

# The Social Responsibility of Multinationals: From an After-Thought to Center Stage <sup>1</sup>

Lorraine Eden, Texas A&M University

**Abstract:** How has the social responsibility of multinationals (MNEs) changed over the past 50 years?

This chapter provides a brief historical tour of MNEs and social issues from the late 1960s to the present. I argue that from the late 1960s forward, scholars in economics and international business (IB) focused on the economic impacts of foreign direct investment (FDI) with some concern for political impacts; whereas international political economy (IPE) scholars paid more attention to political and social issues. It has only been in the past 15 years that the social responsibility of MNEs moved from an after-thought to a mainstream subject of inquiry for most MNE scholars. My arguments are documented through a review of key books and writings together with a personal history of my own research. I then review Schlegelmilch and Szöcs (2020) and argue that the book moves the social responsibility of MNEs literature forward in several ways.

## Introduction

When I accepted the invitation from Bodo Schlegelmilch and Ilona Szöcs to write a Foreword to *Rethinking Business Responsibility in a Global Context: Challenges to Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainability and Ethics*, I accepted partly from curiosity. Would the book offer “rethinking” for the informed reader? In particular, would the book lead me to rethink my own conceptualization of the social responsibility of multinational enterprises (MNEs)? The short answer to both questions is yes. Let me start with a brief historical tour, drawn from my understanding and experiences, of the subject matter and

---

<sup>1</sup> Forthcoming as a Foreword to Bodo B. Schlegelmilch and Ilona Szöcs. 2020. *Rethinking Business Responsibility in a Global Context: Challenges to Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainability and Ethics*. Switzerland: Springer Nature.

then explain my answers.<sup>2</sup>

### **The Social Responsibility of Multinationals: A Canadian Lens**

For most of my academic career I have been interested in the political economy of business or what is typically called “business-government” relations. My focus has been relations between multinational enterprises (MNEs) and the nation state, primarily MNEs and host countries.

The reason for this research interest is probably where I grew up – my home was on the Canadian side of the U.S.-Canada border. During the 1960s, I witnessed an inward flood of U.S. foreign direct investment (FDI), together with the growing resentment of Canadians against what was widely perceived as the “takeover” of the Canadian economy by our neighbors to the south. The year I graduated from Mount Allison University with an honors degree in economics (1970) was the same year that the Canadian government established the Task Force on Foreign Ownership to study the impact of foreign (read “U.S.”) control over the Canadian economy. My master’s degree in economics from McGill was completed in 1973, the same year that the Canadian government established the Foreign Investment Review Agency (FIRA). FIRA was set up to screen both foreign (again, read “U.S.”) acquisitions of Canadian businesses and the establishment of new businesses by foreigners, with the goal of ensuring that Canada received the maximum possible net benefits from inward FDI. FIRA’s assessment criteria were almost wholly economic in nature: the expected impacts of inward FDI on jobs, GDP, productivity, R&D, product variety, competition, Canadian managerial positions, and compatibility with other national policies (Safarian, 1983, 1985).

Securing greater economic benefits from inward FDI, however, was not Canada’s only concern at

---

<sup>2</sup> I limit my brief history tour of “global social responsibility of business” to the “social responsibility of multinationals.” I do not discuss the cross-border/regional/global social responsibility of domestic businesses, which would be an interesting issue for another paper.

the time. The Canadian government (and public) were also sensitive to the socio-cultural impacts of inward FDI from the United States, particularly in culturally sensitive industries (e.g., radio, TV, movies, book publishing) that were overwhelmingly dominated by U.S. firms (Eden and Molot, 1993a; McFadyen, Hoskins and Finn, 2000; Stanbury and Vertinsky, 2004). Especially in Quebec, the need to preserve the French language was also an important cultural concern. The fear of “coca-colonization”, the global dominance of U.S. culture, was a common phrase heard in Canada.

Political concerns were also evident. For example, the film industry was one industry where culture and politics have been intertwined for many years (Acheson and Maule, 1991). Extraterritoriality, where the U.S. government asserted its legal jurisdiction not only over firms within the United States but also over foreign affiliates of U.S. multinationals and required them to abide by U.S. laws, was a second highly visible political issue in Canada. A specific example was the U.S. Trading with the Enemy Act where U.S. subsidiaries in Canada were not permitted to trade with Cuba. U.S. extraterritoriality generated a political and often nationalistic backlash in Canada (Vernon, 1971; Rugman, 1980, Chapter 9; Eden, 1993).

The combination of economic, political and socio-cultural concerns with the overwhelming dominance of U.S. inward FDI created a strong public sentiment in Canada favoring government protection of key sectors such as media and banking. The government, with strong public support, implemented a variety of restrictions on inward FDI, both broad-based (FIRA) and sectoral (e.g., petroleum), despite the economic costs of protectionism (Rugman, 1980; Safarian, 1983) and the lack of a national security justification for closing sectors to inward FDI (Kudrle, 1993). Elsewhere (Eden and Molot, 1993), I have called the 1970s and 1980s in Canada a time period of compensatory liberalism with strong overtones of nationalism.

### **The Social Responsibility of Multinationals: An Economics Lens**

Raised and educated during these years, in a small open economy sharing a border with the world’s largest hegemonic power, it was perhaps not surprising that I became interested in the impacts of

FDI on host countries, not only their economic impacts, but also their political and socio-cultural impacts.

My early years as an academic were spent reading and teaching from works on MNE-state relations by scholars such as John Dunning, Stephen Kobrin, Ted Moran, Alan Rugman, Edward Safarian, and Raymond Vernon. These publications, written almost wholly by economists, focused on the economic aspects of FDI and multinational enterprises (MNEs).

