



# **Adverse Impacts of Business and Transnationalism on Achieving the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals**

**Rúdi Gualter de Oliveira**

Universidade Aberta, Portugal

**Abstract**— Globalization has enabled an increase in economic cooperation between states and the development of so-called multinational companies. The increase in the complexity of production chains, brought with it a series of challenges, highlighting the lack of robust legal resources, the widening of social disparity through the search for lower production costs and the commitment of national sovereignties by multinational companies. All of these presents themselves as adverse impacts, especially when considering the 2030 sustainable development goals. This probe seeks to analyse the impact of increased global production chains and how the presence of multinationals affect the achievement of sustainable development goals. Among these, stand out how the ethical issues of global companies have violated these objectives, as well as the adverse impact of the failure of corporate social responsibility, and finally how corporate involvement in international politics and corporate transnationalism negatively impact sustainable development. A systematic literature review was adopted, through which selected texts on the themes of sustainable development, corporate transnationalism and their political and economic impacts were analysed. Global business can have both positive and negative impacts on sustainable development goals. In short, studies point out that the involvement of multinationals in international politics can cause a greater impairment of national sovereignty, the adoption of unethical practices and against corporate social responsibility has a negative impact on the goals of sustainable development and corporate transnationalism creates gaps legal that can be exploited to increase profits and commit to sustainable development.

**Keywords**— development, globalization, multinationals, sustainability, transnationalism.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

According to Swadźba (2019), globalization has resulted in increased connections and interactions between individuals around the world. The phenomenon has fostered the growth and success of global businesses that have found it convenient to conduct their activities across multiple national borders. Theoretically, global business activities should be guided by its ethical principles and corporate social responsibility to ensure the well-being of society in general (López-Concepción et al., 2021). Evidence suggests that non-compliance with these provisions results in social disputes that manifest themselves in various ways (Szócs & Schlegelmilch, 2020).

In some cases, such disputes are so serious and widespread that they have adverse impacts on the achievement of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Therefore, this paper will examine how global companies are undermining the success of the 2030 SDGs by engaging in unethical practices, ignoring their corporate social responsibility, influencing global policy and participating in illegal transnational activities.



### ***A. Statement of the problem***

Some of the most significant political and economic events of modern times are related to globalization and transnationalism. Globalization provides a new and critical perspective on the economy, as well as the importance of monetary and financial schemes (Tang et al., 2020). However, the globalization trend has also attracted criticism due to its diverse impacts on different people. Initially, it was expected that the establishment of multinational corporations would ensure the flow of money to developing countries due to the high rate of return. However, observation and experience show that money flows from developing to developed countries (Tang et al., 2020). According to Tang et al. (2020), this flow is in line with the SDG agenda of eradicating poverty, especially in developing countries.

In addition, companies have engaged in certain practices that may compromise the success of 2030 SDGs. According to Mačaitytė and Virbašiūtė (2018), Volkswagen's achievements in emissions tests went against the organization's commitment to environmental and economic sustainability. Moreover, multinational corporations have increasingly engaged in practices that violate the labour and human rights of their employees (LeBaron, 2014; Lobel, 2006). These actions go in part against the agenda outlined in the 2030 SDGs.

Transnationalism has created an environment for illegal businesses to thrive, often undetected (Bonnier, 2019; Bueger & Edmunds, 2020; Titeca, 2019; Wasser et al., 2008). Revenue leakages resulting from lack of regulation and taxation deprive governments of the financial support needed to fund public services and violate several SDGs.

Furthermore, the participation of companies in global politics with the sole purpose of protecting their interests compromises the sovereignty of nations around the world (Cerny, 2010; Dahan et al., 2006). Based on the findings of the literature, this investigation will seek to address the problem of several global companies being in the direction of sabotaging the 2030 sustainable development goals by not complying with the requirements of business ethics and corporate social responsibility, engaging in illegal transnational activities and play a partisan role in national and global politics.

### ***B. Objectives and approach issues***

The following document attempts to address the following research questions. How do ethical and corporate social responsibility scandals compromise the 2030 SDGs? How do companies sabotage SDGs success by engaging in global politics? How does transnationalism impact the achievement of the 2030 SDGs?

