



Sinkovics, N., Vieira, L. M. and van Tulder, R. (2022) Working toward the sustainable development goals in earnest – critical international business perspectives on designing and implementing better interventions. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 18(4), pp. 445-456.

(doi: [10.1108/cpoib-05-2022-0059](https://doi.org/10.1108/cpoib-05-2022-0059))

This author accepted manuscript is deposited under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC) licence. This means that anyone may distribute, adapt, and build upon the work for non-commercial purposes, subject to full attribution. If you wish to use this manuscript for commercial purposes, please contact permissions@emerald.com.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/272885/>

Deposited on: 16 August 2022

Working toward the sustainable development goals in earnest – critical international business perspectives on designing and implementing better interventions

Citing this paper:

Sinkovics, Noemi, & Vieira, Luciana Marques, & van Tulder, Rob. (2022). Working toward the sustainable development goals in earnest – critical international business perspectives on designing and implementing better interventions. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 18(4), 445-456. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cpoib-05-2022-0059>

Noemi Sinkovics

University of Glasgow, Adam Smith Business School

noemi.sinkovics@gmail.com

<https://www.sinkovics.com/noemi>

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5143-6870>

Luciana Marques Vieira

FGV-EAESP, Sao Paulo, Brazil

luciana.vieira@fgv.br

<https://eaesp.fgv.br/en/faculty/luciana-marques-vieira>

Rob van Tulder

Erasmus University, Rotterdam School of Management

rtulder@rsm.nl

<https://www.rsm.nl/people/rob-van-tulder/>

Document version:

Author accepted manuscript (pre-print)

Please note that where the full-text provided is the Author Accepted Manuscript, pre-print or proof version, this may differ from the final published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version at <https://doi.org/10.1108/cpoib-05-2022-0059>.

General rights:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible here are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Working towards the Sustainable Development Goals in earnest – critical international business perspectives on designing and implementing better interventions

1 Introduction

Since their launch in 2015, awareness about the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) has significantly increased in international business research as well as in the higher education landscape. In this viewpoint article we highlight their importance as a milestone for concerted efforts to tackle the underlying grand challenges that society in general and multinational enterprises in particular are facing (George et al., 2016; Sinkovics and Archie-acheampong, 2020; Van Tulder et al., 2021; van Tulder and van Mil, 2023). The SDGs are the latest – and clearly the most elaborate - in a series of transnational attempts at designing a governance framework for sustainable development. The scale of stakeholder consultations that preceded the design of the SDGs along with the framework's emphasis on the role of the business sector in achieving these goals makes this framework “the most important frame of the global development agenda until 2030” (Kolk, 2016; van Zanten and van Tulder, 2018: 209). As such, they provide an excellent frame of reference when critically investigating issues that are “of crucial concern to the world, groups of countries or stakeholders” (Buckley, Doh, and Benischke, 2017; Dörrenbächer and Gammelgaard, 2019: 254; George et al., 2016).

However, it is important to realize that the SDGs are a “work in (and on) progress” (van Tulder and van Mil, 2023: 18). On the one hand, the ‘work in progress’ nature of the SDGs means that the related indicators, strategies, and implementations need constant evaluation and improvement (van Tulder and van Mil, 2023). On the other, it is a reminder that progress is an evolutionary and cumulative process built on prior research and institution building work of individuals across multiple disciplines. The SDGs have been portrayed as an effort in ‘hybrid’ or ‘transitional’ governance’ and a move towards a ‘principles-based’ (Nonet et al., 2022) and ‘governance through goals’ approach to deal with global sustainability challenges (Biermann,

Kanie, and Kim, 2017). The hybrid governance structure of the SDG approach was intended to channel progress in a number of concrete areas by means of goal priorities, improved narratives to facilitate broad awareness and commitment, better data development, and instilling of active participation in, for instance, joint research or the creation of new platforms and partnerships around the implementation of the common agenda. Evaluation studies on the progress made in implementing the SDGs by companies still show a considerable discrepancy between ‘walk and talk’, a tendency for ‘cherry picking’ which has led to allegations of ‘SDG washing’ (Van Tulder et al., 2021) and thus to hampered progress in seizing the full potential of the SDG agenda. Is this part of ‘normal’ transition problems, representative of general complexities that companies face when dealing with complex/grand challenges or can this also be attributed to the state-of-knowledge in extant scientific research? In order to contribute to the SDGs ‘in earnest’ it is important to identify, acknowledge and integrate the work that has been done before. Although, it is beyond the scope of this viewpoint article to provide a comprehensive review, we reflect on selected developments and issues.

