

A Critical Review of CSR Transfer and Adaptation in Emerging Markets, 2015–2025

Wael Abdallah*

Box Hill College Kuwait, Kuwait

E-mail: w.abdallah@bhck.edu.kw

*Corresponding Author

Received: July 12, 2025; **Accepted:** December 1, 2025

Abstract: The global CSR discourse has been intensified unprecedentedly in the past decade since the adoption of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement in 2015. However, there is no scholarly consensus on whether, how, and under which conditions CSR norms developed in Western liberal market economies meaningfully transfer to emerging market contexts. This paper provides a critical systematic review of the literature on CSR transfer and adaptation in emerging markets published from 2015 to 2025, including contributions from Africa, Latin America, South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe. We identify four dominant theoretical frameworks that have structured this literature, namely institutional theory, stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and political CSR, and critically evaluate their explanatory power and normative adequacy in emerging market contexts. From the literature, three persistent tensions emerge from the review: between universal CSR norms and context-specific moral ecologies; between voluntary, firm-level CSR and state-mandated or institutionally embedded social responsibility; and between the SDG-alignment agenda and the structural inequalities that shape CSR practice in the Global South. This paper makes the case that existing frameworks share a common shortcoming. All of them implicitly assume a developmental teleology that treats CSR in emerging markets as a flawed approximation of Western ideals. This paper proposes a decolonial remedy aimed at restoring the normative agency of local stakeholders. The paper closes by suggesting guidelines for future research in the area of global business ethics that departs from the notion of development hierarchies.

Keywords: CSR Transfer, Emerging Markets, Institutional Theory, Legitimacy, SDGs

Type: Research Paper



© 2026 The Author(s). This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms of [the Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY 4.0\) License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.51325/ejbt9v49

1. Introduction

In September 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its seventeen Sustainable Development Goals, which represent an unprecedented multilateral commitment to integrate social, environmental, and economic objectives within the global governance framework. Two months later, a legally binding scheme for climate action was adopted through the Paris Agreement, establishing private sector participation as being important to the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Ultimately, the two groundbreaking papers transformed the global paradigm regarding corporate social responsibility, putting pressure on various companies operating around the world to comply with international standards in this area. This pressure is especially evident in emerging economies as the level of institutional development, regulatory quality, and civil society differs.

A large number of studies have been focused on observing the way the broad CSR agenda has unfolded in various institutional contexts of the Global South and the emerging countries around the world. Studies of CSR implementation took place in sub-Saharan Africa (Amaeshi et al., 2016; Idemudia, 2017), Latin America (Montiel et al., 2021; Puppim de Oliveira, 2019), South Asia and Southeast Asia (Jamali and Karam, 2018; Lim and Ansary, 2020), the Middle East and North Africa (Al-Abdin et al 2018; Beddewela and Herzig, 2013), and Eastern Europe (Preuss and Barkemeyer, 2011; Fifka and Pobizhan, 2014). Despite a long list of studies in this direction, the existing literature is still highly fragmented from a theoretical point of view. Its normative basis has not been thoroughly reviewed yet, which refers to explicit and implicit assumptions regarding the main principles and causes of CSR in developing markets.

The purpose of this paper is to fill this gap by conducting a critical systematic review of the literature on CSR transfer and adaptation in emerging markets published between 2015 and 2025. We use the term ‘critical’ advisedly: our aim is not only to map and synthesize what has been written, but also to evaluate the theoretical and normative assumptions structuring the literature, to identify its silences and blind spots, and to propose a corrective that better serves the interests of the communities whose lives are most directly shaped by corporate conduct in these contexts. The review is organized around three broad questions: What have been the dominant theoretical frameworks in scholarly accounts of CSR in emerging markets? What do these frameworks do well? Where do they fall short? And what normative reorientations are needed to overcome the current limitations of the field?

The paper is structured as follows. The review methodology is described in Section 2. In Section 3, we map the dominant theoretical frameworks structuring the literature. Section 4 critically evaluates each framework with respect to the three tensions identified above. In Section 5, we elaborate on the notion of developmental teleology and its distorting effects on emerging market CSR scholarship. A decolonial corrective and a post-developmental research agenda are outlined in Section 6. Section 7 discusses and concludes.

