



**Sustainable Supply Chain Management in a global context:
The perspective of emerging economy suppliers**

Journal:	<i>RAUSP Management Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	RAUSP-05-2022-0141.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Supplier perspective, Global supply chains, Sustainable supply chain management, Emerging economies, Developing economies, Systematic literature review

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Sustainable Supply Chain Management in a global context: The perspective of emerging economy suppliers

Abstract

Purpose: This paper investigates how the extant literature on Sustainable Supply Chain Management (SSCM) empirically explores the perspective of emerging economy suppliers operating in Global Supply Chains (GSCs). It thereby explains the role of emerging economy suppliers in determining the success of SSCM.

Design/methodology/approach: A systematic literature review of 41 empirical papers (published between 2007 and 2021) was conducted, involving both descriptive and thematic analyses.

Findings: Our findings demonstrate that emerging economy suppliers have a key role in SSCM, given their use of positive feedback loops to: (i) proactively create *remedies* to surpass barriers using their collaboration mechanisms, and (ii) exploit authentic sustainability outcomes as *reinforcements* to drive further sustainability initiatives. We also demonstrate that suppliers are particularly focused on the cultural and institutional dimensions of sustainability. Finally, we provide an explanatory analytical framework to reduce the institutional distance between buyers and their global suppliers.

Research implications: This review identifies avenues for future research on the role of emerging economy suppliers in SSCM.

Practical implications: Recognising remedies to surpass barriers and reinforcements to drive new actions can aid SSCM in GSCs and improve understanding between buyers and suppliers.

Social implications: The valorisation of cultural and institutional issues can lead to more responsible supplier interactions and improved sustainability outcomes in emerging economies.

Originality: This review only analyses the viewpoint of emerging economy suppliers, whereas prior SSCM reviews have focused on the buyer perspective. Thus we reduce supplier invisibility and institutional distance between GSC participants.

Keywords: Supplier perspective, global supply chains, sustainable supply chain management, emerging economies, developing economies, systematic literature review.

1. Introduction

Global Supply Chain (GSC) studies have indicated that the majority of global suppliers are based in emerging economy countries (Koberg & Longoni, 2019; Mani et al., 2018), with these suppliers being responsible for many supply chain activities (Jia et al., 2018; Li et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019). As Sustainable Supply Chain Management (SSCM) refers to managing supply chain flows according to various sustainability goals (Seuring & Müller, 2008), GSCs face specific SSCM-related challenges, including (i) emerging economy suppliers have a high impact on global emissions given that this is linked to the activities of extraction, production, and manufacturing (Li et al., 2018); (ii) the requirements of sustainability are commonly

1
2
3
4 stipulated by buyers from developed countries (Chen & Chen, 2019); (iii) the context where
5 these suppliers operate contrasts with the context of their buyers (Park et al., 2018; Sancha et
6 al., 2015; Zhu & Sarkis, 2007); and, consequently, (iv) there is a lack of comprehension from
7 focal companies in developed countries on why some suppliers adopt sustainability initiatives
8 successfully while others do not (Liu et al., 2019). Hence, it becomes necessary to better
9 understand the role of emerging economy suppliers in SSCM because it continues to be under-
10 researched in the literature (Jia et al., 2018; León-Bravo et al., 2022). Within this context, we
11 understand sustainability initiatives as actions to reduce global issues such as climate change,
12 poverty, inequality, and environmental degradation, as well as to promote peace and justice
13 (United Nations, 2023). Specifically, there is a need to understand the perspective of emerging
14 economy suppliers on how and why they implement sustainability initiatives and the factors
15 that impact the success of these initiatives in the context of SSCM.

16
17
18 To develop this understanding of SSCM from the perspective of emerging economy
19 suppliers, we used a systematic literature review method to provide a comprehensive
20 understanding of what has been published to date and identify avenues for future research. This
21 review makes an original contribution to the SSCM literature since prior reviews have either
22 focused on the perspective of the buyer (e.g., Koberg & Longoni (2019), who analyse
23 sustainability in GSCs focusing on governance mechanisms and supply chain configuration)
24 and/or do not distinguish the perspectives being analysed (e.g., Jia et al. (2018) who analyse
25 SSCM in emerging economies). In contrast, we focus entirely on the perspective of the
26 emerging economy suppliers and ask the following research questions:

27
28
29
30 *RQ: How does the extant literature on SSCM empirically explore the perspective of emerging
31 economy suppliers operating in GSCs? Specifically:*

32 (i) *How has this literature evolved?*

33 (ii) *How do the main themes in this literature explain the role of emerging economy
34 suppliers in SSCM?*

35
36
37 We justify this focus as the viewpoint of emerging economy suppliers is relevant
38 because: (i) they are historically silenced voices (Touboulic et al., 2020); (ii) they suffer the
39 main consequences of climate change (Touboulic & McCarthy, 2020); and (iii) consumers and
40 focal company managers remain broadly apart from these contextual challenges (Touboulic &
41 McCarthy, 2020). Hence, this research moves the spotlight from buyer companies based in
42 developed countries to suppliers in emerging economy contexts with different needs,
43 institutional environments, cultures, and social-economic approaches (Fritz & Silva, 2018).

44
45 By focusing on emerging economy suppliers' perspectives, this paper contributes to the
46 literature in three ways. First, to the best of our knowledge, this review is the first to
47 comprehensively understand the need for positive feedback loops for suppliers to either apply
48 remedies to surpass existing barriers or reinforcements to drive new actions. Secondly, this
49 study reveals that the sustainability initiatives of emerging economy suppliers rely on
50 institutional and cultural issues, which deserve further attention from global buyers to increase
51 awareness and change buyer-supplier relationships. And thirdly, our analysis generates an
52 analytical framework that explains the main factors impacting the implementation and
53 effectiveness of sustainability initiatives in GSCs. Understanding these factors may reduce the
54 distance between buyers and suppliers, which influences SSCM (Busse, 2016) and otherwise
55 causes misunderstandings and operational difficulties (Jia & Zsidisin, 2014).

56
57 This analytical framework summarises and explains how suppliers see their role in the
58 context of SSCM in GSCs, and demonstrates that emerging economy suppliers play a vital role
59 in the success of SSCM. Specifically, it illustrates how they perceive drivers, mechanisms, and
60 barriers together with remedies and reinforcements to impact the outcomes of their

sustainability initiatives. In addition to our main contributions, throughout our analysis of the extant literature, we also highlight specific further avenues of research. Our analytical framework can be used to guide scholars in these further endeavours.

2. Theoretical Background

In recent years, interest in SSCM has increased, especially concerning developing and emerging economy countries (Jia et al., 2018; Silva et al., 2017). However, despite this growth, as mentioned by Pagell and Schevchenko (2014, p.1), 'our present knowledge is not sufficient to create truly sustainable supply chains.' Therefore, rather than simply considering the triple bottom line (TBL; Elkington, 2004), i.e., economic, environmental, and social issues in SSCM (Seuring & Müller, 2008), there is a need to include other issues closely related to emerging/developing economies (León-Bravo et al., 2022). Therefore, this study explores an extended TBL concept (so-called TBL+) including five dimensions: economic, social, environmental, cultural, and institutional (Fritz & Silva, 2018). Each TBL+ dimension is described below:

- *Economic sustainability* refers to the ability of organisations to generate positive financial/economic results (i.e., have capital flow and produce a constant long-term return) and promote economic growth/development (Magon et al., 2018; Vachon & Mao, 2008);
- *Social sustainability* refers to how organisations act to promote health and safety, support equality and workforce's well-being, and generate people's skills and capabilities to reach the needs of current and future generations by caring about individuals, local community, and social development beyond companies' boundaries (McKenzie, 2004; Stiglitz et al., 2010; Vachon & Mao, 2008);
- *Environmental sustainability* involves the rational and planned use of renewable and non-renewable natural resources by companies seeking to sustain global life-support systems (i.e., reducing consumption of natural resources and preferring natural regeneration, as in Goodland, 1995; Vachon & Mao, 2008);
- *Cultural sustainability* relates to concepts, values, and language used to support solutions for environmental and social problems (Soini & Birkeland, 2014). This may include established traditions (e.g., indigenous ancestral practices) and local shared beliefs and values (Fritz & Silva, 2018; León-Bravo et al., 2022; Silva et al., 2021); and,
- *Institutional sustainability* refers to support of sustainability policies to help organisational decision making to balance economic, social, and environmental interests (Pfahl, 2005). It also refers to regulatory and economic stability, the effectiveness of policy frameworks, and the level of informality and corruption (Fritz & Silva, 2018; Hoskisson et al., 2000; Silva et al., 2021; Silvestre, 2015; Silvestre et al., 2020; Wright et al., 2005; Wu & Jia, 2018).

