

Exploring the Interface of CSR and the Sustainable Development Goals

Norma Schönherr, Florian Findler and André Martinuzzi*

Transnational corporations (TNCs) today are facing rising expectations that they will engage with societal stakeholders and get involved with sustainable development, even in light of an increasingly uncertain international business environment. This article explores how the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a global agenda may serve as a reference framework that can support TNCs in improving their corporate social responsibility (CSR) engagement in a way that contributes to sustainable development. The authors specifically consider the role of systematically measuring and managing corporate impacts on sustainable development as a prerequisite for demonstrating a net contribution to the SDGs. In order to capture these impacts, existing corporate measurement and evaluation systems need to be adapted and new management instruments have to be developed. We conclude by proposing a research agenda for this purpose.

Key words: transnational corporations, sustainable development, corporate social responsibility, Sustainable Development Goals, impact measurement

1. Introduction

It has long been assumed in the discourse on corporate social responsibility (CSR) that in order to be considered responsible, a transnational corporation (TNC) must “do well and do good” (Falck and Heblich, 2007). Indeed, this idea is at the core of the most widely accepted CSR concepts, such as the triple bottom line or integrated reporting. What these concepts have in common is their focus on integrating traditional business concerns, such as the generation of shareholder profits, with sustainable development concerns, such as a TNC’s impacts on societal and environmental issues. It also resonates with the academic discourse on CSR, which has expended significant effort on establishing a business case for CSR by linking financial performance with CSR engagement.

* The authors are at the Institute for Managing Sustainability, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria. The corresponding author is Norma Schönherr. Contact: norma.schoenherr@wu.ac.at. Funding for research underlying this essay was provided by the European Commission under the 7th Framework Programme in the context of the GLOBAL VALUE project (contract number: 613295).

We understand CSR as an approach that simultaneously strives to satisfy environmental, economic and social standards (Montiel, 2008). This encompasses several key ideas: First, CSR is the obligation of a business to act in accordance with the overarching goals of society, thus directly linking the concept to sustainable development (Martinuzzi and Krumay, 2013). Second, CSR reaches beyond the borders of the corporation to include systemic linkages and interdependencies with stakeholders along the value chain (Seuring and Gold, 2013) and with the biophysical environment in which businesses are embedded (Searcy, 2014; Starik and Kanashiro, 2013). Third, CSR may be implemented in different ways or phases, gradually building up to improving the social, environmental and economic performance of a business (Keijzers, 2005). These phases include compliance and due diligence (to optimize operations and avoid negative impacts); optimization and control (involving the application of quality and sustainability management systems), and, finally, integration of environmental and social issues into the business model and value creation (Keijzers, 2005; Porter and Kramer, 2011; Martinuzzi and Krumay, 2013). Many TNCs have taken strides toward implementing CSR in their internal business operations through sustainability management systems (Martinuzzi and Krumay, 2013). Adherence to international accountability standards and sustainability reporting has become a common practice, enhancing disclosure and transparency related to these activities (Perego and Kolk, 2012). For instance, 323 of the Fortune 500 companies have set sustainability-related management targets on which they report regularly (Pivot Goals, 2017).

However, the assumption that CSR engagement equals a corporate contribution to sustainable development is currently being challenged. For instance, Milne and Gray (2013), argue that current corporate CSR practice hardly ever addresses systemwide sustainability challenges, such as ecosystem degradation, poverty and social justice. Instead, “businesses and their associations have limited their ideas to issues about themselves” (p. 24). Because trust in the private sector’s ability to self-regulate and drive positive social change is waning, TNCs need to find new ways to demonstrate how they are engaging in CSR in a way that contributes to sustainable development (Giannarakis and Theotokas, 2011); just doing good is no longer enough. Many TNCs still struggle to demonstrate what they achieve through their CSR activities across the value chain and the value they create for both the broader society and the environment, i.e. their impacts on sustainable development (Searcy, 2014). In the same vein, management research has so far not produced coherent theoretical frameworks to engage with CSR in a way that captures systemic linkages and interdependencies along the value chain (Searcy, 2014; Starik and Kanashiro, 2013), leading some scholars to question whether CSR contributes to sustainable development at all (Banerjee, 2003; Milne and Gray, 2013).