2. Methodology of the review

2.1. Search strategy and eligibility criteria

This paper adheres to the principles of systematic literature review methodology as adapted for conceptual and critical work in the business ethics scholarship (Tranfield et al., 2003; Fisch and Block, 2018). The primary aim is critical theoretical synthesis rather than bibliometric completeness: we aim to identify and evaluate the most influential and representative contributions to the literature rather than to catalogue every published study. We searched in five major academic databases (EBSCO Business Source Complete, Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR and Google Scholar) using search terms combining variants of “CSR”, “corporate social responsibility”, “business ethics” and “social

responsibility” with terms such as “emerging markets”, “developing countries”, “Global South”, “Africa”, “Asia”, “Latin America”, “Middle East” and “Eastern Europe”. The search was restricted to peer-reviewed articles published in English between January 2015 and December 2025 in journals listed in the ABS Academic Journal Guide at 2* and above.

Initial screening resulted in ~840 potentially relevant articles. Final review corpus consisted of 187 articles after title and abstract screening against the inclusion criteria of substantive engagement with CSR in one or more emerging market or developing country context, theoretical or empirical contribution to understanding CSR adoption, transfer or adaptation, and removal of duplicates and studies focused exclusively on firm-level financial performance outcomes. These were thematically coded using NVivo to identify dominant theoretical frameworks, key empirical findings, and normative assumptions. The following analysis builds on a further purposive selection of 62 articles that represent the most theoretically sophisticated and critically engaged contributions.

2.2. Limits and Boundaries

The review concentrates on peer-reviewed academic literature and does not systematically cover practitioner reports, policy documents, or grey literature, although these are selectively drawn upon where they illuminate theoretical arguments. A key limitation is the focus on English-language publications, which may introduce a systematic bias towards Anglophone academic traditions or perspectives generated or shaped by them. Future reviews should actively seek to include scholarship produced in Arabic, Portuguese, Chinese, and other major languages of the Global South. The choice to focus on the 2015-2025 period is based on the substantive rationale described above - the SDG and Paris Agreement frameworks fundamentally transformed the normative environment for CSR globally - and allows for a targeted analysis of the literature's response to these developments.

3. Main Theoretical Perspectives in the Literature

Our review corpus analysis reveals that four theoretical frameworks have dominated scholarly accounts of CSR transfer and adaptation in emerging markets since 2015: institutional theory, stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and political CSR. Each framework privileges certain explanatory variables and certain normative assumptions. We describe each in turn and then move to critical evaluation.

3.1. Institutional Theories

Institutional theory, broadly defined to include North's (1990) distinction between formal and informal institutions, DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) explanation of isomorphic pressures, and Scott's (1995) three pillars of regulative, normative, and cognitive institutions, has become the dominant theoretical perspective for comparative CSR research across national contexts. The literature on emerging markets has used institutional theory to account for the drivers of CSR adoption and the ways CSR is adapted to local contexts.

The argument is that CSR practices are not transferred across the institutional boundaries in a culturally neutral way but refracted through the

specific institutional configurations of host economies (Jamali and Karam, 2018). In contexts characterized by ‘institutional voids’ – the absence of the regulatory, market, and social infrastructure that supports CSR in advanced economies – firms face different incentive structures, different stakeholder pressures, and different legitimacy requirements than their counterparts in developed economies (Khanna and Palepu, 2010; Mair et al., 2012). Some scholarly works have shown how organizations might symbolize the adoption of language and practices linked to global CSR paradigms in the form of sustainability reporting, SDG alignment, and stakeholder engagement, even if they may not actually provide the social results that these frameworks aim to accomplish. (Fifka and Pobizhan, 2014; Idemudia, 2017).

A significant idea within the context of institutional theories of CSR in developing global markets is the differentiation between the ideas of ‘explicit’ and ‘implicit’ CSR made by Matten and Moon (2008), and later on used by numerous researchers in the comparative studies of CSR. Explicit CSR is about voluntary corporate programs communicating to the outside world the notions of CSR and is usually connected with liberal market economies like the USA or the United Kingdom. Implicit CSR on the contrary means socially embedded and mandated responsibilities which are fulfilled through cooperation rather than through the direct corporate efforts. This concept is more often associated with coordinated market economies and with the economies where the state has the influence. Studies, however, show a more complicated nature of emergence of the forms of explicit CSR, which coexist with the existing implicit CSR practices based on local customs, traditions, and beliefs (Amaeshi et al., 2016; Al-Abdin et al., 2018).

3.2. The Stakeholders theory

The second major theoretical lens for emerging market CSR research has been stakeholder theory. The application of stakeholder theory in emerging market contexts has produced considerable theoretical tensions. The standard stakeholder model, as elaborated in Freeman’s (1984) seminal account, assumes a relatively well-functioning pluralist environment in which diverse stakeholder groups can make their interests known, and can hold firms accountable through market, regulatory and reputational mechanisms. In many contexts of emerging markets, these conditions are absent or severely attenuated: civil society is weak, media independence is limited, regulatory capture is common, and the power asymmetry between multinational corporations and local communities is extreme (Newell, 2005; Idemudia, 2017).