The use of TBL+ as a framework of analysis is necessary due to the complexity attached to GSCs that comprise companies from diverse countries with differences in size, resources, profitability, and bargaining power (Agyemang et al., 2018; Awasthi et al., 2018). In addition, managing sustainability in GSCs is more challenging than in local supply chains due to the peculiarities of countries and the more significant number of stakeholders involved (Agyemang et al., 2018; Awasthi et al., 2018; Koberg & Longoni, 2019). Despite the complexities of this context, companies still need to identify, evaluate and manage impacts and risks related to sustainability throughout the supply chain (Awasthi et al., 2018; Muñoz-Torres et al., 2018). This is essential in modern globalised markets, given that sustainability is increasingly

1
2
3
4 becoming an important competitive advantage (Agyemang et al., 2018; Morais & Silvestre,
5 2018). Therefore, when crossing country borders, GSCs need to effectively inspire suppliers
6 from emerging economies to adopt their sustainability priorities (Morais & Silvestre, 2018;
7 Muñoz-Torres et al., 2018).

8
9 The relationship between SSCM and country development has been raised as an
10 important issue for conducting research and better understanding how sustainability has been
11 managed in emerging economies (Awasthi et al., 2018; Fritz & Silva, 2018; Jia et al., 2018;
12 Silva et al., 2021). The role of suppliers is crucial to disseminate sustainability throughout GSCs
13 (Azimifard et al., 2018; Guarnieri & Trojan, 2019). Therefore, identifying supplier roles helps
14 to better understand their reality and manage their engagement and reciprocity for sustainability
15 in GSCs (Soundararajan & Brammer, 2018). This can avoid an excessive focus on assessing
16 them and lead to new strategic relationships with these key partners through collaboration
17 (Koberg & Longoni, 2019). Nevertheless, the previous literature on sustainability in GSCs that
18 has focused on the mechanisms that lead to sustainability practices in emerging economy
19 countries indicates that the main driver for companies in this context is the pressures by key
20 stakeholders, mainly buyers, that assess suppliers using national and international standards, as
21 well as certification rules (Jia et al., 2018). Thus, collaboration is less common in the research
22 to date (Jia et al., 2018). However, where vertical/horizontal collaboration has been adopted as
23 a mechanism for implementing SSCM initiatives, this has led to higher levels of sustainability-
24 related performance (Jia et al., 2018; Koberg & Longoni, 2019). Therefore, collaboration
25 among supply chain partners can (i) facilitate important sustainability issues such as addressing
26 the global problem of modern slavery in the supply chain (Benstead et al., 2018); (ii) reduce
27 auditing/monitoring of supplier activities and (iii) reduce costs and enable innovation (Yawar
28 & Seuring, 2017). However, this type of global collaboration requires each partner to
29 understand the context of all other parties.

30
31
32
33 Research to understand the context of companies in emerging economy countries has
34 indicated that acting sustainably in GSCs can be a challenge mainly because their operational
35 context has more barriers compared to developed countries (Awasthi et al., 2018; Jia et al.,
36 2018; Liu et al., 2019; Park et al., 2018). These obstacles, also named *institutional voids*, include
37 a lack or weak existence of institutions in terms of infrastructure, market instability, social
38 inequalities, and informality (Silva et al., 2021; Silvestre, 2015; Tanco et al., 2018). Institutional
39 voids can affect companies' strategies and businesses due to their relevance for
40 emerging/developing economies (Khanna & Palepu, 1997; Silvestre, 2015). Internally, these
41 companies also face barriers related to weak organisational culture, lack of knowledge, and lack
42 of top-level management commitment to sustainability (Agyemang et al., 2018). Despite these
43 barriers, suppliers in emerging economies have adopted sustainability initiatives, and,
44 consequently, buyer and supplier sustainability performance has improved (Jia et al., 2018;
45 Koberg & Longoni, 2019). In particular, suppliers have benefited through
46 knowledge/technology from their international buyers (Jia et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019) and
47 built competencies enabling sustainability improvement for the entire GSC (Pereira et al.,
48 2023). Thus, when buyers have obtained knowledge regarding their suppliers' local context,
49 this facilitates the alignment of sustainability goals (Koberg & Longoni, 2019; León-Bravo et
50 al., 2022). In addition, Jia et al. (2018) evidenced positive outcomes linked to improvement of
51 operational practices and company reputation. Nonetheless, Jia et al. (2018) also argue that
52 outcomes from sustainability initiatives remain under-researched in the literature, particularly
53 those obtained by suppliers from emerging economy countries.

54
55
56
57 Some scholars argue that the studies that do investigate supplier sustainability have done
58 so mainly from a buyer's perspective (Jia et al., 2018), and the specific literature about supplier
59 sustainability predominantly relates to their selection and assessment by buyers (Kellner & Utz,
60 2019; Koberg & Longoni, 2019). This literature has therefore considered mainly North-Western

1
2
3
4 domestic problems and not global challenges/barriers (Park et al., 2018), with a need for
5 systematic analysis regarding the context of emerging economy suppliers' sustainability
6 initiatives (Liu et al., 2019). Therefore, a gap exists in identifying how local information
7 surrounding global suppliers could help make better decisions regarding SSCM in GSCs (Park
8 et al., 2018). In particular, research from emerging economy suppliers' perspectives can support
9 GSC managers and scholars in reducing the distance between buyers and suppliers. It is timely,
10 therefore, to take stock of the current literature understanding the perspective of emerging
11 economy suppliers on SSCM as a guide for further empirical studies and to identify the critical
12 gaps in our current understanding. To this end, this paper investigates this current understanding
13 in detail using a systematic literature review and identifies avenues for further research, as
14 described below.
15
16

17 18 **3. Research Method** 19

20 To address the research questions, we employed a systematic literature review method.
21 This method is appropriate to the research aims as it enables a state-of-the-art analysis of extant
22 studies in the emerging research area being investigated here by integrating the findings of all
23 relevant articles collected in a specified manner (Seuring & Gold, 2012). This systematic review
24 was undertaken using the following four-step process proposed by Seuring and Gold (2012):
25 (i) material collection; (ii) descriptive analysis; (iii) category identification; and (iv) material
26 evaluation, as described below.
27

28 *Material collection:* Three databases were used to search for relevant articles: the Web of
29 Science (WoS), Scopus, and Ebsco. WoS was selected because it is one of the leading research
30 databases in the international context and has a long-standing reputation in business literature
31 (Dahlander & Gann, 2010). Scopus was chosen because it contains many articles from
32 engineering studies (Siva et al., 2016) and therefore has the potential to identify articles relating
33 to production and operations management. Additionally, Ebsco was used to amplify the search
34 further. The searches within these databases were unrestricted in terms of academic discipline,
35 journals or dates of publication. The only general criteria used as filters were that the papers
36 were (i) classified as peer-reviewed articles and (ii) written in English. Although the searches
37 did not restrict the publication date, the first paper appeared in 2007, with publications covering
38 a period of 15 years, using the keywords:
39

- 40
41 (i) "supply chain*" AND
42 (ii) "supplier*" AND
43 (iii) "sustainab*" AND
44 (iv) "developing countr*" OR "developing econom*" OR "emerging econom*" OR
45 "emerging countr*" OR "global" OR "international" OR "export-oriented".
46
47

48 A total of 41 (out of 521) articles were selected for detailed analysis. The criteria for
49 exclusion at this point were: (i) triplicate/duplicate papers in the searches due to the multiple
50 combinations of keywords (256 out of 521) and (ii) fit of the paper to the research focus (i.e.,
51 the context that the study explores (Tranfield et al., 2003) (161 out of 265). To better refine the
52 theoretical framework in supply chain management reviews, it is crucial to analyse beyond the
53 title and abstract (Durach et al., 2017). Thus, the abstract, introduction, research method and
54 conclusion were evaluated to verify if the study data were obtained from the point of view of
55 suppliers from emerging economy countries acting in GSCs. Furthermore, given that this
56 research aim is to identify previous studies that gave voice to suppliers, we also analysed how
57 the data was collected (e.g., interviews or questionnaires) (Tranfield et al., 2003), ensuring that
58 the suppliers themselves had provided the data and that they had been asked about their
59 sustainability initiatives. Thus, other papers were excluded because they (i) considered the
60

buyers' perspective about their suppliers' sustainability initiatives (22); (ii) developed secondary data analysis (11) due to the lack of assurance of deeper investigation using the perspective of suppliers. This criterion relates to the aspect of research intervention suggested by Popay et al. (2006); (iii) analysed local supply chains instead of GSCs (4); (iv) analysed suppliers using data from both developed and emerging economies altogether (11); (v) were focused on mathematical modeling (9), or (vi) were developed as theoretical articles (6).

