

CSR and Feminist Organization Studies

Towards an Integrated Theorization for the Analysis of Gender Issues

Grosser, Kate; Moon, Jeremy

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in:

Journal of Business Ethics

DOI:

[10.1007/s10551-017-3510-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3510-x)

Publication date:

2019

License

Unspecified

Citation for published version (APA):

Grosser, K., & Moon, J. (2019). CSR and Feminist Organization Studies: Towards an Integrated Theorization for the Analysis of Gender Issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(2), 321–342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3510-x>

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

General rights

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

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 04. Jul. 2025



CSR and Feminist Organization Studies: Towards an Integrated Theorization for the Analysis of Gender Issues

Kate Grosser and Jeremy Moon

Journal article (Accepted version)

CITE: CSR and Feminist Organization Studies : Towards an Integrated Theorization for the Analysis of Gender Issues. / Grosser, Kate; Moon, Jeremy. In: *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23.03.2017.

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in Journal of Business Ethics. The final authenticated version is available online at:

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3510-x>

Uploaded to [Research@CBS](#): December 2018

CSR and Feminist Organization Studies: Towards an Integrated Theorization for the Analysis of Gender Issues

Running head (shortened title): CSR and Feminist Organization Studies: Towards an Integrated Theorization

Paper accepted at Journal of Business Ethics
March 2017

Authors:

Dr Kate Grosser*
School of Management
College of Business
RMIT University
Melbourne
Victoria 3000
Australia
Tel: +61 3 99251311
kate.grosser@rmit.edu.au

Jeremy Moon
Velux Professor of Corporate Sustainability
Department of Intercultural Communication and Management
Copenhagen Business School
Room 0.141
Porcelaenshaven 18A
2000 Frederiksberg
Denmark
+45 3815 3231
jmo.ikl@cbs.dk

CSR and Feminist Organization Studies: Towards an Integrated Theorization for the Analysis of Gender Issues

Abstract

Although Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) practice increasingly addresses gender issues, and gender and CSR scholarship is expanding, feminist theory is rarely explicitly referenced or discussed in the CSR literature. We contend that this omission is a key limitation of the field. We argue that CSR theorization and research on gender can be improved through more explicit and systematic reference to feminist theories, and particularly those from feminist organization studies (FOS). Addressing this gap we review developments in feminist organization theory, mapping their relevance to CSR. With reference to six major theoretical perspectives in CSR scholarship, we note feminist research relating to each. Drawing upon FOS theory and CSR theory, we then develop an integrated theoretical framework for the analysis of gender issues in CSR. Our framework enables us to identify research strengths in the gender and CSR literature, as well as gaps therein, to open new conversations, and to posit future research directions for this emerging area of scholarship. Our paper illustrates how a better grounding of CSR in feminist theory can contribute to CSR research more broadly.

Keywords: Corporate social responsibility, Feminist organization studies, Feminist theory, Gender.

Introduction

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) practice has begun to engage with gender issues in a variety of ways, both through specific gender initiatives and broader CSR programs. Company CSR initiatives relating to women in particular have developed in: the workplace; the community; the marketplace; and supply chains (e.g., Westpac, Rio Tinto, Nike). Gender issues feature in various CSR initiatives, such as the Women's Empowerment Principles, a partnership of UN Women and the UN Global Compact, whose seven principles cover gender equality in corporate leadership, in the workplace, in enterprise development, in supply chains and in marketing practices. Moreover, CSR guidelines and benchmarks on gender equality are proliferating, often incorporated within mainstream CSR initiatives (e.g., Global Reporting Initiative (GRI); Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI)). CSR initiatives have begun to incorporate stakeholder consultation on gender issues (e.g., GRI Gender Working Group held in 2010; see also: International Finance Corporation 2007; Keenan et al. 2014). In addition, numerous accounts of attention to gender issues in local CSR program developments are emerging (e.g., Grosser et al. 2016).

However, CSR research is mainly disengaged from feminist theory, feminist ethics apart. An emerging literature explores gender issues through a CSR lens. This has led to research not only on workplace practice (e.g., Grosser and Moon 2005a, 2008; Larrieta-Rubín de Celis et al. 2015), but also on the wider gender impacts of corporations in the marketplace, including through supply chains (e.g., Barrientos et al. 2003; Barrientos and Smith 2007; Hale and Opondo 2005; Prieto-Carrón 2004, 2008), through corporate value chains via entrepreneurship programs for example (e.g., Dolan and Scott 2009; Dolan et al. 2012), and in the community (e.g., Newell 2005; Pearson 2007; Rio Tinto 2009). In addition, research has explored gender and CSR with respect to corporate governance (Bear et al. 2010; Fernandez-Feijoo 2014), CSR governance (Kilgour 2007, 2013; Keenan et al. 2014; Prügl and True 2014; Grosser 2016), CSR leadership (Marshall 2007), and CSR's institutionalization (Karam and Jamali 2013). However, the gender and CSR literature, by which we mean CSR scholarship that addresses gender issues or brings a gender analysis to the field, remains underdeveloped with regard to its theoretical contribution. We consider that this is at least partly related to its patchy engagement with feminist theory.

Meanwhile, advances in research on gender in organization studies have closely engaged with, deployed and developed feminist theory. Extensive elaboration of the relationship between this and organization theory has informed the development of 'feminist organization studies' (FOS) (e.g., Acker 1990, 1998, 2004, 2006; Calas and Smircich 2006; Gherardi 2010; Benschop and Verloo 2016). Incorporating research on gender and corporations, FOS has been the source of key insights regarding gender issues in organization studies for more than a quarter of a century. We thus regard FOS as a particularly appropriate lens to inform gender and CSR research. Our paper contends that, while feminist organization theory has been deployed in CSR scholarship, its use remains underdeveloped. We map the ways in which different types of CSR scholarship draw upon different types of feminist theory and in this light we identify and flesh out further opportunities for theorization of CSR and gender issues.

The limited extent to which CSR research has incorporated gender analysis has been explained with reference to the marginalization of gender issues, and of women's voices and perspectives in practice and in our academic field (e.g., Spence 2016b). Reflecting wider struggles in management and organization studies, this situation is seen to result from the institutionalization of gender inequality within organizations, academia and society more broadly (Martin 1994, 2000). Important though these explanations are, in this paper we move beyond these accounts to explain limitations in gender and CSR research as deriving from a lack of systematic and explicit utilization of feminist theory. With reference to FOS we show how use of such theory can progress the field, to the benefit of CSR research broadly. Thus our paper extends our understanding of current limitations in the field, opens new conversations, and offers a detailed set of suggestions to advance knowledge of CSR and gender issues.

The first contribution of our paper is to offer a new explanation for current limitations in gender and CSR research. This leads us to our second contribution, which is to review

developments in feminist organization theory and map their relevance to CSR. In particular, where some gender and CSR research draws implicitly upon liberal, and sometimes psychoanalytic feminist theory, our paper draws attention to the relevance, not only of making these relationships more explicit, but also of using more critical feminist organization perspectives, including socialist, poststructuralist/postmodern and postcolonial/transnational theories. These perspectives highlight the intersections of gender, race, class and other forms of oppression and discrimination, and the importance of critical men's studies. The third contribution of our paper is to highlight a variety of CSR theoretical approaches (ethical, instrumental, stakeholder, political, institutional and critical), and to map feminist engagement with these.

Our fourth, and major, contribution is to develop a theoretical framework for the analysis of gender and CSR which integrates FOS and CSR perspectives. This enables us to identify research approaches not previously used in the field, to open new conversations, and to outline novel directions for future research in deploying both 'women-centred' and 'gendering' feminist organization theories to the field of CSR. With respect to women-centred approaches, we note in particular: the absence of liberal feminist perspectives, which focus on equal opportunities and non-discrimination, in ethical, political and critical CSR research; a dearth of radical feminist perspectives guiding CSR research; and the paucity of attention in political and critical CSR to the concept and value of 'women's difference', as identified in psychoanalytic feminist theory. With respect to 'gendering' approaches, we show how each of these theoretical perspectives can inform understanding of societal level impacts of CSR; how research focusing on 'missing voices' can assist our understanding of CSR practice and research, especially through the adoption of post-colonial feminist theory; and how critical CSR research could benefit from all such research strategies.