Researchers have described the effects of this power asymmetry in various contexts. In the case of extractive industry CSR in sub-Saharan Africa, for instance, research has revealed that formally participatory stakeholder engagement processes are often a means for legitimizing pre-determined corporate decisions rather than genuinely incorporating community preferences (Idemudia, 2017; Rajak, 2011). Research on CSR in supply chains connecting producers in developing countries with global buyers (Lim and Ansary, 2020; Soundararajan et al., 2019) has documented how the formal stakeholder requirements embedded in supplier codes of conduct and certification schemes may be systematically undermined by cost pressures that incentivize surface compliance rather than substantive change. And research on CSR in post-conflict and fragile state contexts (Jamali et al., 2015; Miklian and Schouten, 2019) has

highlighted the ways in which corporate stakeholder engagement can become enmeshed with governance vacuums in ways that reproduce rather than challenge existing patterns of exclusion and marginalization.

In light of these findings, there is an increasing body of literature calling for a 'critical stakeholder theory' (Banerjee, 2018) that interrogates the managerialist presumptions of the dominant model and foregrounds the normative agency of marginalized communities. This critical turn draws on political economy, postcolonial theory, and feminist ethics to interrogate the power structures that determine whose interests are recognized as legitimate stakeholder claims and whose are systematically excluded from corporate decision-making. This critical strand is still a minority position in the literature, but it is gaining momentum and is increasingly represented in leading business ethics journals.

3.3. The Legitimacy Theory

The concept of legitimacy posits that organizations must obtain social acceptance within their institutional settings in order to survive and flourish. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) helps organizations achieve such acceptance. This theory has been widely acknowledged in literature dealing with CSR in emerging economies (Suchman, 1995; Deegan, 2002). The basic idea is that corporations that is involved in CSR act not because they are inherently committed to responsible citizenship, but because they want to attain legitimacy resources such as reputation, regulatory benevolence, and community permission to operate (Ashforth and Gibbs, 1990).

In emerging market settings, legitimacy theory has been particularly fruitful in explaining patterns of CSR adoption that seem puzzling from a purely normative perspective. Why do companies in countries with poor regulatory enforcement spend on costly environmental management systems? Why do extractive companies operating in voiceless communities commission elaborate community development programs? Legitimacy theory offers a simple answer: these investments purchase the reputational capital and social licence that allow the company to continue operating (Idemudia, 2017; Nkrumah, 2019). Moreover, the theory clarifies what is meant by "decoupling," or discrepancy between formal CSR commitments and substantive practices, emphasizing that this phenomenon can be interpreted as a rational reaction to institutional frameworks where appearance-based compliance avoids incurring the cost of making necessary changes (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

However, critics have noted that the explanatory power of legitimacy theory entails a considerable normative price to pay. By understanding CSR mainly as a strategy for legitimacy management, legitimacy theory tacitly supports an instrumental view of corporate social responsibility that strips it of real ethical content. If CSR is simply a technology for managing stakeholder perceptions, then the distinction between authentic social responsibility and clever greenwashing disappears – a state of affairs that is particularly worrying in the context of emerging markets where power asymmetries between corporations and communities are most pronounced, and the stakes of CSR failure are highest.

3.4. Political CSR

The political CSR framework, developed primarily by Scherer and Palazzo (2007, 2011) and rooted in Habermasian discourse ethics and theories of deliberative democracy, is the most theoretically ambitious and normatively demanding approach in the literature. Political CSR claims that in a globalized world with regulatory gaps and a weakened state capacity, big firms have taken on quasi-political functions like provision of public goods, regulation of social standards, and engagement in global governance, which require democratic legitimation beyond the scope of traditional stakeholder management processes. The story goes that legitimate CSR entails firms engaging in genuinely inclusive, reason-giving deliberative processes in which all affected parties have an equal voice.

The political CSR framework has yielded valuable scholarship on the governance aspects of CSR in emerging markets, particularly with respect to multi-stakeholder initiatives, global supply chain governance, and the politics of CSR standard-setting (Mena and Palazzo, 2012; Soundararajan et al., 2019). Its focus on the democratic legitimacy of CSR processes, not just their outcomes, offers a richer normative criterion by which to judge corporate social engagement. Studies that have applied the framework to emerging market settings have found a large gap between the deliberative ideal and the reality of CSR governance in most contexts, characterized by deep imbalances of information, resources, and political capacity between corporate actors and local communities (Banerjee, 2018; Miklian and Schouten, 2019).