2 The SDG induced paradigm shift – implications for integrative work

Doh and Lucea (2013) identify a number of strategies for the mitigation of the high cost of integrative research; namely, cross-disciplinary co-authorship, step-wise integration of perspectives, and institutional reform. The latter can be driven by exogenous shocks and/or the purposive behavior of individuals. In the decade following the publication of Doh and Lucea’s (2013) article, the international business field has witnessed progress arguably driven by both exogenous shocks and the persistent work of individual scholars. The widespread support of the SDGs at government, business, and civil society level opened the door for a paradigm shift. Whether this latest of societal pressure waves will indeed lead to a paradigm shift remains to be seen (Elkington and Braun, 2013).

Nevertheless, whereas before the SDGs, the cost of doing research that integrates social and environmental aspects with economic aspects were more likely to be absorbed by individual

researchers (cf. Doh and Lucea, 2013), the launch of the SDGs acted as a catalyst for the mobilization of resources to increase the information and evidence base needed to advance the development agenda (van Zanten and van Tulder, 2020). As a result, the extent to which integrative, inter-disciplinary, and societally engaged research is featuring in universities' and funding bodies' strategic aspirations has also increased. This development is evidenced by the increased number of universities that have actively embraced the SDG framework and UN Global Compact related initiatives like PRME (introducing Principles of Responsible Management Education) for their teaching and research profiles.

Examples of institutional changes that incentivize such research include the Times Higher Education Impact Rankings¹ and the inclusion of impact cases into the UK's Research Excellence Framework². In the field of international business, the launch of the Sustainability Shared Interest Group of the Academy of International Business³ marked a milestone with high symbolic value towards the purposeful integration of sustainability research with the traditionally more economically oriented research of AIB members.

These institutional changes, can be partially explained by the clarity with which the goals are problematized and the pragmatic reasoning that underpins each goal; namely, it is clear why the goal is important and what the negative consequences are, for states and companies alike, of not reaching it (van Tulder and van Mil, 2023). Further, the effects of pollution, resource constraints, climate change, war, and other socio-ecological challenges are no longer issues that are predominantly observable in geographically distant and economically under-developed countries (cf. Sinkovics and Archie-acheampong, 2020). The detection of microplastic particles in fresh falling snow (Wang, Saadé, and Ariya, 2021) and most recently in human blood (Leslie et al., 2022) is just a further, perhaps less known example of observable impact than cases of human rights violations through irresponsible business practices (e.g. Wettstein et al., 2019). Additionally, the

¹ <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/impactrankings>

² <https://www.ref.ac.uk/>

³ <https://sustainabilitysig.aib.world/>

pandemic exposed vulnerabilities of current systems and arguably “accelerate[d] and amplifie[d] old legacies, uneven structures and deep-seated conflicts in the contemporary world economy” (Dörrenbächer et al., 2021: 150). As a result the volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity of our socio-economic reality has been amplified and progress towards to SDGs slowed (van Zanten and van Tulder, 2020).

Against this background, it is encouraging that scholarly debate on the SDGs is increasing in international business as evidenced by conference themes and special issues; for example, *Journal of International Business Policy* (2021, Volume 4, Issue 1), *AIB Insights* (2022, Volume 22, Issue 1), *Journal of Business Ethics* (forthcoming) and *Critical Perspectives on International Business* (this issue). However, the SDGs cover a wide range of interconnected issues. Addressing issues in isolation leads to trade-offs and significant unintended consequences (Hofstetter et al., 2021; Sinkovics, Sinkovics, and Archie-Acheampong, 2021; van Zanten and van Tulder, 2020). As a result, embracing the SDGs in international business will require more integrative research. Such research is not only needed to bring in knowledge from other, relevant disciplines (cf. Buckley, Doh, and Benischke, 2017). We argue, that integration efforts are also needed within disciplinary areas. This is because, “reinventing the wheel within disciplinary silos will not only slow progress but will also be unsustainable in the face of decreasing research funds and increasing respondent fatigue” (Hofstetter et al., 2021: 38).