I taught my first undergraduate economics course on MNEs in 1984-1985 at Brock University, using Hood and Young (1979) as the textbook. In 1988, I began teaching a graduate course on MNEs after moving to the Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University in Ottawa, adding Caves (1982) as the textbook. In Spring 1993, I spent a semester team-teaching a (fabulous) graduate seminar on *MNEs and Public Policy* with Ray Vernon at the Kennedy School. After returning to the Paterson School and then later at Texas A&M University, I added Dunning's (1993b) magnum opus.

How did these books – and I – teach about the social responsibility of MNEs in this time period? The blunt answer is, basically as an after-thought. The core concept in my reading and my teaching during this period was a focus on FDI (the activity) rather than the MNE (the entity). FDI was “a package of capital, technology and management skills”, where the package had a variety of economic impacts on both the host and home countries. The available texts (e.g., Bergsten, Horst and Moran, 1980; Caves, 1982; Dunning, 1993b; Hood and Young, 1979) focused their analysis on the economic effects of FDI (e.g., impacts on GDP, trade, balance of payments, wages, technology, taxes) with some attention to the political impacts. Typically, there was a separate chapter on FDI in developing countries, and another on FDI regulatory policies. Political issues were discussed in terms of extraterritoriality (primarily U.S. based) and political risk (mostly in the context of expropriation of foreign investments in Latin America). However, the texts only briefly discussed socio-cultural issues (even less on the environment) and mostly under the rubric of “possible other impacts” of inward FDI on host countries.

A few scholars (e.g., Boddewyn, Kobrin, Moran, Strange, Vernon) were also keenly interested in MNE-state relations. Most work in this area was framed in terms of Vernon's *Sovereignty at Bay* and his model of the obsolescing bargain between MNEs and host country governments (Vernon, 1971). The

MNE and the Nation State were viewed as the two key actors in the world economy. They had different goals: the MNE's goal was singular and narrow (global after-tax profit maximization); the Nation State's goals were multiple and broad (economic, political and socio-cultural development and sovereignty). They brought different resources to the table: ownership advantages for the MNE; locational advantages for the State. They also faced different constraints: while the State was confined to its own jurisdiction (except where the home government resources and constraints of the two actors brought them into regular conflict, as conceptualized through the lens of the obsolescing bargain model (Eden, 1991; Vernon, 1971), which I later updated in the multi-party, multiple-round political bargaining model (Eden, Lenway and Schuler, 2005).

Only national governments – not MNEs -- cared about the socio-cultural impacts of FDI in these early models of MNE-state relations. There was no “social responsibility of MNEs”, only a singular focus on maximizing global profits. The business of business was profit maximization, very much as Milton Friedman argued. Differences across countries, both in resources and in government regulations, were simply opportunities for cross-border arbitrage. Government policies (e.g., taxes, tariffs, but also socio-cultural regulations such as local content rules) were modeled as “exogenous non-market imperfections” that offered arbitrage opportunities for the MNE. Such regulatory arbitrage could create a competitive advantage for the MNE over domestic firms and was therefore seen as one of the core advantages of multinationality. MNEs were viewed as efficient actors because they could arbitrage both exogenous market and non-market differences across countries. It is hard to believe now, looking back to the 1980s, that economists, including me (Rugman and Eden, 1985) viewed cross-border regulatory arbitrage by MNEs as potentially “efficient” and “welfare maximizing.” In fact, most of my early publications on transfer pricing were microeconomic models of MNEs manipulating transfer prices so as to avoid corporate income taxes, tariffs and other government regulations; Eden (2019) provides a recent review.

### **The Social Responsibility of Multinationals: An International Political Economy Lens**

My economic efficiency view of the MNE began to change at the end of the 1980s. When I

moved to the Paterson School at Carleton University, in January 1988 I began team-teaching the core seminar in International Political Economy (IPE) with a political scientist, in Spring 1988 with Michael Dolan and then for several years with Maureen Molot. We used Gilpin (1987) as the textbook supplemented with a huge reading list drawn mostly from IPE scholars. I also joined the International Studies Association (ISA), the professional association to which most IPE scholars belonged and where they presented their research. I realized that my IPE colleagues had very different – and typically much more critical – views of MNEs and FDI than did my colleagues in economics.

Critical/radical perspectives on MNEs and FDI -- including Marxist, neo-Marxist, post-colonialist, and deconstructionist lenses – were written primarily by political scientists and sociologists, mostly from the perspective of developing countries, e.g., Steven Cox, Gary Gereffi, Robert Gilpin, Dieter Ernst, Stephen Hymer, Raphael Kaplinsky, Alain Lipietz, Lynn Mytelka and Raul Prebisch. The core topics in this IPE literature on MNEs and FDI were uneven development (a.k.a. dependent development or dependencia) and third-world industrialism (a.k.a. global Fordism or the new international division of labor). IPE scholars were studying global value chains in the toys, garment and electronics industries, symbolized by the “nimble fingers” of children and women working for MNEs in export processing zones. Their critiques focused the developmental, cultural, social (including gender and human rights) and political impacts of FDI. Many authors were Canadian. Stephen Hymer, for example, whose 1960 MIT dissertation is now viewed as a founding cornerstone of MNE theory, was a Canadian neo-Marxist who wrote frequently (and negatively) on uneven development and the socio-cultural aspects of FDI (Dunning and Rugman, 1985; Cohen, Felton, Van Liere and Nkoi, 1979; Pitelis, 2002). Team-teaching the IPE seminar at Carleton with a political scientist and attending ISA conferences spilled over first my teaching, and then into my writing, on MNEs and FDI.

In 1991, at the repeated urgings of John Dunning and Alan Rugman, I joined the Academy of International Business (AIB). I learned that many AIB members were economists who had left economics departments to join departments of international business or management where they were engaged in “unpacking the black box” of the MNE. Here the MNE (the actor), not FDI (the action) or the nation

state, was the unit of analysis.