As such, the analysis proposes to explore how the ethical issues of global companies have violated the SDGs and how the failure of corporate social responsibility is against the achievement of the 2030 SDGs. Explain how global companies are in the direction of compromising the SDGs of 2030 by engaging in politics in the global arena. Explore how transnationalism is negatively impacting the achievement of the 2030 SDGs.

## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### ***A. 2030 Sustainable Development Goals***

The sustainable development goals for 2030 (2030 SDGs) refer to seventeen broad agendas focused on ensuring sustainability in the economic and social aspects of humanity and its interactions with the natural environment

(Arora & Mishra, 2019). When the process of establishing the 2030 SDGs (Figure 1) began in 2012, the United Nations (UN) welcomed the private sector to contribute through an open working group in 2013. The initiative sought to coordinate interactions between business, civil society and the of the UN. The United Nations hoped that the platform would enable the private sector to contribute to global sustainable development. More specifically, the initiative aimed to address long-term societal needs and priorities, resulting in successful business operations (Pedersen, 2018).



**Figure 01: United Nations Sustainable Development Goals for 2030 (QBE, 2022)**

Unfortunately, some global organizations perceived the SDGs agenda as expensive and risky (Pedersen, 2018). More specifically, these companies believe that higher costs are on the agenda due to regulations and unwillingness from customers who refuse to buy "SDG-non-compliant" products. In addition, other companies believe that the SDGs agenda increases some operating costs. As an example, Pedersen (2018) mentions that some companies that use raw materials that are unsuitable for the SDGs and energy supply systems, such as coal, to combat needs, are forced to make the transition to the use of renewable energy.

### **B. Transnationalism**

According to Faist and Bilecen (2017), transnationalism was introduced in migration studies in the early 1990s. They claim that transnationalism concerns the diffusion of symbolic social ties, organizational positions, economic activities, and networks that cross more than one nation. Therefore, transnationalism refers to continuous and sustained multi-local social, religious, cultural, economic, and political transactions that cross national borders.

While pressures at the national and international levels lead companies to adapt to the local norm, some organizations try to shape a universal institutional environment in all nations and cultures (Dahan et al., 2006). In this sense, global companies are often influenced to define their institutional environment as fragmented and integrative, based on their national location (Bruce, 2002). Bruce (2002) reveals that, as multinational corporations located in different countries, face integration challenges in different national institutions. According

to Dahan et al. (2006), global companies should use these differences as advantages, establishing research and development facilities in countries that offer tax incentives. However, as these different environments have specific conformational expectations for business, multinational organizations often face certain challenges in their ability to conform (Kostova & Roth, 2002).

Transnationalism has created a way for illegal businesses and illicit trades to thrive. As example, according to Titeca (2019), the illicit trade in ivory is facilitated by transnationalism. Likewise, Wasser et al. (2008) state that the growing illegal trade in ivory is conducted through growing criminal networks and international crime syndicates located in various nations globally. Transnationalism is also linked to organized crime at sea, according to Bueger and Edmunds (2020), the UN held a debate entitled "transnational organized crime at sea" to examine how such crimes threaten international security and peace. The authors point out that the crimes included human trafficking, garbage at sea, illegal fishing, maritime piracy and trafficking in narcotics and weapons. Bonnier (2019) resumes the argument, revealing that crimes committed through transnational business activities generate between US\$ 1.6 trillion and US\$ 2.2 trillion.

#### ***The TRACIT Report - Transnational Alliance to Combat Illicit Trade***

In 2019, the Transnational Alliance to Combat Illicit Trade (TRACIT) initiated a study to examine various industries and their involvement in illicit trade. Sectors included agri-food, alcohol, forestry, fisheries, pharmaceuticals, petroleum, pesticides, tobacco, precious stones and precious metals, wildlife, as well as all types of piracy and counterfeiting. In collaboration with the United Nations on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), these sectors were selected for their massive involvement in international trade. Overall, these industries have been found to create an annual global drain of up to \$2.2 trillion.

The report concluded that the interaction and diffusion of economic activities involving these sectors and across several nations represented threats to the entire SDG agenda (Bonnier, 2019).