3 Identifying, acknowledging, and integrating knowledge beyond what is published in ‘top’ international business journals

Identifying and integrating knowledge within international business that is relevant for making progress towards the SDGs starts with being more inclusive when searching for articles. This entails taking into account the changes in terminologies over time (cf. Kolk, 2016) as well as broadening the search to journals beyond what rankings may classify as ‘top’ journals (cf. Tüselmann, Sinkovics, and Pishchulov, 2016). The fundamental issues that are problematized by the SDGs are not new; nor is the view that business needs to take responsibility for co-creating

these problems as well as for mitigating and alleviating them (Latapí Agudelo, Jóhannsdóttir, and Davídsdóttir, 2019). Although scholarly attention on the business - society nexus including environmental challenges is substantially larger outside of international business journals (e.g. Sinkovics and Archie-acheampong, 2020), themes related to people, planet, prosperity, peace, and partnerships have been present to some extent in the field's oldest journals from early on (Kolk, 2016; Kolk and van Tulder, 2010).

Narrow searches informed by the latest 'trend' words may lead to the exclusion of relevant articles in search results even in top journals. It is undoubtedly important to understand the knowledge accumulated under the umbrella of specific concepts such as corporate social responsibility, non-market strategies, or sustainable development. However, excluding publications due to an incomplete search strategy or lack of awareness about how terminology related to a phenomenon evolves over time is not in line with the spirit of the SDG approach (cf. Kolk, 2016; Latapí Agudelo, Jóhannsdóttir, and Davídsdóttir, 2019; Sinkovics and Reuber, 2021; Sinkovics, Sinkovics, and Archie-Acheampong, 2019; van Tulder and van Mil, 2023). At the same time, it needs to be noted that no search strategy is fully comprehensive, regardless of the number of iterations they undergo. Additionally, authors need to keep in mind that journal databases are themselves a work in progress and may not include all published articles in a given journal.

For example, Sinkovics, Sinkovics, and Archie-Acheampong (2019) crafted a search string consisting of 105 terms related to corporate responsibility and irresponsibility. The objective of the study was to map the breadth of themes discussed in the 14 international business journals that were listed in the Web of Science at the time of search (cf. Tüselmann, Sinkovics, and Pishchulov, 2016). Although the search yielded 484 articles due to the extensive search strategy, at the time of search only 55 articles were associated with Critical Perspectives on International Business in the Web of Science. Therefore, using Scopus for the search would have yielded a more complete outcome (cf. Dörrenbächer and Gammelgaard, 2019).

Further, literature searches should be extended beyond the top journals in the field, especially when the goal is to identify prior research on issues that were considered non-mainstream only a decade ago (e.g. Doh and Lucea, 2013; Kolk, 2016; Kolk and van Tulder, 2010; Sinkovics, Sinkovics, and Archie-Acheampong, 2019). As Doh and Lucea (2013) point out, integrative research can incur high individual costs. In addition to the time needed to accumulate expertise in different fields, integrative researchers may also have experienced challenges to get their work published in top journals with a narrower disciplinary focus (Doh and Lucea, 2013). Therefore, relevant publications may have found a home in book chapters, journals outside of international business, and in younger and more niche international business journals or journals that may not be classified as ‘top’ in various journal rankings. Buckley et al. (2017) suggest that over time the work of authors whose research is related to grand challenges but were published in lower ranked journals may find their way into the mainstream and they may become part of multidisciplinary teams. However, a citation analysis on the Web of Science does not show significant progress in this regard (see next section).

4 SDG mapping in selected international business journals

To demonstrate what happens if the focus is shifted from direct key word searches such as “sustainable development”, “sustainability”, and “SDG” to conducting searches that attempt to capture the underlying issues, we draw on the University of Auckland’s SDG keyword mapping exercise⁴. This mapping exercise was part of the SDG Research Mapping Initiative⁵, a collaboration between Elsevier, the University of Southern Denmark, the Aurora (represented by Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam), and the University of Auckland. We downloaded the SDG keywords from the University of Auckland’s website. We subsequently edited the original search protocols to improve their precision. For example, we removed some key words associated with a particular SDG if they had a stronger relevance for another SDG. We then used the edited key word lists to