Descriptive analysis: To start the analysis, we first mapped the main characteristics of the articles, such as the evolution of publications over time and the journals in which they were published (Seuring & Gold, 2012). The following information was also thus identified and described: (i) country of study (Jia et al., 2018), (ii) sector analysed (Zorzini et al., 2015), (iii) main contributions of study (Jia et al., 2018), (iv) data collection technique (Bossle et al., 2016); (v) type of sustainability dimension studied (Touboulis & Walker, 2015); and (vi) theory used to support the study (Zorzini et al., 2015). In terms of sustainability, at this stage, the TBL dimensions (Elkington, 2004) were adopted as this has been the main approach adopted in the SSCM literature to date (Touboulis & Walker, 2015).

Category identification for thematic analysis: The main analysis was developed through deductive and inductive approaches using content analysis (Mayring, 2004; Seuring & Gold, 2012). As shown in Table 1, we used multiple definitions to conduct a deductive encoding process (Simsek et al., 2021) according to four themes of analysis: drivers, barriers, mechanisms, and outcomes. To better represent the main themes found in the papers analysed, we divided both drivers and barriers into two sub-themes: *internal* and *external* (Busse et al., 2016; Thong & Wong, 2018). In addition, the outcomes from sustainability initiatives were classified according to the TBL+ approach (Fritz & Silva, 2018), given that these additional themes (i.e., cultural and institutional) emerged during content analysis. Two other themes emerged from the inductive analysis but were also connected to the extant literature: *remedies* and *reinforcement*. The theme *remedies* first emerged from one of the analysed papers - Busse et al. (2016). *Reinforcements* were also added to show a more dynamic process, as the analysis suggested that some suppliers had implemented more sustainability initiatives due to positive outcomes from prior sustainability initiatives (Thong & Wong, 2018).

Table 1

Material evaluation: The final list of papers analysed was organised in an Excel file, facilitating the findings' transparency (Seuring & Gold, 2012). The detailed list and results are available upon request. The main findings within each theme are defined as those evidenced at least three times in the sample of articles, thus providing triangulation of evidence. Concerning internal validation, several rounds of analysis and categorisation were undertaken to ensure that all information presented in the selected articles was included. To ensure external validity, we presented the analysis results at an international conference on sustainable operations and supply chains so that other researchers and practitioners could both assess and comment on the review, as suggested by Seuring and Müller (2008).

4. Findings

This section presents the main results of the systematic literature review. Firstly, RQ(i) is addressed in section 4.1 below with a descriptive presentation of the evolution of the publications. In addition, RQ(ii) is addressed in section 4.2 (i.e., thematic analysis) to demonstrate all existing SSCM themes from a supplier perspective.

4.1. Descriptive Analysis

To address the evolution of the literature, Figure 1 illustrates the recent growth in the number of publications per year. While the earliest article identified was published in 2007, most papers were published between 2018 and 2021, demonstrating this literature review's timeliness.

Figure 1

These publications were identified in a range of 24 different journals (see Table 2), with the highest number of articles published in the Journal of Cleaner Production (5), International Journal of Production Economics (4), International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management (3), Journal of Business Ethics (3) and Supply Chain Management: An International Journal (3). For the majority of the journals only one publication was identified, indicating that various journals (e.g., agroecology and sociology) have published research relevant to this review. Therefore, this demonstrates that SSCM research is not limited to specific disciplines and may take a multi-disciplinary approach.

Table 2

Regarding additional details about these publications, the Supplementary Table summarises further information for the sample. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight the countries and sectors of the suppliers identified in the analysis. Concerning countries, the suppliers studied were mostly located in Asia (30) in comparison to Latin America (7) and Africa (4). Furthermore, an evolution was identified in our sample because, in the first years (2007-2014), only six papers were published (Asia [3], Latin America [2], and Africa [1]). The second half of the sample (2015-2021) shows 35 publications, including Asia (27), Latin America (5), and Africa (2). Concerning sectors, the articles were based on studies of companies operating in a variety of sectors, but mainly in the clothing (14) and food (13) industries. In addition, some articles (8) analysed multiple industries in the same research.

In terms of sustainability dimensions, the extant literature highlights the scarcity of studies that investigate the social dimension in SSCM research (Silva et al., 2017; Allaoui et al., 2018); however, in this review, we have found that most of the articles studied social aspects either in isolation or linked to other TBL dimensions (see Supplementary Table). Thus the review shows a shift of emphasis when studying a supplier perspective compared to prior reviews (mainly from a buyers perspective) that concluded that environmental and/or economic issues are more commonly studied (Seuring & Müller, 2008). This finding is significant given that these studies concern companies in emerging economies where social problems are more commonplace, and there is a lack of qualified workers (Silvestre, 2015). Furthermore, it acknowledges the importance of social sustainability in supply chains, which will later (section 4.2) be aligned with institutional and cultural issues (Fritz & Silva, 2018). This result highlights one of the potential reasons to explain the distance between developed country buyers and emerging economy suppliers as it illustrates that sustainability management has a greater emphasis on additional sustainability elements (i.e., cultural and institutional dimensions). These findings indicate that in emerging economies, SSCM is very linked to local development and improvement of social conditions.

4.2. Thematic Analysis

1
2
3
4 In answer to the second research question, the analysis below focuses on the following
5 six main themes: internal and **external drivers**; **mechanisms** of sustainable action; internal and
6 external **barriers** evidenced in this context; **remedies** (i.e., strategies to surpass barriers); the
7 main **outcomes** of sustainable action; and **reinforcements** to drive new actions. The overview
8 of papers can be checked in the Supplementary Table.
9

10 11 *4.2.1. External and internal drivers*

12
13 The main **external drivers** identified in our analysis were: buyers' stipulating
14 requirements, pressures by stakeholders, and local government regulations (see details in the
15 Supplementary Table). Buyer's stipulated requirements included certification adoption in 11
16 articles. In the further pursuit of buyer stipulated requirements, some studies emphasised the
17 importance of suppliers participating in the establishment of SC sustainability strategies (Paper
18 21; Paper 22). However, the suppliers' perception of justice prevented them from understanding
19 buyer requirements as a motivation to be more sustainable (Paper 21). When they do not fully
20 understand the targets for these requirements and how they can benefit from them, they consider
21 such requirements unfair. Pressures by the local community, NGOs/other stakeholders were
22 evidenced as a result of tragedies or instances of slave labour gaining prominence in the media
23 (Paper 28; Paper 13).
24

25
26 The main **internal drivers** identified were: organisational strategic orientation towards
27 sustainability; improvement of competitiveness; and top management commitment to
28 sustainability goals (see details in the Supplementary Table). For example, companies in the
29 clothing industry in Vietnam experienced increased social sustainability awareness after the
30 Rana Plaza incident in Bangladesh in 2013 (Paper 13). Thus, a new organisational strategic
31 orientation emerged as a consequence of this social tragedy, as it pushed them to act more
32 sustainably. Furthermore, the importance of sustainability goals was also found in the coffee
33 producer context, as their internal aim for adopting certifications was to increase company
34 learning (Paper 23). Thus, we found some internal and external drivers, which were inherently
35 linked to each other, given that internal changes towards their implementation of sustainability
36 initiatives were often motivated by external events.
37

38
39 The drivers evidenced above are similar to those presented by Jia et al. (2018); however,
40 new insights were identified due to our focus on the supplier perspective. For example, national
41 regulations strongly affected suppliers and acted as an additional driver. Scholars argue that in
42 emerging economies the national governmental laws on environmental impact and labour rights
43 are less strict and lack regulatory enforcement (Morais & Silvestre, 2018; Silva et al., 2021;
44 Silvestre, 2015). However, from the suppliers' perspective, we conclude that local government
45 regulations act as regulatory pressure. Therefore, future research is needed to understand how,
46 when, and why local regulation drives emerging economy suppliers to adopt more sustainability
47 initiatives.
48

49 50 *4.2.2. Mechanisms*

51
52 Mechanisms refer to how suppliers act sustainably (see the Supplementary Table).
53 Suppliers commonly adopted three mechanisms: collaboration with SC members and other
54 stakeholders such as universities, research centres and NGOs; sustainability certifications
55 programmes; and other formal governance mechanisms. In some cases, all three mechanisms
56 were studied together since they have close connections. Sustainability certification
57 programmes were spotted in this review as an action to access developed country markets
58 (Paper 4; Paper 23; Paper 9; Paper 11; Paper 3; Paper 13; Paper 35, Paper 36; Paper 41). For
59 example, Paper 9, studying Mexican suppliers, evidenced that export-oriented businesses need
60

1
2
3
4 to implement sustainability certification programmes because not having certifications can
5 hinder market entry. Paper 35 and Paper 23 evidenced the relevance of these certification
6 programmes as guides for implementing sustainability initiatives. Most papers scanned suggest
7 that suppliers believe that certification programmes are the primary tool to act sustainably,
8 which also links with how buyers evaluate them (Paper 4; Paper 23; Paper 28; Paper 13; Paper
9 24; Paper 9).