The purpose of this paper is to explore whether and how the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) can be a reference framework that may help TNCs better link core

business operations and CSR engagement with sustainable development. We therefore review some of the scholarship that has provided new impetus into the discussion on CSR and juxtapose it with the evolving discourse on the contribution of businesses to the SDGs. We specifically highlight the importance of measuring the corporate contribution to sustainable development as a prerequisite for strategically engaging with the SDGs and outline avenues for future research that may inform both scholarly discourse and managerial practice.

2. Exploring expectations towards TNCs in the post-crisis business landscape

Doing well, in the sense of maintaining economic and financial performance, has become harder for many TNCs. Since the global economic, financial and social crises of 2008–2009, a new business landscape has emerged that is much more prone to uncertainty than ever before (Szalavetz, 2016). It has become increasingly clear that the ongoing restructuring of the economic order has particularly affected TNCs (The Economist, 2017). TNCs operate in the context of global value chains that encompass hundreds of locations for various corporate activities. In addition, many TNCs had moved or were moving towards globally integrated structures before the crises (The Economist, 2017). But the notion that the constituent parts of the value chain can be unbundled and distributed almost anywhere at will has been challenged by economic volatility, and changing political sentiments regarding borders and trade. The post-crisis economy seems to have entered a new equilibrium, which is characterized by higher risk, low growth and diminished capital flows (El-Erian, 2016). For instance, capital flows between countries and trade in goods and services have retreated significantly (Sharma, 2016). Foreign direct investment has fallen from its pre-crisis high of over \$3 trillion to about \$2 trillion in 2015 (World Bank, 2017).

Concurrently, trust in the private sector's ability to self-regulate and drive positive social change has been waning. Negative consequences of trade and globalization, including rising inequality and stagnant wage levels, have increased opposition to TNCs, in particular, and globalization, more generally (Gardels and Berggruen, 2017). In response, governments, market regulators and stock exchanges have increasingly adopted regulations or listing requirements mandating CSR disclosures (Hörisch et al., 2014; Schneider, 2015), including the European Union's Non-Financial Disclosure Directive (EC, 2017). According to the Global Reporting Initiative's (GRI) Sustainability Disclosure Database, the total number of instruments requiring or encouraging CSR disclosures reached 400 across 71 countries in 2016, up from 180 instruments across 44 countries in 2014 (Bartels and Fogelberg, 2016). This indicates an emerging consensus that TNCs can and ought to contribute to sustainable development by enhancing positive impacts (e.g. on livelihoods, health and education) and reducing

negative ones (e.g. resource consumption, pollution, human rights violations) (Milne and Gray, 2013; Scherer et al., 2014; Vigneau et al., 2015). This also means that doing good, in the sense of giving back to society some of the proceeds of commercial activity and engaging in voluntary, philanthropic activities, is increasingly considered insufficient by stakeholders, including governments, consumers and civil society (see Martinuzzi and Krumay, 2013).

Consequently, expectations are rising for TNCs to address societal needs in everyday business and to effect positive impacts for local communities (Edelman, 2017). For example, the Edelman Trust Barometer, a global online survey investigating trust in institutions across 28 countries, found that more than half of the over 33,000 respondents did not consider business a trustworthy institution and that only 37% considered global business leaders to be trustworthy individuals. Concurrently, 75% of respondents agreed that a company can and ought to take specific actions that both increase profits and improve the economic and social conditions in the community where it operates (Edelman, 2017).

The way in which trust from citizens, investors and policymakers can positively affect the performance of TNCs that credibly engage with CSR has become manifest in the context of the financial and economic crises in 2008–2009. Empirical research finds that TNCs with high CSR intensity had higher stock returns and performed better in terms of profitability, growth, and sales than their peers during the crisis (Lins et al., 2016). Firms that were viewed to perform well on CSR also enjoyed greater trust from bondholders during the financial crisis, which was mirrored in better initial credit ratings (Amiraslani et al. 2017). Evidence also suggests that TNCs that have managed to established relationships of trust within the communities in which they operate are more likely to successfully engage in public policy deliberations (Liedong et al., 2014). These developments have inspired changing notions of CSR, which we explore in the following section.

3. Edging closer to sustainable development – the evolution of CSR

Until the turn of the millennium, CSR was mainly understood to be a voluntary type of social engagement of corporations, built on principles of charity and stewardship (Van Marrewijk, 2003). One of the most widely accepted conceptualizations remains Carroll's Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility (Carroll, 1991), which views philanthropy as the pinnacle of a pyramid of economic, legal and ethical responsibilities. We perceive four significant expansions on this original idea of CSR that have gained prominence over the last decade and jive with the context of a changed post-crisis business landscape presented above.