We conclude with a discussion of the limitations of our approach, and the implications of our framework for gender and CSR research, and CSR scholarship more broadly. With increasing evidence that gender analysis is central to such societal challenges as poverty (Habermas 1998), development (e.g., UN Sustainable Development Goals 2015) and environmental degradation (Marshall 2011), and growing acknowledgement of the importance of pluralism to the CSR field (Scherer and Palazzo 2011), our paper illustrates how a better grounding of CSR in feminist theory can contribute to CSR research more broadly.

Why Feminist Organization Studies and CSR

Here we briefly define our terms with respect to gender and CSR, and explain our rationale for considering the relationship between FOS and CSR. Gender is conceptualized as a central organizing characteristic of social life (Acker 1990). It pertains to the socially-constructed norms, values, roles, identities, opportunities and threats accorded to human beings on the basis of their (assumed) sex. While bodies and identities matter, so do institutional and social practices and power. Organizations are, accordingly, gendered in that gender is an integral part of all organizational practices and processes such that they cannot

be properly understood without incorporating a gender analysis (Acker 1990). Moreover, FOS commonly starts from a position in which gender relations, and its intersections with other systems of social inequality and difference, such as race, class and sexuality, are regarded as fundamental to contemporary organizations and capitalism (Acker 2004; Calas and Smircich 2006), and to scholarship in these fields:

the changing social and historical meaning of ‘gender’ is destabilizing its interpretive categories, bringing to the fore the plurality of differences (not only those relating to gender) and together with the appearance of multiple voices, the claim to multiple knowledges (Gherardi 2010, p. 210).

Thus, as well as helping us address gender and CSR, this area of scholarship has the potential to contribute to wider research on pluralism in CSR (e.g., Scherer and Palazzo 2007, 2011) and the development of more inclusive CSR research.

We contend that FOS is an appropriate lens to bring to CSR research on gender because it has long been the source of key insights with respect to gender issues in the field of organization studies. Moreover, FOS scholars have participated in the ongoing battle over what profit-making organizations are responsible for (Acker, 2004). Indeed the project of making “large-scale organizations more democratic and more supportive of humane goals” has been an aim of FOS since its origins (Acker 1990, p.140), an objective shared by many CSR scholars. Moreover, since the emergence of “a systematic feminist theory of organizations” (Acker 1990, p. 140), research in this area has drawn upon a wide range of feminist theoretical perspectives, including liberal, radical, psychoanalytic, socialist, poststructuralist/postmodern, postcolonial, transnational/(post)colonial and intersectional theories, and critical men’s studies. These have been deployed to advance our understanding of gender and organizations, and each offers rich insights for gender and CSR scholarship. Through detailed exploration of the contributions of FOS, this paper shows how feminist theory can advance CSR scholarship.

Definitions of CSR are plentiful, perhaps reflecting Votaw’s observation that “The term [CSR] is a brilliant one; it means something, but not always the same thing, to everybody” (1973, p. 11). It has frequently been observed that the concept of CSR is dynamic, contextual and ‘essentially contested’. Hence definitions vary. Some are relatively specific, such as “the firm’s consideration of, and response to, issues beyond the narrow economic, technical and legal requirements of the firm” (Davis 1973, p. 312) and “the economic, legal, ethical and discretionary expectations that society has of organizations” (Carroll 1979, p. 500). Generally, however, the definition of Matten and Moon gives space for the variety of practices that a dynamic, contextual and clustered concept warrants: “policies and practices of corporations that reflect business responsibility for some wider societal good” (2008, p. 405). In the context of its potential for engagement around gender issues, it is worth highlighting how CSR has developed both to more closely respond to regulatory

initiatives and to assume neo-governmental roles (Crane et al. 2008; Gond et al. 2011; Knudsen et al. 2015; Matten and Crane 2005; Moon 2002; Scherer and Palazzo 2011).

While an instrumental paradigm still dominates CSR research (e.g., McWilliams and Siegel 2002; Aquinis and Glavas 2012), the field is increasingly also conceptualized with reference to wider governance processes, involving businesses, government and civil society actors, addressing various structural challenges facing society (Scherer and Palazzo 2007, 2011). Accordingly, CSR has developed from being a ‘corporate-centred’ to a ‘corporate-oriented’ concept (Rasche et al. 2013) extending to new accountability for business, and drawing upon a wide range of theoretical perspectives (McBarnet et al. 2007; Moon et al. 2011; Auld et al. 2008). By implication, CSR has become an arena for a variety of different kinds of engagement by feminist scholars. Our paper aims to facilitate such interdisciplinary research.

Feminist Organization Theory and CSR Scholarship

Here we clarify FOS’s theoretical terrain in order to highlight its relevance and importance for CSR scholarship. We briefly review the key theoretical perspectives and the insights each has brought to organization studies, and then discuss how these lenses have informed CSR scholarship. We draw upon Calas and Smircich (2006) in particular because their specific intention is “to foster feminist theories as conceptual lenses to enact a more relevant organization studies” in order to “signal the existence and strengths of possibilities already opened” and to “inspire many more” (p.286). This is exactly our ambition with respect to CSR studies. Moreover, the Calas and Smircich (2006) framework continues to provide a foundation for discussion of feminist organization theory (e.g., Gherardi 2010; Benschop and Verloo 2016), and has been acknowledged as useful for gender and CSR research (Marshall 2011).

Each feminist theoretical lens discussed here represents a substantive body of work in organization and management scholarship. Space does not permit a comprehensive overview of these theoretical domains, however we summarize key contributions of each. In particular, we identify significantly different: *accounts* of gender issues; *framing of the ‘problem’* with respect to gender and organizations; and suggested *solutions* to these problems. Furthermore, while “feminist theory is a critique of the status quo and therefore *always political*... the degree of critique and the nature of the politics vary”, leading to agendas that range from fixing individuals and “reforming organizations; to transforming organizations and society; to transforming our prior understanding of what constitutes knowledge” in our field (Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 286, emphasis in the original; see also Gherardi 2010). We follow Calas and Smircich (2006) in differentiating two main types of feminist theory, the first centered on women and the second on ‘gendering’.

First we examine those theories centred on ‘women’ that consist of liberal, radical and psychoanalytical feminist theories. These share the assumption that “women’s oppression is

located in the condition of women” and tend not to differentiate between women but rather imply an essentialist “transcultural and transhistorical ‘woman’ and attempt to develop an understanding of her subordination to ‘man’” (Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 288). Table 1a summarizes the three main theoretical perspectives in this women-centred approach, and

Table 1a about here

With roots in 18th and 19th century liberal political theory, liberal feminist approaches (Table 1a, column 1), including research on women in management, mostly involve accounts of women and work which relate inequalities to sexual difference and gender stereotypes (see Metcalfe and Woodhams 2012). Here, sex is regarded as a biological endowment, a binary variable, and gender is socialized onto sexed human beings for appropriate behavior (e.g., gender roles). The focus is on individual freedom, choice, opportunity and equality (Benschop and Verloo 2016). Organizations (and organization theory) are regarded as gender neutral. The problem with respect to gender and organizations is conceived as residing largely within individuals, while solutions lie in correcting sex/gender imbalances through human resource development initiatives for women, and structural/legal reforms and interventions to advance equal opportunities for women and men to develop themselves and compete equally for rewards. Research focuses on the problems of discrimination that women face in labour markets, mostly using positivist and quantitative social science methodologies.

As CSR research and practice have been dominated by functionalist and instrumental perspectives (Windsor 2001), it is hardly surprising that gender and diversity are often addressed therein from a liberal feminist viewpoint (Maxfield 2007; see also Roberts 2012), reflecting an essentialist view of women and men. CSR and gender research of this kind attempts to make women visible, and address women’s representation on corporate boards and in management, for example as part of the CSR in the workplace agenda (Bear et al. 2010; Fernandez-Feijoo et al. 2014; Larrieta-Rubin de Celis et al. 2015; Williams 2003; Terjesen et al. 2015; del Mar Alonso-Almeida et al. 2015; see also Werhane 2007). In line with the neo-liberal feminist focus on market values and individualism (Rottenberg 2014; Benschop and Verloo 2016), this approach has extended to research on women as entrepreneurs (Dolan and Scott 2009), identifying the potential for individual women’s empowerment through CSR. It has also been used to increase visibility of women stakeholders in supply chains and communities, and as consumers. Literature on gender mainstreaming is sometimes categorized as liberal feminist (Walby 2005); however, research on gender mainstreaming and CSR also explores participation and voice within

wider CSR initiatives (Grosser and Moon 2005a, 2005b) thus bridging liberal, socialist and post-structural perspectives.