But the political CSR framework has not convinced all. Its Habermasian roots have been critiqued for not giving enough consideration to structural power inequalities that distort deliberative processes before they even begin (Banerjee, 2011). Researchers working in the most marginalized emerging market contexts have questioned the implicit assumption that meaningful deliberation is possible in extreme power asymmetries. The Western political theory foundation leads to concerns regarding its potential transferability to other cultures; specifically, whether its presupposed communication and deliberation norms stem from Eurocentric traditions, which cannot easily apply in different culturally distinct environments (Khan, et al. 2010).

4. Three Enduring Tensions in the Literature

4.1. Universal Norms and Context-Specific Moral Ecologies

The first and most basic tension that runs through the emerging market CSR literature is between the universalizing aspirations of global CSR frameworks and the moral particularism of local cultural, religious, and communal traditions. CSR is presented as a universal set of principles that can be applied irrespective of cultural context in global frameworks such as the UN Global Compact, the GRI Sustainability Reporting Standards, and the ISO 26000 guidance standard. This universalising tendency is further reinforced by the SDGs embedding CSR expectations within a single, globally endorsed normative framework that makes an explicit claim to represent 'the world's shared plan for prosperity, people and planet' (United Nations, 2015).

However, it has long been established in the literature on developing countries that localized ethical settings, made up of the socially defined principles,

practices and systems through which communities establish their notions of company responsibilities, do not always correspond to, and may even oppose, the principles underlying the global CSR frameworks. Studies on Islamic business ethics in the Middle East and North Africa have shown the richness and cultural specificity of the normative architecture of corporate social responsibility offered by concepts such as zakat (obligatory charitable giving), waqf (Islamic endowment), and maslaha (public interest), which does not translate neatly into Western CSR categories (Al-Abdin et al., 2018; Beekun and Badawi, 2005). Research on Ubuntu ethics in sub-Saharan Africa has highlighted that communitarian notions of personhood and obligation produce types of corporate social responsibility that focus on collective well-being and community embeddedness rather than the individualist stakeholder balancing of conventional CSR theory (Mangaliso, 2001; Amaeshi et al., 2016).

This tension has provoked three broad responses from researchers. A first group, with a broadly universalist orientation, contends that apparent cultural specificity conceals underlying convergence towards global CSR norms driven by institutional isomorphism, investor pressure, and the disciplinary power of global supply chain governance (Lim and Ansary, 2020). A second group, taking a pluralist position, advocates for the legitimate coexistence of multiple CSR traditions and calls for the development of culturally sensitive frameworks that accommodate local normative diversity within a broadly shared commitment to human dignity and social welfare (Idemudia, 2017; Jamali and Karam, 2018). A third group, which has become more prominent over recent years, adopts a more radical position, arguing that the very idea of CSR as defined in Western academic and practitioner discourse is a culturally specific artefact of liberal capitalism and should be subject to a fundamental critique rather than simple adaptation to local conditions (Banerjee, 2018; Khan et al., 2010).

4.2. Voluntary CSR and Institutionally Embedded Social Responsibility

The second tension relates to the type of social responsibility embedded in the institutional setting and negotiated collectively, as opposed to the voluntary model of CSR at the firm level that dominates global frameworks and that characterizes many emerging market contexts. The voluntary model assumes that CSR is a primarily individual corporate choice – firms decide whether, how much, and in what domains to invest in social responsibility, according to business case calculations and reputational considerations. This model works quite well in liberal market economies with strong civil society, active media, and corporate governance structures based on shareholder primacy. It is much less appropriate to emerging market contexts that are characterized by state-led development models, relational capitalism, and corporate governance structures that embed social obligations in ownership structures and political relationships rather than voluntary strategic choices (Fifka and Pobizhan, 2014; Preuss and Barkemeyer, 2011).

One particularly important development in the post-2015 literature has been the emergence of mandatory CSR frameworks in a number of major emerging economies. India's Companies Act, 2013, which came into full effect in 2014 and has gradually been strengthened, mandates that firms above specified thresholds of net worth, turnover, or net profit spend at least 2% of average net

profits on CSR activities. South Africa, Nigeria, Indonesia, and several other emerging economies have also adopted or bolstered similar, less prescriptive, mandatory frameworks. The academic literature on mandatory CSR has expanded rapidly, addressing issues such as the effect of mandates on the quality and authenticity of CSR (Dharampala and Khanna, 2018), the relationship between mandatory and voluntary CSR investments (Mukherjee and Bird, 2016), and the institutional conditions under which mandatory frameworks are most likely to produce real compliance versus symbolic compliance (Bansal et al., 2014).