⁴ <https://www.sdgmapping.auckland.ac.nz/>

⁵ <https://www.elsevier.com/about/partnerships/sdg-research-mapping-initiative>

identify articles related to each SDG in nine international business journals by using the Web of Science: *Critical Perspectives on International Business* (CPoIB), *Multinational Business Review* (MBR), *Management International Review* (MIR), *Journal of International Management* (JIM), *International Business Review* (IBR), *Global Strategy Journal* (GSJ), *Journal of World Business* (JWB), *Journal of International Business Policy* (JIBP), and *Journal of International Business Studies* (JIBS). We selected these journals to provide a balance in terms of age, rank, and niche. This analysis is not meant to be comprehensive, it merely serves the purpose to demonstrate the importance of inclusiveness in terms of journals and search terms. In terms of time limit, we limited the search to the time period between 2000 and April 2022. We chose the year 2000, because this was the year when the United Nations Millennium Declaration was signed.

Table 1 provides an overview of the number of articles in each SDG category across the nine journals. As some articles belong to more than one SDG category, the total number of papers in Table 1 includes duplicates. We corrected this number in the first column of Table 2 that shows the number of individual articles yielded by the search per journal. Specifically, the keyword search resulted in 2,987 articles that can be connected to at least one SDG. The second column provides the total number of articles in each journal that are currently available on the Web of Science. The third column in Table 2 informs about the percentage of articles that can be linked to at least one SDG in a specific journal out of the total number of articles available on the Web of Science for this journal. The remaining columns in Table 2 show the breakdown for each SDG per journal as a percentage of the total number of articles available on the Web of Science for a specific journal.

Although this exercise does not provide us with information about the quality of the insights in the identified studies, it offers a broad mapping of existing international business research in each SDG category. Specifically, this analysis indicates where international business has already built capacity and what the extent of this capacity is, at least nominally. As expected, international business has a lot to offer with respect to the economically oriented SDGs; SDG 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth, SDG 9 Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure, SDG 10 Reduced Inequality,

and SDG 12 Responsible Consumption and Production (see Table 1). Although a large proportion of studies in these SDG categories may have a predominantly economic focus, they are nonetheless an important starting point for integration efforts.

Further, the results indicate that especially when it comes to the social and environmental goals, younger journals do have valuable insights to offer. For example, our search yielded four articles related to SDG 6 Clean Water and Sanitation. Two out of the four were published in *Critical Perspectives on International Business* (see Birke and Bohm, 2006; Dziubaniuk, Ivanova-Gongne, and Berdysheva, 2021), one in *Multinational Business Review* (see Darendeli et al., 2021), and one in *Journal of International Business Policy* (Pisani et al., 2019). Although the distribution of articles connected to individual SDGs varies across journals, Table 1 clearly demonstrates that there is valuable capacity in younger and lower ranked journals. Therefore, if international business research wants to over-come its inward looking and self-referential tendency and engage in more integrative research that appropriately bridges the classic works of IB with knowledge from allied social sciences (Buckley, Doh, and Benischke, 2017), this needs to start with looking beyond what is published in top IB journals.

Insert Table 1 and Table 2 here

In a further analysis, we checked the progress on Buckley et al.'s (2017) prediction that more relevant work may find its way into higher ranked journals.

For instance, *Critical Perspectives on International Business* was founded in 2005 with the mission to provide a platform for the critical study of international business issues (Dörrenbächer and Gammelgaard, 2019). Although 258 articles published in CPoIB as of April 2022 (59.6% of total articles available on the Web of Science, see Table 2) have been identified to be relevant to at least one of the 17 SDGs, only 19 articles in *Journal of International Business Studies* and 15

articles in the *Journal of World Business* are citing studies from this pool of publications (see Table 3).

To create a better basis for comparison, we performed a similar analysis for *Multinational Business Review* and *Journal of International Business Policy*. The results are reported in Table 3. For *Multinational Business Review*, our search identified 183 articles that can be linked to at least one SDG; this number accounts for 48% of the total number of articles available on the Web of Science for this journal. However, looking at the number of articles in higher ranked journals that are citing from this pool, there are only 38 studies in the *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23 in *International Business Review*, and 22 in *Journal of World Business*.