#### ***C. Business Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility***

Ethical issues manifest themselves in corruption, bribery, inequality, harmful products, misleading advertising, harm to innocents, child labor and unfair compensation (Brenkert, 2019; Lobel, 2006). The Special Representative of the UN Secretary General, John Ruggie, has documented several unethical practices among global companies. These include the abuse of workers' rights to equality, safety and freedom of movement and security (Ruggie, 2008).

According to Szócs and Schlegelmilch (2020), corporate social responsibility refers to proactive behaviours' that aim to promote sustainable products, supply chains, processes and communities. From a social perspective, corporate social responsibility involves making investments that improve the well-being of customers, employees, and the community, rather than just minimizing mistreatment.

From an environmental point of view, the concept involves the use of renewable resources, the recovery of natural resources and the shift from careless and abundant consumption to conservative practices. Still according to Szócs



and Schlegelmilch (2020), companies involved in corporate social responsibility play a crucial role in tackling social problems such as economic inequality, poverty, and unemployment.

On the other hand, companies that violate ethical requirements and do not fulfil their corporate social responsibility compromise their success through scandals (Mačaitytė & Virbašiūtė, 2018). Scandals harm business through sales declines, reputation decline, loss of customer loyalty and stakeholder exit (Mačaitytė & Virbašiūtė, 2018). For these reasons, Schwartz and Cragg (2017) advise corporations to align their processes and operations with sustainable practices, such as environmentally friendly operations that reduce toxic emissions, charitable donations, among other options.

### ***The Volkswagen case***

The following case study presents an example of how a multinational company compromised its ethics and failed to deliver on its promise of corporate social responsibility.

In 2007, Volkswagen released its "Strategy 2018", revealing the company's aspiration to become the core business of the automotive industry. The strategy covered the company's commitment to ecological and economic sustainability, minimizing harmful emissions and supporting fuel efficiency. However, in 2015, the Environmental Protection Agency revealed that the company had used software linked to the cars' control device to hide the legitimate amount of nitrogen oxide gas in its vehicles.

The report indicated that the cars polluted up to forty times the maximum emissions limit. Volkswagen was rocked by the infamous "Dieselgate" scandal after the announcement. Eventually, the company admitted to cheating emission tests, resulting in damage to the company's reputation. The company not only deceived its customers, but also manifested unethical practices in its commitment to the environmental sustainability agenda (Mačaitytė & Virbašiūtė, 2018).

### ***D. Businesses as political actors in the global arena***

Companies often become involved in the politics of the global arena to promote favourable socio-political environments. According to Kim and Milner (2019), multinational companies engage in political lobbying initiatives that influence issues such as investment protection, taxation, and immigration at a global level. Participation is motivated by their characteristics as exporters, global employers of skilled labour, their integration into global value chains and large expenditures on research and development (Kim & Milner, 2019). These characteristics give them broad power, influence, and position in global economic and political environments (Mikler & Ronit, 2020).

However, some multinational corporations abuse their power and influence (Mikler & Ronit, 2020). In this sense, Bruce (2002) argues that some multinational companies may be assuming the important roles played by national governments, introducing the concept of corporate sovereignty. According to Wilks (2013), these global business influences manifest a strong desire for governance and political authority. Cerny (2010); Dahan et al. (2006) establish that governments are sometimes forced to adhere to the pressures of these influential companies, as they fear that, unless their interests are met, organizations will move to nations with favourable political environments.



Thus, powerful global businesses set agendas, set boundaries or boundaries for actions, provide order and security, and drive the implementation of favourable contracts (Bruce, 2002). Therefore, Wilks (2013) warns that companies will be so powerful and influential that their collaborations in transnational networks will lead states to act according to their stipulations.

### ***The Facebook case***

According to Madrigal (2017), Facebook played a partisan role by influencing several elections in the United States. More specifically, the social platform company influenced an increase in voter turnout in 2012, more specifically in the younger generation. Madrigal (2017) argues that, as a greater percentage of the young population aligns with the Democratic agenda, the overall effect of Facebook's involvement in the election was aimed at helping Democrats win the election. Furthermore, Bossetta et al. (2017) claim that Facebook has played a partisan role in European politics. The authors claim that Facebook's algorithm is intentionally designed to drive traffic to certain ideological pages designed to drive certain political agendas.