The mandatory CSR literature exposes a fundamental ambiguity at the core of the voluntary/mandatory distinction. Going beyond legal requirements, if CSR is defined as such, makes mandatory CSR an oxymoron. With a broader definition of CSR, as systematic corporate attention to social and environmental impacts, the distinction between the mandatory and voluntary dimensions of CSR is less important than the quality and depth of the social engagement they generate. This conceptual ambiguity is important because it affects our evaluation of the adequacy of the CSR practices actually observed in emerging market contexts: a framework that interprets real CSR as necessarily voluntary tends to see mandatory programs as trivial compliance, but ignores the potentially important social goods they may generate.

4.3. Structural Inequality and SDG Compatibility

The third tension concerns the relationship between the SDG alignment agenda that has shaped global CSR discourse since 2015 and the structural inequalities in power, resources, capabilities, and institutional quality that constrain CSR practice in the Global South. The SDG framework implicitly assumes that, given the will, firms can make a meaningful contribution to globally defined development objectives in all contexts, and that the main obstacle to such contribution is the lack of appropriate incentives or strategic frameworks. This has resulted in the development of frameworks, tools, and indicators that assist firms in identifying their potential contribution to the SDGs and aligning their CSR programs accordingly (van Zanten and van Tulder, 2018; Scheyvens et al., 2016).

But the emerging market CSR literature paints a more structurally informed picture. For instance, research on extractive industries in sub-Saharan Africa has consistently demonstrated how the fiscal and governance structures of resource-dependent economies systematically constrain the social returns from corporate investment regardless of the quality of firm-level CSR programs (Idemudia, 2017; Nkrumah, 2019). Studies of CSR in export-oriented manufacturing sectors in South and Southeast Asia have documented how the competitive dynamics of global value chains generate systematic pressure on lead firms and suppliers alike to minimize labor costs and externalize social risks in ways that undermine the SDG-aligned labor standards they publicly espouse (Soundararajan et al., 2019; Lim and Ansary, 2020). And research on the role of multinational corporations in developing country CSR has raised fundamental questions regarding whether the CSR activities of foreign investors produce real social value or mainly serve to legitimate the continued extraction of economic surplus from host economies (Banerjee, 2018; Newell, 2005).

These structural critiques do not suggest that firm-level CSR is irrelevant in emerging market contexts and the evidence clearly indicates that high-quality corporate social engagement can produce significant local social goods. But they do suggest that the SDG-alignment agenda, as currently articulated, tends to overstate the scope of corporate agency and understate the structural determinants of social outcomes in ways that serve the interests of corporations seeking to burnish their sustainability credentials without confronting the structural conditions that limit the social returns from their activities. A more adequate account of CSR in the SDG era must make structural analysis central to the research agenda, not treat it as an external constraint on firm-level behavior.

5. Perverse Effects of Developmental Teleology

All three of the tensions identified above are underpinned by what we term a developmental teleology, an implicit assumption, embedded in the dominant theoretical frameworks and normative architectures of the CSR literature, that the direction of legitimate CSR development is from the practices found in emerging market contexts to those of advanced Western economies. This teleology manifests itself in various forms: through the framing of emerging market CSR as ‘catching up’ with global standards; through the deployment of Western CSR frameworks as the standard with which local practices are compared; through the treatment of institutional voids as obstacles to be overcome rather than as features of a different institutional logic; through the systematic privileging of explicit, voluntary, firm-level CSR over the implicit, collective, and institutionally embedded forms of social responsibility that may be more deeply rooted in local moral traditions.

The developmental teleology does not merely pose a theoretical dilemma. It brings about both practical and political implications. By portraying the CSR activities of developing nation companies as inferior versions of some administrative excellence modeled on the western standard, it contributes to promoting a brand of CSR colonialism where the ethical norms of global CSR are set by the most influential stakeholders (multinational corporations, international investors, NGOs from developed countries, etc.) who comprise the elite of the world and benefit from maintaining structural injustices hindering the CSR capacity of the enterprises from developing nations. It undermines the moral agency of local communities that are regarded as unacceptably primitive because of their highly sophisticated and culturally rooted perceptions of corporate responsibility. At the same time, this approach ignores the contradictions existing in the CSR practices applied by developed economies, as the recent literature (published since 2015) about greenwashing, tax evasion, and labor exploitation proves.

