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Abstract

This chapter summarizes key themes and findings from research over the past decades, also considering its geographic foci (developed, developing and/or emerging countries). Furthermore, noting that scholars are starting to explore the uptake of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by organizations in practice, frameworks are presented for understanding ways in which business (can) engage with the SDGs, elucidated by a case example. This chapter closes with reflections on the SDGs as part of the broader debate on development, offering suggestions for further research considering current ‘blind spots’ and the added value of combining international business and other disciplinary perspectives.

1. Introduction

The role of international business in development has long been a source of interest and controversy, also depending on one’s views of companies and conceptualizations of the development notion. The topic has attracted increasing attention from business scholars, while at the same time some companies are gradually taking a more (pro)active role in addressing some of the so-called grand societal challenges (Kolk 2016). This trend is also perceived to be controversial as multinational enterprises (MNEs) are seen to possess more power and influence in determining the dominant discourses of international business and development (Banerjee 2014; Ruggie 2017). Over the years, business is increasingly seen as an actor that, in partnership with governments, nongovernmental organizations and other stakeholders, participates in sustainable development. Most recently, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a set of aspirational goals spearheaded by the United Nations (UN), has become an influential initiative illustrating the call for companies to collaborate with other actors to achieve development. The SDGs are becoming a focal point of attention for the whole range of stakeholders involved, as well as, gradually, for international business academics (Kolk, Kourula, and Pisani 2017). While the need to deal
with issues such as poverty, inequality and climate change has long been understood, development has often been seen as the realm of governments, inter-governmental organizations and international nongovernmental organizations. With the rise of corporate social responsibility (CSR), private governance, and multi-stakeholder initiatives, companies are more and more seen as appropriate partners, indeed even as direct actors, in addressing development.

Although international business scholars have long been interested in development, this broad area of inquiry, and specific themes within it, remain relatively under-researched. In this chapter, we argue that the field of international business (IB) has much to offer to development research given its interdisciplinary approach and knowledge of the key firms that operate across borders, and also very often in developing countries and/or in relation to relevant development issues. It should be noted that our focus here is not on economic development as such, an area to which IB has paid attention, also in relation to developing countries (see Fortanier and Kolk 2007; Kolk 2016), but a much broader notion including also the environmental and social dimensions, as explained above. The chapter first presents key trends in IB scholarship, including a review of recent relevant academic review articles on the theme (section 2), and the geographical and thematic foci of investigation (in sections 3 and 4, respectively). Subsequently, section 5 gives a short summary of the Sustainable Development Goals covered by existing IB research reviews. We then present frameworks for understanding ways in which organizations (can) engage with the SDGs into their strategy and activities, elucidated with a case example. The final section offers reflections, conclusions and recommendations for both researchers and practitioners.

2. An overview of relevant academic reviews

The past decade has seen quite some reviews on CSR in general, or, in a smaller number of cases, specifically concerning the role of international firms and/or business in development. In a very recent review article, Pisani, Kourula, Kolk, and Meijer (2017) provide a summarizing Table with details of the most relevant ones to date (see Table 1), including the journals and periods covered, keywords addressed, key foci, concepts and recommendations. Thereafter, Pisani et al. (2017) give an extensive analysis of almost 500 articles from 31 journals over a 31-year period, a dataset that we use here for the purpose of this chapter for an additional examination on how IB research on development and developing countries has evolved in the past three decades, relying on the relevant subset of articles.

As shown in Table 1, early reviews by Egri and Ralston (2008) and Kolk and Van Tulder (2010) identify several gaps within IB scholarship, including the lack of attention to developing countries. In this chapter, we argue that this call for research is yet to be properly answered. Nonetheless, some of the recommendations by Kolk and Van Tulder (2010), such as exploring the various institutional, industry, firm, supply and demand drivers for CSR have received a fair amount of attention already. Kolk (2016) and Pisani et al. (2017) provide more up-to-date and longer-term overviews of how international business scholarship has addressed development issues, typically from a CSR lens, while – in the process – also paying specific attention to IB activities in and implications for developing countries. Kolk (2016) describes how the field has moved from exploring ethics and the environment to emphasizing the CSR and sustainable development concepts. Thus, over time we see increased concern with development and, with particular issues of importance, to (least-)developed countries. Below, we will present and

International Business Policy, resulting from a call for papers launched in the second half of 2018, and a more generic, not international business focused one per se, of Academy of Management Discoveries.

4 Although IB most often focuses on profit-making entities (firms/companies) active in more than one country, it never excluded state-owned enterprises (SOEs), which are partly or sometimes even fully owned by governments and operate in sectors or areas in which for-profit organizations are (or could have been) playing a role; in recent years, attention for SOEs has grown further in the international business and management literature.
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discuss the state of the art and key trends in more detail.

3. **Key geographic trends in research**

In their review of international CSR, Pisani et al. (2017) demonstrate a rise in research on this topic in the key journals in the most relevant fields of study. Figure 1 shows the same 494 articles published in 31 journals over a period of 31 years to explore the focal countries of the studies. While the literature has employed the labels ‘developing’ and ‘emerging’ countries in multiple ways, Pisani et al. (2017) use the World Bank’s classification that distinguishes between low-income, middle-income and high-income in order to group developing, emerging and developed countries, respectively. Considering the extensive search for articles undertaken by Pisani et al. (2017) in a comprehensive list of journals, using a broad and inclusive range of keywords related to CSR as well as indicating the international/global/transnational dimensions, we argue that a majority of studies focusing on development is covered in our analysis. This is especially the case as only studies that combined these two types of aspects were included, also on closer inspection and going through them one by one.