10
11 Research has also shown that this sustainability certification programme mechanism is
12 often linked to collaboration, as it is often how suppliers learn (Paper 35, Paper 36). Hence, the
13 collaboration that leads to successful accreditation has been an important mechanism for
14 suppliers to ensure that their sustainability initiatives are acceptable to their buyers (Paper 7;
15 Paper 12). In addition, training and raising the awareness of employees towards sustainability
16 has been shown to be a key means of changing employee culture (Paper 25) as well as being a
17 requirement of certifications (Paper 13).

18
19 Other formal governance mechanisms were identified to enable sustainability (e.g.,
20 Nespresso AAA programme of sustainable quality studied in Paper 4), which stipulate buyer
21 requirements that suppliers need to follow to improve the supply chain relationship and
22 strengthen trust and transparency throughout the supply chain. Additionally, the analysed
23 studies revealed the importance of non-traditional supply chain actors (i.e., NGOs, research
24 centres, universities) to support supplier sustainability initiatives as these actors help to
25 strengthen the supply chain relationships. Thus, a better understanding of the role of these non-
26 traditional supply chain actors in emerging economy suppliers' sustainability is required.
27 Sometimes, these governance mechanisms start informally and later become formal to
28 strengthen the relationships between organisations (Paper 4), and, in some cases, these
29 mechanisms are guided by certifications and go on to further improve management/efficiency
30 (Paper 23; Paper 36; Paper 37).

31
32 Other studies consider mechanisms to include the assessment/involvement of sub-
33 suppliers (Paper 29; Paper 31; Paper 32; Paper 41). Thus, this review emphasises the need to
34 study sustainability beyond the first tier to diffuse sustainability initiatives in other supply chain
35 tiers. Based on these findings, future research needs to investigate when and how emerging
36 economy suppliers use these mechanisms and how this affects sustainability in GSCs. For
37 instance, this focus on sub-supplier involvement with sustainability actions provides a multi-
38 tier perspective on GSCs to discover when suppliers disseminate sustainability. The use of these
39 mechanisms reveals new approaches for GSCs in which buyers are not only concerned about
40 certification requirements, but also identify how their suppliers change their sustainability
41 initiatives.
42
43
44

45 46 4.2.3. Barriers 47

48 Barriers were categorised into *internal* and *external* barriers (see details in the
49 Supplementary Table). First, lack of manager knowledge was the main *internal barrier*
50 evidenced. This barrier weakened buyer-supplier relationships and affected the suppliers'
51 reputation regarding sustainability (Paper 13). Secondly, non-monetary costs, such as changing
52 mentalities and cultures, can also act as an internal barrier to change (Paper 2; Paper 5). Thirdly,
53 financial constraints act as internal barriers, occurring when sustainability-related
54 adaptations/improvements demand high investments and suppliers do not receive additional
55 payment for making these changes (Paper 5; Paper 11). For example, the transition to organic
56 production by South African grape and wine producers was costly due to a lack of knowledge
57 leading to a gradual implementation through trial and error (Paper 1), acting as a long-term
58 investment for which there was no immediate payback.
59
60

1
2
3
4 In terms of *external barriers*, the contextual differences between buyers and suppliers
5 (Silva et al., 2021; Silvestre, 2015) were evidenced in a significant number of studies. These
6 differences included institutional and cultural settings that impact supplier operations (Silva et
7 al., 2021). In particular, some studies suggest that suppliers have complained that a lack of
8 buyers' understanding of these differences leads buyers to impose sustainability requirements
9 that do not correspond to the suppliers' context. For example, supplier managers have been
10 found to argue that their employees want to do overtime to gain additional payments, but this
11 contravenes certification/buyer rules on the number of hours of overtime allowed per day (Paper
12 5). In addition, Paper 8 and Paper 13 signaled that linguistic, geographical, and cultural
13 differences between buyers and suppliers could disrupt the negotiation process and working
14 practices. For example, Paper 8 suggests that linguistic distance affects communication leading
15 to inefficiencies in transmitting messages and loss of meaning. Their evidence indicates that
16 supplier managers often prefer to send emails rather than have calls due to difficulties using
17 buyer languages. Hence, sustainability efforts in supply chains may be hampered by
18 misunderstandings.

19
20
21 Another external barrier identified was the sustainability requirements imposed by
22 buyers. Although we often find these requirements in the literature as drivers for sustainability
23 (see Berardi & Brito, 2015), in our analysis, they were also identified as barriers in multiple
24 articles because of the imposition element. For example, Paper 21 evidenced that when focal
25 buyers simply impose codes of conduct for their suppliers without supporting them or asking
26 for suppliers' commitment, these codes/standards act only as a wish list. Thus the authors of
27 Paper 21 evidenced buyer's imposition of a code of conduct as an obstacle to supplier
28 engagement with sustainability. This confirms that some requirements can work as barriers
29 because (1) they are not connecting buyers and suppliers properly, (2) suppliers do not
30 understand how to achieve these requirements, or (3) they are not achievable in some emerging
31 economy contexts.

32
33
34 Weak national legislation and poor oversight in emerging economies acts as a barrier to
35 supplier sustainability initiatives (Paper 19; Paper 32; Paper 31). Lack of government support
36 was also evidenced as a barrier in some studies, with Paper 17 concluding that supportive
37 government tactics are more effective than punitive tactics. Local corruption was evidenced as
38 an additional barrier to supplier sustainability because the outcome of government inspections
39 is commonly influenced by bribes (Paper 5). Hence suppliers have avoided the consequences
40 of breaking the law through corruption (Paper 13). These barriers are very closely related to the
41 institutional voids presented in Section 2, which influence the dynamic of GSCs.

42
43
44 In summary, this research presents the following additional items to the literature in terms
45 of barriers faced by emerging economy suppliers: (i) contextual differences between buyers and
46 suppliers; (ii) unsupported sustainability requirements imposed by buyers; and (iii) non-
47 monetary costs of training/monitoring of changes. Our study, therefore, provides a fuller
48 understanding of the barriers faced by suppliers in emerging economy countries. Recognising
49 these barriers becomes important as it enables companies to develop strategies to overcome
50 them and to consider the role of various stakeholders and other supply chain agents in
51 improving SSCM (Jia et al., 2018). Thus, future research should explore how buyers can
52 support emerging economy suppliers to face these barriers to improve the supply chain's
53 sustainability.

54 55 56 4.2.4 Outcomes

57
58 The analysis of positive outcomes was developed according to the TBL+ perspective as
59 follows:
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Economic sustainability relates to some specificities of certification programmes triggering economic outcomes. For instance, supplier power to decide product prices was evidenced only when products were differentiated, such as by being organic (Paper 1; Paper 23). These outcomes are linked to the abovementioned barrier because most suppliers cannot take this decision as buyers require certifications/standards and stipulate the price to pay for products.

Social sustainability outcomes were highlighted as they were associated with improving employee well-being (Paper 1, Paper 2, Paper 5, Paper 6, Paper 13, Paper 34, Paper 41). For instance, suppliers indicated reduced absenteeism and employee turnover, which led to reduced workforce-related costs (Paper 2).

Environmental sustainability impacted supplier operations because these outcomes are related to reducing the use of natural resources within their production processes (Paper 3, Paper 7, Paper 12). In addition, an outcome identified that related directly to the agriculture sector was the improvement in water and soil use (Paper 12; Paper 3).

Cultural sustainability aspects were identified in terms of how increased sustainability understanding and awareness of managers and employees now influence the company daily operations (Fritz & Silva, 2018). For example, Paper 13 evidenced changes in the concepts applied in the SC processes as a result of worker sustainability training - for example, leading to improvements in buyer/supplier communication and a reduction of tensions due to their different cultural settings. In addition, Paper 7 found improvements in worker awareness and perception of the link between food safety and sustainability. This affected the shared beliefs and values.

Institutional sustainability outcomes were discussed in a considerable number of papers in terms of the institutional environment elements affecting business processes (Paper 1, Paper 2, Paper 5, Paper 7, Paper 10, Paper 13, Paper 14, Paper 15, Paper 19, Paper 22, Paper 23, Paper 36). Particularly, some papers showed that suppliers gained a better reputation for tackling poor quality policy frameworks as a result of these suppliers gaining visibility, legitimacy, and reliability in doing business due to certifications (Paper 23; Paper 13). Buyers feel more secure regarding supplier performance and the quality of processes and products when they have these governance mechanisms (Paper 7; Paper 5). Institutional outcomes have been vital in terms of GSCs sustainability management.