Lastly, in the *Journal of International Business Policy*, our key word search identified 94 articles that can be linked to at least one SDG. They account for 72.9% of all articles available on the Web of Science for this journal. Despite the journal's young age, there are 41 articles in the *Journal of International Business Studies* that are citing studies from this pool. Further, there are 13 and 12 citing articles in the *Journal of World Business* and *Global Strategy Journal* respectively.

Considering that the first volume in *Journal of International Business Policy* was published in 2018, the number of citing articles in the *Journal of International Business Studies* is significant; 10% of articles published between 2018 and 2022 in *Journal of International Business Studies* cite from the SDG related article pool of *Journal of International Business Policy* studies. In contrast, the relative percentage of articles⁶ that are citing SDG relevant *Critical Perspectives on International Business* or *Multinational Business Review* papers in the *Journal of International Business Studies* are 1.5% and 3.27% respectively.

Insert Table 3 here

⁶ Percentage of citing articles of the total articles published in the timeframe in which the SDG relevant articles were published; 2005-2022 for CPoIB and 2007-2022 for MBR

5 An annotated introduction to the contributions of the special issue

This special issues includes five papers, four of which are conceptual in nature. Rygh, Chiarapini, and Segovia (2021) examine the field's paradigmatic nature and identify a number of existing theories that have been or can be used to integrate more SDG thinking into international business studies. Further, Rygh, Chiarapini, and Segovia (2021) provide a valuable resource in the form of seven concrete, actionable recommendations on how international business research can contribute towards the SDGs.

Celone et al. (2021) conduct a focused literature review on the role of multinational enterprises in achieving the SDGs. As opposed to the broad mapping exercise conducted in section 4 that focused on relevant keywords subsumed under individual SDGs, Celone et al. (2021) explicitly searched for the terms “sustainable development goals” and “SDG”. The findings from the identified studies are then summarized under three themes: the importance of multinational enterprises for achieving the SDGs, frameworks capturing how multinational enterprises go about achieving the SDGs, and the challenges they face when working towards the SDGs. The main contribution of this conceptual piece is the authors' application of Gleicher's formula of change to reflect on the steps needed to progress towards the SDGs.

Whereas the papers by Rygh, Chiarapini, and Segovia (2021) and Celone et al. (2021) present high-level and big picture perspectives, the remaining three articles zoom in on more specific aspects. Araujo et al. (2021) propose an eco-centric management mindset framework and discuss how adopting such a mindset can help companies contribute to the SDGs. Specifically, the framework provides a set of guidelines on how to identify the underlying issues and how to subsequently convert this awareness into sustainable behavior at firm level. Although Araujo et al. (2021) match their theoretical framework against empirical patterns, these are derived from secondary data.

In contrast, Dziubaniuk, Ivanova-Gongne, and Berdysheva (2021) demonstrate the challenges of cross-border multi-stakeholder interactions associated with the implementation of a

water supply and sanitation project in Nepal by a Finnish consulting firm. However, the contributions of this study go beyond linking these management challenges to SDG outcomes. Specifically, the study embodies several of Rygh et al.'s (2021) recommendations for conducting international business research that is more relevant for the SDGs. Further, the empirical insights also reveal practical challenges connected to Araujo et al.'s (2021) eco-centric management framework; especially to the dimensions linked to sense making and embeddedness. Similarly, Hamilton's (2021) conceptual article on the role of government procurement as a social policy mechanism makes contributions beyond providing and overview of how public procurement can be used to progress towards the SDGs. When read in conjunction with Celone et al.'s (2021) discussion on how Gleicher's formula of change can apply to working towards the SDGs, Hamilton's (2021) piece offers some practical insights from an institutional perspective.

6 Concluding remarks

A common theme across all five special issue papers is that they echo previous calls in the literature to take a more systemic view of inter-dependent issues (e.g. Sinkovics et al., 2015; van Zanten and van Tulder, 2020). Further, all five articles represent integration efforts. The composition of the special issue is representative of the wider trend of publications aiming to conceptualize how the SDG approach can fit into or will alter the course of business and management research. The majority of articles identified by Celone et al. (2021) were conceptual or literature reviews. Studies specifically linking their empirical findings to SDGs within international business are still limited in number and are predominantly qualitative. This can be partially explained by the complexity of setting up large scale research projects. Another explanation is that an increasing number of (international) business and management researchers are building up their individual capacity to contribute to integrative research.