![Insert Figure 1 here](image)

Overall, we see a strong rise in scholarly interest in international CSR and development over the 31-year period, with a spike around 2009 and 2010 mostly due to a few more articles published in key outlets as well as special issues on the theme. When analyzing in further detail the focal countries of the studies, we note a very strong emphasis on developed-country contexts with a fairly steady rise of interest in emerging countries. It is worth considering the specific methodology used by Pisani et al. (2017) to classify studies according to their primary focus on developed, emerging or developing countries. In fact, when a specific study covered countries belonging to more than one of the three categorizations (e.g., both developing and emerging countries), the authors classified it as being primarily focused on only one category based on the country categorization that was mostly represented in the sample. This implies that, while very few studies have indeed the primary (or sole) focus on developing countries as highlighted in Figure 1, the reality is that many more studies in the literature consider some developing as well as developed or emerging countries in their empirical settings. To this end, Table 2 offers the list of emerging and developing countries considered in the articles sampled by Pisani et al. (2017),

---


6 Pisani et al. (2017: 591) follow Aguinis’ definition for CSR, comprising “context-specific organizational actions and policies that take into account stakeholders’ expectations and the triple bottom line of economic, social, and environmental performance”. Their keywords include these three dimensions as well, thus also covering what Bansal (2005) named ‘corporate sustainable development’, a translation of the social equity, environmental integrity and economic prosperity notions of the Brundtland commission to the business realm. Interestingly, she finds international experience, a typical IB feature, to be important for enabling such an application of generic sustainable development to corporate reality.
documenting a relatively inclusive coverage of these countries in the literature, even if not as primary target countries.

Based on the same data and analysis used in Pisani et al. (2017), Figure 2 goes deeper into the home and host countries of international CSR studies providing such country-level information. This data indicates a strong rise in studies exploring CSR of companies based in or operating in emerging economies. This trend in research is reflective of the rise in corporate and media interest in Brazil, Russia, India and China as well as other emerging economies. To further elucidate the coverage of countries in the literature on international CSR in Table 2, we report the complete list of emerging and developing home and host countries investigated in the articles sampled by Pisani et al. (2017) (see the lower part of Table 2). We thus highlight the relatively large variety of both emerging and developing countries included in the empirical settings of these studies. The results reported in the Table also substantiate the rise in coverage of emerging countries, with China leading both home- and host-country groupings. Whereas in the home-country grouping few developing countries have been considered (e.g., Ethiopia), their coverage in the host-country grouping is significantly larger. Looking more specifically at the subset of so-called ‘fragile and conflict affected’ countries, these appear even less often in research, only in an incidental case as home country, and in a few more instances as host countries.

4. Key themes and findings

Moving from examining geography to a more thematic analysis also based on Pisani et al. (2017), Table 3 summarizes the broad themes and key findings in the international research focused on emerging and developing countries. In terms of antecedents in emerging and developing countries, existing studies highlight the contextual, firm and individual drivers of international CSR engagement. Key contextual drivers that support and/or stifle CSR include pressure from intergovernmental organizations, regulatory agencies, financial markets, nongovernmental organizations and local communities and institutions. At the firm level, industry, type of product and pollution caused, the customer, the ownership and governance structure all have an impact on corporate engagement. At the individual levels, studies have examined the role of employee participation and management commitment as drivers of international CSR engagement.

In terms of the CSR phenomenon, studies focusing on the home- and host-country contexts have examined topics as diverse as when do firms invest in conflict regions, what is the importance of national histories in the globalization of the notion of CSR and how do philanthropy, resources and ethical culture affect whether a company will collaborate or be assertive with a host government. Furthermore, depending on the institutional context, local vs. foreign firms adopt different priorities and internal tools, such as codes of conduct, are seen to be more influential than external ones, such as globally certified management systems. While firms often also use government stakeholder relations strategically in foreign operations, it is still not seen to be very effective in getting new licenses and contracts. The types of CSR implemented locally and the subsidiary’s strategic commitment have a large impact on firm value creation. Studies also examine the conditions under which CSR programs and partnerships can become successful and sometimes even warn against implementing symbolic partnerships with nongovernmental organizations and/or assuming supplier compliance to CSR programs.

In terms of consequences of international CSR, the institutional-level outcomes of CSR can be seen to be
conflicting across studies. Local engagement and adaptation of CSR can lead to competitive advantage, reputational gains and local empowerment, but it does not necessarily improve community relations in all cases and can lead to paternalistic practices with unintended consequences. A tension can also build between local adaptation and global regulation. At the firm level, MNEs can also take advantage of regulatory loopholes leading to substandard ethical practices. In fact, CSR is often framed only as compliance instead of taking a more proactive stance to regulatory requirements. Nonetheless, other articles suggest that CSR can improve operations and mitigate public crises for companies. Overall, several studies exploring the consequences of international CSR remain skeptical about cosmetic responses.

Our review as presented here provides a relatively comprehensive overview of existing insights, some of which have come to the fore elsewhere as well. The review by Jamali and Karam (2016), included in Table 1, focuses on CSR and developing countries. It describes the national business system related and international antecedents of CSR, the formal and informal elements of governance of business conduct, the new forms of CSR that emerge and the positive and detrimental impacts of business in developing countries. They highlight the importance of a contextually sensitive and locally shaped form of CSR. Similarly, Jamali, Karam, Yin and Soundararajan (2017) also provide an overview of CSR in developing countries by exploring an institutional logics approach. They describe how implicit institutions such as the state, the market, corporations, professions, families and religions interact with the local institutional context in terms of the translation and adaptation processes of CSR.

5. Attention for the UN SDGs: A further review of relevant reviews

As noted in the introduction, the past few years have seen much interest in the Sustainable Development Goals. Adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2015, the SDGs consist of 17 goals with 169 accompanying targets (see Table 4 for an overview of these 17 goals and the number of targets and indicators for each of them), that are to be realized by 2030. The quantitative and qualitative objectives which cover the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development have also been categorized into five categories (the five P’s): people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership. While the latter category is also an aim of the SDGs, partnership is at the same time the all-encompassing collaborative approach adopted throughout the process to achieve and implement what has been called ‘the plan for action’ (UN 2015: 1). This 5th P remains in that sense somewhat ambiguous.