During the rise of certain anti-austerity movements in Europe, the company drove traffic to the Spanish Revolution and "Take the Square" Facebook pages in Spain. The popularity drove the pan-European wave of political protests (Bossetta et al., 2017). In addition, in 2018, Facebook was also accused of illegally obtaining data from users of the platform and selling it to political entities to influence certain political outcomes (Brown, 2020). According to Smith-Roberts (2018), Facebook sold the data to Cambridge Analytica and Russia in political movements that influenced the 2016 elections in the United States and Brexit in Europe.

## **III. RESEARCH METHOD**

The present research adopted a systematic literature review as a research methodology, in order to present an overview of the existing theories relevant to the subject and analyse them from the perspective of the objectives and research questions (Moreira, 2004). To this end, selected texts were presented in the areas of corporate social responsibility, political involvement by multinational companies, business transnationalism and sustainable development objectives. A total of 27 documents including collection of case studies, reviews, and data sources were analysed that can be consulted on *table 1* of the appendix.

### ***A. Research questions***

- How do ethical and corporate social responsibility scandals compromise the 2030 SDGs?
- How do companies sabotage the success of the SDGs by becoming involved in global politics?
- How does transnationalism impact the achievement of the 2030 SDGs?

### ***B. Objectives***

- Explore how ethical issues in global business have violated the SDGs.
- How failing corporate social responsibility is against achieving the 2030 SDGs
- Explain how global companies are moving towards achieving the 2030 SDGs by engaging in politics in the global arena.
- Explore how transnationalism is negatively impacting the achievement of the 2030 SDGs.



#### **IV. RESULTS CRITICAL ANALYSIS**

##### ***A. Impacts of ethical and corporate social responsibility scandals on achieving the 2030 SDGs***

The failure of global companies to fulfil their corporate social responsibility poses a significant threat to the success of the SDGs. In this sense, some of the challenges faced by global companies include weak implementation of their corporate social responsibility policies, lack of compliance incentives and lack of monitoring provisions (Lobel, 2006; Schönherr et al., 2017). As a result, globalization efforts serve as a legitimizing platform for global capitalism, sustaining the unequal distribution of resources. More specifically, despite gaining significantly from cheap labour in developing countries, successful multinational corporations fail to engage in foreign direct investment or social services that would benefit underserved communities (Ross, 2019). The issue manifests itself in a widening gap between rich and poor, both at the individual and national levels.

The tenth target of the SDGs concerns the reduction of global inequalities. According to Nations (2022), the richest ten percent hold approximately forty percent of global income, while the poorest ten percent earn between two and seven percent. The UN's objective is to eradicate inequalities by improving the monitoring and regulation of institutions and encouraging development assistance in developing regions (Nations, 2022). However, as discussed above, multinational corporations have failed to facilitate these provisions by failing to implement, enforce and monitor their corporate social responsibility policies. It is clear, therefore, that multinational corporations are widening the margins of global inequalities by facilitating and driving global capitalism.

In addition, multinational corporations compromise the SDG agenda by focusing on maximizing profits and minimizing production costs. According to LeBaron (2014), multinational corporations employ aggressive tactics to reduce operating costs, subcontracting workers around the world to manufacture goods at extremely low costs. Demand drives manufacturers to lower environmental and labour standards, avoid unionization, increase working hours, eliminate jobs, and cut benefits and wages (LeBaron, 2014; Lobel, 2006). In some cases, manufacturers, as in the infamous cases of Chinese factories, are driven to outsource child labour to school children (Lobel, 2006). Likewise, Schönherr et al. (2017) state that current corporate social responsibilities hardly address global sustainability challenges, such as social justice, poverty, and ecosystem degradation. Evidence shows that global companies are more motivated by increasing their profits at the expense of achieving the SDGs. These unethical tactics, often employed by multinational corporations, manifest a lack of corporate social responsibility and compromise SDG agendas.