Also unlike the economists, IB scholars were working on socio-cultural issues related to MNEs. A core research question was the impact of cultural distance on MNE strategies and structures, building on Kogut and Singh (1988) and Hofstede (1980). Many IB scholars (e.g., Nancy Adler, John Child, Rosalie Tung) were also engaged in building the new field of cross-cultural management (Adler, Doktor and Redding, 1986).

As of 1991, I was now listening to and participating in three different conversations: the first among IPE scholars (at ISA meetings), the second, among economists (American and Canadian Economics Association meetings), and third, among IB scholars (AIB meetings). I realized that the core unit of analysis differed for the three groups: for IPE scholars, it was the government/nation state; for economists, the economic impacts of FDI; and for IB scholars, the MNE.

Eden (1991) was my first attempt to bridge the divide among the three conversations. I brought together IPE and IB scholars for an ISA panel honoring Raymond Vernon; the papers later became a 1991 special issue of *Millennium*. Looking back at these papers, I now recognize that Casson (1991) was an early, prescient exploration of how socio-cultural differences need and could be brought into the theory of the MNE. My own paper in the special issue discussed the various “faces” of the MNE in the international political economy (IPE) and international business (IB) literatures. I argued that IPE scholars needed to “bring the firm back in” by “opening the black box” of the MNE and explored various ways to bridge the conversations (Eden, 1991: 218).

I followed up with a co-edited book (Eden and Potter, 1993) bringing together IPE and IB scholars to discuss where MNE-state relations were headed in a world that was rapidly globalizing. My introductory chapter (Eden, 1993), starts out referencing an IBM advertisement showing a world map dotted with blue pins for IBM offices, entitled “Thinking globally?” While the book’s focus was clearly on economics and politics, socio-cultural issues were also highlighted. John Dunning’s chapter, for example, acknowledged the non-economic costs of cross-border production by MNEs, including “the export of unacceptable health, safety, and environmental standards, and the erosion of country-specific

social norms and cultures” (Dunning, 1993a: 72). Alan Rugman’s chapter was particularly prescient:

“Multinational enterprises are in business; they are not social agencies. Yet over the next decade there will be more criticism of the performance and social responsibility of multinational enterprises, including their linkage to the environment. The single goal of efficient economic performance through a simplistic globalization strategy will be compromised by the need for the multinational enterprises to be more responsive to social needs and national interests.” (Rugman, 1993: 87).

I also began to bring socio-cultural issues into my own research on MNEs, much of it co-authored with Maureen Molot on Canada-U.S. Free Trade, NAFTA and the auto industry. An early piece was Eden and Molot (1993b) where in one section we discussed how Japanese auto assemblers (e.g., Honda) had started to engage in corporate philanthropy and community outreach in the United States – and then advertise about these activities in U.S. newspapers! We argued that corporate social activities were a way foreign MNEs could demonstrate they were good “corporate citizens” and “insiders” in a host country. I believe this may be one of the first papers to argue (in today’s language) that CSR could be a coping mechanism for liability of foreignness.

A related set of insights came from the NAFTA negotiations where labor and environmental issues were critical issues in the debates in all three countries. *Multinationals in North America* (Eden, 1994) explored how North American insider and outsider MNEs were likely to respond to NAFTA, the first regional integration arrangement involving both rich and poor economies. The book chapters examined not only the likely economic and political impacts but also social and environmental impacts. For example, Mayer (1994) compares and contrasts the labor and environmental negotiations, documenting the important role played by “interest groups” (what we now call “civil society” or “non-governmental organizations (NGOs)”).

### **The Social Responsibility of Multinationals: An International Business Lens**

In 1995, I moved as a tenured associate professor to the Management Department at Texas A&M



University where my new colleagues were experts in the various subfields of management, most of which were new to me. I began to read the international strategy literature, focusing on transaction cost, institutional and resource based perspectives. I started teaching undergraduate International Business (IB) and continued teaching my MNEs course with Dunning (1993b) as the core text, switching later to Dunning and Lundan (1998), which introduced CSR into the “Political, Cultural and Social Issues” chapter for the first time. By the end of the 1990s, I was finally covering international CSR in my graduate seminar on MNEs!

My own work related to the social responsibility of MNEs expanded has broadened into at least three directions since the end of the 1990s. I discuss each in turn below: (1) MNE-state relations and globalization, (2) culture, corruption and liability of foreignness, and (3) global governance.

#### ***MNE-State Relations and Globalization***

Raymond Vernon’s death in August 1999 led Stefanie Lenway and I to put together a panel honoring him at the Academy of International Business meetings in November 1999. Revised versions of these papers were published in a *Journal of International Management* Special Issue in 2000.

My paper (Eden, 2000) focused on Vernon’s work on MNE-state relations over 30 years. I noted that a key shift between his earlier writings and his last book (Vernon, 1998) was that he now viewed the MNE and its home country as potentially antagonistic. Vernon (1998) argued that the uneven distribution of benefits from market openness (e.g., globalization, free trade agreements) within the Triad countries was likely to create a social and political backlash against MNEs because they would be seen as the primary cause (and beneficiaries) of market openness. His particular concerns were the social welfare net, ageing populations, employment, and MNE tax avoidance. Vernon (1998) also continued to see MNE-host country relations as antagonistic, with two new catalysts on the horizon. First, privatization and liberalization in emerging and transition economies were creating the potential for a political backlash against inward FDI. Second, he argued that extraterritoriality would no longer only be a U.S. issue because the rise of state-owned MNEs from emerging and transition economies would make them vulnerable to pressures from their own governments to engage in extraterritoriality. As I look back now at

Vernon (1998), 21 years later, his concerns appears remarkably – but perhaps not surprisingly given how ahead of his time Vernon typically was -- prescient.