The SDGs have received much interest amongst policymakers and stakeholders and a range of researchers, thus far mostly those specialized in development studies and sustainability sciences. In a recent review, Kourula, Pisani, and Kolk (2017) explore how international business, management, and business and society literatures have addressed the 17 SDGs in the most recent few years. Overall, studies have focused on environmental and labor issues, with much less emphasis on human wellbeing and empowerment. Some SDGs (particularly SDGs 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 14, 15, and 16) have received limited attention within this field. In another recent review article, Kolk et al. (2017) zoomed in on key themes, providing an overview of how particular SDGs, namely poverty and inequality, energy and climate change, and peace have been addressed in IB scholarship in the past decade. The analysis suggests that poverty and inequality, as well as peace have been underexamined. Remarkably, their search for articles related to peace and (post)conflict yielded results on conflict and terrorism, but not on peace, which thus seems a crucial gap. While a multidisciplinary body of work on ‘business for peace’ or ‘peace through commerce’ has been emerging outside of IB, this deserves further attention within the field.

These reviews thus identify key gaps and also offer suggestions for interdisciplinary approaches to tackle them. Ultimately, much critical research is still necessary to understand the interconnectedness between SDGs and targets, and more importantly, of the SDGs and their systemic impacts. In addition to a need to investigate these interrelationships, it is also crucial to discover the determinants affecting
one or more specific SDGs. Interestingly, such an approach may provide insights that can subsequently be utilized and extended to better understand other SDGs as well, either similarities or differences in terms of drivers and consequences. In a recent review article, Kolk, Rivera-Santos, and Rufín (2018) present findings from business, economics and policy, developing a cross-disciplinary framework to disentangle business, country and industry effects influencing poverty alleviation (see Figure 3).

Several things are valuable for transferring to other SDGs. One is the multi-faceted nature of many of the issues, be it one SDG or even sometimes one target. In this case, Kolk et al. (2018) focus on absolute poverty and already distinguish, following World Bank definitions, five dimensions of that construct. Furthermore, they note that it is important to distinguish between those type of activities that are typically and inherently part of pro-poor, CSR or related types of trade and investment activities (‘responsible globalization’), for example fair trade or social entrepreneurship. Furthermore, ‘mainstream’ globalization entails core activities with or without the explicit goal of, in this case, poverty alleviation, and what is called ‘peripheral’ activities (or non-core), which are not inherently related to core business functions but are part of separate philanthropy, corporate citizenship or social responsibility policies. In the next section, we present further frameworks based on a similar categorization of core business with a specific SDG goal, core business activities without such a goal and peripheral business activities to guide research and practice.

6. Frameworks for SDGs in research and practice, and an application

Figure 4 presents a framework that can be used to guide further research on international business and the SDGs, distinguishing between different types of business activities (explained in the previous section), and including key dimensions of MNEs, i.e. the ‘parent’ firm on the one hand, and their relationships with local entities in the developing country of activity. It also includes the links to the people, planet, peace and prosperity categories discussed in section 5.

After providing our assessment of the state of IB research on CSR and development and possible frameworks that can be used for further investigation, we now, lastly, turn to exploring how companies can participate in development. Figure 5 provides a practically oriented overview of a process that different types of organizations may use to engage with the Sustainable Development Goals. Step 1 consists of assessing the place of the SDGs in general, or individual ones in particular, in the overall set of the activities of the organization. This can help to provide a good insight into the relative importance, which may help to assign, for example, concomitant staff and budgets, as well as streamline communications to internal and external stakeholders, particularly to properly manage expectations. Step 2 helps to envision the specific ‘P’ on which to focus, while the third step fine-tunes in terms of the identification of more specific goals, targets and indicators for measurement. While focus is important, it is crucial to remember the interconnectedness of the SDGs and that promoting specific goals should not be used to hide negative impacts on other goals. The final step entails the implementation with regard to the need or desire to reach out to other organizations to help realize the best engagement strategy. It should be noted that all of this will be very organization-specific and depend on history, characteristics and contexts (see section 7). Below, we will discuss one company case to illustrate how the framework may be applied in practice.

Our illustrative case concerns FMO, the Development Bank of the Netherlands (‘Nederlandse Financierings-Maatschappij voor Ontwikkelingslanden N.V.’, or as put on the frontpage of their most recent annual report, ‘Entrepreneurial Development Bank’). It is owned 51% by the Dutch State, 42% by
Dutch private banks, with small shares owned by other groups. FMO aims to make a positive difference in emerging economies by empowering entrepreneurs to build a better world. FMO does this by investing in emerging market businesses, projects and financial institutions and supporting job and income generation. It also helps businesses to operate and grow transparently and in an environmentally and socially responsible manner.

Though FMO’s main activity has long been to foster development in emerging and developing markets, the Dutch government has called upon FMO to clearly show how it supports the SDGs. Thus, FMO has been working recently to better incorporate the SDGs into its strategy and portfolios. As its core purpose is development and all its activities can generally be related to themes of the SDGs, FMO did not undertake the first step described in the model above of assessing which of its current core and peripheral activities are relevant to the SDGs or not. The first step FMO took was to connect its mission and vision with the SDG themes of People, Planet and Prosperity. Similar to our note above regarding gaps in scholarship related to the SDG for peace, FMO did not consider that the goal of peace was sufficiently connected to its strategy to be addressed at this initial stage.

As next step FMO identified three main SDGs particularly relevant to its overall goals at the corporate level, as well as indicators and measurements by which it can assess progress. First, FMO directly contributes toward SDG 8, decent work and economic growth, and sets itself the objective under this goal to double the number of jobs supported by its investments. FMO also finds that SDG 10, reduced inequalities, is highly relevant to its development activities, and will seek to increase its investments labeled as reducing inequality to achieve this goal. Finally, FMO focuses on SDG 13, climate action, as related to its core business, particularly its investments in renewable energy. FMO will measure its progress toward SDG 13 by measuring the amount of greenhouse gas avoided as a result of its investments and increasing the share of its green investments (under its green label).