First, Porter and Kramer (2011) have posited that focusing on the generation of shared value for shareholders as well as broader societal groups may result in both long-term success and the creation of a tangible contribution to sustainable development. In stressing the integration of core business concerns with the creation of wider societal value, the concept thus emphasizes the mutual interdependence between business and society. More specifically, Porter and Kramer (2011) argue that corporations may enhance both societal impact and competitiveness by (a) reconceiving products and markets to meet unmet societal needs; (b) focusing on the productivity of the whole value chain to eliminate inefficiencies and mitigate risks; and (c) focusing on developing mutually beneficial relationships, for instance by developing the skills of suppliers. Although the concept still focuses on what companies do, rather than on what they achieve in terms of sustainable development, the shared value approach has drawn renewed attention to a fundamental debate on the purpose of corporations in society that goes beyond philanthropic or ethical considerations and considers impacts on others outside the boundaries of the corporation. This discourse has also been significantly shaped by Freeman's stakeholder theory (Arjaliès et al., 2013). Both Porter and Kramer (2011) and Freeman (in Hörisch et al., 2014) stress that an orientation towards stakeholders and shared-value creation is to be seen as an expansion of the purpose of corporations rather than an alternative to creating shareholder value. The responsibility of corporations in this view is thus to carefully negotiate relationships with broader stakeholder groups, including shareholders.

Second, this view is complemented by the planetary boundaries framework of Whiteman et al. (2013). Whiteman and colleagues argue that CSR need not only consider impacts on societal groups but in addition "link business processes to macro ecological processes and boundary conditions" (p. 2). The authors identify looking beyond the boundaries of the corporation towards its role in the larger ecological system as one of the main challenges for future management research on CSR (also see Montiel and Delgado-Ceballos, 2014). Increasingly, this view is adopted in management research and has spawned attempts to better anchor linkages between business and the environment in management theory. However, these attempts are still in their infancy. Starik and Kanashiro (2013), for instance, note that "most organization/management theories that have been used in sustainability research do not either explicitly or implicitly recognize the obvious (or near-obvious) fact that all human organizations are embedded within the natural environment." (2013, p. 9). However, this seems to be a necessary precondition for truly capturing the contribution of TNCs to sustainable development.

Third, a recent review of the international business literature (Kolk, 2016) notes that research in this field "has tended to mostly focus on economic issues, often spillovers, in relation to foreign direct investment" (p.30) at the expense of other issues relevant to sustainable development. A broadening of sustainable development issues

considered in CSR research, including poverty, peace and conflict or human rights, the author argues, is desirable but requires a nuanced consideration of their specific characteristics and relevance across locations, sectors and corporations. This links up with the observation that local expressions of CSR, relevant issues and the varied impacts of addressing them are highly context specific (see for instance, Jamali and Karam, 2016). Consequently, some authors argue that TNCs increasingly have to engage with the claims of nation states and a growing number of heterogeneous stakeholder groups (see Mason and Simmons 2014) and learn to deal with the implications of shared responsibility for impacts on sustainable development that are beyond the direct control of individual TNCs (see Font et al., 2016, Hemphill and Kelley, 2016).

In summary, we thus arrive at a conceptualization of CSR that directly links the CSR activities of TNCs with what they achieve for the broader society and the environment. Such a conceptualization of CSR requires managers to engage with a much more complex system of relationships and responsibilities, many of them not under the exclusive control of any one TNC. This means that TNCs will be increasingly benchmarked against the degree to which they manage to integrate CSR into their business models, their impacts on sustainable development and the degree to which they create tangible value for both themselves and their stakeholders.

4. Linking CSR and the Sustainable Development Goals

The expanded understanding of CSR elaborated above sets a high standard for a TNC's capability to identify societal needs, understand the complex dynamics of the social and biophysical systems in which they are embedded, and engage with a multitude of stakeholders to address sustainable development issues beyond their direct and exclusive control. Measuring up to this ambition is a challenging task in the absence of integrated theoretical or managerial frameworks that guide TNCs through the process of measuring and managing their impacts on sustainable development (Starik and Kanashiro, 2013; Searcy, 2014).