One of the factors leading to the emergence of development teleology is the institutional background of global CSR discourse. The principles of global CSR, such as UN Global Compact's Ten Principles, GRI reporting standards, ISO26000 guidelines, among others, were produced by various actors associated with institutions located in Northern part of the world. In emerging market contexts, adoption has been driven less by bottom-up pressures from local stakeholder communities than by top-down pressures from investors, supply chain buyers, and international financial institutions that condition access to capital and

markets on demonstrated alignment with global CSR norms. The outcome is a global CSR architecture that represents the interests and perspectives of its Northern architects much more than it does the communities it purports to serve.

6. Towards a Decolonial Corrective and a Post-Developmental Research Agenda

6.1. Postcolonial Business Ethics Principles

The decolonial perspective on corporate social responsibility in emerging markets begins with an understanding that mainstream theories of global business ethics are not culturally neutral, as they stem from historical, political, and intellectual antecedents which have been globalized due to coloniality (Mignolo 2011; Quijano 2000). Decolonizing business ethics does not mean rejecting ethical universalism, which refers to the idea that all human beings necessarily share the same moral value and that all human interests have the same level of significance. However, it does mean critically examining the content of ethical norms and the means of defining them from the standpoint of those people who have historically been excluded from their definition.

The implication of decolonization for corporate social responsibility (CSR) must include three key components and changes. The first step is to position local normative cultural systems into the center of the CSR discourse as valid references for developing the notion of corporate responsibility and obligation. However, this does not entail blind acceptance of all locally accepted practices. Some local norms may turn out to be oppressive as well and can be criticized, but nonetheless, there should be a willingness on the part of corporate representatives to believe that local cultural systems can contribute to an understanding of moral issues that is beyond the capabilities of Western CSR practices.

The second point on the decolonial corrective places emphasis on the need to examine the politics of knowledge production in CSR with a particular focus on the question of who speaks and who does the defining, understanding what CSR actually is, what it involves, and how it gets assessed. Such offenses in knowledge include the difficulties in reducing the number of the voices of global South scholars in leading business ethics journals, the rise to use of data in case studies that was gathered with the help of community members by northern teams visiting the field, and the use of theoretical frameworks developed in the western part of the world in study contexts (Fricker, 2007; Santos, 2014).

Thirdly, and again, most importantly, the role of decolonial procedure is essential in correcting development-based views that characterize emerging markets' CSR as an incomplete version of Western CSR. Such a correction requires recognizing that various institutional contexts can yield potentially different but equally valid forms of CSR. In other words, Ubuntu ethics, Islamic banking and communal land ownership systems do are not primitive ancestors of global CSR but rather fully recognized ethical systems that regulate corporate responsibility.

6.2. A Post-Developmental Research Agenda

Building on these principles, we propose five priority areas for a post-developmental research agenda in global business ethics. First, comparative research that begins with local moral traditions rather than with departures from

a global norm. Such research would develop indigenously grounded accounts of corporate obligation in different cultural settings and explore the conditions under which these accounts converge or diverge from global CSR frameworks. Such research would attend equally to what local traditions can learn from global norms, and what global norms can learn from local traditions.

Second, structural and political-economic analyses of the conditions that enable and preclude CSR from generating meaningful social change in the contexts of emerging markets. Such analyses would move beyond the firm-level focus of most existing research to explore the macro-institutional and global governance structures that shape the range of socially responsible options available to firms in structurally constrained environments. But they would not only ask whether firms are meeting global CSR standards but also whether the standards themselves are adequate to the structural realities of the contexts they purport to govern.

Third, research that takes the normative agency of local communities as active participants in the definition and evaluation of CSR, rather than as passive recipients of corporate social programs. This requires methodological innovation—breaking away from the typical survey and interview methods that tend to reproduce existing power asymmetries and moving towards participatory research designs that truly embed community perspectives into the research process. It also requires normative innovation: the creation of ethical frameworks for CSR research that place the interests and perspectives of the most marginalized stakeholders at the center of the analytical enterprise.

In addition, longitudinal studies about the development of CSR in emerging market settings since 2015 can examine how the SDG and Paris Agreement frameworks have influenced corporate practices over time. The most commonly used methods in this field, such as cross-sectional surveys and single case studies, are not a good fit to examine the dynamic, feedback process through which CSR norms are negotiated, accepted, changed, and disputed over time. Longitudinal studies allow researchers to find not only out whether CSR practices evolve but also how they are evolving and what consequences do they create for the communities affected.