Although there are arguments for and against embracing the SDGs as mechanisms to contribute to sustainable development in the context of multinational enterprises (Cuervo-Cazurra et

al., 2022), their inclusive nature may achieve what previous labels such as social value creation and corporate social responsibility could not. Moreover, the efforts made by so-called ‘custodian agencies’ like the OECD, the Worldbank, UNICEF or IOM to increase the reliability and comparability of international data-bases that cover all 169 targets of the SDGs and most of the 230 indicators, provide an increasingly rich basis for linking the micro-efforts of multinational companies to the macro policies of countries (van Zanten and van Tulder, 2020).

In his commentary on two papers on the social value creation of MNEs in a previous *Critical Perspectives on International Business* special issue (see Rygh, 2019; Sinkovics and Archie-acheampong, 2020), Doh (2019) points to potential resistance from international business scholars. This is because widening the focus beyond the economic success or failure of businesses may challenge the established identity of the field (cf. Doh, 2019). In contrast to more polarizing labels and the defensive risk-oriented thinking they may convey, the positive opportunity seeking outlook of the SDGs (van Tulder and van Mil, 2023) offers a path where integrating social and environmental with economic perspectives does not need to threaten the identity of the field. What is more, the SDG mapping exercise across nine selected journals clearly demonstrates that mainstream, economically focused research can contribute to the SDGs as long as the discipline allows more room for integrators.

7 References

- Araujo, C.L., Picavet, M.E.B., Sartoretto, C.A.P.d.S., Dalla Riva, E., and Hollaender, P.S. (2021), "Ecocentric management mindset: A framework for corporate sustainability", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*.
- Biermann, F., Kanie, N., and Kim, R.E. (2017), "Global governance by goal-setting: The novel approach of the un sustainable development goals", *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, Vol. 26-27, pp. 26-31.
- Birke, O. and Bohm, S. (2006), ""The people" and resistance against international business the case of the bolivian "water war"", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 299-320.

- Buckley, P.J., Doh, J.P., and Benischke, M.H. (2017), "Towards a renaissance in international business research? Big questions, grand challenges, and the future of IB scholarship", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 48 No. 9, pp. 1045-64.
- Celone, A., Cammarano, A., Caputo, M., and Michelin, F. (2021), "Is it possible to improve the international business action towards the sustainable development goals?", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*.
- Cuervo-Cazurra, A., Doh, J.P., Giuliani, E., Montiel, I., and Park, J. (2022), "The United Nations' sustainable development goals: Pros and cons for managers of multinationals", *AIB Insights*, Vol. 22 No. 1.
- Darendeli, I., Hill, T.L., Rajwani, T., and Cheng, Y. (2021), "Surviving the arab spring: Socially beneficial product portfolios and resilience to political shock", *Multinational Business Review*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 522-44.
- Doh, J. (2019), "Commentary: Considering the social value of IB", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 76-78.
- Doh, J.P. and Lucea, R. (2013), "So close yet so far: Integrating global strategy and nonmarket research", *Global Strategy Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 171-94.
- Dörrenbächer, C. and Gammelgaard, J. (2019), "Critical and mainstream international business research", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 15 No. 2/3, pp. 239-61.
- Dörrenbächer, C., Sinkovics, R.R., Becker-Ritterspach, F., Boussebaa, M., Curran, L., de Jonge, A., and Khan, Z. (2021), "The covid-19 pandemic: Towards a societally engaged IB perspective", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 149-64.
- Dziubaniuk, O., Ivanova-Gongne, M., and Berdysheva, E. (2021), "Challenges of network interaction in managing sustainable development projects in developing countries: Case of an international consulting company", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*.
- Elkington, J. and Braun, S. (2013), "Breakthrough business leaders, market revolutions", in Volans. George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., and Tihanyi, L. (2016), "Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 59 No. 6, pp. 1880-95.
- Hamilton, S.G. (2021), "Public procurement - price-taker or market-shaper?", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*.
- Hofstetter, J.S., De Marchi, V., Sarkis, J., Govindan, K., Klassen, R., Ometto, A.R., Spraul, K.S., Bocken, N., Ashton, W.S., Sharma, S., Jaeger-Erben, M., Jensen, C., Dewick, P., Schröder, P., Sinkovics, N., Ibrahim, S.E., Fiske, L., Goerzen, A., and Vazquez-Brust, D. (2021), "From sustainable global value chains to circular economy—different silos, different perspectives, but many opportunities to build bridges", *Circular Economy and Sustainability*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 21-47.
- Kolk, A. (2016), "The social responsibility of international business: From ethics and the environment to CSR and sustainable development", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 23-34.
- Kolk, A. and van Tulder, R. (2010), "International business, corporate social responsibility and sustainable development", *International Business Review*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 119-25.
- Latapí Agudelo, M.A., Jóhannsdóttir, L., and Davídsdóttir, B. (2019), "A literature review of the history and evolution of corporate social responsibility", *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- Leslie, H.A., van Velzen, M.J.M., Brandsma, S.H., Vethaak, A.D., Garcia-Vallejo, J.J., and Lamoree, M.H. (2022), "Discovery and quantification of plastic particle pollution in human blood", *Environment international*, Vol. 163, pp. 107199.
- Nonet, A.-H.N.G., Gössling, T., Van Tulder, R., and Bryson, J.M. (2022), "Multi-stakeholder engagement for the sustainable development goals: Strategic and organizational challenges for principles-based approaches", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. forthcoming No. Special Issue on the SDGs.