We posit that the SDGs may fill this gap and provide such an integrated framework for future-oriented CSR engagement. The 17 SDGs with their 169 targets present a universally agreed upon sustainable development vision for 2030. They recognize the interrelated nature of issues such as poverty, inequality, decent work, gender equality and ecosystem conservation, as well as the necessity for all societal actors to jointly tackle them (Le Blanc, 2015). For the first time, the private sector was represented at the negotiation table and involved in designing a global sustainable development agenda alongside political and civil society actors (Scheyvens et al., 2016). TNCs are explicitly encouraged to adopt responsible practices and report on sustainability impacts (Goal 12.6) and to partner with governments and civil society for the achievement of the SDGs (Goal 17).

Awareness of the SDGs among TNCs high, with 92% of respondents from international businesses surveyed by PwC in 2015 reporting awareness of the goals (PwC, 2015). The SDGs are frequently perceived by TNCs as an opportunity for reviving growth and technological innovation, which create win-win situations for them, society and the environment (Scheyvens et al., 2016; also see Porter and Kramer, 2011). This perception is echoed by a recent report by the Business and Sustainable Development Commission, a high-level forum of business leaders from TNCs, as well as from other private sector and civil society organizations. The business case for engaging with the SDGs, they posit, is strong: rewards are estimated to amount to at least US\$12 trillion in new business opportunities (BSDC, 2017). This jives with management literature, which has expended much effort on establishing a business case for CSR and identifying win-win opportunities for corporations, society and the environment over the past 25 years (Carroll and Shabana, 2010; Dyllick and Hockerts, 2002).

Beyond the business case for TNC engagement with the SDGs, the global goals may also entail an opportunity for them to tackle the broader systemic challenges of better meeting societal expectations and contributing to sustainable development across the value chain. Indeed, the Business and Sustainable Development Commission specifically highlights the need for demonstrating substantial contributions to achieving the SDGs. Furthermore, it strongly recommends integrating them into corporate values, governance and strategy, and pursuing CSR at a sectorial level (BSDC, 2017).

In light of the expanded understanding of CSR presented above, the SDGs may prove beneficial in three distinct ways. First, they contain a universally agreed-upon and delimited set of sustainable development issues, many of them broken down into targets that are directly relevant to business. They thus delimit the potential plethora of sustainable development issues that TNCs might engage with. Second, the SDGs provide a common set of goals around which multiple sets of stakeholders, including TNCs, may rally and build partnerships. This may be helpful in identifying common interests, where it is necessary to jointly tackle sustainable development issues beyond the control of an individual TNC. Indeed, such partnerships are promoted as one of the major levers of business involvement into the SDGs. Third, the SDGs fully acknowledge the integrated and systemic nature of sustainable development issues. They may consequently provide a framework against which TNCs may start to map their CSR activities in order to identify leverage points for enhancing positive impacts and mitigating negative ones.

However, finding ways to address the SDGs is related to a fundamental difficulty: we know very little of the actual impacts of CSR engagement on sustainable development. Existing evidence is frequently inconclusive (Oetzel and Doh, 2009) and mainly restricted to the economic dimension of sustainable development (Kolk, 2016). Much of the existing evidence suggests that TNCs, especially when operating

in developing countries, have tended to be guided by narrow economic interests at the expense of adequate safety standards, human rights and the environment (Banerjee, 2008). It is thus not surprising that only 13% of respondents in the above-mentioned survey report having identified the tools necessary to assess their impacts against the SDGs (PwC, 2015).

5. The importance of impact measurement and management

In order to formulate management responses, TNCs need to better understand their impacts on sustainable development, including both direct and indirect impacts. The business expression, “if you can measure it, you can manage it” – and its converse – is an apt illustration. It thus seems particularly necessary to explore how TNCs can expand existing sustainability measurement and management systems to capture impacts on sustainable development that occur along the value chain and accrue at the level of the broader society and the environment. This requires timely access to data and, more importantly, a framework to indicate which data are important and relevant, i.e. material (Hardi et al., forthcoming).

The SDGs and related targets cover wide-ranging areas of a diversified nature. Different sustainable development issues possess varying degrees of relevance to different industries and different contexts. TNCs need to be able to set and monitor management goals in those areas where they have the most significant impacts, a notion that has recently been discussed under the term materiality assessment (Calabrese et al., 2016). The SDGs now provide a comprehensive reference framework for which of the many sustainable development issues should be deemed essential and can thus help businesses broaden the scope of their measurement efforts while simultaneously limiting the number of material issues to be considered.