The UN intends to eliminate poverty by adopting salary and social protection policies that guarantee fair remuneration. However, due to the low wages paid to the working class, unethical practices undermine the objective. By engaging in unethical work-outsourcing practices, multinational corporations undermine the SDGs goal of equal and quality education for all. In addition, the tendency of global companies to increase working hours, ignore the human rights of their employees, safety standards and the right to unionize, as stated by Lobel (2006); Schönherr et al. (2017) run counter to the SDGs objective of promoting decent work and economic goals (López-Concepción et al., 2021). The objective in question aims to eradicate forced labour, modern slavery, promote labour rights and ensure safe and secure working conditions. As such, global companies directly compromise the success of the SDGs by maximizing their profits at the expense of their workforce.



Furthermore, failure to implement environmentally sound business operations, as in the case of Volkswagen, compromises the climate action agenda, the thirteenth goal of the SDGs (LeBaron, 2014; Mačaitytė & Virbašiūtė, 2018). According to Arora and Mishra (2019); Nations (2022), greenhouse gas emissions are at least fifty percent higher in this decade than in 1990. The shift has contributed to the rise in disasters related to climate change in recent times. As such, the UN aims to eradicate these dangers through investments in low-carbon development. Therefore, when multinational organizations engage in unethical business practices that pollute the environment, they directly jeopardize the success of the thirteenth SDG agenda.

### ***B. Impacts of business involvement in global arena politics on SDGs success***

The involvement of companies in global and local politics compromises the success of the 2030 SDG targets. The UN's intention is to leverage multinational corporations as powerful political actors capable of positively influencing various SDGs agendas. More specifically, the UN stipulates that global business is a powerful force capable of reducing poverty, generating economic growth, and driving the implementation of human rights policies (Buhmann et al., 2019). These responsibilities belong to the first, eighth and sixteenth agendas of the SDGs (Nations, 2022). However, as stated above, some multinational corporations have become so powerful that they can influence governments to act as per their stipulations. In some cases, the political interests of global companies are motivated by the need to maximize their profits at the expense of social welfare (Cerny, 2010; Dahan et al., 2006). In this way, the involvement of multinational corporations in politics in the global arena runs counter to the UN objective of enabling them to be instruments of positive political reforms.

The Facebook case manifests a clear violation of the agenda of the sixteenth SDG, establishing peace, justice, and strong institutions. In this sense, the UN predicts that sustainable development can only be achieved through effective governance, guided by the rule of law (Nations, 2022). The UN aims to achieve this by reducing corruption in all forms and developing transparent and accountable institutions at all levels. More importantly, the UN reveals that the agenda can only be achieved with responsive, inclusive, representative, and participatory decision-making. However, rather than remain non-partisan, Facebook sold its users' data to Cambridge Analytica and Russia, which in turn interfered in certain countries' elections through targeted ads and political propaganda (Smith-Roberts, 2018). By popularizing the Spanish Revolution and the "Take the Square" Facebook pages in Spain, Facebook boosted the pan-European wave of political protests, sabotaging the sixteenth agenda focused on peace and security (Bossetta et al., 2017).

Furthermore, Facebook compromised the sovereignty of the United Kingdom by selling user data to Cambridge Analytica, a strong advocate of Brexit (Larson & Vieregger, 2019; Smith-Roberts, 2018). The measure went against the UN objective of promoting the rule of law at the international level and facilitating participatory and representative decision-making, as per the sixteenth objective (Nations, 2022). Thus, it is evident that, if left unregulated, global business will continue to negatively influence policy in the global arena.

### ***C. Impacts of Transnationalism on the Achievement of the SDGs***

Transnationalism has provided some regulatory loopholes that compromise the success of the SDGs. More specifically, some organizations use various networks established by the free movement of economic activities of





transnationalism to conduct illegal business. As stated by May (2017), transnational crime manifests itself in the form of drug trafficking, arms trafficking, human and organ trafficking, illegal, unreported, unregulated fishing, illegal mining, and illegal wildlife trade. Unfortunately, the huge revenue resulting from these activities is used to expand illegal activities to new countries, avoiding detection and taxation. Furthermore, these illegal activities expose customers to harmful products and plunder natural resources. TRACIT findings according to Bonnier (2019) prove a direct violation of the SDGs agenda by involving global companies in illicit and non-taxable ventures. In this sense, illicit trade crowds out legitimate economic activity, deprives the government of revenue to invest in public services, displaces thousands of legitimate jobs, and compromises the ecosystem.