FMO also works to identify SDGs that are relevant to its sector portfolios. As FMO has a significant amount of investments in the agribusiness value chain, SDG 2 for no hunger is highly relevant. Given its significant investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency, FMO identifies SDG 7 for affordable and clean energy, as another significant goal. FMO also focuses on SDG 5 for gender equality, through a variety of investments, such as those that promote capacity development for women-owned businesses. Finally, as much of its investing is through blended structures joined by other financing parties, there is a natural connection to SDG 17, partnerships. Figure 6 details how FMO has envisioned its strategy related to the goals. In order to ensure that the company makes progress toward these goals, it identifies specific targets and ambitions in order to be able to measure its achievements.

FMO has made great progress in linking its vision and strategy to the SDGs and finding ways to measure implementation. However, one limitation inherent to drilling so deep into specific goals makes it difficult to see the SDGs as a systemic and interactive network, with overarching synergies and tensions between the goals. FMO maintains attention to the SDG trade-offs and synergies by listing all the SDGs in the inner circle of Figure 6, and includes them in ESG management. Understanding the interconnectedness between the SDG targets can help see how progress (or regression) on one target can have spillover effects on other targets. Further, there can be feedback loops between specific targets, leading positive feedback to result in virtuous circles, or negative impacts resulting in vicious circles. When companies develop a full overview of the SDGs as a dynamic network making up an indivisible whole, it can help to understand and avoid negative “externalities.” Finally, such fuller planning can lead to better accountability and improved strategic planning to point out where strategic intervention can improve overall progress.

7. Discussion and conclusions

In this final section, we first reflect on the SDG framework presented and illustrated with the case...
above. Overall, the example of FMO shows that an organization is more likely to be proactive in promoting the SDGs in its work if it follows an approach demonstrated in the SDG framework. In order to achieve the fullest impact, leaders at the highest level should consider how the SDGs fit into the organization’s mission, vision and overall strategy. For those business operations most relevant to the SDGs, it is important to work out how progress and performance will be measured. While the UN provides a list of indicators for each of the targets under the goals, the firm must ensure that the indicators they choose make sense within their specific operational and organizational contexts. Finally, understanding the SDGs as a wholly integrated network of goals helps organizations to understand the interactions between various targets within the SDGs.

Although the FMO is primarily based in the Netherlands with investments in firms located in countries throughout the developing world, this example seems illustrative for MNEs (and/or the specific category of partly state-owned enterprises, see section 1) with international operations and multiple subsidiaries. A common challenge in the case of such MNEs is the dissemination of strategic goals and performance measures from headquarters to foreign subsidiaries, as well as the monitoring of achievements in different locations and bringing them together in a coherent manner. It should be noted that, as development bank, FMO typically has core activities with SDG focus (the first category in the box in the upper middle of Figure 4), which may be very different for other trade- or investment-oriented firms. Still, for them as well, and even in the case of ‘peripheral’, CSR-oriented SDG activities, it is key to clearly assess beforehand which SDGs are most relevant, and go through the focusing, targeting and partnering steps included in Figure 5.

As mentioned above, the debate on business and development seems to show a certain tendency to be fully channeled, or some might say, ‘narrowed down’ to the SDGs. This may, for example, give rise to research focusing on which SDGs are adopted most or least often by firms, as reported or perceived by these firms themselves, based on corporate communications or surveys (cf. Van Zanten and Van Tulder 2018). While valuable as such, resulting debates might merely concentrate on the self-perceived activities or intentions of firms and/or shaped by them. Importantly, although the SDGs are very broad and comprehensive, there is more to development than how they are framed in this UN-led initiative, as valuable as it is. More critical notions related to, e.g., empowerment or inclusiveness (cf. Pouw and Gupta, 2017) can easily be forgotten if one exclusively focuses on the SDGs.

In addition, it is crucial to take firm characteristics, peculiar to international business that operates across borders, into account (see Figure 4, left-hand box). IB scholarship has much to offer to explicate drivers and better understand the why and how of firm behavior and consequences, and thus also how these can be influenced by policymakers and other stakeholders, as well as industry dynamics. As noted in section 5, review studies have concluded that a research agenda on sustainable development is emerging in IB, which can contribute many insights at the firm-level as well as the impacts of firms on their environment. At the same time, as shown in the first half of this chapter, the field has its limitations, with several ‘blind spots’, despite all its contributions. We want to mention at least three of them here, which are related to lack of geographical scope, selective attention to topics, and limited interdisciplinarity.

**Blind spot 1:** Dearth of research on least-developed and fragile countries.

**Blind spot 2:** Too much focus on specific topics, at the cost of other topics and systemic impacts.

**Blind spot 3:** Too limited interaction across disciplines.

First, as Figures 1 and 2 indicate, the focus of research has been on developed countries with only a
recent increase in studies examining emerging countries. In terms of the latter, most of the literature in IB is on a rather small subset of high-growth emerging countries. The context of developing countries receives scarce attention in comparison. This opens a new research agenda for IB on least-developed and fragile countries. IB scholars are especially well positioned to address this call for research due to extensive cross-national expertise and an in-depth understanding of corporate impacts, both direct positive and negative as well as indirect spillovers.

Second, as is clear from our literature review and the thematic analysis of Table 3, the focus of business in development research tends to be on particular themes or SDGs, such as poverty, responsible consumption and production, climate action and partnerships (Kolk et al. 2017; 2018; Kourula et al. 2017). This means that a spotlight effect makes a handful of themes receive much of the attention, while other important and interconnected topics receive little attention from IB scholars. In addition, the spotlight effect also makes it more difficult to identify the interconnectedness between themes and sustainable development goals and the systemic impacts. Both our thematic analysis and illustrative case provide insights into how we could understand and manage these systemic impacts.