Radical feminist theory (Table 1a, column 2) emerged from the women's liberation movements of the late 1960s, and women's dissatisfaction with the sexism found in the new left and civil rights movements. Viewed as their own 'sex class', here women are considered an oppressed class in a society where gender is a social construction that ensures women's subordination to men. From this perspective the problem is that organizations are mostly institutions of the patriarchal order, created to maintain gender segregation and discrimination in the public domain and sexual oppression in the private domain. Solutions lie in alternative feminist organizing practices, including separate organizations reflecting feminist values of equality, community and participation, and the empowerment of women. Research methodologies focus on female-centred knowledge generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures (e.g., case studies, consciousness-raising groups). There is little evidence of this lens in the CSR literature. Although women's empowerment and entrepreneurship literature draws upon some of these ideas with a focus on women's collaboration and community, for example, such initiatives largely emerge from within patriarchal structures, and are critiqued for not reflecting women's knowledge and participation (Tornhill 2016; Johnstone-Louis forthcoming).

Psychoanalytic feminist theory (Table 1a, column 3) evolved from Freudian and other psychoanalytic theories. From this perspective, individuals become identified in the context of their psychosexual development. Gender structures a social system of male domination which influences psychosexual development. The problem is that organizations reproduce patriarchal psychosexual development which helps maintain the dominant system of gender relations. Solutions lie in valuing women's differences as beneficial for organizations, and for women themselves (e.g., women's ways of knowing and leadership). Here the focus has been on ethics of care, women's empathy, and women's relational skills and 'interactive leadership'. However, the question has also been raised as to whether "the focus on female advantage actually 'advantages' females" (Fletcher 1994, p. 74) or further entrenches gender stereotypes. Nevertheless, Marshall (1995) and Fletcher (1998, 2004) reveal how this perspective has helped to challenge the gendered status quo by emphasizing the power and significance of relational activities for organizations. Methodologies focus on articulating feminine and masculine values and their implications for organizations.

In CSR scholarship this theoretical lens has been used to considerable effect, particularly in the business ethics literature where, drawing upon Gilligan (1982), stakeholder theory has been rethought more as a relational concept than as a transactional one (Wicks et al. 1994; Burton and Dunn 1996; Derry 1996; Liedtka 1996). Yet Derry (1996) and Grosser (2009), among others, have questioned whether this approach actually benefits women given that it remains instrumental at its core. Reflected in the diversity management literature which informs much CSR practice, this approach regards difference not so much as something to be fixed, but more as something to be utilized and capitalized upon by organizations.

In general, the women-centered approaches discussed above tend to identify significant benefits to women as individuals. However, liberal feminism has inspired a focus on the advancement of women in management, often to the exclusion of women at other levels. Moreover, in “taking a ‘how to succeed’ perspective liberal feminism tends to be uncritical of the gendered (male) nature of organizations” (Calas and Smircich 2006). Radical and psychoanalytic feminism encourage us to put the perspectives and practices of women at the centre of our analysis, which has been extremely useful in organizational and CSR research. However, critiques of new forms of liberal feminism such as that described as ‘transnational business feminism’ (Roberts 2015) locate the problem with reference to the limitations of these approaches, arguing that the neoliberal macroeconomic framework creates and sustains gender-based and other forms of oppression through the global feminization of labor (Standing 1999), and the erosion of support for social reproduction (Roberts 2015; Hayhurst 2014; Dolan et al. 2012). It thereby utilizes gender and race-based inequality as a resource for global capital (Acker 2004, 2006) and destroys societal resources. This analysis suggests the importance of other FOS theoretical perspectives for CSR.

We next discuss the approaches that centre on ‘gendering’ (see Table 1b). These approaches move beyond the insights of the women-centred approaches, particularly as they aim to denaturalize assumptions within them through engagement with “relations of power, in which gendered (and other) identities and subjectivities are formed” (Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 301).

‘Gendering’ as social(ly) system(ic) is a process, produced and reproduced through relations of power among differently positioned members of society, including relations emerging from historical processes, dominant discourses and institutions and dominant epistemological conceptualizations, all of which become naturalized as ‘the way it is’ (Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 301).

Table 1b about here

The key contribution of socialist feminist theory and gendered organization approaches in this regard (Table 1b, column 1) has been to show how attempts to understand, and theorize about, gender and organizations were trapped by the assumption that organizational structures were gender neutral, rather than highly gendered:

To say that an organization ...is gendered means that advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned

through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine. Gender is not an addition to ongoing processes, conceived as gender neutral. Rather, it is an integral part of those processes, which cannot be properly understood without an analysis of gender (Acker 1990, p. 146).

This approach sees gender and gender identities as constructed social practices. It draws upon a sociological understanding of gender “as a routine, methodical, and recurring accomplishment” (West and Zimmerman 1987, p. 126) that is embedded in everyday interaction, and performance (Butler 2004). At the level of the organization, “Gendered inequalities, gendered images, and gendered interactions arise in the course of the ongoing flow of activities that constitute ‘an organization’” (Acker 1998, p. 196). For example, traits that are commonly ascribed to men are routinely privileged within organizations while those ascribed to women, such as interpersonal dimensions of work, are devalued or ignored (Meyerson and Kolb 2000). Images of ideal workers, managers and leaders remain highly gendered, so that ‘doing gender’, ‘doing power’ and ‘doing leadership’ are interlinked (Fletcher 1994, 1998, 2004). Workers are conceived of as having no significant caring obligations that encroach on working time. The ‘gendered division of labour’ whereby women and men work in different jobs, in different industries and in different organizations, paid at unequal rates, reflects unequal and persistent sex-based patterns of employment. This division of labour is seen to underlie capitalism; through it, the marginalization of women as a secondary labour force is perpetuated. Recent examples include deteriorating working conditions associated with non-standard precarious employment, and part-time work (Benschop and Verloo 2016). Drawing upon Marxist, psychoanalytic and radical feminism, socialist feminism explores the intersection of gender and class, as well as marginalization based on race, sexuality and other differences, such that organizations can be conceived of as ‘inequality regimes’ (Acker 2006; see also Holvino 2010).

The problem with respect to gender and organizations from this perspective lies not just with individuals, but at the level of organizational practice. Bringing in more female/other bodies cannot in itself solve these structural problems. Solutions lie in identifying how organizational practices are gendered, and addressing these structural issues, including exploring the relationship between ‘productive’ and ‘reproductive’/care work. Research methods include case studies, ethnographies and studies of micro-social activities and practices (see special issue of *Organization* (2000) Volume 7(4)). Organizational practices are often contextualized within the wider gendered institutional environment (Yancey-Martin 2004), where ‘gendered institutions’, and particularly the whole sphere of reproduction, are seen to provide the substructure for ‘gendered organizations’.

This perspective is reflected also in ‘critical studies of men’ (Hearn 2004), which explore men, power and masculinities, in particular hegemonic masculinity, in organizations. Naming ‘men as men’ (Collinson and Hearn 1994), this approach attempts to break the silence that renders masculinity invisible and removes it from discourse, and instead reveals masculinity to be “a standpoint claiming to [sic] the monopoly of ‘objectivity’” (Gherardi 2010 p. 227). Masculinity is also viewed as a practice rather than an attribute, with literature

exploring different ways in which men, as well as women, practise masculinity in organizations. Socialist feminism is concerned with the politics of knowledge as well as practice, in how knowledge is constituted and for whom, and the centrality of different standpoints to the legitimacy of any field of study. Thus emphasis is given to the simultaneity and linkages of power and oppression at the intersection of sex, race, class power relations and sexuality, among other differences (Calas and Smircich 2006; Gherardi 2010) in organizations and organization studies.