These results run counter to several SDG agendas. By avoiding taxation, illegal commercial activities facilitated by transnationalism undermine poverty reduction, decent jobs, and economic growth in line with SDGs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8 (Nations, 2022). Furthermore, by depriving governments of taxable income, global corporations undermine governments' ability to invest in public services, a benefit outlined in SDGs nine and seventeen. Illegal transnational business also undermines the objectives of security, peace, and stability, as envisaged in the 16th SDG target, as it involves criminal and sometimes violent involvements (Bonnier, 2019). In addition, transnational commercial ventures, such as those involving ivory trade or fishing, as shown by Bueger and Edmunds (2020); May (2017); Titeca (2019); Wasser et al. (2008), abuse supply chains and plunder natural resources. These example activities run counter to SDG targets six, fourteen and fifteen, targets on clean water and sanitation, underwater life and life on land, respectively. Therefore, transnationalism has provided an avenue for companies and organizations to engage in illicit activities that directly jeopardize the success of the SDGs.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

Based on the above literature and analysis, it is clear, that global business and transnationalism are part of the path to the success or failure of the 2030 SDGs. But when global business engages in unethical practices and fails to honour its corporate social responsibility, it compromises the SDGs related to guaranteeing the well-being and health of society, decent work, and economic growth, eliminating poverty, reducing inequalities and minimizing climate change. Likewise, business involvement in global arena politics runs counter to the SDG objective of establishing peace, justice, and strong institutions. As seen in the case of Facebook, global companies often abuse their power and influence by dictating and influencing political decisions for their own benefit. The trend runs counter to the UN's intention to empower and encourage multinational corporations to be agents of positive social and economic change. Furthermore, the concept of transnationalism has provided a way for influential organizations to grow and prosper in their illegal businesses while avoiding detection, regulation, and taxation. Consequently, the illegal businesses facilitated by transnationalism deny governments the revenue needed to facilitate economic development. Therefore, transnationalism somewhat negatively runs counter to the SDGs of poverty reduction, decent jobs, combating climate change, economic growth, security, peace, justice, and strong institutions. These illegal transnational businesses also sabotage the SDG targets on clean water and sanitation, life below water and life on land. For these reasons, it is clear, that if left unregulated, global business and transnationalism will continue to have adverse impacts on the success of the 2030 SDGs.



This investigation sought to present an overview of available theories regarding the impact of transnationalism on the goals of sustainable development. However, its limitation lies in the fact that these are not the only challenges to achieving these objectives. Likewise, as this is a systematic literature review, it did not examine cases of successful adoption of ethical practices, nor did it analyse companies that have successfully committed to the SDGs.

## APPENDIX

*Table 1: Sources of research*

Authors	Source
<b>Bonnier, L. (2019)</b>	The negative impact of illicit trade on financing the UN SDG
<b>Bossetta, M., Segesten, A. D., &amp; Trezz, H.-J. (2017)</b>	Engaging with European politics through Twitter and Facebook: Participation beyond the national? In Social media and European politics
<b>Brenkert, G. G. (2019)</b>	Mind the gap! The challenges and limits of (Global) business ethics
<b>Brown, A. J. (2020)</b>	"Should I Stay or Should I Leave?": Exploring (Dis) continued Facebook Use After the Cambridge Analytica Scandal
<b>Bueger, C., &amp; Edmunds, T. (2020)</b>	Blue crime: Conceptualising transnational organised crime at sea
<b>Buhmann, K., Jonsson, J., &amp; Fisker, M. (2019)</b>	Do no harm and do more good too: Connecting the SDGs with business and human rights and political CSR theory
<b>Dahan, N., Doh, J., &amp; Guay, T. (2006)</b>	The role of multinational corporations in transnational institution building: A policy network perspective.
<b>Kim, I. S., &amp; Milner, H. V. (2019)</b>	Multinational Corporations and their Influence Through Lobbying on Foreign Policy.
<b>Kostova, T., &amp; Roth, K. (2002)</b>	Adoption of an organizational practice by subsidiaries of multinational corporations: Institutional and relational effects
<b>Larson, E., &amp; Vieregger, C. (2019)</b>	Strategic Actions in a Platform Context: What Should Facebook Do Next?
<b>LeBaron, G. (2014)</b>	Subcontracting is not illegal, but is it unethical? Business ethics, forced labor, and economic success
<b>Lobel, O. (2006)</b>	Sustainable capitalism or ethical transnationalism: Offshore production and economic development
<b>López-Concepción, A., Gil-Lacruz, A. I., &amp; Saz-Gil, I. (2021)</b>	Stakeholder engagement, Csr development and Sdgs compliance: A systematic review from 2015 to 2021
<b>Mačaitytė, I., &amp; Virbašiūtė, G. (2018)</b>	Volkswagen emission scandal and corporate social responsibility – a case study
<b>Madrugal, A. C. (2017)</b>	What Facebook did to American democracy
<b>May, C. (2017)</b>	Transnational Crime and the Developing World
<b>Mikler, J., &amp; Ronit, K. (2020)</b>	Introduction: MNCs and their pathways of influence in global politics. In MNCs in Global Politics