The following year, Stefanie Lenway and I guest edited a Special Issue of the *Journal of International Business Studies (JIBS)* on “Multinationals: The Janus Face of Globalization.” Our introductory paper (Eden and Lenway, 2001) argued that MNEs had three roles in the global economy: market-making firms, investment bridges, and agents of change. While academics viewed the roles of MNEs positively, the general public and NGOs did not. They saw MNEs as powerful actors sowing social, cultural and environmental havoc around the world, that is, as the Janus Face of Globalization. We ended with the call for IB scholars to devote more time to studying the costs as well as the benefits of MNEs and globalization.

Stefanie Lenway and I continued to write together. Eden, Lenway and Schuler (2005) updated Vernon’s obsolescing bargain model to today’s realities of multiple actors and multiple iterated bargains. Schuler, Lenway and Eden (2006) analyzed uneven development theory at the turn of the millennium (that is, in a globalized world of MNEs engaged in knowledge competition, international strategic alliances, and – yes! – corporate citizenship). We discussed whether the search by MNEs for low-cost production locations would generate a “race to the bottom” in terms of labor, environmental and taxation (a concern in Vernon (1998) given what he viewed as toothless international codes of conduct). We concluded this was unlikely given the new and important role that NGOs were playing in terms of pressuring MNEs to engage in corporate citizenship.

### ***Culture, Corruption and Liability of Foreignness***

I also began to work with Stewart Miller, who was writing on the concept of liability of foreignness. Eden and Miller (2004), the first of my many publications with Stewart, deconstructed the costs of doing business abroad into two groups: hard (economic) costs and liability of foreignness (LOF), the soft (socio-cultural) costs. The piece explored how different types of institutional distance (regulatory, normative and cognitive) could affect LOF and the MNE’s choice of entry mode into a host country. We then modeled differences in types and levels of culture and corruption, as forms of institutional distance,

and theorized about their impacts on MNE strategies. This was my first paper – published 15 years ago -- where socio-cultural issues were “front and center” in my analysis of MNEs.

My interest in thinking about how differences in types and levels of corruption across countries could influence MNE strategies led me to invite two assistant professors in my department, Peter Rodriguez and Klaus Uhlenbruck, to work with me writing a paper on MNEs and corruption, in response to a Call for Papers at *Academy of Management Review*. We published three papers on MNEs and corruption together out of that project (Doh, Rodriguez, Uhlenbruck, Collins and Eden, 2003; Rodriguez, Uhlenbruck and Eden, 2005; and Uhlenbruck, Rodriguez, Doh and Eden, 2006), and (see below) a Special Issue of the *Journal of international Business Studies (JIBS)*. I later wrote a fourth paper with other coauthors (Lee, Oh and Eden, 2010).

Whiles socio-cultural issues have not been front and center in most of my more recent work with Stewart Miller, there have been some exceptions. In particular, we have built on Eden and Molot’s (1993b) early insight that corporate social activities could help foreign MNEs obtain legitimacy and insider status in host countries. Eden and Miller (2010), for example, argued that Chinese MNEs entering the U.S. market should use CSR activities to improve their social embeddedness and be perceived more as insiders. We have also tested whether using CSR as a coping mechanism could positively affect MNE performance, and whether CSR activities were related to institutional distance. Campbell, Eden and Miller (2012) and Miller, Eden and Li (forthcoming) examine the CSR activities of banks of different nationalities in the U.S. market, where CSR is defined as going “above and beyond” the mandated requirements of the Community Reinvestment Act.

The mid-2000s were the time period when international CSR really began to emerge as a mainstream research area for IB scholars, as documented in Pisani, Kourula, Kolk and Meijer’s (2017) review of research published between 1985 and 2015. They found that less than 10 publications per year occurred between 1985 and 2002. The first “big jump year” was 2006 when the *JIBS* Special Issue “Three Lenses on the Multinational Enterprise: Politics, Corruption and CSR” was published (Pisani et al. 2017: 595 and Online Appendix). I wrote the proposal, invited the guest editors, and was the *JIBS* Inside Editor

on that issue. Our introductory paper (Rodriguez, Siegel, Hillman and Eden, 2006) reviewed the literature on MNEs and each “lens” and discussed potential linkages and agendas for future research. We noted (consistent with Pisani et al., 2017) that, “Of the three lenses on the MNE, the literature on multinationals and CSR is the most embryonic” (Rodriguez et al. 2006: 736).

### ***Global Governance and MNEs***

Eden and Hampson (1997) was, for me, one of my most significant attempts to bridge the conversations in business, economics and political science.<sup>3</sup> In “Clubs Are Trump” Fen Hampson and I built a theory of international governance structures, exploring which structures were likely to emerge under four types of international structural failures: efficiency, distributional, macroeconomic and security. We modeled both private and public responses to these structural failures including, for example, trade associations, MNEs, bilateral treaties and international regimes. Some industries such as petroleum, we argued, were highly controlled by both private (MNEs) and public (OPEC) international governance institutions. Other industries (e.g. services) were low control, dominated by local firms with little to no international regulation.

Two of the four international structural failures Eden and Hampson (1991) explored fall clearly under the “global social responsibility” umbrella discussed in this book: efficiency and distribution. We argued that efficiency failures were driven by the gap between private and social costs and benefits. International governance structures could reduce “collective social bads” (e.g., environmental spillovers, tragedy of the commons) and nurture “collective social goods” (e.g., information sharing, international trade). We viewed international codes of conduct and bilateral investment treaties as possible ways to regulate MNE noncompetitive behaviors. Distributional failures, the gap in income between rich and poor individuals within and across countries, we argued mattered more to governments than to MNEs given differences in their goals. We viewed the international trade (GATT) and debt (World Bank, IMF) regimes as international regime responses to distributional failures.

---

<sup>3</sup> The piece has had very few citations so clearly others have not agreed with me!