These findings increase our understanding of the advantages of SSCM since they do not focus on economic, social, and environmental dimensions alone but also include cultural and institutional outcomes (Fritz & Silva, 2018). Previous literature argued for the need for outcomes beyond the traditional TBL (e.g., Silva et al., 2021; Silvestre, 2015; Wu & Jia, 2018) for SSCM. Our study particularly reveals how sustainability dimensions have been crucial for emerging economy suppliers and their positive contribution to generating reinforcement feedback (see section 4.2.6). In particular, this review shows that the literature suggests that within an emerging economy context, institutional outcomes include improved supplier organisational processes leading to improved reputation in the international market/GSC. Thus, future research should further explore suppliers' and sub-suppliers' institutional and cultural dimensions to understand how they act sustainably according to these dimensions and the resulting outcomes.

4.2.5 Remedies

In contrast to other reviews, we identified the existence of remedies as positive feedback actions developed by companies to create strategies to surpass barriers related to their sustainability initiatives. These remedies were classified as (i) strengthening of partnerships; (ii) close communication with other suppliers; and (iii) intensification of sustainability

1
2
3
4 knowledge sharing. Remedies are consciously planned management efforts to mitigate
5 obstructive effects associated with one or more barriers (Paper 8). They represent internal
6 planning on surpassing barriers and becoming more sustainable based on their needs and lack
7 of knowledge. Remedies are commonly developed by suppliers without the influence of buyers
8 (i.e., they are actions to remedy supplier losses or weaknesses). Thus, by analysing the papers,
9 we found that when emerging economy suppliers face barriers (mainly a lack of sustainability
10 knowledge to achieve buyer/certification/legislation requirements), these remedies were
11 applied: strengthening of partnerships (Paper 2, Paper 8, Paper 10, Paper 22, Paper 35, Paper
12 36); close communication with other suppliers (Paper 19; Paper 7; Paper 35, Paper 36); and
13 intensification of sustainability knowledge sharing (Paper 7, Paper 10, Paper 12, Paper 19,
14 Paper 35, Paper 36).

15
16 Remedies involve, therefore, a localised way to solve problems. For example,
17 partnerships with local research institutions support actions for sustainability (Paper 35 and
18 Paper 36). Specifically, Paper 36 identified strong horizontal collaboration among supplier
19 members of a cooperative developed through partnerships with universities, research
20 institutions, and NGOs. This remedy was used to surpass barriers, such as lack of knowledge,
21 sustainability requirements imposed by buyers, and to reduce contextual differences. In this
22 sense, the stronger inter-organisational relationship contributed to reducing structural
23 inefficiencies along supply chains (Paper 12; Paper 40) and protected relationship-specific
24 investments (Paper 8; Paper 22).

25
26 Analysing remedies emerged as an important contribution of our review. It demonstrates
27 the need for further analysis of these remedies to better understand how suppliers and sub-
28 suppliers in emerging economies have faced and mitigated barriers to sustainability. This
29 perspective demonstrates a clear recognition of bottom-up actions from suppliers towards GSC
30 activities. Future studies could address remedies in specific sectors and relate barriers to specific
31 supplier strategies to overcome them worldwide. For example, further studies could support a
32 greater understanding of strategic remedies that reduce the distance between buyers and
33 suppliers and reduce institutional voids, that is, conditions that challenge the management of
34 supply chains in emerging economies in terms of lack of infrastructure, social inequalities,
35 corruption etc. (Wu & Jia, 2018; Silvestre, 2015). Given that the existence of institutional voids
36 hampers the development of sustainability initiatives, such research has the potential to have a
37 powerful impact on the field of SSCM.

42 43 *4.2.6. Reinforcements: outcomes as new drivers*

44
45 Other positive feedback actions are related to reinforcements. The findings indicate that
46 feedback resulting from suppliers' sustainability outcomes acts as a motivating factor to
47 reinforce or further develop sustainability drivers. This happens because when suppliers receive
48 positive outcomes from their sustainability initiatives, this reinforces/drives them to make
49 further sustainability-related changes. For instance, the evidenced outcomes can generate
50 improvements in processes that turn into new drivers (e.g., reduced losses resulting from
51 collaboration lead to strengthening this collaboration) for more sustainability initiatives (Paper
52 12; Paper 17). In addition, Paper 21 found that when buyers recompense suppliers for their
53 sustainability outcomes, this reinforces new drivers for their sustainability initiatives. The
54 authors of Paper 21 also found that suppliers were motivated by their positive perception
55 regarding justice and rewards associated with their relationship with buyers. Finally, continuous
56 improvement projects also acted as new drivers for sustainability because companies aimed at
57 further improving their scores on certification programmes (Paper 23).

58
59 Identifying feedback as reinforcements for new drivers for sustainability initiatives
60 provides a more dynamic interaction between factors related to emerging economy suppliers.

Further studies should investigate the flow of information to understand a more dynamic interaction between reinforcements and drivers, especially to identify nuances related to internal and external drivers for SSCM.

5. Discussion

The findings above explain how the literature on SSCM from the perspective of emerging economy global suppliers has evolved over time – this is an important contribution as it responds to several calls to better understand SSCM from the perspective of these suppliers (León-Bravo et al., 2022). To open doors for future research based on our review, we propose the framework below, which links the factors affecting the sustainability initiatives of emerging economy global suppliers (Figure 2). This analytical framework revealed drivers, barriers, and mechanisms aligned with the existing literature on GCSs and with prior SSCM literature reviews from the perspective of developed countries (see Jia et al., 2018; Koberg & Longoni, 2019); however, we make three additional theoretical contributions to the literature as a result of our thematic analysis. First, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first review to explain how emerging economy suppliers exploit positive feedback loops in the context of their sustainability initiatives. Second, we explain how institutional and cultural issues impact the role of emerging economy suppliers involved in SSCM. Thirdly, we contribute by explaining the extant literature understanding of the perception of emerging economy suppliers on their SSCM role, which can aid in reducing the institutional distance between these suppliers and their buyers in GSCs.

Figure 2

Our findings suggest that emerging economy global suppliers have developed positive feedback actions in the context of their sustainability initiatives. These positive feedback actions were either related to *remedies* to overcome the effects of existing barriers or *reinforcements* that exploited sustainability outcomes to support new drivers for sustainability initiatives (Figure 2). These results refer to our first theoretical contribution, as we systematically show the relevance of remedies and reinforcement as suppliers' positive feedback actions to act towards SSCM. During the analysis of our sample, on the one hand, remedies emerged to represent the ability of suppliers to surpass their difficulties to operate sustainably (Benstead et al., 2018; Jia et al., 2018; Koberg & Longoni, 2019). Thus, improving inter-organisational relationships worked as a source to enhance partnerships, communication, and sustainability knowledge sharing.

Furthermore, reinforcements emerged to strengthen existing strategies and initiatives by showing the benefits of working sustainably. For example, environmental sustainability outcomes with less harm to nature (Liu et al., 2019) can potentially lead to new drivers. This indicates that for these emerging economy suppliers, operating sustainably and having positive outcomes that they believe make an authentic difference in their context strengthens the way they continue improving their sustainability initiatives. Based on our results, a set of propositions emerged:

Pl1a: Emerging economy global suppliers proactively generate remedies to surpass barriers related to their sustainability initiatives when this is enabled by mechanisms involving collaboration.

1
2
3
4 *P1b: Sustainability outcomes act as reinforcements that boost drivers for sustainability*
5 *initiatives when emerging economy global suppliers perceive these outcomes to be authentic in*
6 *benefitting their context.*
7

8
9 Secondly, we found a significant influence of institutional and cultural issues on the
10 sustainability initiatives of emerging economy global suppliers. By using the TBL+ framework
11 (Fritz & Silva, 2018), different sustainability outcomes were mapped. However, special
12 attention was given to the institutional dimension (Silva et al., 2021; Silvestre, 2015). Several
13 papers were interested in poor-quality government policy frameworks and how suppliers can
14 gain legitimacy to influence them when they become certified by global buyers. We also found
15 certification essential to cope with institutional influences on suppliers' operations (e.g., Paper
16 13; Paper 23). The cultural dimension was also identified as it relates to local traditions (Fritz
17 & Silva, 2018; León-Bravo et al., 2022) and shared beliefs and values (Silva et al., 2021). These
18 results are vital to demonstrating that within GSCs, sustainability targets cannot be limited to
19 the three TBL dimensions as traditionally defined. Instead, taking the supplier's perspective,
20 other concerns also affect how they respond to SSCM. This illustrates for buyers, mainly in
21 developed countries, the need to enhance incentive requirements and develop new needs and
22 targets (represented in our analytical framework as drivers) and suggests that SSCM initiatives
23 that consider these additional dimensions are more likely to be successful. Thus, the second
24 proposition states that:
25
26
27