Fifthly, the most immediate is imperative to undertake critical research into political economy of global CSR governance which includes the process of setting, enforcing and changing global CSR standards and the interests and powers involved in this process. Growing mandatory CSR literature has made some positive moves in this direction but focused mainly on CSR compliance effects for firms, not the politics of standard setting per se. More politically involved research should focus on power relations in GRI, UN Global Compact and OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises to investigate what interests they are based upon and to make clear which interests they overlook systematically.

7. Discussion

This critical review has reviewed a decade of scholarship on CSR transfer and adaptation in emerging markets, a period of normative development marked by the adoption of the SDGs and the Paris Agreement, and empirically characterized by an unprecedented intensification of global CSR pressure on firms

in all geographical contexts. The review reveals a literature that is rich in empirical work but fragmented theoretically and limited normatively. The scholarly discourse has been organized around four prominent theoretical paradigms: institutional theory, stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and political CSR. Each of these paradigms has contributed significantly to the literature, but they all have a common flaw-the implicit developmental teleology that depicts emerging market CSR as a deficient approximation of a Western ideal.

We identified three persistent tensions that crossed the frameworks and shed light on the core challenges of the field. The tension between global CSR norms and local moral ecologies reveals the real challenge of developing a global framework that is adequate to the normative pluralism of human communities.

The tension between voluntary firm-level CSR and institutionally embedded social responsibility reveals the limits of a model of corporate social responsibility developed for liberal market economies when it is applied to the heterogeneous institutional configurations of the Global South. And the tension between the SDG-alignment agenda and the structural inequalities shaping CSR practice in emerging markets exposes the gap between the aspirational language of global sustainability governance and the structural realities constraining corporate social agency in many of the world's most economically marginalised communities.

In light of this tension-ridden background and the notion of development that serves as the basis for the conflict, we have come up with the idea of developing a decolonial remedy based on three proposals. First, we suggest reinstating local ethical practices as valid normative references; second, we identify the importance of examining the politics of knowledge production related to CSR; third, developmental notions must be abandoned. Finally, we propose areas of research development along five points to go beyond ideas of development and implement comparative, structural, participatory, historical, and politically-oriented research in the field. To sum up, the measures discussed above represent a significant step towards changing research in global business ethics, since they require researchers to appreciate the power of moral agency of communities that are impacted by business practices and hold accountable institutions managing CSR.

This is a dangerous turn of events. At a time of heightened climate crisis, lasting structural inequality and the growing political assertiveness of the communities of the Global south, ethics scholarship in business that duplicates, rather than questions global capitalism's assumptions is inadequate in theory and complicit in the type of injustices it claims to combat. The challenge of the next decade is to create a truly global business ethics that draws on the diverse value systems of humanity and has equal relevance in such cities as Lagos and Louisville, Jakarta and Johannesburg and can hold accountable all forms of corporate power, not only that of emerging market countries.

References

- Al-Abdin, A., Roy, T. and Nicholson, J.D. (2018). Researching corporate social responsibility in the Middle East: The current state and future directions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 25(5), 799-815. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1439>

- Amaeshi, K., Adaeze, C., Ogbechie, C., Amao, O., Abiodun, A., Nnedumm, A.U. and George, O. (2016). Corporate social responsibility in SMEs: A shift from philanthropy to institutional works? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 138(2), 385-400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2633-1>
- Ashforth, B.E. and Gibbs, B.W. (1990). The double-edge of organizational legitimation. *Organization Science*, 1(2), 177-194. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1.2.177>
- Banerjee, S.B. (2011). Voices of the governed: Towards a theory of the translocal. *Organization*, 18(3), 323-344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508411398729>
- Banerjee, S.B. (2018). Transdisciplinary research and engaged scholarship in sustainable development. *Organization & Environment*, 31(4), 375-378.
- Bansal, P., Gao, J. and Qureshi, I. (2014). The extensiveness of corporate social and environmental commitment across firms over time. *Organization Studies*, 35(7), 949-966. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613515564>
- Beddewela, E. and Herzig, C. (2013). Corporate social reporting by MNCs' subsidiaries in Sri Lanka. *Accounting Forum*, 37(2), 135-149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2012.09.001>
- Beekun, R.I. and Badawi, J.A. (2005). Balancing ethical responsibility among multiple organizational stakeholders: The Islamic perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60(2), 131-145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-004-8204-5>
- Deegan, C. (2002). Introduction: The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures - A theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282-311. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435852>
- Dharampala, D. and Khanna, V. (2018). The impact of mandatory CSR on innovation and value creation: Evidence from mandatory CSR funding in India. *The Journal of Law, Finance, and Accounting*, 3(2), 169-216.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Fifka, M.S. and Pobizhan, M. (2014). An institutional approach to corporate social responsibility in Russia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 82, 192-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.06.091>
- Fisch, C. and Block, J. (2018). Six tips for your (systematic) literature review in business and management research. *Management Review Quarterly*, 68(2), 103-106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-018-0142-x>
- Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman, Boston.
- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>
- Idemudia, U. (2017). *The CSR-development nexus: Is there a need for a new approach?* In A. Rasche, M. Morsing and J. Moon (Eds.), *Corporate Social Responsibility: Strategy, Communication, Governance* (pp. 313-336). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jamali, D. and Karam, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(1), 32-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12112>