Materiality assessment is considered a necessary tool to measure and manage sustainable development impacts because it limits the complexity of such an endeavour by prioritizing those issues where the most significant impacts occur (Calabrese et al., 2016). While materiality assessment is now a central component of pertinent sustainability reporting standards, such as the GRI Standards (GRI, 2016) and dedicated guidelines for corporate engagement with the SDGs, such as the SDG Compass¹, there is as of yet no accepted process for carrying out materiality assessments in a CSR context. Most authors on this topic currently agree that stakeholders should have a say in identifying what counts as material impacts (Manetti and Becatti, 2009;

¹ SDG Compass (2016). Available at: <https://sdgcompass.org/>. Accessed on June 7 2017.

Calabrese et al., 2016). Regarding the process, methodology and evaluation criteria to be employed, the discourse is still in its infancy, thus providing opportunities for future research. Questions to be explored might include the following: How should materiality assessment deal with potential trade-offs between different sustainability impacts, for example when environmentally oriented sourcing excludes suppliers from contracts and may entail job losses among particularly vulnerable people along the value chain? How should it consider the value and interests of stakeholders that have no voice and of the environment? How should it balance competing stakeholder interests and potential conflicts between stakeholder and management goals?

Beyond the challenge of identifying material issues related to sustainable development, approaches and tools for measuring the impacts of corporate activities on sustainable development also need to consider a TNC's entire value chain, a broad set of sustainability issues as delimited by the SDGs, within a specific sustainability context. Although many TNCs have gained experience with sustainability reporting (Milne and Gray, 2013), environmental and social accounting (Bebbington and Larrinaga, 2014) and the implementation of international accountability standards (Vigneau et al., 2015) in the past decade, they have struggled to develop measurement systems that deliver reliable, synthesized and actionable information on impacts materializing beyond their organizational boundaries (Searcy, 2014).

We can identify three major challenges discussed in management literature in this regard. First, within corporations, Maas et al. (2016) find a disconnect between measurement efforts for the purpose of creating transparency and decision support. For both purposes, corporate measurement systems are seen to be fragmented and only insufficiently linked to core management functions. Second, Milne and Gray (2013) posit that existing measurement approaches frequently fail to look "beyond physical transactions towards relational aspects of sustainability" (p.18). If accepted, this implies a need to include a careful analysis of stakeholders and collaboration opportunities within the focal firm, its value chain and beyond the value chain (Schneider and Wallenburg, 2012, cited in Searcy, 2014). With regard to the role of TNCs in multi-actor governance arrangements for the SDGs, future research may also provide important insights into how businesses are embedded into larger societal arrangements and collaborate with other actors to enhance positive and mitigating negative impacts (Scheyvens et al., 2016; Vigneau et al., 2015).

Finally, Milne and Gray (2013) posit that extant measurement efforts of TNCs tend to disregard the growing body of data concerning sustainable development. They formulate the need to extend the scope of measurement beyond companies' internal performance indicators towards companies' external data on sustainable development trends, risks and opportunities, while respecting "basic standards of information reliability and completeness that we assume for financial information" (p.21). This is arguably the biggest challenge facing TNCs wishing to tackle the SDGs, because it entails breaking down societal-level indicators of sustainable development

and operationalizing them for a corporate context. Various organizations and consultants have attempted to adapt societal-level indicators to business realities in order to make them operational for corporations.² Efforts have also been made by the United Nations to specifically operationalize business indicators that address human rights (Addo, 2014). Searcy (2014) notes that these efforts have been successful to a very limited extent so far because research on how to set social and environmental boundaries in a corporate context and how to translate this into contextually based measures of sustainable development are still in an embryonic stage (see, for instance McElroy et al., 2008). This means that quantifiable information linking corporate activities along causal pathways to changes in societal-level sustainability indicators may still be a long way off.

One way of dealing with this difficulty is to be transparent about the (e)valuation criteria that are employed to assess available data, identify potential win-win situations and trade-offs, and translate results into action (Hörisch et al., 2014). Notwithstanding efforts to improve the measurement of impacts on the SDGs, it will also be essential for TNCs to be included into the ongoing efforts to develop a multi-level monitoring and evaluation system for the SDGs across countries, sectors and societal groups. While some initiatives, like the GRI, are starting to explore potential linkages between corporate sustainability disclosures and higher-level data on sustainability trends, for example from statistical offices, this space is still largely unexplored.