28 *P2: SSCM in a GSC context succeeds more often when drivers lead to mechanisms that lead to*
29 *positive institutional and cultural outcomes.*
30

31
32 Finally, our findings provide insights into reducing the institutional distance between
33 buyers and suppliers, as our thematic analysis explains how emerging economy suppliers
34 perceive their role within SSCM. The proposed framework (see Figure 2) presents the
35 relationship between the drivers that motivate supplier sustainability initiatives, their
36 mechanisms of action for sustainability initiatives, the barriers to adopting these initiatives, the
37 remedies (strategies to cope with barriers), and the reinforcements (outcomes acting as new
38 drivers). Understanding these links can help to reduce the distance between buyers and suppliers
39 in different institutional and cultural settings. In addition, as claimed by León-Bravo et al.
40 (2022), more attention needs to be given to supplier priorities, competences, and resources,
41 which are often overlooked by buyers of GSCs. Based on these reflections, we open doors for
42 future research in this context as we show throughout the findings section how each of these
43 elements leads to reduced institutional distance.
44
45

46 **6. Conclusions**

47
48
49 In this study, we have demonstrated how the literature that empirically captures the
50 perceptions of emerging economy global suppliers explains their role within SSCM in GSCs.
51 Our results provide theoretical implications, as explained in the previous section. Additionally,
52 *managerial implications* were identified by this research. Specifically, this paper contributes
53 by demonstrating how global suppliers manage sustainability and how positive feedback
54 actions motivate both new sustainability strategies and a way to surpass barriers. Therefore, on
55 the one hand, managers in supplier companies should explore how to exploit these feedback
56 actions to strengthen their sustainability initiatives in GSCs. For example, a constant barrier
57 identified was the lack of (sustainability) knowledge. Therefore, these managers can use these
58 feedback actions (such as greater levels/ more types of collaboration as a result of successful
59 collaboration) to improve their knowledge and reduce their dependence on buyers in this regard.
60

1
2
3
4 On the other hand, managers of buyer companies should use these feedback actions as a path
5 to better support their suppliers. For example, they should try to better understand which of the
6 existing sustainability outcomes motivate suppliers, and this understanding can then impact the
7 SSCM external and internal drivers.
8

9 Still regarding managerial implications, our results on the relevance of the cultural and
10 institutional sustainability dimensions provide new insights to managers of both supplier and
11 buyers companies. Specifically, these insights suggest that managers should increase their
12 awareness of how to obtain authentic benefits for sustainability initiatives throughout the GSC,
13 thereby improving global performance as well as that of the emerging economy context.
14 Moreover, managers should strengthen existing drivers to give additional support for
15 mechanisms that lead to positive outcomes on all TBL+ sustainability dimensions in the entire
16 supply chain. This action would improve SSCM in GSCs and reduce the distance between buyer
17 and supplier contexts.
18

19 Some *policy implications* also emerged from this study. In particular, the findings
20 demonstrated the importance of considering institutional and cultural settings as part of SSCM.
21 Therefore, policymakers should develop policies to reinforce national regulations that protect
22 their local cultural practices and also improve company competitiveness and sustainability,
23 thereby aiding economic transactions with international buyers. This research also revealed the
24 relevance of public policies to support research institutions, NGOs, and universities, as they
25 have an essential role in promoting global supplier sustainability initiatives. Finally, social
26 implications emerge as this study highlighted how to manage sustainability involving emerging
27 economies' suppliers effectively. Specifically, our findings show the role of employee well-
28 being and the maintenance/improvement of local cultures in emerging economy suppliers.
29 Thus, people in these places will benefit when GSC members pay greater attention to these
30 elements.
31

32 A limitation of this study is that we did not find evidence of negative outcomes of SSCM
33 from the perspective of the emerging economy suppliers, as no such outcomes were highlighted
34 in the analysed literature. Future research should validate our theoretical contributions focusing
35 on (i) understanding the role of local government regulations and how research institutions can
36 contribute to supplier sustainability in emerging economies; (ii) investigating the influence of
37 cultural aspects surrounding supplier sustainability initiatives and the impact of these aspects
38 in this context; (iii) exploring how GSC members have used remedies to surpass barriers to
39 sustainability; and (iv) identifying the influence of reinforcements to strengthen positive
40 sustainability outcomes in GSCs (i.e., how these benefits have reinforced sustainability
41 initiatives). Further empirical studies should investigate these points in different GSCs,
42 comparing country and industry contexts. Finally, it is necessary to increase research on how
43 emerging economy suppliers have been involved in local social and institutional sustainability
44 initiatives and how they include their buyers in these initiatives.
45
46
47
48
49

50 References

- 51
52
53 Agyemang, M., Zhu, Q., Adzanyo, M., Antarciuc, E., & Zhao, S. (2018). Evaluating barriers to green
54 supply chain redesign and implementation of related practices in the West Africa cashew industry.
55 *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, Vol.136, pp.209-222.
56 Allaoui, H., Guo, Y., Choudhary, A., & Bloemhof, J. (2018). Sustainable agro-food supply chain design
57 using two-stage hybrid multi-objective decision-making approach. *Computers & Operations*
58 *Research*, Vol. 89, pp.369-384.
59 Awasthi, A., Govindan, K., & Gold, S. (2018). Multi-tier sustainable global supplier selection using a
60 fuzzy AHP-VIKOR-based approach. *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 195,
pp.106-117.