Finally, as our analysis of IB and SDGs implies and as Kolk et al. (2017) and Kourula et al. (2017) point out, there are many unused opportunities to gain insights and inspiration from other disciplines beyond business studies. Development studies, political science, and environmental/sustainability science amongst other fields are particularly interesting as complementary or even contradictory perspectives to business studies. While environmental/sustainability sciences are particularly well suited to support SDGs related to the biosphere (life on land, life below water, clean water and sanitation, and climate action), political science, development studies, economics, engineering and medical sciences often tackle societal SDGs (poverty, sustainable cities, peace, clean energy, health, education, gender and hunger). IB and other business scholars’ insights are particularly relevant to and can take the lead in exploring economic goals (decent work and economic growth, industry innovation and infrastructure, reduced inequalities, and responsible consumption and production). Nonetheless, all biosphere and societal goals also include elements where international business studies can offer rigorous analysis and perceptive theorizing. For instance, it would be good, as shown by Kolk et al. (2018), and Kolk and Rivera-Santos (2018), to also consider macro-level insights from economics and especially their empirical approaches. By combining levels of analysis, these multiple fields can achieve a better picture of the role of business in development and its positive and negative impacts.
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### Table 1

**Key Features of Most Relevant Review Articles (in Chronological Order per Category)**

Source: Pisani et al. (2017). Adapted from the original table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Focus/context of article (IB) journal sample</th>
<th>Period covered</th>
<th>Search criteria to identify articles</th>
<th>Main analytical concepts and/or dimensions addressed</th>
<th>Recommendations for research(er)s, and if applicable, research institutes, policy, business practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egri &amp; Raiston (2008)</td>
<td>State of corporate responsibility (CR) research over a decade as introduction to a special issue</td>
<td>APJM, CCM, EMJ, IBR, IJCM, IJHRM, JIM, ISMO, JIBS, JIM (Mgt), JWB, MIR, TIBR</td>
<td>Search on CSR (16 key words), environmental (9), ethics (6), governance (4)</td>
<td>Level of emphasis on corporate responsibility research, primary content focus, predominantly theoretical or empirical, and how ‘international’ in scope</td>
<td>Broadening of research away from merely wealthy nations, and from restricted variance in contexts and questions; Collecting local data in countries with largest CR problems; Studying internationalization of CR research in specialized CR journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolk &amp; Van Tulder (2010)</td>
<td>Overview of research trends in four main IB journals, compared to earlier reviews, as introduction to special issue on IB, CSR and sustainable development</td>
<td>Focus on IBR, JIBS, JWB, MIR (with article counts compared to journals from general management (8), functional areas (5), CSR/ethics (‘core’ 3))</td>
<td>Search on key words CSR; sustainable development</td>
<td>Overview of numbers of articles published on the themes in the journals, specific consideration of trends and special issues, and comparison with earlier reviews (in IB, but also in management, marketing and specifically on Africa given observed dearth of studies on this region)</td>
<td>Moving away from predominant focus on US and some Triad countries where larger-scale databases are more easily available; Moving research more to the mainstream in terms of outlets and links to/embeddedness in IB theories and themes; Building on innovative articles of the special issue (also on Africa); Conducting studies on institutional, industry, organisational, supply and demand drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtbrügge &amp; Dögl (2012)</td>
<td>State of research on international aspects of corporate environmental responsibility</td>
<td>4 IB journals: JIM (Mgt), IBR, JIBS, JWB + 8 management journals: AMJ, AMR, ASQ, JIM, JMS, MS, OSC, SMJ</td>
<td>11 key words regard the environment (including CER, green and sustainability)</td>
<td>Corporate environmental responsibility (CER)</td>
<td>Designing further multi-country studies; Moving away from developed countries to include analyses of developing countries; Including more industries especially environmentally friendly ones and industry comparisons; Going beyond RBV and institutional theory; Supporting interdisciplinary studies in universities; Developing more stringent environmental regulation in developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doh &amp; Lucea (2013)</td>
<td>Focus on extent to which international strategy articles integrate market and non-market aspects using a bibliographical analysis</td>
<td>Articles included in SSCI or A&amp;HCI and classified as ‘business’ or ‘management’ by Web of Science</td>
<td>Search for combination of global/international strategy and a non-market type of key word (including CSR, sustainability, stakeholder)</td>
<td>Relationship between nonmarket actors (governments and civil society organizations) and international strategy; focus on integration of market and non-market using different search terms</td>
<td>Integrating competitive, social and governmental aspects of the global environment in which firms operate; Increasing our understanding of MNE-NGO interaction, NGOs as actors, local and comparative issues and diffusion mechanisms, and individual level issues; Changing institutional arrangements in universities and intervening from scholars, journal editors, deans, and accreditation agencies to support complex and cross-disciplinary research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolk (2016)</td>
<td>Quasi-historical review of overall trajectory of ethical, environmental and social concerns in IB and of MNEs’ consideration of their sustainable development impacts</td>
<td>JWB and JIBS over the full period, plus other journals considered where relevant</td>
<td>Manual screening of all JWB and JIBS issues/articles, plus author’s expert view of the (sub)fields covered</td>
<td>Examination of three subthemes: the (green) environment; ethics, rights and responsibilities; poverty and sustainable development.</td>
<td>Studying MNEs’ impact on sustainable development broadly defined (in post-2015 goals) through their FDI, trade and ‘pro-poor’ activities, and where relevant in the interaction with local firms and other organizations; Considering specific issues (with people, justice, dignity clusters standing out); Reaching out to other disciplines where applicable; Being braver and opening to unconventional work in field journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Focus/context of article (IB journal sample)</td>
<td>Period covered</td>
<td>Search criteria to identify articles</td>
<td>Main analytical concepts and/or dimensions addressed</td>
<td>Recommendations for research(ers), and if applicable, research institutes, policy, business practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguinas &amp; Glavas (2012)</td>
<td>Review of the corporate social responsibility literature, not meant as “exhaustive historical review”, but to “offer a general theoretical framework that is broad” and “allows for inclusion of more variables in the future”</td>
<td>1970-2011 (41 years)</td>
<td>Keyword search (“corporate social responsibility”) in 20 journals with content analysis restricted to 17 of them (combined with prior reviews; author specific search; general keyword search in Web of Science of additional keywords of “corporate social performance” and “corporate citizenship”, inclusion of selected books and book chapters)</td>
<td>Institutional, organizational and individual levels of analysis; predictors of CSR, mediators and moderators of CSR-outcomes relationship, outcomes of CSR</td>
<td>Integrating theories and multiple levels of analysis (variables at different levels and relationships between them, multilevel modelling, theory pruning, bringing CSR contributions to other fields); Exploring the microfoundations of CSR (underlying mechanisms and individual level processes, including micro-level variables as mediators; CSR implementation at the individual and team levels, role of training, recruitment, and supervisor communication, work); Developing methodologies (going beyond cross-sectional single-level designs, rethinking measurement approaches, nested data across hierarchies and time, multilevel quantitative and qualitative data).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frynas &amp; Yamazaki (2016)</td>
<td>Review of theories used to explain the external and internal drivers of CSR</td>
<td>1990-2014 (25 years)</td>
<td>Search for articles “related to social and environmental responsibilities of firms (e.g. environmental standards, corporate community involvement)”</td>
<td>Theorizing external drivers (stakeholder theory, institutional theory, legitimacy theory, resource dependency theory), and internal drivers (resource-basedview, agency theory)</td>
<td>Conducting multi-theory studies (combination of internal and external drivers for CSR, combination of e.g. institutional, RBV, and agency perspectives); Designing multi-level studies (multiple levels, surpassing methodological weaknesses, studying illegal activities); Employing individual level analyses (theories of individual action e.g. psychology, and rediscovering role of individuals in more mainstream theories).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamali &amp; Karam (2016)</td>
<td>Focus on “how CSR in developing countries is commonly understood” and its expression and implementation there “in practice”</td>
<td>1990-2014/2015 (25 years)</td>
<td>Combination of keywords on CSR (4) and on developing countries (5 or 6 depending on search set)</td>
<td>Antecedents and consequences of CSR at the institutional, organizational and individual levels; plus ‘CSR thinking’ and ‘CSR doing’</td>
<td>Examining CSR variation coming from national business system configurations and outside such configurations; Studying the salience of different actors involved in formal and informal governance; Exploring hybridized and other nuanced forms of CSR; Analyzing developmental and detrimental CSR consequences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b The article uses different formulations for time periods/years, including: “between 1997 and 2010” (Holtrögge & Dögl, 2012, p. 180), “13-year time period from 1997 to 2009” (p. 181), “from 1997 to 2010” (p. 181), “from 1997 to 2011” (p. 193), “Limiting our time period to a 15-year frame” (p. 193), and – the phrasing that is most explicit and that we thus put in the table, “including all CER articles that were published until the end of 2010” (p. 18).