6. Outlook

The SDGs provide a new and comprehensive vision for sustainable development until 2030. For the first time, the private sector has been actively involved in shaping a global sustainable development agenda and is explicitly recognized as both an addressee and an important partner in its achievement. In this context, we have argued, TNCs have a unique opportunity to use the SDGs as a framework for improving CSR engagement of TNCs in line with changing societal expectations. Through impact assessment and a strategic sensitivity to global sustainable development challenges, TNCs may contribute to shared value creation, enhance positive impacts (e.g. poverty alleviation, livelihoods, health and education) and reduce negative ones (e.g. resource consumption, pollution, human rights violations) across bottom lines.

² e.g., PwC Total Impact Measurement and Management builds on the Human Development Index (PwC, 2013); the GRI Standards explicitly highlight the importance of considering the sustainability context (GRI, 2016).

Effectively measuring and managing business impacts is no easy task. Socio-ecological effects of business activities materialize along complex pathways. They span global value chains, affect diverse stakeholder groups and involve trade-offs that can be daunting to deal with. As business moves towards a new and expanded understanding of CSR, sound instruments for systematically mapping, measuring, evaluating and managing impacts are needed (Searcy, 2014). To truly capture impacts in the context of the SDGs, corporate measurement and evaluation systems will need to (a) carefully delimit the purpose and ambition of measurement (Maas et al., 2016); (b) take explicit account of environmental and social system boundaries (Milne and Gray, 2013; Whiteman et al., 2013); (c) develop new indicators apt to capture multidimensional and systemic effects of corporate activities on society and fill corresponding data gaps (Searcy, 2014), and (d) develop and openly discuss with stakeholders the (e)valuation factors that determine how results are translated into action (Hörisch et al., 2014).

This opens a range of potential areas for new research in international business, CSR, sustainability accounting and other management disciplines. Our review of contemporary thinking and the expanded scope of CSR suggests a need to discuss the contribution of business to sustainable development from various disciplinary and thematic perspectives (also see Bebbington and Larrinaga, 2014), thus identifying remaining knowledge gaps and exploring the future role that TNCs can play in the context of the SDGs.

Given that evidence on the (positive) impacts of corporate activities on sustainable development is still scarce or inconclusive (Oetzel and Doh, 2009; Kolk, 2016), it might be useful to further explore the normative, conceptual and methodological challenges of sound corporate impact measurement and management in the context of the SDGs, especially in underresearched environmental and social areas covered by the goals (Searcy, 2014; Bebbington and Larrinaga, 2014). As Milne and Gray's (2013) work suggests, there is also ample room for well-founded and constructive critiques of existing tools and methods for measuring the corporate contribution to sustainable development in general and the SDGs, in particular. Measuring, monitoring and evaluating progress towards the achievement of the SDGs will play a key role in the years to come in order to enable effective implementation of the goals (Lu et al., 2015). In this regard, the SDGs offer a real opportunity to shift the focus from what TNCs do (activities for sustainable development) towards what they achieve (impacts on sustainable development) through their core business and philanthropic engagement. However, this requires a rethinking of the purpose and scope of measurement, filling important data gaps, and establishing evaluation criteria and procedures that consider the value, worth and merit of impacts on sustainable development. It also requires that due consideration be given to the perspectives of both the TNC and its stakeholders, as well as global environmental carrying capacities (Bebbington and Larrinaga, 2014; Searcy, 2014).

Although this is an ambitious agenda, improved impact measurement and evaluation provides a real opportunity for TNCs to glean more substantial and valuable information for addressing the SDGs in a business landscape marked by uncertainty. At the same time, a deeper understanding, better data on concrete contributions to the SDGs and a more transparent, participatory approach to evaluation can help TNCs regain public trust and fulfil their role as an important partner in their achievement.

References

- Addo, Michael K. (2014). Business and human rights indicators: opportunities and challenges in measuring corporate respect for human rights. <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Business/DamianoMeasuringBHR17Mar2014.pdf>.
- Amiraslani, Hami, Karl V. Lins, Henri Servaes and Ane Tamayo (2017). A matter of trust? The bond market benefits of corporate social capital during the financial crisis, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2978794.
- Arjaliès, Diane-Laure, and Julia Mundy (2013). The use of management control systems to manage CSR strategy: a levers of control perspective, *Management Accounting Research*, 24(4), pp. 284–300.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata, B. (2003). Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature, *Organization Studies*, 24(1), 143–180.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata, B. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: the good, the bad and the ugly, *Critical Sociology*, 34 (1), pp. 51–79.
- Bartels, Wim, and Teresa Fogelberg (2016). Carrots and Sticks – Global trends in sustainability reporting regulation and policy, <http://www.sseinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Carrots-Sticks-2016.pdf>.
- Bebbington, Jan, and Carlos Larrinaga (2014). Accounting and sustainable development: an exploration, *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, 39 (6), pp. 395–413.
- BSDC (Business and Sustainable Development Commission) (2017). Better Business, Better World. <http://report.businesscommission.org>.
- Calabrese, Armando, Roberta Costa, Nathan Levaldi and Tamara Menichini (2016). A fuzzy analytic hierarchy process method to support materiality assessment in sustainability reporting, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 121, pp. 248–264.
- Carroll, Archie B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: towards the moral management of organizational stakeholders, *Business Horizons*, 34 (4), pp. 39–48.
- Carroll, Archie B., and Kareem M. Shabana (2010). The business case for corporate social responsibility: a review of concepts, research and practice, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12 (1), pp. 85–105.
- Dyllick, Thomas, and Kai Hockerts (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability, *Business Strategy & the Environment*, 11 (2), pp. 130–141.