<b>Pedersen, C. S. (2018)</b>	The UN sustainable development goals (SDGs) are a great gift to business
<b>Ross, A. G. (2019)</b>	Governance infrastructure and FDI flows in developing countries
<b>Schönherr, N., Findler, F., &amp; Martinuzzi, A. (2017)</b>	Exploring the interface of CSR and the sustainable development goals
<b>Schwartz, M. S., &amp; Cragg, W. (2017)</b>	'The Wal-Mart Effect and Business, Ethics, and Society'
<b>Smith-Roberts, A. (2018)</b>	Facebook, fake news, and the First Amendment
<b>Swadźba, S. (2019)</b>	Globalization vs. economic growth in new countries of the European Union
<b>Tang, S., Wang, Z., Yang, G., &amp; Tang, W. (2020)</b>	What are the implications of globalization on sustainability?—A comprehensive study
<b>Titeca, K. (2019)</b>	Illegal ivory trade as transnational organized crime? An empirical study into ivory traders in Uganda
<b>Wasser, S. K., Joseph Clark, W., Drori, O., Stephen Kisamo, E., Mailand, C., Mutayoba, B., &amp; Stephens, M. (2008)</b>	Combating the illegal trade in African elephant ivory with DNA forensics
<b>Wilks, S. (2013)</b>	The political power of the business corporation

## REFERENCES

- [1] Arora, N. K., & Mishra, I. (2019). United Nations Sustainable Development Goals 2030 and environmental sustainability: race against time. In (Vol. 2, pp. 339-342): Springer
- [2] Bonnier, L. (2019). The negative impact of illicit trade on financing the UN SDGs. Transnational Alliance to Combat Illicit Trade. Retrieved 22/01/2022 from <https://www.tracit.org/tracit-talking-points/the-negative-impact-of-illicit-trade-on-financing-the-un-sdgs>
- [3] Bossetta, M., Segesten, A. D., & Trenz, H.-J. (2017). Engaging with European politics through Twitter and Facebook: Participation beyond the national? In Social media and European politics (pp. 53-76). Springer.
- [4] Brenkert, G. G. (2019). Mind the gap! The challenges and limits of (Global) business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(4), 917-930.
- [5] Brown, A. J. (2020). "Should I Stay or Should I Leave?": Exploring (Dis) continued Facebook Use After the Cambridge Analytica Scandal. *Social Media+ Society*, 6(1), 2056305120913884.
- [6] Bruce, R. (2002). The emergence of private authority in global governance (Vol. 85). Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Bueger, C., & Edmunds, T. (2020). Blue crime: Conceptualising transnational organised crime at sea. *Marine Policy*, 119, 104067.
- [8] Buhmann, K., Jonsson, J., & Fisker, M. (2019). Do no harm and do more good too: Connecting the SDGs with business and human rights and political CSR theory. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*.



