanding responsibilities: Upstream and downstream corporate social responsibility. *Business & Society*, 61(5), 1085–1121.
- [18] Sun, P., Doh, J., Rajwani, T., & Doh, J. (2021). Navigating cross-border institutional complexity: A review and assessment of multinational nonmarket strategy research. 52. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-021-00438-x>
- [19] Tashman, P., Marano, V., & Kostova, T. (2019). Corporate social responsibility decoupling in emerging market multinationals. 50(2), 153–171.
- [20] Denis, J.-L., Lamothe, L., & Langley, A. (2001). The dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 809–837. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069417>