We were not alone, of course, in discussing international codes of conduct as a way to reduce the unethical (deliberate and unintended) behaviors of MNEs including, for example, bribery, environmental spills, child labor, and human rights violations. Such discussions had been going on at the United Nations and OECD since the early 1970s and became particularly salient after the 1984 Union Carbide chemical plant spill in Bhopal, India. Much has been written on the efficacy of codes of conduct, both internally developed by and externally imposed on, MNEs, especially in terms of human rights, socio-cultural and environmental issues. See, for example, Langlois and Schlegelmilch (1990), Schlegelmilch and Robertson (1995), Robertson and Fadil (1998) and Monshipouri, Welch and Kennedy (2003).<sup>4</sup>

I cannot close out this time period without also referring to John Dunning's book, *Making Globalization Good: The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism* (Dunning, 2003), which brought together many leading thinkers from economics, religion and business to discuss ethical and social issues of multinationals in the global economy. Many international business scholars including, among others, Petra Christmann, Jonathan Doh, Ans Kolk, Hildy Teegen, Rob van Tulder were also writing during these years on social and environmental issues and NGOs. At the end of the 2010s, as we move into the decade of the 2020s, the field of global social responsibility, especially within international business scholars, is now well established.

---

<sup>4</sup> Almost all of Raymond Vernon's works from Vernon (1971) through Vernon (1998) also discuss international codes of conduct, albeit with a jaundiced view as Vernon regarded non-binding codes without punishments attached as basically window-dressing. My own view historically was the same as Vernon's. Today, with Twitter and the iniquitousness of social media, "naming and shaming" MNEs that sign and do not comply with codes of conduct, even voluntary ones, are likely to have their reputations damaged by non-compliance. See, for example, the Cargill case documented in Yaffe-Bellany's (2019).

### **The Social Responsibility of Multinationals: New Insights from Schlegelmilch and Szócs (2020)**

This ends my brief trip through the last 50 years, looking at how academics, particularly in Canada and the United States have viewed the social responsibility of business in a global context from the perspectives of economics, IPE and international business. I argued that from 1970 through the early 2000s, the social responsibility of MNEs was a mostly an after-thought topic for economics and international business scholars. The only real exception has been MNE-state relations. International political economy (IPE) scholars during these years were much more engaged in studying MNEs and social responsibility, primarily from a radical/critical perspective, where they focused on the social impacts of FDI on developing host countries, particularly in Africa and Latin America. Since the millennium, however, much more attention has been paid by economists and IB scholars to the social (broadly defined) responsibility of MNEs in a global context. Pisani et al. (2017: 595), for example, reports that there are now between 50 and 60 scholarly publications each year on international CSR.

Clearly, the social responsibility of multinationals is now a well-established domain of inquiry. Where the field is now and where it is going is the theme of the new book by Bodo Schlegelmilch and Iona Szócs that you have in your hands. Does this new book offer “rethinking” to the informed reader? Have I rethought my own conceptualization of the topic after reading this book? The short answers are yes and yes. Let me enumerate a few reasons why I think the book is innovative and believe you will find it to be also.

First, the definition of “social issues” has clearly broadened significantly over the years. Originally conceived as cultural and social issues, the term is now broadly and holistically defined to include such issues as environmental protection, education, health, human rights, gender, poverty relief, and workforce conditions. “Social issues” is now a broad umbrella that includes almost everything -- except economics and business (market) issues. Thinking about the implications of such a broad definition of “social issues” for MNEs is going to be a critically important issue in the next decade.

Second, the terms “CSR” and “social responsibility” have also broadened and are now viewed as generators of collective value. Social responsibility now involves not only minimizing the negative

aspects of business but also fighting societal challenges and taking a pro-active role in international development. In my research (e.g., Rodriguez et al., 2010; Campbell et al., 2012; Miller et al., forthcoming) CSR was narrowly defined as “going above and beyond” minimum mandated levels of governmental social (including environmental) regulations. Szócs and Schlegelmilch, however, argue that the definition of CSR must move beyond voluntary compliance and “doing no harm” to a much higher and broader standard: a “restorative” or “net positive” approach (Chapter 3: 2). Engaging in “net positive” CSR means MNEs must pro-actively lead by moving the standards bar higher over time.

Third, as Szócs and Schlegelmilch argue in Chapter 1, the new role for business in society requires that MNEs become deliberate agents of change in terms of social issues. The authors argue that, historically, the United Nations (UN) played an important role in broadening both the concept and agenda for social issues, starting with the 1987 Brundtland Report and the 1992 UN Conference on the Environment and Development. The 2015-2030 UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which built on the earlier 2000-2015 UN Millennium Development Goals, imply that “sustainability demands an integration of social and environmental issues with economic issues” (Chapter 1: 4). The authors argue that this means not only governments, but also business and NGOs, must serve society and address global problems. The private sector has the means (resources and capabilities) to advance sustainability and should engage in multi-stakeholder partnerships with governments and NGOs. This activist role for MNEs in terms of social responsibility also goes well beyond my own work in this area. Eden and Hampson (1997), for example, in their discussion of efficiency and distributional structural failures, were much more cautious about the private sector role in solving these problems.

Fourth, CSR has been criticized for its ad-hoc nature and lack of strategic purpose within MNEs. A key linchpin in Szócs and Schlegelmilch’s argument is that MNEs must move their intellectual frame from CSR to “corporate social strategy.” CSR must be viewed strategically and dynamically linked to corporate strategy. Szócs and Schlegelmilch in Chapter 3 develop a five-step CSR strategy roadmap:

1. Corporate aspiration: What do we want to achieve?
2. Scope of CSR: Where will we play?

3. Rules of Engagement: How will we win?
4. Capabilities and Causes: What capabilities must we have?
5. Management Systems: What management systems do we need?