This theoretical perspective informs a number of emerging streams of CSR scholarship. Gendered analysis of corporate supply chain codes of conduct extends attention to the second and third tier supply chains where workers are predominantly women, and where CSR codes of conduct rarely reach. This analysis reveals how such codes can exacerbate gender inequality when working standards are raised in formal supply chain factories and women are driven into informal sub-tier production networks (e.g., Barrientos et al. 2003; Prieto-Carrón 2004, 2006). Other research reflecting this approach analyses various aspects of CSR from a gender perspective, including: CSR benchmarks and socially responsible investment criteria (e.g., Grosser and Moon 2005a); CSR initiatives such as the UN Global Compact (Kilgour 2007, 2013); CSR and sustainability leadership (Marshall 2007, 2011); and CSR as a process of governance (Grosser 2016). Such research also addresses the gendered institutional contexts of multinational companies, identifying women's reproductive labour as a major issue in global supply chain safety and ethics (Pearson 2007). Research on gendered institutional change with respect to the impact of CSR in the Middle East (Karam and Jamali 2013), and gendered value chain analysis (Loconto 2015; McCarthy 2015) also reflects this theoretical approach. Indeed, much of this more recent scholarship reflects all three of the 'gendering' theories discussed in this section.

This perspective in FOS also informs emerging research on the relationship between masculinity, hegemonic masculinity in particular, and CSR (Marshall 2007, 2011; Knights and Tullberg 2012). Coleman (2002) problematizes hegemonic masculinity in CSR, and Marshall (2007, 2011) explores how it shapes discourse and practice, powerfully invoking d'Eaubonne's statement that "no revolution led by masculine qualities in society (rather than men *per se*) will address the destruction of natural resources" (Marshall 2011, p. 279). Such research aligns with scholarship on gendering sustainability and the environment (Plumwood 1993), now discussed in the context of organizational/corporate environmentalism (Phillips 2014) and CSR. Others, such as Elias (2008), address the relationship between masculinist managerialism and women workers in multinational companies in order to develop a gendered understanding of global production central to gender and CSR debates. In a similar vein, Knights and Tullberg (2012) argue that the mismanagement of masculinity lies at the very heart of the corporate *irresponsibility* which led to the global financial crisis.

Poststructuralist/postmodern feminist theories (Table 1b, column 2) are located in contemporary poststructuralist critiques of knowledge, identity and subjectivity, or the 'linguistic turn' to a focus on language as "constitutive of the things we can think/know

rather than simply representative of them” (Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 309). Here sex/gender are “discursive practices that constitute specific subjectivities through power and resistance” (Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 302), and gender and other (e.g., race, class, sexuality) discourses actually constitute organizations and set the conditions of possibility for everyone. Drawing upon de Saussure’s (1966) structural linguistics, Derrida’s (1978) ideas about the impossibility of universal truth, and Foucault’s (1980) work on the power of discourse, this approach challenges the idea that gender categories are essentially dual, binary, oppositional and fixed. Rather gender and sexuality are revealed as “shifting, fluid, multiple categories” (Lober 1997, quoted in Benschop and Verloo 2016, p. 106). This allows for a more sophisticated understanding of gender as a social practice, and the study of numerous subversive opportunities, for “what constitutes the subject position of a ‘man’ or a ‘woman’ is the outcome of the whole complex of performance in specific spatial-temporal settings” (Benschop and Verloo 2016, p. 106).

From this perspective the problem that needs addressing is that organizations are the discursive mobilization of power/knowledge resources that work in favour of the more powerful in society. Solutions lie in denaturalizing and deconstructing the discourses of ‘organization’ (theory and practice) so as to expose the norms therein, identifying who has been silenced / what is missing from mainstream organizational discourses, and working to include a wider variety of voices and perspectives in defining and resolving the key issues that need to be addressed in organizations and organizational studies. Such research explores partiality, difference and struggle in the relationship between “discourse, gendered identities, power relations and organizing” (Ashcraft and Mumby, quoted in Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 314). Recent manifestations of this approach increasingly use Foucauldian analysis to explore discursive formation of gendered organizational subjectivities and subject positions, along with discourses of resistance to these. Research methods here include textual and discourse analysis / deconstruction. Deconstruction is presented as a powerful process for studying the ways language (and its absence, silence) can be used to suppress women and other subordinated groups in organizations and organizational research (Martin and Knopoff 1997). Again, complex intersections of gender, race/ethnicity and class are stressed in this literature, where “lines of differentiation are not parallel, but intersect in multiple ways and are expressed in multiple voices” (Gherardi 2010, p. 217), in different spatial locations (Metcalf and Woodhams 2012). In line with questioning the concepts of objective knowledge and universal truths, this approach gives particular attention to how the social location of the researcher affects their construction/production of knowledge and potential complicity in gendered power relations (Benschop and Verloo 2016; Gherardi 2010; Pullen 2006).

In management and organization studies, poststructuralist/postmodern feminism has been used to question how people perform gender in organizational life and organization studies, or how they ‘do’ and ‘undo’ gender in the course of their work. Such approaches remain in their infancy in CSR research, however. Coleman (2002) explicitly introduces feminist post-structuralism to CSR in her call for greater reflexivity by researchers about the politics and impact of the knowledge they create. She argues that:

issues of inclusion and exclusion, of scrutiny of the power to define and contribute to the debate become critical if this is to be an opportunity for the realisation of some new reality, a process of co-creation of something other than business-as-usual (Coleman 2002, p. 22).

Marshall (2007, 2011) explores women's participation in CSR leadership, and the ways in which their contributions are heard or silenced. Singh and Point (2006) draw implicitly upon this approach to analyse constructions of gender and ethnicity in diversity statements on European company websites. Similarly, critical discourse analysis underlies Kemp et al.'s (2010) exploration of gender, CSR and organizational change. Keenan et al. (2014) reflect poststructuralist perspectives in their exploration of gendered participation in agreements between mining companies and communities. Lauwo (2016) draws on poststructuralist feminism to challenge the masculinity of CSR discourses in the mining industry in Tanzania and propose policy changes to enable platforms for women's concerns to be voiced.

This theoretical perspective is also implicit in attempts to include the voices of women's NGOs in defining CSR (Holgersson and Thøgersen 2016). Exploring marginalized voices in CSR governance, Grosser (2016) finds women's NGOs are contesting and expanding the definition and scope of CSR to include issues pertaining to violence against women, including domestic violence and sexual violence, as well as pornography. Moreover, Foucauldian analysis informs recent exploration of gendered CSR discourse and resistance, for example in cocoa farming in Ghana (McCarthy 2015), and the need to include missing voices of women is leading to new CSR research methods (McCarthy and Muthuri forthcoming).

Our final column (Table 1b, column 3) addresses transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory. This draws upon gendered critiques of Western feminism, and postcolonial critiques of Western epistemologies, to focus on the gendered aspects of globalization, including the role of organizations as institutions of the colonizer. Here the problem with respect to gender and organizations is that transnational corporations are "primary actors in the perpetuation of race/gender/sex relations of modernities" (Calas and Smircich 2006, p. 302). Solutions lie in addressing intersections of gender, race and ethnicity with questions of 'the nation' and transnational institutions, including corporations and global value chains. This approach draws attention to what is left out of much feminist theorizing, "namely the material complexity, reality and agency of Third World women's bodies and lives... in the production of knowledge about globalization" (Mohanty 2003, p. 230). It challenges ongoing imperialism and colonialism to suggest new possibilities for transnational feminism to subvert multiple oppressions at local and global levels. Further, it extends poststructuralist theories and attempts to escape the dualism of male/female to explore representation, power and identity as well as justice and ethics in practices of globalization (Calas and Smircich 2006). Research methods utilize textual and post-colonial deconstruction/reconstruction analysis, moving beyond a focus on internal organizing processes to deconstruct 'development' and address wider structural inequality. Research attempts to articulate the other's knowledge with reference to subjects and objects of research, including by

facilitating the voices of scholars from the Global South. Calas and Smircich (2006) identify three kinds of analytical focus here: on masculinities in globalizing capital; on the gendered construction of the division between capitalist production and human reproduction; and on the analysis of gender as a resource for global capital. We will return to these in our discussion of future CSR research agendas.