- 1
2
3
4 Azimifard, A., Moosavirad, S. H., & Ariafar, S. (2018). Selecting sustainable supplier countries for
5 Iran's steel industry at three levels by using AHP and TOPSIS methods. *Resources Policy*, Vol.57,
6 pp.30-44.
- 7 Benstead, A.V., Hendry, L.C., & Stevenson, M. (2018). Horizontal collaboration in response to modern
8 slavery legislation. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 38 No.12,
9 pp.2286-2312.
- 10 Bossle, M. B., de Barcellos, M. D., Vieira, L. M., & Sauvée, L. (2016). The drivers for adoption of eco-
11 innovation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 113, 861-872.
- 12 Busse, C. (2016). Doing well by doing good? The self-interest of buying firms and sustainable supply
13 chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 52 No.2, pp.28-47.
- 14 Busse, C., Schleper, M.C., Niu, M., & Wagner, S.M. (2016). Supplier development for sustainability:
15 contextual barriers in global supply chains. *International Journal of Physical Distribution &*
16 *Logistics Management*, Vol. 46 No.5, pp.442-468.
- 17 Chen, Y. & Chen, I. (2019). Mediated power and sustainable supplier management (SSM): Linking
18 power use, justice, and supplier performance. *International Journal of Physical Distribution &*
19 *Logistics Management*, Vol. 49 No.8, pp.861-878.
- 20 Dahlander, L. & Gann, D.M. (2010). How open is innovation? *Research Policy*. Vol. 39 No.6, pp.699-
21 709.
- 22 Durach, C.F., Kembro, J., & Wieland, A. (2017). A new paradigm for systematic literature reviews in
23 supply chain management. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol.53 No.4, pp.67-85.
- 24 Elkington, J. (2004). Enter the triple bottom line. *The triple bottom line: Does it all add up?*. pp. 1-16.
25 Routledge.
- 26 Fritz, M.C. & Silva, M. (2018). Exploring supply chain sustainability research in Latin
27 America. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, Vol. 48 No.8,
28 pp.818-841.
- 29 Goodland, R. (1995). The concept of environmental sustainability. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
30 *Systematics*, pp.1-24.
- 31 Guarnieri, P. & Trojan, F. (2019). Decision making on supplier selection based on social, ethical, and
32 environmental criteria: A study in the textile industry. *Resources, Conservation & Recycling*, Vol.
33 141, pp.347-361.
- 34 Hoskisson, R. E., Eden, L., Lau, C. M., & Wright, M. (2000). Strategy in emerging economies. *Academy*
35 *of Management Journal*, Vol.43, No.3, pp.249-267.
- 36 Jia, F. & Zsidisin, G.A. (2014). Supply relational risk: what role does Guanxi play? *Journal of Business*
37 *Logistics*, Vol. 35 No.3, pp.259-267.
- 38 Jia, F., Zuluaga-Cardona, L., Bailey, A., & Rueda, X. (2018). Sustainable supply chain management in
39 developing countries: An analysis of the literature. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 189, pp.263-
40 278.
- 41 Khanna, T. & Palepu, K. G. (1997). Why focused strategies may be wrong for emerging markets.
42 *Harvard Business Review*, 75: 41–51.
- 43 Kellner, F. & Utz, S. (2019). Sustainability in supplier selection and order allocation: Combining integer
44 variables with Markowitz portfolio theory. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol.214, pp.462-474.
- 45 Koberg, E. & Longoni, A. (2019). A systematic review of sustainable supply chain management in
46 global supply chains. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 207, pp.1084-1098.
- 47 León-Bravo, V., Jaramillo-Villacres, M., & Silva, M.E. (2021). Analyzing competing logics toward
48 sustainable supplier management. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*.
- 49 Li, Q., Xue, Q., Truong, Y., & Xiong, J. (2018). MNCs' industrial linkages and environmental spillovers
50 in emerging economies: The case of China. *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol.
51 196, pp.346-355.
- 52 Liu, L., Zhang, M., & Ye, W. (2019). The adoption of sustainable practices: A supplier's perspective.
53 *Journal of Environmental Management*, Vol. 232, pp. 692-701.
- 54 Magon, R.B., Thomé, A.M.T., Ferrer, A.L.C., & Scavarda, L.F. (2018). Sustainability and performance
55 in operations management research. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 190, 104-117.
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Mani, V., Gunasekaran, A., & Delgado, C. (2018). Enhancing supply chain performance through
5 supplier social sustainability: An emerging economy perspective. *International Journal of*
6 *Production Economics*, Vol. 195, pp.259-272.
- 7 McKenzie, S., (2004). Working Paper Series. Social Sustainability: Towards Some Definitions. *Hawke*
8 *Research Institute*, vol. 27. University of South Australia.
- 9 Morais, D.O. & Silvestre, B.S. (2018). Advancing social sustainability in supply chain management:
10 Lessons from multiple case studies in an emerging economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol.
11 199, pp.222-235.
- 12 Muñoz-Torres, M.J., Fernández-Izquierdo, M.Á., Rivera-Lirio, J.M., Ferrero-Ferrero, I., Escrig-
13 Olmedo, E., Gisbert-Navarro, J.V., Marullo, M.C. (2018). An assessment tool to integrate
14 sustainability principles into the global supply chain. *Sustainability*, Vol.10, No.2, 535.
- 15 Pagell, M. & Shevchenko, A. (2014). Why research in sustainable supply chain management should
16 have no future. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol.50, No.1, pp.44-55.
- 17 Pagell, M. & Wu, Z. (2009). Building a more complete theory of sustainable supply chain management
18 using case studies of 10 exemplars. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp.37-56.
- 19 Park, K., Kremer, G.E.O. & Ma, J. (2018). A regional information-based multi-attribute and multi-
20 objective decision-making approach for sustainable supplier selection and order allocation. *Journal*
21 *of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 187, pp.590-604.
- 22 Pereira, M.M.O., Silva, M.E., & Hendry, L.C. (2023). Developing global supplier competences for
23 supply chain sustainability: The effects of institutional pressures on certification adoption. *Business*
24 *Strategy and the Environment*, pp.1-22.
- 25 Pfahl, S. (2005). Institutional sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 8,
26 No.1-2, pp.80-96.
- 27 Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., ... & Duffy, S. (2006).
28 Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. *A product from the ESRC*
29 *methods programme Version*, Vol.1, No.1, b92.
- 30 Sajjad, A., Eweje, G., & Tappin, D. (2015). Sustainable supply chain management: motivators and
31 barriers. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 24 No.7, pp. 643-655.
- 32 Sancha, C., Longoni, A., & Giménez, C. (2015). Sustainable supplier development practices: Drivers
33 and enablers in a global context. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, Vol. 21 No.2,
34 pp.95-102.
- 35 Seuring, S. & Gold, S. (2012). Conducting content-analysis-based literature reviews in supply chain
36 management. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 17 No.5, pp.544-555.
- 37 Seuring, S., & Müller, M. (2008). From a literature review to a conceptual framework for sustainable
38 supply chain management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 16 No.15, pp.1699-1710.
- 39 Silva, M.E., Fritz, M.M.C., & Nunes, B. (2017). Scanning insights on sustainability and supply chain
40 management in Brazil. *Journal of Operations & Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 10 No.1, pp.33-
41 54.
- 42 Silva, M.E., Silvestre, B.S., Ponte, R.C.D.V., & Cabral, J.E.O. (2021). Managing micro and small
43 enterprise supply chains: A multi-level approach to sustainability, resilience and regional
44 development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol.311, pp.127-567.
- 45 Silvestre, B.S. (2015). Sustainable supply chain management in emerging economies: Environmental
46 turbulence, institutional voids and sustainability trajectories. *International Journal of Production*
47 *Economics*, Vol. 167, pp.156-169.
- 48 Silvestre, B. S., Silva, M. E., Cormack, A., & Thome, A. M. T. (2020). Supply chain sustainability
49 trajectories: learning through sustainability initiatives. *International Journal of Operations &*
50 *Production Management*. Vol. 40 No. 9, pp. 1301-1337.
- 51 Simsek, Z., Fox, B., & Heavey, C. (2021). Systematicity in organizational research literature reviews:
52 A framework and assessment. *Organizational Research Methods*. pp.1-30.
- 53 Siva, V., Gremyr, I., Bergquist, B., Garvare, R., Zobel, T., & Isaksson, R. (2016). The support of Quality
54 Management to sustainable development: A literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol.
55 138, pp.148-157.
- 56 Soini, K. & Birkeland, I. (2014). Exploring the scientific discourse on cultural
57 sustainability. *Geoforum*, Vol.51, pp.213-223.
- 58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2010). *Mismeasuring our lives: Why GDP Doesn't add up*. New
5 York: The New Press.
- 6
7 Soundararajan, V. & Brammer, S. (2018). Developing country sub-supplier responses to social
8 sustainability requirements of intermediaries: Exploring the influence of framing on fairness
9 perceptions and reciprocity. *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 58, pp. 42-58.
- 10
11 Tanco, M., Escuder, M., Heckmann, G., Jurburg, D., & Velazquez, J. (2018). Supply chain management
12 in Latin America: current research and future directions. *Supply Chain Management: An
13 International Journal*, Vol. 23 No.5, pp.412-430.
- 14
15 Thong, K.C. & Wong, W.P. (2018). Pathways for Sustainable Supply Chain Performance—Evidence
16 from a Developing Country, Malaysia. *Sustainability*, Vol.10 No. 8, 2781.
- 17
18 Touboulic, A. & McCarthy, L. (2020). Collective action in SCM: a call for activist research. *The
19 International Journal of Logistics Management*, Vol. 31 No.1, pp. 3-20.
- 20
21 Touboulic, A., McCarthy, L., & Matthews, L. (2020). Re-imagining supply chain challenges through
22 critical engaged research. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 56 No.2, pp. 36-51.
- 23
24 Touboulic, A. & Walker, H. (2015). Theories in sustainable supply chain management: a structured
25 literature review. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, Vol. 45
26 No.1/2, pp.16-42.
- 27
28 Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing
29 evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of
30 Management*, Vol.14 No.3, pp.207-222.
- 31
32 United Nations. *Take Action for the Sustainable Development Goals*. Accessed on: 17 January 2023.
33 Available on: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>.
- 34
35 Vachon, S. & Mao, Z., (2008). Linking supply chain strength to sustainable development: a country-
36 level analysis. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. Vol.16, No.15, pp.1552-1560.
- 37
38 Walker, H., Di Sisto, L., & McBain, D. (2008). Drivers and barriers to environmental supply chain
39 management practices: Lessons from the public and private sectors. *Journal of Purchasing and
40 Supply Management*, Vol.14 No.1, pp.69-85.
- 41
42 Wright, M., Filatotchev, I., Hoskisson, R.E., & Peng, M.W. (2005). Guest Editors' Introduction Strategy
43 Research in Emerging Economies: Challenging the Conventional Wisdom. *Journal of Management
44 Studies*. Vol. 42 No.1, pp.1-33.
- 45
46 Wu, Z. & Jia, F. (2018). Toward a theory of supply chain fields – Understanding the institutional process
47 of supply chain localization. *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 58, pp.27-41.
- 48
49 Zorzini, M., Hendry, L.C., Huq, F.A., & Stevenson, M. (2015). Socially responsible sourcing: reviewing
50 the literature and its use of theory. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*,
51 Vol. 35, No.1, pp.60-109.
- 52
53 Zhu, Q. & Sarkis, J. (2007). The moderating effects of institutional pressures on emergent green supply
54 chain practices and performance. *International Journal of Production Research*. Vol. 45, No. 18-
55 19), pp. 4333-4355.
- 56
57 Yawar, S.A. & Seuring, S. (2017). Management of social issues in supply chains: a literature review
58 exploring social issues, actions and performance outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141(3), 621-
59 643.
60