f Looking at the full set of articles used (Appendix 3), it includes publications in well-known outlets (e.g. Aguinis & Glavas list, especially JBE), but also quite some unknown ones of which the quality is uncertain. Examples include Comservices; Ataturk Universitesi Bilimler Fakultesi; BMC Public Health; Developing World Bioethics; International Journal of Cuban Studies; IUP Journal of Corporate Governance; Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics; Journal of Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science; Journal of Health, Population & Nutrition; Kajian Malaysia; North Carolina Journal of International Law & Commercial Regulation; RAM - Revista de Administração Mackenzie; Review of Income and Wealth; SCMS Journal of Indian Management.

g The article refers to 2015 sometimes (e.g. Table 1), but the full list of journals included in their Appendix 3 reveals that there are only 5 articles from 2015, of which 2 seemingly forthcoming (7 others, in earlier years, also lack volume/issue numbers so appear to have been included as online doi versions, without necessarily being published in that specific year).
### TABLE 2

**Emerging and Developing Home and Host Countries Investigated in International CSR Research**

Source: Pisani et al. (2017). Adapted from the original table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Home country</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Host country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Argentina, Malaysia, Mexico</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Africa, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brazil, Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hungary, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Vietnam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Peru</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Ethiopia, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Romania, Serbia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Turkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2 continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Home country</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Host country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Angola, Kenya, Lebanon, Myanmar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Congo, Peru, Romania, Tanzania, Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colombia, Dem. Rep. of the Congo, Hungary, Malawi, Malaysia, Trinidad and Tobago, Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colombia, Dem. Rep. of the Congo, Hungary, Malawi, Malaysia, Trinidad and Tobago, Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Albania, Bermuda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Gambia, Haiti, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Nepal, Panama, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela, Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Albania, Bermuda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Gambia, Haiti, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Nepal, Panama, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of developing and emerging countries per group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Home country</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Host country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Emerging countries</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Emerging countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The number refers to the number of papers in which a given country is considered in as either home or host country in the empirical analysis.*
### TABLE 3