- Jamali, D., Lund-Thomsen, P. and Khara, N. (2015). CSR institutionalized myths in developing countries: An imminent threat of selective decoupling. *Business & Society*, 56(3), 454-486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315584303>
- Khan, F.R., Westwood, R. and Boje, D.M. (2010). 'I feel like a foreign agent': NGOs and corporate social responsibility interventions into Third World child labour. *Human Relations*, 63(9), 1417-1438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709359330>
- Khanna, T. and Palepu, K.G. (2010). *Winning in Emerging Markets: A Road Map for Strategy and Execution*. Harvard Business Press, Boston. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974173920100316>
- Lim, A. and Ansary, A. (2020). Responsible supply chain management in developing economies: Drivers, barriers and practices. *Business Strategy & Development*, 3(4), 616-627.
- Mair, J., Marti, I. and Ventresca, M.J. (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 819-850. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0627>
- Mangaliso, M.P. (2001). Building competitive advantage from Ubuntu: Management lessons from South Africa. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 15(3), 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2001.5229453>
- Matten, D. and Moon, J. (2008). 'Implicit' and 'explicit' CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 404-424. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.31193458>
- Mena, S. and Palazzo, G. (2012). Input and output legitimacy of multi-stakeholder initiatives. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(3), 527-556. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201222333>
- Meyer, J.W. and Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>
- Mignolo, W.D. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity*. Duke University Press, Durham. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822394501>
- Miklian, J. and Schouten, P. (2019). Broadening 'business', widening 'peace': A new research agenda on business and peacebuilding. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 19(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2019.1561612>
- Montiel, I., Cuervo-Cazurra, A., Park, J., Antolin-Lopez, R. and Husted, B.W. (2021). Implementing the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals in international business. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 52(5), 999-1030. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-021-00445-y>
- Mukherjee, A. and Bird, R. (2016). *Analysis of mandatory CSR: An institutional perspective*. Working Paper, Indian Institute of Management.
- Newell, P. (2005). Citizenship, accountability and community: The limits of the CSR agenda. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 541-557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2005.00468.x>
- Nkrumah, M.K. (2019). Corporate social responsibility in the Ghanaian mining sector: Stakeholder engagement, legitimacy and community development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 220, 536-545.

- North, D.C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678>
- Preuss, L. and Barkemeyer, R. (2011). CSR priorities of emerging economy firms: Is Russia a different shape of BRIC? *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 11(4), 371-385.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/14720701111159226>
- Puppim de Oliveira, J.A. (2019). Business and sustainable development: The case of Latin America. *Sustainability*, 11(23), 6603.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215-232.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>
- Rajak, D. (2011). *In Good Company: An Anatomy of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804781619>
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Paradigm Publishers, Boulder.
- Scheyvens, R., Banks, G. and Hughes, E. (2016). The private sector and the SDGs: The need to move beyond 'business as usual'. *Sustainable Development*, 24(6), 371-382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1623>
- Scherer, A.G. and Palazzo, G. (2007). Toward a political conception of corporate responsibility: Business and democracy in a globalized world. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1096-1120.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26585837>
- Scherer, A.G. and Palazzo, G. (2011). The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(4), 899-931. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00950.x>
- Scott, W.R. (1995). *Institutions and Organizations*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Soundararajan, V., Brown, J.A. and Wicks, A.C. (2019). Can multi-stakeholder initiatives improve global supply chains? Improving deliberative capacity with a stakeholder orientation. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 29(3), 385-412.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2018.38>
- Suchman, M.C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571-610.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/258788>
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D. and Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207-222.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>
- United Nations (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations, New York.
- van Zanten, J.A. and van Tulder, R. (2018). Multinational enterprises and the Sustainable Development Goals: An institutional approach to corporate engagement. *Journal of International Business Policy*, 1(3-4), 208-233.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214-018-0008-x>