Table 1. Categories of analysis and respective definitions

Category of analysis	Definition	References
Deductive categories		
Internal Drivers	Internal factors that motivate companies to engage in sustainable initiatives.	Pagell and Wu (2009); Thong and Wong (2018)
External Drivers	External factors that motivate or pressure companies to have sustainable initiatives.	Thong and Wong (2018); Walker et al. (2008)
Mechanisms	Methods or approaches to ensure that companies are acting sustainably or strengthening their sustainability initiatives.	Jia et al. (2018)
Internal Barriers	Difficulties inherent to the companies regarding the adoption of sustainability.	Busse et al. (2018); Walker et al. (2008)
External Barriers	Difficulties related to the environment in which companies operate that impede their sustainability initiatives.	Busse et al. (2018); Sajjad et al. (2015); Walker et al. (2008)
Outcomes	Results obtained from sustainable performance according to triple bottom line plus dimensions (TBL+)	Fritz and Silva (2018)
Inductive categories		
Remedies	Strategies used by suppliers to reduce or overcome the effects of barriers.	Busse et al. (2018)
Reinforcement	Actions resulting from outcomes providing feedback that incentivises continuity or improvement of sustainability initiatives (reinforcing the drivers).	Liu et al. (2019), Pagell and Wu (2009); Thong and Wong (2018)

Table 2. Distribution of articles in journals

Journal	Number of articles
Journal of Cleaner Production	5
International Journal of Production Economics	4
International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management	3
Journal of Business Ethics	3
Supply Chain Management: An International Journal	3
International Journal of Production Research	2
Journal of Operations Management	2
Sustainability	2
Social Responsibility Journal	2
Agroecology and sustainable food systems	1
Clothing and Textiles Research Journal	1
Cogent Business & Management	1
Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society	1
International Journal of Operations & Production Management	1
International Journal of Sustainable Engineering	1
International Business Review	1
Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies	1
Journal of Business Logistics	1
Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing	1
Latin American Business Review	1
Progress in Industrial Ecology: An International Journal	1
Production and Operations Management Society	1
Rural Sociology	1
Sustainable Development	1




Figure 1. Evolution of publications over years




Figure 2. Linking the factors impacting the sustainability initiatives of emerging economy suppliers

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Supplementary Table. Descriptive analysis of the sample and thematic analysis categories related to each paper

Nº	Author	Country (empirical field)	Sector	Main focus	Data Collection Technique	Sustainability analysis	Theory/Theoretical approach	ID	ED	M	IB	EB	R	EO	SO	ENO	CO	IO	R
1	Ras et al. (2007)	South Africa	Food	They examined supplier-retailer-user cooperation in greening SCs and actions to address barriers.	Interviews and document analysis	TBL	-		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
2	Tencati et al. (2008)	Vietnam	Multiple	They investigated the influence of increasingly sustainable sourcing policies by multinational corporations on suppliers from developing countries. They found the main difficulties and benefits from sustainability adoption.	Interviews and questionnaires	Mix (Economic and social)	-			X	X	X	X	X	X				X
3	Ras and Vermeulen (2009)	South Africa	Food	They investigated whether suppliers have entrepreneurial qualities to enable successful responses to sustainability requirements based on the European market and whether these qualities relate to producers' environmental and economic performance.	Questionnaires	Mix (Economic and environmental)	-			X				X		X			X
4	Alvarez et al. (2010)	Costa Rica, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, and Brazil	Food	They studied network evolution and governance dynamics in a multi-stakeholder SC sustainability initiative.	Interviews and document analysis	TBL	-			X									
5	Huq et al. (2014)	Bangladesh	Clothing	They studied the drivers, barriers, and enablers of social sustainability in exporting garment industries.	Interviews	Social	Transaction Cost Economic Theory	X	X		X	X		X	X				X
6	Diabat et al. (2014)	India	Clothing	They investigated facilitators for sustainability management in the supplying organizations.	Questionnaires	TBL	-			X					X				
7	Bloom (2015)	Honduras	Food	This research evidenced the relevance of public-private	Interviews	TBL	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

				determinants in the adoption of social sustainability.			Theory of legitimacy						
15	Mani et al. (2018)	India	Multiple	They studied the benefits suppliers and buyers gain by effectively managing social sustainability issues.	Questionnaires	Social	-	x	x				x
16	Sjauw-Koen-Fa et al. (2018)	Indonesia and India	Food	They assessed the best way for food and agribusiness multinationals to include smallholder farmers in their supply strategies and to act sustainably.	Interviews and observations	Mix (Social and environmental)	-		x	x	x		
17	Thong and Wong (2018)	Malaysia	Multiple	They evidenced that a significant linkage between social practices and social performance is a pathway for the former to improve economic performance.	Questionnaires	TBL	Resource-based view, Institutional theory	x	x				x
18	Tong et al. (2018)	China	Multiple	They demonstrated situations where supportive governmental tactics can be more effective than punitive tactics.	Questionnaires	Social	-				x		
19	Akbar and Ahsan (2019)	Bangladesh	Clothing	They investigated the challenges faced by suppliers in implementing safety-compliant workplaces.	Interviews	Social	-			x	x	x	x
20	Al-Esmael et al. (2019)	Qatar and Oman	Manufacturing	They examined the barriers to socially responsible behaviour by small and medium-sized suppliers.	Questionnaires	Social	-			x	x		
21	Chen and Chen (2019)	China	Multiple	They studied how buyers' use of power may incite varying perceptions of justice from suppliers that affect sustainable supplier performance.	Questionnaires	TBL	Prospect theory	x			x		x
22	Fontana and Egels-Zanden (2019)	Bangladesh	Clothing	They applied the inter-organizational network approach to the global value	Interviews	Social	-	x	x		x	x	x

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

30	Venkatesh et al. (2021)	India	Clothing	They studied social sustainability governance by utilizing a causal-effect analysis to classify noncompliance antecedents into causal and effect groups and analyse the interactions.	Interviews	Social	Stakeholder theory and theory of reasoned action	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	
31	Khan et al. (2021)	Pakistan	Clothing	They studied the barriers to multitier sustainable supplier management and strategies to overcome these barriers.	Interviews	TBL	-				x	x	x				
32	Wilhelm and Villena (2021)	China	Electronic	They studied the attributes that enable first-tier suppliers to adopt sustainable procurement, leading to global brands' sustainability requirements cascading throughout their multitier supply chains.	Interviews	TBL	-	x	x	x			x				
33	Amoako et al. (2021)	Ghana	Food	They analysed the effect of training and reward on social sustainability in cocoa's suppliers and the role of green buyer-supplier relationship (governance and trust).	Questionnaires	Social	Resource-Based View theory and Social Exchange Theory	x	x	x							
34	Wu et al. (2021)	China and Bangladesh	Clothing	They investigated the role of open costing in the buyer-supplier relationship.	Interviews	Mix (Social and environmental)	Social exchange theory				x			x	x	x	x
35	Pereira et al. (2021a)	Brazil	Food	They investigated the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on SC sustainability learning associated with changes in sustainability initiatives.	Interviews and secondary sources	TBL	-	x		x					x	x	
36	Pereira et al. (2021b)	Brazil	Food	They analysed how collaborative practices influence sustainability initiatives and the relational rents of global suppliers.	Interviews and secondary sources	TBL	Relational view			x	x					x	x
37	Nath et al. (2021)	Bangladesh	Clothing	They studied how institutional pressures, mechanisms, and	Interviews	TBL	Institutional theory			x	x						

1										
2										
3										
4				challenges influence the sustainability implementation of a multitier apparel suppliers.						
5	38	Villena et al. (2021)	China	Manufacturing	This study unpacks the environmental and social dimensions of supplier responsibility and links each dimension to distinct drivers	Interviews	Mix (Social and environmental)	Stakeholder theory and relational view	x	x
6										
7										
8	39	Mani and Gunasekaran (2021)	India	Food	They studied the effect of the upstream value chain governance mechanisms in relation to ethical issues and how the governance mechanisms impact supply chain performance and reputation.	Interviews and questionnaires	Mix (Social and environmental)	-		x
9										
10										
11										
12	40	Khan et al. (2021)	Asia and North Africa countries	Multiple	They investigated the obstacles that hinder the adoption of social sustainability in the multitier supply chain and effective solutions to promote the adoption of this concept.	Questionnaires	Social	-	x	x
13										
14										
15										
16										
17	41	Mathiyazhagan et al. (2021)	India	Manufacturing	They identified the key social sustainability practices and the method to evaluate them in multitier manufacturing firms.	Interviews	Social	-		x
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
29										
30										
31										
32										
33										
34										
35										
36										
37										
38										
39										
40										
41										
42										
43										
44										
45										
46										

Key to Themes: ID: Internal Drivers, ED: External Drivers, M: Mechanisms, IB: Internal Barriers, EB: External Barriers, R: Remedies, EO: Economic Outcomes, SO: Social Outcomes, ENO: Environmental Outcomes, CO: Cultural Outcomes, IO: Institutional Outcomes, R: Reinforcement