Mohanty (2003) and Metcalfe and Woodhams (2012) argue that a partial picture of key challenges hinders theory formulation in any field where this transnational/(post)colonial feminist perspective is missing. In the field of CSR, it is rarely explicitly referenced (c.f., Prieto Carrón 2004). However, this lens appears relevant to much research in the field, for example on CSR and development, and global supply chains (e.g., Barrientos et al. 2003; Kabeer 2004; Barrientos and Smith 2007; Pearson 2007; Prieto Carrón 2004, 2006, 2008), which highlights the importance of local knowledge. This perspective is more clearly evident in research exploring the impact of the mining industry on indigenous women, and women in developing countries (Lahiri-Dutt and Macintyre 2006; Keenan et al. 2014), and in CSR, particularly in Lauwo's (2016) study of mining in Tanzania. Metcalfe and Woodhams (2012) recommend using transnational feminist theory to engage with multiple social and political actors and to re-imagine agentic possibilities to eradicate discrimination and social injustice. Increasingly, gender and CSR scholars are arguing for the inclusion of the voices of those traditionally left out, with particular reference to those from the Global South, and especially women (Newell 2005; Hale and Opondo 2005; Prieto-Carrón 2004, 2006; Keenan et al. 2014; Lauwo 2016; McCarthy and Muthuri forthcoming). Moreover, feminist perspectives from the Global South are challenging and expanding CSR scholarship, in calling, for example, for a stronger focus on SMEs in developing countries, and a discussion of power-to rather than power-over in CSR research (Karam and Jamali 2015).

Our introduction to key strands in feminist organization theory has revealed significantly different accounts of what constitute 'gender issues', what the 'problem' is with respect to gender and organizations, and what kind of 'solutions' are recommended. We illustrate how these different theoretical lenses have implicitly informed CSR scholarship. We find a variety of contributions with respect to their feminist theoretical base, albeit with little explicit acknowledgement of that theory. Scholarship is emerging on gender and CSR that not only utilizes liberal feminist theory, but also a range of more critical feminist theoretical perspectives. These draw attention to the connection between CSR, neoliberalism and neoliberal feminism (Rottenberg 2014; Prügl and True 2014), and challenge scholars to explore new forms of feminist agency in this context (Prügl 2015).

Next we turn to CSR theory to elucidate ways in which different types of CSR scholarship draw upon different types of feminist theory.

CSR Theory and Feminist CSR Scholarship

Although business ethics remains a cornerstone of CSR, it is now complemented by other conceptualizations of business responsibility to, and for, society. In order to demonstrate the relevance of this we adapt Garriga and Melé's (2004) theoretical mapping of 'Instrumental', 'Political', 'Integrative' and 'Ethical' theories, and add to this reference the growing application of institutional and critical theories in CSR research (see Table 2). Clearly, there are points of overlap and interaction, but these theories give a broad account of the way in which CSR, or its absence, are explained. We identify key contributions and map feminist engagements with each perspective (Table 2, row 2).

Table 2 about here

Ethics in business (Table 2, column 1) have been part of an often 'implicit' CSR (Matten and Moon 2008). Many national CSR stories refer to ancient religiously- and philosophically-based expectations of what wealthy individuals and those in trade ought to do. In the last fifty years or so, business ethics has been concerned with applying general ethical theories to business situations. These include social contract theory (Donaldson and Dunfee 1994), virtue ethics (e.g., Hartman 2013) and duty-based ethics (e.g., Bowie 1999). CSR manifestations of an ethical strain include the development of various principles and standards around human rights (e.g., United Nations 2011) and ethical trade (e.g., ETI). The feminist literature which intersects with this theoretical strand in CSR (Table 2, column 1, row 2) focuses in particular on the feminist 'ethics of care' (e.g., Wicks et al. 1994; Burton and Dunn 1996; Liedtka 1996; Derry 1999; Hamington and Sander-Staudt 2011). Historically, there has been less discussion of feminist 'ethics of justice' which addresses "the inequities of discrimination rather than finding in women's skills a fortuitous tool to economic efficiency" (Derry 1996, p. 106). Yet, this is changing, as the debate about the intersection of feminist ethics and business ethics is elaborated in more detail (Borgerson 2007), and as new definitions of CSR from feminist perspectives emerge in the literature. These include more extensive attention to 'care' issues, and also to 'corporate sexual responsibility' which incorporates responsibility for business-related sex purchasing, including pornography, and sex entertainment for example (e.g., Ferguson 1997; Holgersson 2011; Grosser 2016; Holgersson and Thögersen 2016).

Feminist research has also begun to critique masculine norms in CSR practice and research (e.g., Holgersson 2011; Spence 2016b). We note earlier contributions from FOS to business

ethics with respect to defining business responsibility, which remain pertinent today. For example, Ferguson (1997, p. 88) notes:

Feminists argue for an expanded and reconstituted notion of responsibility as the need to *respond*, to extend oneself, to take care. While not abandoning the idea of individual agency, the concept is broadened to be more collective and more relational. One is responsible not only for what one has done, or even for what one has not done, but for what is *required* (emphasis in the original).

This point illustrates nicely how views from the margins, in this case the feminist margins, have the potential to transform central concepts in CSR research (see also Borgerson 2007 for further discussion of feminist ethics and definitions of responsibility).

Instrumental approaches (Table 2, column 2) have dominated the CSR literature in recognition of the legitimacy that CSR can bring to business. There has been a burgeoning of academic literature on the relationship between social and financial performance (e.g. Margolis and Walsh 2003; Orlitzky et al. 2003; Aquinis and Glavas 2012), with the consensus that there is a modest positive relationship, varying greatly by place and sector (Vogel 2005). In the world of practice, CSR professionals increasingly focus on ‘the business case’ for CSR, which can include employee loyalty, attractiveness to investors, new customer markets and efficiency savings, as illustrated in the ‘shared value’ concept (Porter and Kramer 2011), designed to expressly encourage companies to invest in business that delivers social benefits and profits. Given the roles of women as employees, supply chain workers, entrepreneurs, consumers, community members and other kinds of stakeholders, this aspect of CSR has opened up numerous possibilities for feminist research (Table 2, column 2, row 2) (e.g., Bear et al. 2010; Larrieta-Rubín de Celis et al. 2014; Fernandez-Feijoo et al. 2014) (see also Table 1a, final row).

Whilst the stakeholder approach to CSR (Table 2, column 3) contains ethical (Evan and Freeman 1988) and strategic elements (Freeman et al., 2007), it is distinguished as a theory because it is an actor-based theory rather than exclusively a normative or a performance-based theory. Although it was developed as an approach to strategic management, stakeholder theory has been adopted by companies to explain and manage their CSR, as well as by CSR scholars to develop best practice (e.g., Mitchell et al. 1997; Rowley 1997). A conversation with feminism here (Table 2, column 3, row 2) involves recognition of stakeholders, and stakeholder processes, as gendered, and the representation of women as well as men in stakeholder relations and consultation (Hale and Oppondo 2005; Grosser 2009). For example, Hale and Oppondo (2005), Prieto-Carrón (2004, 2006) and Hale and Wills (2007) emphasize the importance of local multi-stakeholder participatory approaches to code of conduct implementation with respect to women supply chain workers. Keenan et al. (2014) explore community stakeholders and mining sector agreements with respect to gender participation. More broadly, feminist scholarship has provided important critiques

and contributions to stakeholder theory, mostly based on feminist ethics (Wicks et al. 1994; Burton and Dunn 1996; Liedtka 1996; Derry 1999, 2012; Spence 2016a).