- EC (European Commission) (2017). Non-financial reporting directive – transposition status. https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/non-financial-reporting-directive-transposition-status_en.
- Edelman. (2017). Trust Barometer 2017. <http://www.edelman.com/executive-summary>.
- El-Erian, Mohamed A. (2016). *The only game in town: Central banks, instability, and avoiding the next collapse* (New York: Random House).
- Falck, Oliver, and Stephan Heblich (2007). Corporate social responsibility: Doing well by doing good, *Business Horizons*, 50(3), 247–254.
- Font, X., Guix M. & Bonilla-Priego, M.J. (2015). Corporate social responsibility in cruising: Using materiality analysis to create shared value. In: *Tourism Management* 53: pp. 175-186.
- Gardels, Nathan, and Nicolas Berggruen (2017). Salvaging globalization, *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 34(1), pp. 67–79.
- Giannarakis, Grigoris, and Ioannis Theotokas (2011). The effect of financial crisis in corporate social responsibility performance, *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 3(1), pp. 2–10.
- GRI (Global Reporting Initiative) (2016). Consolidated set of GRI standards. <https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/gri-standards-download-center>.
- Hemphill, T.A. & Kelley, K.J. (2016). Socially responsible global supply chains: The human rights promise of shared responsibility and ISO 45001. In: *Journal of Global Responsibility* 7:2, pp.163 – 180.
- Hörisch, Jacob, Edward R. Freeman and Stefan S. Schaltegger (2014). Applying stakeholder theory in sustainability management, *Organization & Environment*, 27(4), pp. 328-346.
- IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development) (2016). <https://www.iied.org/effective-evaluation-for-sustainable-development-goals>.
- Jamali, Dima, and Charlotte Karam (2016). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study, *International Journal of Management Reviews*. DOI: 10.1111/ijmr.12112.
- Keijzers, Gerard (2005). *Business, government and sustainable development* (Vol. 28). Abingdon, U.K. and New York: Routledge.
- Kolk, Ans (2016). The social responsibility of international business: from ethics and the environment to CSR and sustainable development, *Journal of World Business*, 51(1), pp. 23–34.
- Le Blanc, David (2015). Towards integration at last? The Sustainable Development Goals as a network of targets, *Sustainable Development*, 23(3), pp. 176–187.
- Liedong, Tahiru A., Abby Ghobadian, Tazeeb Rajwani, Nicholas O'Regan. (2015). Towards a view of complementarity: trust and policy influence effects of corporate social responsibility and corporate political activity, *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), pp. 405–427.
- Lins, Karl V., Henri Servaes and Ane Tamayo (2016). Social capital, trust, and firm performance: The value of corporate social responsibility during the financial crisis. *Journal of Finance*, forthcoming.