**Broad Themes and Key Findings in International CSR Research Focused on Emerging and Developing Countries**

Source: Pisani et al. (2017). Adapted from the original table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Representative references</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antecedents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Contextual drivers** | Adegbite et al. (2013); Mathuri & Gilbert (2011); Membe & Mclean (2014) | • Three major stakeholders (international organizations, rating agencies, and local institutions) trigger the development of corporate governance practices in emerging economies and pull them in multiple directions.  
  • A firm’s CSR agenda is strongly influenced by civil society activism, community expectations, public and private regulations, and pressure from financial markets.  
  • Conditions that stifle CSR uptake such as lack of government regulations, and the government’s capacity and commitment to enforce regulation also play a role, especially in developing countries. |
| **Firm drivers** | Perez-Batres et al. (2012); Tatogho et al. (2014); Robertson (2009) | • Stakeholder pressures, perceived polluting potential and customer focus are significant antecedents to the adoption of voluntary environmental management practices by foreign subsidiaries in emerging countries.  
  • The type of industry and a firm’s affiliation to a national sustainability program are strong antecedents of its decision to follow local sustainability initiatives transparently.  
  • A firm’s ownership structure and corporate governance, as well as the openness of the economy to international investment and the role of civil society trigger firms’ local responsiveness of CSR. |
| **Micro-level drivers** | Muller & Kolk (2010); Yu (2009) | • Workers’ participation in CSR movement against labor abuses have increased in the recent past. Although worker participation has positive impacts on codes implementation and labor standards improvement, many challenges remain before workers can play deeper and broader participative roles in pursuing a sustainable codes compliance model in emerging countries.  
  • Management commitment to ethics is a dominant driver (compared to extrinsic drivers) of international CSR practices. |
| **Phenomenon** |
| **Home-country institutions** | Driffield et al. (2013) | • Firms based in home countries with weaker institutions and less concern about CSR as well as firms characterized by more concentrated ownership are more likely to invest in conflict regions. |
| **Host-country institutions** | Jamali & Neville (2011); Kolk & Lenfant (2010); Luo (2006) | • Global convergence in CSR practices may materialize in light of mimetic isomorphic pressures, but path dependences are crucial in view of national history trajectories and socio-politico configurations, especially in emerging countries.  
  • MNEs face large CSR dilemmas in emerging and developing countries, especially in the presence of conflicts. These range from the level of contribution they can give to their attitude vis-a-vis ongoing conflicts. Whereas MNEs clearly see opportunities in these contexts, CSR reporting is fairly generic, and the specific context seems to have little impact on the type of CSR activities.  
  • MNE's propensity to cooperate with the host government is positively related to its philanthropic contribution and resource accommodation, whereas its propensity to be assertive with the host government is positively related to its focus on ethics and organizational credibility.  
  • When perceived corruption increases, an MNE's likelihood to cooperate and be assertive with host governments decreases. |
| **International CSR engagement** | Husted & Allen (2009); Khan & Nicholson (2014); Kolk et al. (2010); Mijatovic & Stokic (2010); Xun (2013); Wigg & Kolstad (2010) | • Local and international firms show differences in their CSR reporting in emerging countries. In the retailing industry and focusing on China, Chinese retailers report more on economic dimensions, including philanthropy, while the international retailers more on product responsibility. Having said that, contentious labour issues and the environment seem to receive relatively limited attention in both groups.  
  • Internal self-regulations such as statements of corporate values and codes of conduct have more influence on CSR practices than external self-regulations such as the implementation of generic management system standards such as the ISO 14001 standard.  
  • Global firms develop specific CSR strategies in emerging countries. Rather than adopting a canonical holistic CSR stakeholder model as typically observed in Western countries, these firms adopt a preferential stakeholder model using government-aimed CSR strategically.  
  • While companies use CSR strategically in emerging/developing countries, it is relatively unimportant in winning licenses and contracts.  
  • Centrality, visibility, and voluntarism of CSR programs are important conditions under which CSR is related to firms’ value creation.  
  • In the interaction between suppliers and buyers, key relational, knowledge transfer, and operational factors need to be considered in three stages (evaluation, exploration and interactive). |
| **Focus on subsidiaries** | Reimann et al. (2015) | • MNE subsidiaries’ strategic commitment to CSR in emerging countries can vary depending on a range of factors. In particular, the greater the administrative distance between MNEs’ home and host countries, the lesser the subsidiaries strategically commit to CSR. Moreover, the greater the administrative distance, the lesser the subsidiaries strategically commit to CSR. |
### Focus on multiple stakeholders

**Representative references**

- Christmann & Taylor (2006);
- Jamali & Keshishian (2009);
- Lim & Phillips (2008); Rotter et al. (2014);
- Wadhwa & Warren (2013);
- Zhao et al. (2014)

**Key findings**

- Partnerships between businesses and NGOs in the context of CSR have become more usual in the recent past, particularly in emerging countries. This said, many partnerships are symbolic and instrumental rather than substantive and integrative, showing a limited scope of activities, fluctuating investments of resources, simple processes, sporadic modes of communication, and low levels of engagement.
- Many firms have adopted CSR practices to address criticisms of working and environmental conditions at subcontractors’ factories. However, supplier compliance has been elusive and even third-party monitoring has proven unsuccessful. Collaborative partnerships where the firm gives suppliers secure product orders and other benefits to incentivize CSR compliance may help.
- Firms strategically select their level of compliance (substantive versus symbolic) depending on customer preferences, customer monitoring, and expected sanctions by customers.
- Cross-sector partnerships involve both instrumental and communicative encounters usually with slow progress with occasional fast development of partners’ understanding of themselves and the challenges they seek to address.
- Firms harness their political influence in CSR practices via collaboration and dialog with stakeholders and civil society actors.

### Institutional effects of CSR outcomes

**Representative references**

- Fong et al. (2013); Gifford et al. (2010); Mein & et al. (2010);
- Neuenham; Kahindi (2011); Nairnanni (2015)

**Key findings**

- Instead of relying on proven global capabilities to adapt existing business models, firms need to adopt a hybrid approach that balances local and global strategies when working in emerging countries. In this context, MNEs develop an institutional environment in the host country where those firms that do not provide substantial local assistance will be at a competitive disadvantage.
- In a host-country market with low consumer animosity, reputation transfer of a local acquisition target is pronounced, whereas in a host country market with high consumer animosity, animosity will restrain or even exceed reputation transferability.
- Implementing global CSR policies to strike a balance between international business capabilities and localization strategies does not necessarily help local community relations.
- Political institutional pressures can stand in the way of mimetic isomorphism and constitute negative forces that add further tension to global regulation.
- Several innovative solutions in business and human rights can build on empowerment, dialogue, and constructive engagement.

### Firm outcomes

**Representative references**

- Maruyama & Wu (2015); Perry et al. (2015); Tan (2009); Zeng et al. (2013)

**Key findings**

- MNEs often adopt double standards in their operating policies and fail to uphold the CSR practices of their host countries in emerging and developing economies. The regulatory and preexisting ethical conditions in these countries have proven inadequate and contribute to this troubling phenomenon. This effect is compounded by an institutional environment that easily offers loopholes for MNEs to exploit.
- MNCs exploitation of these substandard ethical practices and institutional weaknesses, and instituting negligent management over their downstream supply chains, make the MNCs themselves responsible for these conditions.
- Factory management perspectives on the implementation of CSR practices are particularly relevant in emerging and developing countries as they relate to the strategy balancing of ethical considerations against the commercial pressures of cost and lead time. In this context, factory managers often tend to frame CSR in terms of compliance, rather than going above and beyond regulatory requirements.
- Contrary to expectations, CSR activities are not effective in mitigating the disadvantages of perceived importance of supporting domestic retailers faced by foreign retailers entering emerging countries.
- The social dimension of societal marketing is most effective when it impacts firm’s CSR image and legitimacy in an emerging country.