Political theories of CSR (Table 2, column 4) explore the growing role of business in societal governance, along with governments and civil society. In contrast to the view of companies as undermining public goods, here companies are often positioned as potential providers of these goods, and it is recognized that CSR is structured by governmental institutions and by governmental agency (Gond et al. 2011; Knudsen et al. 2015). A literature in the 1980s explored the relationships between CSR and public policy (e.g., Preston and Post 1981). More recent literatures address how CSR features in new national (Moon 2002; Jackson and Bartosch 2016) and international (Crane et al. 2008b; Scherer and Palazzo 2007, 2011; Scherer et al. 2016) governance. This opens up possibilities for discussion about how CSR might address feminist public policy agendas (Elson 2016) as an additional regulatory compliance process, for example (Grosser 2016). Research here (Table 2, column 4, row 2) includes feminist contributions to, and critiques of, CSR theory relating to governance, including engagement with the ‘political CSR’ literature which draws upon deliberative democracy, and legitimacy theory. Feminist commentary on, and critiques of, new multi-stakeholder governance processes involving business, government and civil society, are emerging (Hale and Opondo 2005; Hale and Wills 2007; Grosser 2016).

A great deal of attention has been paid to CSR from various institutional theory perspectives (Table 2, column 5) (Moon and Vogel 2008; Matten and Moon 2008; Aguilera et al. 2007). These share FOS approaches to, and interest in, structuring organizations and their behavior. Campbell (2007), for example, examines national institutional settings and their impact on the nature of CSR at the company level, concluding that national institutions rather than company choices are critical to understanding CSR. Matten and Moon (2008) complement this interest in national institutions with attention to ‘new institutionalism’ as a means of exploring the dynamic, notably globalizing, elements of CSR. In keeping with the wider literature on institutional theory (e.g., Lawrence and Suddaby 2006), there have also been approaches to CSR which stress the role of ‘institutional work’ (Slager et al. 2012). This now extends to analysis of gender-based institutional work in CSR (e.g., Karam and Jamali 2013; McCarthy 2015; see also Kemp et al. 2010).

CSR has also been the subject of analysis from the critical management studies (CMS) perspective (Table 2, column 6). Critical scholarship often points to the potentially negative social, environmental and political impacts of CSR, partly by legitimizing current business arrangements and power (Shamir 2005, 2008; Banerjee 2008; Fleming and Jones 2013). Critical theorists in the field of CSR are skeptical of managerial goodwill and stewardship, governmental regulation and the efficacy of consumer choice in raising corporate responsibility. Rather, they examine “*whose* values become represented in corporate decision-making and *how* those representations influence reasoning” (Kuhn and Deetz 2008, p. 174, emphasis in the original). Drawing upon the work of Habermas, for example (Scherer and Palazzo 2007), they demand “a transformation of organizational governance and decision-making processes to include more decisional voices representing diverse

business and community values and generating explicit value contestation” (Kuhn and Deetz 2008, p. 174). Some critical CSR scholars envisage models of stakeholder inclusion and communication that work with conflict *and* difference to generate creative outcomes (Kuhn and Deetz 2008; Burchell and Cook 2013). The recent growth in CSR scholarship from critical management perspectives is remarkably silent on gender issues. However, given the close alignment of feminist and critical theory historically, it is not surprising that numerous critical feminist perspectives on CSR have emerged (e.g., Table 1b), including more recently from the field of feminist international political economy (e.g., Roberts 2015; Prügl and True 2014).

We therefore find emerging scholarship on gender and CSR that engages with, and contributes to, core theoretical perspectives in CSR. While often marginalized, in that gender research is infrequently referenced in mainstream CSR texts, for example, the literature we have identified makes a contribution across the CSR field. However, we contend that it can be enhanced and extended through a more explicit recognition of feminist organization theory. We now turn to the task of developing an integrated theoretical framework for the analysis of gender issues in CSR.

An Integrated Theoretical Framework for the Analysis of Gender Issues in CSR

Our framework (Table 3) draws upon the theoretical perspectives discussed above (Tables 1a, 1b, 2). It shows how feminist organization theory pertains to different streams in CSR research, and how its use can “open up space for new or alternative conversations in our field” (Crane et al. 2016, p. 787). We comment on those areas of our framework which have received considerable attention to date, and on those areas where little work has yet been undertaken. We point in particular to areas on which future research might focus.

Table 3 about here

Although ethical approaches to CSR (Table 3, column 1), if informed by liberal feminism, could focus on equal opportunities issues (e.g., equal representation of women and men in ethical decision making), we note little such research. Few CSR scholars discuss ideas emerging from radical feminism, although the importance of women-centred knowledge is increasingly recognized (e.g., McCarthy and Muthuri forthcoming), and Spence (2014) discusses related concepts of flattening hierarchies and decentralizing power in organizations, as they relate to business ethics. Yet women-centred approaches in feminist theory have had a major impact upon ethical research in CSR through the application of

psychoanalytic feminist theory, with a focus on the difference between women and men in ethical decision making and behavior, and the articulation of ‘feminine values’ relating to the ethics of care, for example. However, Borgerson (2007) points out that essentialist notions of male and female that underlie this approach are rejected by some feminist ethicists.

With reference to our framework, an extension of ethical CSR might be achieved also through the application of ‘gendering’ feminist theories. Socialist feminist theory would imply ethical analysis of the gendered nature of organizations (Table 3, column 1, row 3). This might draw upon Borgerson’s (2007) critical appraisal of the relationship between feminist ethics and business ethics, including greater attention to relationships, responsibility, experience, agency and power (see also: Thompson 2008; Machold et al. 2008). Attention to these issues leads Borgerson (2007) to point also to the many possible intersections of poststructuralist/postmodern feminist theory with ethical approaches to CSR. These include consideration of the importance of participation and inclusion in ethical decision making (Derry 1996), and the question of whose voices are missing (Derry 2012). Others have analyzed business ethics texts and events using feminist poststructuralist methods such as textual deconstruction analysis (e.g., Martin and Knopoff 1997). This approach could be applied more broadly to recent texts across the field. However, there is little evidence in the CSR and business ethics literature of perspectives from Third World women, in the context of defining ethical norms, for example, as would be suggested by an application of transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory (Table 3, column 1, row 5). These missing or little covered applications of FOS theory can inform future research.

To the extent that it has engaged with gender issues, instrumental CSR research (Table 3, column 2) draws predominantly on the women-centred approaches offered by liberal and psychoanalytical feminist theory. The former informs the business case for women’s equality and empowerment in the workplace, with a focus on equal opportunities / representation of women in management and on boards. This approach is also evidenced in research relating to women in the marketplace (e.g., regarding nondiscrimination and equal opportunities for women supply chain workers, women as consumers and equal opportunities for women entrepreneurs). Given its separatist origins, radical feminism has been little utilized to date in instrumental approaches to CSR. However, Table 3, column 2 reveals that psychoanalytical feminist theory underpins the business case, with respect to valuing women’s differences as beneficial for organizations, highlighting women’s relational abilities as leaders, for example, and their care skills. Such approaches are often found in the diversity management literature.

With respect to ‘gendering’ approaches, as illustrated in our framework, a socialist feminist/gendered organization perspective on instrumental CSR shifts the focus to analysis of instrumental CSR research and practice as a gendered domain, to explore limitations with respect to CSR gender rhetoric and indicators, for example (Grosser and Moon, 2005a, 2008), and the incorporation of gender issues within particular CSR initiatives, such as the UN Global Compact (Kilgour 2007, 2013). Such an approach extends also to exploring the

gendered nature of corporate supply chains (e.g., Barrientos et al. 2003), and of corporate community impacts (e.g., Keenan et al. 2014), including research that draws out the role of masculinity, especially hegemonic masculinity, in instrumental CSR practice and research (e.g., Marshall 2007, 2011; Knights and Tullberg 2012). A poststructuralist/postmodern feminist approach to instrumental CSR would involve analysis of whose perspectives are missing from this field of research and practice, and would invite feminist deconstruction analysis of instrumental CSR texts and stories (e.g., Coleman 2002; Marshall 2007, 2011). Finally, the use of transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory would lead to further research exploring Third World women's experience of instrumental CSR, as supply chain workers and entrepreneurs, for example (e.g., Kabeer 2004; Grosser et al. 2016).