- [9] Cerny, P. G. (2010). The competition state today: from raison d'État to raison du Monde. *Policy studies*, 31(1), 5-21.
- [10] Dahan, N., Doh, J., & Guay, T. (2006). The role of multinational corporations in transnational institution building: A policy network perspective. *Human Relations*, 59(11), 1571-1600.
- [11] Faist, T., & Bilecen, B. (2017). Transnationalism. In *Routledge international handbook of migration studies* (pp. 499-511). Routledge.
- [12] Kim, I. S., & Milner, H. V. (2019). Multinational Corporations and their Influence Through Lobbying on Foreign Policy. *Multinational Corporations in a Changing Global Economy*.
- [13] Kostova, T., & Roth, K. (2002). Adoption of an organizational practice by subsidiaries of multinational corporations: Institutional and relational effects. *Academy of management journal*, 45(1), 215-233.
- [14] Larson, E., & Vieregger, C. (2019). Strategic Actions in a Platform Context: What Should Facebook Do Next? *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 30(2), 97-105.
- [15] LeBaron, G. (2014). Subcontracting is not illegal, but is it unethical? Business ethics, forced labor, and economic success. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 20(2), 237-249.
- [16] Lobel, O. (2006). Sustainable capitalism or ethical transnationalism: Offshore production and economic development. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 17(1), 56-62.
- [17] López-Concepción, A., Gil-Lacruz, A. I., & Saz-Gil, I. (2021). Stakeholder engagement, Csr development and Sdgs compliance: A systematic review from 2015 to 2021. *Corporate social responsibility and environmental management*.
- [18] Mačaitytė, I., & Virbašiūtė, G. (2018). Volkswagen emission scandal and corporate social responsibility – a case study. *Kaunas University of Technology*.
- [19] Madrigal, A. C. (2017). What Facebook did to American democracy. *The Atlantic*, 12.
- [20] May, C. (2017). Transnational Crime and the Developing World (Global Financial Integrity Issue. G. F. Integrity.
- [21] Mikler, J., & Ronit, K. (2020). Introduction: MNCs and their pathways of influence in global politics. In *MNCs in Global Politics*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [22] Nations, U. (2022). The SDGs In Action. United Nations. Retrieved 22/01/2022 from
- [23] Pedersen, C. S. (2018). The UN sustainable development goals (SDGs) are a great gift to business! *Procedia Cirp*, 69, 21-24.
- [24] QBE (2022). Sustainable development goals. Retrieved 05/01/2022 from <https://www.qbe.com/sustainability/our-approach-to-sustainability/sustainable-development-goals>
- [25] Ross, A. G. (2019). Governance infrastructure and FDI flows in developing countries. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 11(2), 109-119.
- [26] Ruggie, J. G. (2008). Clarifying the concepts of "sphere of influence" and "complicity" : report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the Issue of Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises (Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development., Issue. U. Nations.



- [27] Schönherr, N., Findler, F., & Martinuzzi, A. (2017). Exploring the interface of CSR and the sustainable development goals. *Transnational Corporations*, 24(3), 33-47.
- [28] Schwartz, M. S., & Cragg, W. (2017). R. Edward Freeman (2006), 'The Wal-Mart Effect and Business, Ethics, and Society', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20, pp. 38-40. In *Corporate Social Responsibility* (pp. 539-542). Routledge.
- [29] Smith-Roberts, A. (2018). Facebook, fake news, and the First Amendment. *Denver Law Review Forum*,
- [30] Swadźba, S. (2019). Globalization vs. economic growth in new countries of the European Union. *Ekonomicko-manazerske spektrum*, 13(1), 1-11.
- [31] Szócs, I., & Schlegelmilch, B. B. (2020). Embedding CSR in corporate strategies. *Rethinking Business Responsibility in a Global Context*, 45-60.
- [32] Tang, S., Wang, Z., Yang, G., & Tang, W. (2020). What are the implications of globalization on sustainability?—A comprehensive study. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3411.
- [33] Titeca, K. (2019). Illegal ivory trade as transnational organized crime? An empirical study into ivory traders in Uganda. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 59(1), 24-44.
- [34] Wasser, S. K., Joseph Clark, W., Drori, O., Stephen Kisamo, E., Mailand, C., Mutayoba, B., & Stephens, M. (2008). Combating the illegal trade in African elephant ivory with DNA forensics. *Conservation Biology*, 22(4), 1065-1071.
- [35] Wilks, S. (2013). *The political power of the business corporation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