- Lu, Yonglong, Nebojsa Nakicenovic, Martin Visbeck and Anne-Sophie Stevance (2015). Policy: five priorities for the UN Sustainable Development Goals, Comment, *Nature*, 520 (7548), pp. 432–433.
- Maas, Karen, Stefan Schaltegger and Nathalie Crutzen (2016). Integrating corporate sustainability assessment, management accounting, control, and reporting, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 136, pp. 237–248.
- Manetti, Giacomo, and Lucia Becatti (2009). Assurance services for sustainability reports: Standards and empirical evidence, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, pp. 289–298.
- Martinuzzi, André, and Barbara Krumay (2013). The good, the bad, and the successful—how corporate social responsibility leads to competitive advantage and organizational transformation, *Journal of Change Management*, 13(4), pp. 424–443.
- Mason, C. and John Simmons (2014). Embedding Corporate Social Responsibility in Corporate Governance: A Stakeholder Systems Approach, In: *Journal of Business Ethics* 119:1, pp. 77–86.
- McElroy, Mark W., Rene J. Jorna and Jo van Engelen (2008). Sustainability quotients and the social footprint, *Corporate Social Responsibility & Environmental Management*, 15(4), pp. 223–234.
- Mian, Atif R., Amir Sufi and Francesco Trebbi (2014). Resolving debt overhang: political constraints in the aftermath of financial crises, *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 6(2), pp. 1–28.
- Milne, Markus J., and Rob Gray (2013). Whither ecology? The triple bottom line, the global reporting initiative and corporate sustainability reporting, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118(1), pp. 13–29.
- Montiel, Ivan (2008). Corporate social responsibility and corporate sustainability separate pasts, common futures, *Organization & Environment*, 21(3), 245–269.
- Montiel, Ivan, and Javier Delgado-Ceballos (2014). Defining and measuring corporate sustainability?, *Organization & Environment*, 27(2), pp. 113–139.
- Oetzel, Jennifer, and Jonathan P. Doh (2009). MNEs and development: a review and reconceptualization, *Journal of World Business*, 44(2), pp. 108–120.
- Perego, Paolo, and Ans Kolk (2012). Multinationals' accountability on sustainability: The evolution of third-party assurance of sustainability reports, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110(2), pp. 173–190.
- Pivot Goals (2017). The sustainability goals of the world's largest and leading companies: an initiative of Winston Eco-Strategies. <http://www.pivotgoals.com>.
- Porter, Michael E., and Mark R. Kramer (2011). Creating shared value, *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), pp. 62–77.
- PwC (2013). Measuring and managing total impact – strengthening business decisions for business leaders. <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/sustainability/publications/total-impact-measurement-management/assets/pwc-timm-for-ceos.pdf>.
- PwC (2015). Make it your business: engaging with the Sustainable Development Goals. http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/sustainability/SDG/SDG%20Research_FINAL.pdf.

- Scherer, Andreas Georg, Guido Palazzo and Dirk Matten (2014). The business firm as a political actor: A new theory of the firm for a globalized world, *Business & Society*, 53(2), pp. 143–156.
- Scheyvens, Regina, Glenn Banks and Emma Hughes (2016). The private sector and the SDGs: the need to move beyond “business as usual”, *Sustainable Development*, 24(6), pp. 371–382.
- Schneider, Anselm (2015). Reflexivity in sustainability accounting and management: transcending the economic focus of corporate sustainability, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(3), pp. 525–536.
- Searcy, Cory (2014). Measuring enterprise sustainability, *Business Strategy & the Environment*, 25(2), pp. 120–133.
- Seuring, Stefan, and Stefan Gold (2013). Sustainability management beyond corporate boundaries: from stakeholders to performance, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 56, pp. 1–6.
- Sharma, Ruchir (2016). *The rise and fall of nations: Forces of change in the post-crisis world* (New York: Norton & Company).
- Starik, Mark, and Patricia Kanashiro (2013). Towards a theory of sustainability management: Uncovering and integrating the nearly obvious, *Organization & Environment*, 26(1), pp. 7–30.
- Szalavetz, Andrea (2016). Post-crisis developments in multinational corporations’ global organizations. *Competition & Change*, 20(4), pp. 221–236.
- The Economist* (2017). The retreat of the global company, January 28, <http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21715653-biggest-business-idea-past-three-decades-deep-trouble-retreat-global>.
- World Bank (2017). Listed domestic companies, total, World Federation of Exchanges database, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/CM.MKT.LDOM.NO?locations=US-Z7&start=1994&end=2015&view=chart%22%20width=%27450%27%20height=%27300%27%20frameBorder=%270%27%20scrolling=%22no%22>.
- Van Marrewijk, Marcel (2003). Concepts and definitions of CSR and corporate sustainability: between agency and communion, *Journal of Business Ethics* 44(2), pp. 95–105.
- Vigneau, Laurence, Michael Humphreys and Jeremy Moon (2015). How do firms comply with international sustainability standards? Processes and consequences of adopting the global reporting initiative, *Journal of Business Ethics* 131(2), pp. 469–486.
- Whiteman, Gail, Brian Walker and Paolo Perego (2013). Planetary boundaries: ecological foundations for corporate sustainability, *Journal of Management Studies* 50(2), pp. 307–336.