Stakeholder approaches to CSR (Table 3, column 4) can be productively analysed using women-centred feminist approaches. Liberal feminism suggests the need for investigation of individual women and men as stakeholders, for example (Derry 1996; Grosser 2009; Crane and Ruebottom 2011; Keenan et al. 2014), and equal opportunities for participation. Inclusion of female-centred knowledge generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures, via women-only focus groups, for example, could bring valuable insights and contributions to stakeholder relations inspired by radical feminist perspectives. We note methodologies along these lines used by McCarthy and Muthuri (forthcoming). However, as noted above, psychoanalytical feminism has been the most commonly referenced feminist theory in the CSR stakeholder literature, informing significant debates about stakeholder management as a relational process, and a feminist 'ethics of care' approach.

With respect to 'gendering' perspectives, feminist discussion of stakeholder approaches to CSR have begun to adopt a socialist feminist/gendered organization lens involving analysis of the gendered nature of CSR stakeholder concepts and processes (Keenan et al. 2014; Grosser 2009; Spence 2016a), yet this perspective has not been well developed to date. Poststructuralist/postmodern feminist theory applied to this area of CSR research would investigate gender and missing stakeholders (Keenan et al. 2014). It would also suggest a need for feminist deconstruction analysis of the stakeholder literature/texts, an approach not yet evident in the literature. Acknowledgement of, and focus on, knowledge creation regarding different global stakeholders and their interests, including Third World women from a variety of countries, would result from an application of transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory to stakeholder research. Again, this is an area little covered in current CSR literature, although the voices of Third World women have begun to emerge in the supply chain literature (e.g., Kabeer 2004; Prieto-Carrón 2004, 2006), and the CSR and women's entrepreneurship literature (Tornhill 2016).

Analysis of 'political CSR' (Table 3, column 4) using women-centred approaches would include application of liberal feminist theory, which might focus on equal opportunities for women and men in CSR governance processes, for example. Radical feminism would extend this to include female-centred knowledge, generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures, via women only focus groups, for example. The implications of psychoanalytical feminism for political CSR also have yet to be explored. With regard to

‘gendering’ theories, a socialist feminist/gendered organization lens has begun to be applied to analyze CSR as a political multi-stakeholder process of governance from a feminist perspective. Overlapping with poststructuralist/postmodern feminist research, such analysis explores whose voices are missing from CSR governance processes/forums, and aims to address this (Grosser 2016; Keenan et al. 2014; Kilgour 2007, 2013). Poststructuralist/postmodern feminist research in this area would also include feminist deconstruction analysis of the ‘political CSR’ literature, which we have not seen to date. Finally, a transnational/(post)colonial feminist lens would inform research that brings Third World women’s voices and perspectives to ‘political CSR’ as a process of governance (Hale and Oppondo 2005). There is currently little literature at this intersection.

With regard to institutional CSR (Table 3, column 5), we see the emergence of women-centred approaches. A liberal feminist lens would suggest research on how equal opportunities for men and women are reflected within institutional settings of CSR, and how CSR practice can address this issue (e.g., Karam and Jamali 2013). Application of psychoanalytical feminist theory here would further suggest investigation of differing expectations regarding men’s and women’s roles and behaviours in the institutional contexts where CSR takes place. Such issues have been explored by Pearson (2007) and Karam and Jamali (2013). We do not currently see the application of radical feminist theory to institutional CSR. Gendering approaches in this research area would imply analysis of ‘gender as an institution’ (Yancey-Martin 2004) and its relationship to CSR, thus bringing socialist feminist/gendered organization perspectives to the institutional CSR literature. We consider that research by Pearson (2007), Karam and Jamali (2013) and McCarthy (2015) begins to apply this perspective. As yet, we see little feminist deconstruction analysis of CSR and institutional theory texts, as would be implied by poststructuralist/postmodern feminist theory. However, this lens, sometimes alongside transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory, is emerging in discussion of gender and the global institutionalization of CSR, and on gendered resistance to CSR programs in developing countries (McCarthy 2015; Tornhill 2016).

Finally, with reference to the critical (CMS) literature on CSR (Table 3, column 6), women-centred approaches drawing upon liberal feminism would imply a discussion of equal opportunities for women and men in critical CSR research. We see little evidence of this to date. As noted above, radical feminism implies the generation of female-centred knowledge which is little evident in the CMS CSR literature. The implications of psychoanalytical feminist theory for critical CSR research are also yet to be explored. From the ‘gendering’ perspective, socialist feminist approaches would necessitate investigation of critical CSR research as a gendered domain of scholarship, exploring gender blindness, and hegemonic masculinity therein, for example. The application of poststructuralist/postmodern feminist theory to this area of CSR scholarship would suggest a need for feminist deconstruction analysis of CMS CSR literature/texts. Use of transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory would lead to feminist deconstruction analysis focused on the extent to which Third World women’s perspectives are included in critical CSR research. Yet, we see little evidence of consideration of gender lenses in critical CSR scholarship.

Discussion

Our framework lays out ways in which FOS theory intersects with CSR research to inform gender and CSR scholarship. We have pointed to instances in which CSR research on gender has drawn upon such theory. However, we note that many of these instances are relatively rare in the CSR and gender literature, and thus our framework can be used to help identify where CSR and gender research can be strengthened by greater engagement with FOS theory. Moreover, our framework has enabled the identification of areas where little research has yet been undertaken. Overall, we note Calas and Smircich's (2006) suggestion that liberal feminism can be useful in facilitating debate about issues such as poverty, health and wider global conditions of inequality in the context of neo-liberal times, and we have pointed to the fact that this, along with psychoanalytic feminist theory, can help advance the business case for addressing gender in the context of CSR. However, we see numerous research gaps, in particular relating to the application of 'gendering' theories. Below we discuss the implications of this observation.

First, whilst socialist feminist/gender organization theory encourages gendered analysis of CSR practices and research, there have been few studies on the impact of masculinities/hegemonic masculinity in the field. Calas and Smircich point to the importance of such scholarship where analyzing masculinities in the context of globalizing capital reveals a "'trans-national business masculinity' that is egocentric, whose loyalties are conditional, showing a declining sense of responsibility for others" (2006, p. 323). Socialist feminist/gender organization theory also focuses on the gendered construction of the division between capitalist production and human reproduction, and in particular claims of business non-responsibility for the reproduction of human life from the local level to globalization processes. Relatedly, analysis of gender inequality as a resource for global capital also emerges from this theoretical perspective, where it is noted that Third World women act as cheap labour for capitalist production directly, and also subsidize, with their cheap labour, those in the West whose caring responsibilities become increasingly difficult to meet in the context of work intensification, for example. The importance of these issues for CSR research is partly explained by the fact that they point to ways in which corporations are implicated in the relationship between gender and poverty.

Second, we see little application of poststructuralist/postmodern feminist theory, despite calls for its use in CSR scholarship by Coleman (2002). While this perspective has begun to inform discussion of 'missing voices' in the context of instrumental, stakeholder and political CSR, poststructuralist theory, and deconstruction analysis in particular, might be utilized more broadly to reread significant mainstream CSR texts "to assess the extent to which ... sexism is part of the mainstream representation of knowledge in the field" (Calas and Smircich 1997, p. 55). Such an approach might also inform broader reflexivity in CSR scholarship regarding the power and role of researchers in knowledge construction.

Third, even more glaring is the dearth of literature that brings the varied perspectives of Third World women to mainstream CSR research, as would be required by the application

of transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory to inform CSR as a field of scholarship. This perspective might be employed to further theorize CSR research on gender and supply chains, and gender and development in the context of globalization. Given increased attention in CSR to issues of poverty, development, and environmental degradation, and a new focus on the sustainable development goals, the application of transnational/(post)colonial feminist theory in CSR research represents a particularly urgent research agenda which will necessitate, among other things, support for Third World women CSR scholars. Despite the discursive turn in feminist theory, and the ongoing value of feminist discourse and deconstruction analysis, the processes of globalization are material in their effects such that the study of bodies and their contexts matters.

Finally, all three of the ‘gendering’ theoretical lenses discussed here would facilitate evaluation of how CSR research itself “reproduces or changes power relations and patriarchal models” (Calas and Smircich 1997, p. 67). Not only does such analysis have the potential to impact gender and CSR research, it can also bring new insights to the wider field of CSR scholarship by expanding both our empirical focus (e.g., Karam and Jamali 2015) and our methodological approaches (e.g., McCarthy and Muthuri forthcoming).