Step 1 involves connecting CSR initiatives to the MNE's core business purpose in terms of mission and vision statements. Step 2 defines the playing field or "reach" of the firm's CSR activities. Here the authors argue that the firm should focus on those CSR issues most closely tied to the firm's objectives. Industry context and issues are likely important contextual factors so an industry-specific approach to CSR is likely warranted. The authors argue for three forms of CSR actions: market driven, standards based and operational based. As an example, the authors discuss the food industry where a "higher nutrition" goal as a corporate social strategy might lead the firm to redesign more healthy products, set internal healthy food standards, and redesign its global value chain to generate less waste.

Step 3, rules of engagement, involves integrating CSR into day-to-day management and execution. Support from top executives is viewed as vital as is communication with stakeholders. The authors discuss the benefits and costs of various types of communication with stakeholders, linking the choice to fit with corporate objectives and strategies. Step 4 involves matching the firm's resources and capabilities with its core business and fitting its CSR activities in ways that best fit the firm's overall strategy. Finally, step 5 is about setting up management systems that foster, support and measure the effects of the firm's CSR strategy. The five steps are viewed by the authors as a cascading iterative and ongoing process with the long-run goal of moving CSR from an ad hoc activity into part of the firm's overall strategy portfolio.

Let me bring a real-world example to Chapter 3. I have been working with Niraja Srinivasan, a vice president and chief economist for transfer pricing and international tax at Dell Technologies in Austin, Texas. Working with Niraja at the November 2018 UNCTAD World Investment Forum, and after reading Chapter 3 in this book, I now believe that Dell is a good example of a U.S. multinational that is following the five-step mapping outlined in Chapter 3, of building CSR into its corporate and business level strategies. In 2013, Dell set up a "Legacy of Good" plan with three specific minimum CSR goals for



2020: recovering two billion pounds of used electronics; using at least 100 million pounds of recycled plastic and other sustainable materials; and volunteering five million community service hours (Dell Technologies, 2019a: 5). The MNE has now established its own 2030 sustainable development goals (Dell Technologies, 2019c) that focus on sustainability (the circular economy, where sustainability is carried out throughout the value chain), inclusion (equal opportunities for all), technology (digital access for all), and ethics (internal codes of conduct for ethics and privacy).

Fifth, another contribution of the book is its emphasis on CSR impact measurement and reporting. The authors argue that the European Commission has played a leading role by redefining CSR as business being responsible for its societal impacts. The Commission has now mandated disclosure by firms of their social and environmental policies. Many national governments are also moving to mandate CSR reporting. The authors also discuss the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), which since 1997, has provided a common sustainability reporting framework for firms. All of these actions the authors argue now mean that annual CSR reporting is a fact of life for large and medium-sized firms, many of which now tie this reporting to the UN SDGs. Here Dell Technologies is another good example of how MNEs can lead on social responsibility. Dell is reporting annually on its social responsibility goals as part of the GRI (Dell Technologies, 2019b). The firm has been on the Ethicsphere Institute's 2019 list of the "world's most ethical companies" and has been for six consecutive years (Dell Technologies, 2019c: 18).

A sixth contribution of the book is its exploring the difference between global business values and local realities. Chapters 1-3 focused on social responsibility from a global perspective. Chapter 4 asks whether MNE subsidiaries should implement top-down centralized CSR standards or more bottom-up locally responsive CSR strategies. This is, of course, a version of the Integration-Responsiveness (I-R) framework that IB scholars use to explore four types of international business strategy. While the authors do not reference the I-R matrix, their arguments for paying attention to the pressures for globalization versus local responsiveness also apply to international CSR strategies. Putting together the lessons from Chapters 3 and 4, a key takeaway is that MNEs should tailor their CSR strategies not only by industry but also by location – one size does not fit all.

My concern with this chapter is that local responsiveness could be used to justify a “lower common denominator” approach to global CSR by the MNE on the grounds that it is “simply too difficult to implement” a high CSR policy across different political and institutional environments. My own interpretation here is different. My thinking is that the MNE should be pro-active – by leading and moving the bar upwards – on global social responsibility by implementing its best world-wide practices across all of its subsidiaries. That is, a U.S. MNE should not simply implement its U.S. practices around the world but rather determine where its best practices lie within its affiliates (perhaps in Norway, Finland or Brazil) and implement those practices throughout the MNE group (including within the U.S. parent). That is a much higher standard, one that I view as shifting the MNE’s goal for global social responsibility to moving to the “highest common denominator” across its global footprint. This is, of course, a much higher and tougher definition of CSR than the one currently used in IB research.

Seventh, an interesting application of CSR strategy appears in the chapter on buffering and backfiring impacts of CSR during a crisis, written by Barbarossa and Murphy. The authors assume that firms are already engaging in CSR activities when a crisis erupts that is viewed as socially irresponsible (e.g., corporate misconduct, product recalls and so on). The questions are whether CSR positively (buffers) or negatively (backfires) moderates the impact of the negative crisis on firm performance. The authors extensively review the literature on this topic concluding that the jury is still out and point usefully to directions where more research is needed.

Let me add another real-world example here. A recent example of how failure to meet CSR commitments can be found in Yaffe-Bellany’s (2019) article in the *New York Times* about Cargill being labeled by the environmental advocacy group Mighty Earth as “the worst company in the world.” Cargill received this designation for its refusal to agree to a moratorium on buying soybeans grown in environmentally sensitive lands in Cerrado, Brazil, and its failure to meet its own published commitments on anti-deforestation. The article notes that as more MNEs start making public CSR commitments, there will be more that fail to meet these commitments and such failures are likely to be punished by stakeholders. This suggests that having measurable – and doable – CSR targets will be important for

MNEs if they wish to avoid them backfiring later on.