- Pisani, N., Kolk, A., Ocelik, V., and Wu, G. (2019), "Does it pay for cities to be green? An investigation of FDI inflows and environmental sustainability", *Journal of International Business Policy*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 62-85.
- Rygh, A. (2019), "Social value creation by multinational enterprises the next "big question" for international business research?", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 47-75.
- Rygh, A., Chiarapini, E., and Segovia, M.V. (2021), "How can international business research contribute towards the sustainable development goals?", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*.
- Sinkovics, N. and Archie-acheampong, J. (2020), "The social value creation of MNEs – a literature review across multiple academic fields", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 7-46.
- Sinkovics, N. and Reuber, R.A. (2021), "Beyond disciplinary silos: A systematic analysis of the migrant entrepreneurship literature", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 56 No. 4, pp. 101223.
- Sinkovics, N., Sinkovics, R.R., and Archie-Acheampong, J. (2019), "An overview of social responsibility dimensions in international business", *Socially responsible international business*, Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 29-72.
- Sinkovics, N., Sinkovics, R.R., and Archie-Acheampong, J. (2021), "Small- and medium-sized enterprises and sustainable development: In the shadows of large lead firms in global value chains", *Journal of International Business Policy*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 80-101.
- Sinkovics, N., Sinkovics, R.R., Hoque, S.F., and Czaban, L. (2015), "A reconceptualisation of social value creation as social constraint alleviation", *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, Vol. 11 No. 3-4, pp. 340-63.
- Tüselmann, H., Sinkovics, R., and Pishchulov, G. (2016), "Revisiting the standing of international business journals in the competitive landscape", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 487-98.
- Van Tulder, R., Rodrigues, S.B., Mirza, H., and Sexsmith, K. (2021), "The un's sustainable development goals: Can multinational enterprises lead the decade of action?", *Journal of International Business Policy*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 1-21.
- van Tulder, R.J.M. and van Mil, E. (2023), *Principles of sustainable business: Frameworks for corporate action on the SDGs*, Routledge.
- 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*, Vol. 1 No. 3-4, pp. 208-33.
- van Zanten, J.A. and van Tulder, R. (2020), "Beyond covid-19: Applying "sdg logics" for resilient transformations", *Journal of International Business Policy*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 451-64.
- Wang, Z., Saadé, N.K., and Ariya, P.A. (2021), "Advances in ultra-trace analytical capability for micro/nanoplastics and water-soluble polymers in the environment: Fresh falling urban snow", *Environmental Pollution*, Vol. 276, pp. 116698.
- Wettstein, F., Giuliani, E., Santangelo, G.D., and Stahl, G.K. (2019), "International business and human rights: A research agenda", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 54-65.