### Irresponsible corporate behavior

**Representative references**

- Zhao et al. (2014)

**Key findings**

- Firms’ social adaptation activities have significant positive effects in mitigating public crises associated with their irresponsible behavior while certain aspects of economic adaption, such as early entry into the host country, reliance on local leadership, and speedy expansion of local employees lead to public crises.

### Micro-level outcomes

**Representative references**

- Khan et al. (2010);
- Wettstein (2012); Relal & Roberts (2010)

**Key findings**

- Many Western-led interventions to eliminate child labor in emerging countries rest on universalistic, paternalistic, de-contextualizing, and atomistic assumptions that bring negative unintended consequences. A post-colonial perspective insistent on an inclusive ‘bottom-up’, ‘reversed engineered’ approach, wherein CSR problems are traced back to Western MNEs’ policies and practices is needed.
- Global businesses are confronted with the question of complicity in human rights violations committed by abusive host governments, and this is especially the case in emerging and developing countries.
- MNEs have a moral responsibility beyond the negative realm of doing no harm to help protect human rights by putting pressure on perpetrating host governments involved in human rights abuses.
- Stakeholder agents generally believe that the motivation and practice of CSR reporting develops as response to pressures from international markets and generates largely cosmetic responses.

---

*The number of articles considered is 494, i.e., the full set of articles used for the content analysis.

*The key findings reported in regular font refer to studies that contain information on the home and/or host countries and focus on emerging countries as either home or host countries.

*The key findings reported in italic and underlined font refer to studies that contain information on the home and/or host countries and focus on developing countries as either home or host countries.
### TABLE 4

Number of Targets and Indicators for Each SDG *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development Goal</th>
<th>Number of Targets</th>
<th>Number of Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. End poverty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Zero hunger</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensure healthy lives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender equality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clean water &amp; sanitation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affordable &amp; clean energy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Decent work &amp; economic growth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Industry, innovation, &amp; infrastructure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reduced inequalities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sustainable cities &amp; communities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsible consumption &amp; production</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Climate action</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Life below water</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Life on land</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Peace, justice, &amp; strong institutions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Partnerships for the goals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The table includes the number of SDGs and targets mentioned in the text, and also the number of indicators per SDG. In the calculation of the total number of indicators we have excluded duplicate targets that appear under more than one goal.
FIGURE 1

The Evolution of International CSR Research and its Focus on Developed, Emerging, and Developing Countries

Source: Pisani et al. (2017). Adapted from the original table.

*The number of articles considered is 494, i.e., the full set of articles used for the content analysis in Pisani et al. (2017).*
FIGURE 2
The Distribution of International CSR Articles over Developing, Emerging, and Developed Countries

Source: Pisani et al. (2017). Adapted from the original table.

* The number of articles considered is 257, i.e., the articles that report information on the home and/or host countries.
* The first year considered is 1995 due to the fact that the first article that reported information on the home and/or host countries was published in 1996. Percentages are on the basis of 3-year averages per group.
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FIGURE 3

Modeling the Link between International Business, MNEs, and Poverty

Source: Kolk et al. (2018), p. 98

International Business effects
- “Mainstream” globalization
- Firm-specific decisions
  - Core business activities with no explicit goal of poverty alleviation (e.g., FDI, global value chains)
  - Core business activities with an explicit goal of poverty alleviation (e.g., BoP, trade with poverty goals)
  - "Peripheral" business activities (e.g., CSR initiatives, nonmarket strategies)
- “Responsible” globalization

Dimensions of poverty
- Material deprivation
- Lack of education
- Ill health
- Vulnerability
- Voicelessness and exclusion

Country and Industry effects
- Level and nature of poverty
- Governance characteristics
- Country characteristics beyond governance
- Industry effects
FIGURE 4
Framework for Analyzing MNEs’ ‘Impact’ on Sustainable Development

Source: Adapted from Kolk et al. (2017; 2018).

Parent MNE
(firm-, sector-, country characteristics)

Core activities with SDG focus
Core activities without SDG focus
‘Peripheral’ activities

Local firms
Other organizations

People
End poverty and hunger; fulfil human beings’ potential in dignity and equality, and in a healthy environment

Planet
Protection from degradation; sustainable production/consumption and natural resource management; urgent action on climate change

Peace
Foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies which are free from fear and violence

Prosperity
Ensure that all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives and that economic, social and technological progress occurs in harmony with nature
**FIGURE 5**

An Engagement Framework for SDGs

Sources: Adapted from Kolk (2016); Kolk et al. (2017); Kolk et al. (2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Assessing (State of current activities)</th>
<th>Core activities with SDG focus</th>
<th>Core activities without SDG focus</th>
<th>Peripheral activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>End poverty and hunger; fulfil human beings’ potential in dignity and equality, and in a healthy environment</td>
<td>Planet</td>
<td>Protect our planet from degradation; sustainable production/consumption and natural resource management; urgent action on climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2: Focusing</strong> (Vision and objectives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3: Targeting</strong> (Grounding to SDGs)</td>
<td>Goals and indicators</td>
<td>Specific targets and measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4: Partnering</strong> (Implementation plan)</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Current and potential implementation partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 6

FMO Goals
Source: FMO (2017), p. 16
(For the color version, which could not be included in this book, but offers much more clarity, see https://annualreport.fmo.nl/fbcontent.ashx/pub_1000/downloads/2017%20FMO%20Annual%20Report.pdf)