Lastly, the book then moves into individual country- and industry-level chapters written by other authors. Several chapters explore CSR practices and regulations in specific countries, for example, the United States, Egypt, Germany, Poland, India, Thailand and Colombia. CSR projects in three industries—bee keeping, brewing, and early childhood education – are included. These chapters usefully explore the points made in Section 1 on “Rethinking Global CSR.”

## **Conclusion**

This chapter started as a brief Foreword to Schlegelmilch and Szócs (2020) but has morphed over the course of writing this paper into a much longer piece on the history of the social responsibility of MNEs. The subject matter kept growing, reflecting the broadened umbrella of sub-topics that the book’s authors argue must be included in global social responsibility. I hope that reader will find the historical journey of interest and possibly a springboard for their own research.

My thanks to those scholars who have made the journey with me, as co-authors, colleagues, friends, mentors, students and teachers since the early 1970s. My apologies if I omitted something you thought should have been included. Every personal history has a point of view and a story to tell and each person’s intellectual journey is different. All errors and omissions are my own.

My overall takeaway is that global social responsibility as a field of inquiry moved significantly from a minor topic in 1970 to an issue in 2010, exploded in the last 10 years, and is poised to do so again. Corporate social responsibility is no longer an after-thought but is now front and center as a core concern for managers of multinational enterprises. Scholars in economics and international business need to catch up and do the same. The chapters in this book are a great start in that direction.

## References

- Acheson, Keith and Christopher Maule. 1991. Shadows Behind the Scenes: Political Exchange and the Film Industry. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 20.2: 287-307.
- Adler, Nancy J., Robert Doktor and S. Gordon Redding. 1986. From the Atlantic to the Pacific Century: Cross-Cultural Management Reviewed. In J.G. Hunt and J.D. Blair (editors). *1986 Yearly Review of Management of the Journal of Management*, 12.2: 295-318.
- Bergsten, C. Fred, Thomas Horst and Theodore Moran. 1980. *American Multinationals and American Interests*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Broomhill, Ray. 2007. *Corporate Social Responsibility: Key issues and debates. Dunstan Paper No. 1*. Adelaide, Australia: Don Dunstan Foundation.
- Campbell, Joanna Tochman, Lorraine Eden and Stewart R. Miller. 2012. Multinationals and Corporate Social Responsibility in Host Countries: Does Distance Matter? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43: 84-106.
- Casson, Mark. 1991. Modelling the Multinational Enterprise: A Research Agenda. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 20.2: 271-285.
- Caves, Richard E. 1982. *Multinational Enterprise and Economic Analysis*. First edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Robert B., Nadine Felton., Morley Nkosi, and Jaap van Liere. (editors). 1979. *The Multinational Corporation: A Radical Approach. Papers by Stephen Herbert Hymer*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Dell Technologies. 2019a. *FY19 Corporate Social Responsibility Report: A Progress Report on our 2020 Plan*. Austin, TX: Dell Technologies.
- Dell Technologies. 2019b. *GRI Content Index, FY 2019*. Austin, TX: Dell Technologies.
- Dell Technologies. 2019c. *Progress Made Real: How Dell Technologies is focusing to make the most meaningful social impact*. Austin, TX: Dell Technologies.
- Doh, Jonathan, Peter Rodriguez, Klaus Uhlenbruck, Jamie Collins, Lorraine Eden. 2003. Coping with

- Corruption in Foreign Markets. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17.3: 114-127.
- Dunning, John H. 1993a. Governments and Multinational Enterprises: From Confrontation to Cooperation? In Lorraine Eden and Evan H. Potter (editors). *Multinationals in the Global Political Economy*. London and New York: Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press, pp. 59-78.
- Dunning, John H. 1993b. *Multinational Enterprises and the Global Economy*. First edition. Addison Wesley.
- Dunning, John H. (editor). 2003. *Making Globalization Good: The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dunning, John H. and Sarianna Lundan. 2008. *Multinational Enterprises and the Global Economy*. Second edition. Addison Wesley.
- Eden, Lorraine. 1991. Bringing the firm back in: Multinationals in international political economy. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 20(2): 197–224.
- Eden, Lorraine. 1993. Thinking Globally – Acting Locally: Multinationals in the Global Political Economy. In Lorraine Eden and Evan H. Potter (editors). *Multinationals in the Global Political Economy*. London and New York: Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press, pp. 1-18.
- Eden, Lorraine. 1994a. Multinationals in North America: An Introduction to the issues. In Lorraine Eden (editor). *Multinationals in North America*. Industry Canada Research Series, Volume 3. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, pp. 1-21.
- Eden, Lorraine (editor). 1994b. *Multinationals in North America*. Industry Canada Research Series, Volume 3. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Eden, Lorraine. 2000. The Realist Adjusts the Sails: Vernon and MNE-State Relations over Three Decades. *Journal of International Management*, 6: 335-342.
- Eden, Lorraine. 2019. The Economics of Transfer Pricing: Looking Back, Thinking Forward. In Lorraine Eden (editor). *The Economics of Transfer Pricing*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Eden, Lorraine and Fen Hampson. 1997. Clubs Are Trump: The Formation of International Regimes. In Russell Boyer and Rogers Hollingsworth (editors). *Contemporary Capitalism: The*