Table 1 Number of articles in a journal associated with a particular SDG

IB Journals/SDGs	SD G1	SD G2	SD G3	SD G4	SD G5	SD G6	SD G7	SD G8	SD G9	SD G10	SD G11	SD G12	SD G13	SD G14	SD G15	SD G16	SD G17	Total	Total - SDG 9
CPoIB	15	5	21	34	11	2	7	69	118	43	2	59	10	2	4	42	13	457	339
GSJ	0	2	5	13	1	0	1	34	114	34	3	15	1	1	2	15	2	243	129
IBR	10	2	13	42	18	0	0	262	301	74	6	41	4	1	0	41	1	816	515
JIBP	1	2	21	5	1	1	2	29	30	25	5	18	3	3	0	31	11	188	158
JIBS	3	2	17	69	15	0	9	167	332	78	7	43	15	4	0	62	3	826	494
JIM	1	1	7	12	6	0	3	76	143	46	1	15	1	0	0	23	1	336	193
JWB	6	1	8	45	23	0	1	199	236	45	4	59	10	3	2	41	4	687	451
MIR	0	0	3	12	3	0	2	62	112	42	3	15	3	1	0	15	1	274	162
MBR	1	1	5	14	1	1	0	62	75	38	5	23	1	1	2	18	2	250	175
Total	37	16	100	246	79	4	25	960	1461	425	36	288	48	16	10	288	38	4077	2616

Note: articles that are relevant for more than one SDG are counted multiple times (total numbers per journal include duplicates)

Table 2 Percentage of articles relevant for SDGs in a journal of total articles available on WoS for that journal

Journal	Articles relevant for SDGs	Total articles available on WoS	% of Total	SDG 1	SDG 2	SDG 3	SDG 4	SDG 5	SDG 6	SDG 7	SDG 8	SDG 9	SDG10	SDG11	SDG12	SDG13	SDG14	SDG15	SDG16	SDG17
CPoIB	258	433	59.6%	3.5%	1.2%	4.8%	7.9%	2.5%	0.5%	1.6%	15.9%	27.3%	9.9%	0.5%	13.6%	2.3%	0.5%	0.9%	9.7%	3.0%
GSJ	163	303	53.8%	0.0%	0.7%	1.7%	4.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	11.2%	37.6%	11.2%	1.0%	5.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	5.0%	0.7%
IBR	647	1332	48.6%	0.8%	0.2%	1.0%	3.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	19.7%	22.6%	5.6%	0.5%	3.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	3.1%	0.1%
JIBP	94	129	72.9%	0.8%	1.6%	16.3%	3.9%	0.8%	0.8%	1.6%	22.5%	23.3%	19.4%	3.9%	14.0%	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%	24.0%	8.5%

JIBS	653	1522	42.9 %	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	4.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0.6%	11.0 %	21.8 %	5.1%	0.5%	2.8%	1.0%	0.3%	0.0%	4.1%	0.2%
JIM	248	533	46.5 %	0.2%	0.2%	1.3%	2.3%	1.1%	0.0%	0.6%	14.3 %	26.8 %	8.6%	0.2%	2.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.2%
JWB	516	1055	48.9 %	0.6%	0.1%	0.8%	4.3%	2.2%	0.0%	0.1%	18.9 %	22.4 %	4.3%	0.4%	5.6%	0.9%	0.3%	0.2%	3.9%	0.4%
MIR	225	506	44.5 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	2.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.4%	12.3 %	22.1 %	8.3%	0.6%	3.0%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	3.0%	0.2%
MBR	183	381	48.0 %	0.3%	0.3%	1.3%	3.7%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	16.3 %	19.7 %	10.0%	1.3%	6.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	4.7%	0.5%
Grand Total	2987	6194	48.2 %	0.6%	0.3%	1.6%	4.0%	1.3%	0.1%	0.4%	15.5 %	23.6 %	6.9%	0.6%	4.6%	0.8%	0.3%	0.2%	4.6%	0.6%

Table 3 Analysis of how many SDG relevant articles in a given journal are cited in selected IB journals

Journals	Articles relevant to SDGs in journal	Total number of citing articles	Citing Journals*								
			CPoIB	G SJ	IBR	JIBP	JIBS	JIM	JWB	MIR	MBR
CPoIB	258	1801	165	8	19	7	19	13	15	13	9
JIBP	94	919	20	12	7	81	41	4	13	4	10
MBR	183	879	20	6	23	8	38	17	22	8	86

* the number of articles in each IB journal that are citing from the pool of articles identified as relevant for at least one SDG