- Embeddedness of Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 361-394.
- Eden, Lorraine and Maureen Appel Molot. 1993a. Canada's National Policies: Reflections on 125 Years. *Canadian Public Policy /Analyse de Politiques*, 19.3 (September) 232-251.
- Eden, Lorraine and M.A. Molot. 1993b. Insiders and Outsiders: Defining 'Who Is Us?' in the North American Auto Industry. *Transnational Corporations* 2.3 (December): 31-64.
- Eden, Lorraine and Stefanie Lenway. 2001. Introduction to the Symposium "Multinationals: The Janus Face of Globalization." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32.3: 383-400.
- Eden, Lorraine, Stefanie Lenway and Douglas Schuler. 2005. From the Obsolescing Bargain to the Political Bargaining Model. In Robert Grosse (ed.) *International Business-Government Relations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 253-271.
- Eden, Lorraine and Stewart Miller. 2004. Distance Matters: Liability of foreignness, institutional distance and ownership strategy. In M.A. Hitt & J.L.C. Cheng (eds.), *The Evolving Theory of the Multinational Firm. Advances in International Management*. Volume 16, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands, pp. 187-221.
- Eden, Lorraine and Stewart Miller. 2010. Revisiting Liability of Foreignness: The Socio-Political Hazards facing Chinese Multinationals in the United States of America. In Karl Sauvart (editor). *Is the United States Ready for Foreign Investment from China?* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Edgar, pp. 122-141
- Eden, Lorraine and Evan H. Potter (editors). 1993. *Multinationals in the Global Political Economy*. London and New York: Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press.
- Gilpin, Robert. 1987. *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hofstede, Geert. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hood, Neil and Stephen Young. 1979. *The Economics of Multinational Enterprise*. London: Longman.
- Kogut, Bruce and Harbir Singh. The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of*

- International Business Studies*, 19.3: 411-32.
- Kudrle, Robert. 1993. No Entry: Sectoral Controls on Incoming Direct Investment in Developed Countries. In Lorraine Eden and Evan H. Potter (editors). *Multinationals in the Global Political Economy*. London and New York: Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press, pp. 142-167.
- Langlois, Catherine C. and Bodo B. Schlegelmilch. 1990. Do Corporate Codes of Ethics Reflect National Character? Evidence from Europe and the United States. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21.4: 519-539.
- Lee, Seung-Hyun, Kyeungrae Oh and Lorraine Eden. 2010. Why do firms bribe? Insights from residual control theory into firms' vulnerability and exposure to corruption. *Management International Review*, 50: 775-796.
- Mayer, Frederick. 1994. The NAFTA, Multinationals and Social Policy. In Lorraine Eden (editor). *Multinationals in North America*. Industry Canada Research Series, Volume 3. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, pp. 509-525.
- McFadyen, Stuart, Cohn Hoskins and Adam Finn. 2000. Cultural industries from an economic-business perspective. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 25.1 (winter): 127-144.
- Miller, Stewart R., Lorraine Eden and Dan Li. Forthcoming. CSR Reputation and Firm Performance: A Dynamic Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Monshipouri, Mahmood, Claude E. Welch, Jr., and Evan T. Kennedy. 2003. Multinational Corporations and the Ethics of Global Responsibility: Problems and Possibilities. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 25.4: 965-989.
- Pisani, Niccolò, Arno Kourula, Ans Kolk and Renske Meijer. 2017. How global is international CSR research? Insights and recommendations from a systematic review. *Journal of World Business*, 52: 591-614.
- Pitelis, Christos N. 2002. Stephen Hymer: Life and the political economy of multinational corporate capital. *Contributions to Political Economy*, 21: 9-26.
- Robertson, Chris and Paul A. Fadil. 1998. Developing Corporate Codes of Ethics in Multinational Firms:

- Bhopal Revised. *Journal of Managerial Studies*, 10.4 (Winter): 454-468.
- Rodriguez, Peter, Don Siegel, Amy Hillman and Lorraine Eden. 2006. Three Lenses on the MNE: Politics, Corruption and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of International Business Studies* 37, 733–746.
- Rodriguez, Peter, Klaus Uhlenbruck and Lorraine Eden. 2005. Government Corruption and the Entry Strategies of Multinationals. *Academy of Management Review*, 30.2: 383-396.
- Rugman, Alan M. 1980. *Multinationals in Canada: Theory, Performance, and Economic Impact*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishing.
- Rugman, Alan M. 1993. Drawing the Border for a Multinational Enterprise and a Nation-State. In Lorraine Eden and Evan H. Potter (editors). *Multinationals in the Global Political Economy*. London and New York: Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press, pp. 84-100.
- Rugman, Alan M. and Lorraine Eden. 1985. Introduction. In Alan M. Rugman and Lorraine Eden (editors). *Multinationals and Transfer Pricing*. St. Martins and Croom Helm, pp. 1-10.
- Safarian, A. Edward. 1983. *Governments and Multinationals: Policies in the Developed Countries*. Washington, D.C.: British North-American Committee.
- Safarian, A. Edward. 1985. *FIRA and FIRB: Canadian and Australian Policies on Foreign Direct Investment*. Toronto: Ontario Economic Council/University of Toronto Press.
- Schlegelmilch, Bodo B. and Diana C. Robertson. 1995. The Influence of Country and Industry on Ethical Perceptions of Senior Executives in the U.S. and Europe. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26.4: 859-881.
- Schuler, Doug, Stefanie Lenway and Lorraine Eden. 2006. Multinational Corporations through the Uneven Development Lens. In Subhash C. Jain and Sushil Vachani (editors). *Multinational Corporations and Global Poverty Reduction*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Stanbury, William T. and Ilan B. Vertinsky. 2004. Economics, Demography and Cultural Implications of Globalization: The Canadian Paradox. *Management International Review, Special Issue on "Challenges of Globalization"*, 44.2: 131-156.



Uhlenbruck, Klaus, Peter Rodriguez, Jonathan Doh and Lorraine Eden. 2006. The Impact of Corruption on Entry Strategy: Evidence from Telecommunication Projects in Emerging Economies.

*Organization Science*, 17.3 (May-June): 402-414.

Vernon, Raymond. 1971. *Sovereignty at Bay: The multinational spread of U.S. enterprises*. New York: Basic Books.

Vernon, Raymond. 1998. *In the Hurricane's Eye: the Troubled Prospects of Multinational Enterprises*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yaffe-Bellany, David. 2019. From Environmental Leader to 'Worst Company'. *The New York Times*. July 30, pages B1 and B6.