Conclusions

Corporations increasingly address gender issues in the context of CSR, and governments now aim to drive equality agendas through legislation that encourages self-regulation by companies. These developments, along with the centrality of gender issues to the global challenges of poverty, development and environmental sustainability, among others on the CSR agenda, provide the context for a pressing need to support and advance gender and CSR scholarship.

Our paper began by contending that limitations in this field are not only the result of marginalization of gender issues and of women’s voices and perspectives on the ground, and in academia. We argue that such limitations also derive from a failure to utilize feminist theory systematically as a resource for CSR scholarship. Drawing upon FOS theory to develop an integrated theoretical framework for the analysis of gender issues in CSR, we have illustrated how a better grounding in such theory can contribute to the field. This enabled us to systematically map progress in CSR research on gender, to open space for new conversations, and to identify a number of novel directions for future research.

As a result of this theoretical mapping (Tables 1a, 1b, 2 and 3), we are able to make various contributions concerning the theorization of CSR and gender. With respect to ‘women-centred’ approaches, three findings stand out. First, there is little evidence of the influence of liberal feminism, with a focus on equal opportunities/representation of women and men, in the CSR literature on ethics, or on ‘political CSR’. Research in such areas could shed light on what are currently rather marginal sets of questions about who leads CSR, for example. Second, while the separatist foundations of radical feminist organization theory might make

this approach appear incompatible with mainstream CSR scholarship, the value of women-centred knowledge implied here is emerging in the gender and CSR literature. We would suggest further exploration of the potential contributions of this theoretical domain. Third, whilst the focus on the value of ‘women’s difference’ (from men) adopted in much psychoanalytic feminist theory has been influential in ethical and instrumental CSR research, it has potential to also complement analysis of ‘political CSR’.

With regard to ‘gendering’ approaches, again three findings are particularly noteworthy. First, we find that the application of ‘gendering’ theoretical perspectives can facilitate a more detailed, nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the gender impacts of CSR practice at a societal level, rather than simply an individual level, across the CSR research domain. For example, further utilization of socialist feminist organization analysis can help us question and evaluate the influence of CSR on gender relations and gender equality regarding, for example, power relations, unequal pay, the gendered provision of unpaid care work, and the normalization of particular kinds of masculinity. Second, significant research gaps and opportunities relating to the application of poststructuralist feminist organization theory to CSR are identified across the board. This perspective facilitates exploration of whose voices are missing in all kinds of CSR, offering potential to inform the development of more inclusive research. For example, we identify a need to re-read seminal CSR texts across the different sub-fields of scholarship to assess whether and how women, and other traditionally marginalized peoples, are included and represented as authors and subjects of knowledge. Third, and relatedly, we identify a lack of reference to feminist transnational/(post)colonial theory. Such research has the potential to bring the varied perspectives of Third World women to CSR research of all kinds, and further contribute to an inclusive research agenda. Finally, one of the most significant findings from our analysis is the lack of feminist theory/perspectives in critical CSR research. This gap offers important research potential, that could make a significant impact upon the relevance, and application of critical CSR scholarship in terms of its ability to address inequality and poverty issues globally.

The limitations of our paper lie mainly in the fact that the theoretical terrain of FOS is vast, and in our brief overview we have not been able to review all the texts in this field. New theoretical approaches continue to emerge therein. For example, researchers increasingly challenge the gendered nature of forms of writing to “take forward Irigaray’s ideas to develop a feminist *écriture* of/for organization studies that points towards ways of writing from the body” (Fotake et al. 2014, p. 1239). This approach is taken up in CSR research by Marshall (2011) who aims to avoid a scientific sequential style of academic writing in favour of more poetic styles that combine ambivalence with authority. Lauwo (2016) employs a similar strategy to challenge the masculinity and disembodied rationality dominating CSR discourses in the mining industry.

In line with Benschop and Verloo’s (2016) argument regarding feminist and organization theory, we consider it important that the influence of feminist and CSR theory is a two-way process. We hope our framework will facilitate such cross-fertilization of ideas. In addition,

we acknowledge the relevance of other feminist theory to CSR. Ultimately we would advocate the extension of our framework to areas of feminist theory beyond organization studies, including feminist: ethics; philosophy; economics; political science; and political economy, for example. This might enable broader, and yet more focused and nuanced, feminist contributions to the field, relating to the different strands in CSR scholarship as identified in Table 3. Thus we hope our paper will inspire others to build upon the theoretical framework we have developed.

This paper has identified a significant and growing body of work on gender and CSR. Yet, along with Benschop and Verloo (2016 p. 100) it is “Between these assertions of feminist success and achievement on the one hand and the isolation and marginalization of feminist theory on the other” that we write. As we have seen, one of the key messages of FOS is that in order to address contemporary challenges in CSR in the context of globalization, there is a need to be aware of the inseparability of power and knowledge (Gherardi 2010). Thus we need to further interrogate the politics of knowledge in our field so that our work does not only benefit dominant groups, elites and organizations. FOS theory tells us that the intersections of gender, race, class, nationality/ethnicity and sexuality are central to our ability to do this. Scholarship on these intersections will help us create knowledge from the margins, and build a more inclusive and pluralist CSR research agenda.

Yet, feminist scholarship often develops alongside rather than as part of mainstream theory, such that it is effectively ignored, its implications overlooked and its insights missed (Shanley and Pateman 1991). In organizational research, most mainstream scholarship continues to be presented as if theories and data were gender neutral (Gherardi 2010), and Borgerson (2007) argues that important feminist contributions have been consistently overlooked, misunderstood and improperly applied within business ethics and CSR. In advancing the research agendas outlined in this paper, we envisage significant roles for men as well as women CSR researchers to overcome such challenges. All academics can explore the contributions of feminist theories. They can also facilitate strategies for change that these theories suggest, including for example: support and mentoring for women academics from a variety of backgrounds and parts of the world; support for and citation of feminist research; and investigation of how masculinity dominates CSR research, discourse, organization and practice.

If gender is historical and situated practice and discourse, then it can be ‘done’ differently (Butler 2004). By drawing more systematically upon feminist theory, and FOS theory in particular, we hope that CSR scholarship can become more inclusive, increasingly producing knowledge from the margins and discovering new ways of knowing and acting. Such changes have the potential to counteract discrimination, gender inequality and the marginalization of perspectives that are in fact central to addressing the really big contemporary challenges in the CSR field, and for society.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4(2), 139–158.
- Acker, J. (1998). The future of “Gender and Organizations”: Connections and boundaries. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 5(4), 195–206.
- Acker, J. (2004). Gender, capitalism and globalization. *Critical Sociology*, 30(1), 17–41.
- Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society*, 20(4), 441–464.
- Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C.A., & Ganapath, J. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 836–886.
- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don’t know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 44(4), 932–968.
- Auld, G., Bernstein, S., & Cashore, B. (2008). The new corporate social responsibility. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 33, 413–435.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Critical Sociology*, 34(1), 51–79.
- Barrientos, S., Dolan, C., & Tallontire, A. (2003). A gendered value chain approach to codes of conduct in African horticulture. *World Development*, 31(9), 1511–1526.
- Barrientos, S., & Smith, S. (2007). Do workers benefit from ethical trade? Assessing codes of labour practice in global production systems. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(4), 613–729.
- Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Post, C. (2010). The impact of board diversity and gender composition on corporate social responsibility and firm reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(2), 207–221.
- Benschop, Y., & Verloo, M. (2016). Feminist organization theories: Islands of treasure. In R. Mir, H. Willmott & M. Greenwood (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to philosophy in organization studies*. Oxford & New York: Routledge.
- Borgerson, J. (2007). On the harmony of feminist ethics and business ethics. *Business and Society Review*, 112(4), 477–509.
- Bowie, N. E. (1999). *Business ethics: A Kantian perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burchell, J., & Cook, J. (2013). CSR, co-optation and resistance: The emergence of new agonistic relations between business and civil society. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(4), 741–754.
- Burton, B., & Dunn, C. (1996). Feminist ethics as moral grounding for stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 6(2), 133–147.
- Butler, J. 2004. *Undoing gender*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1997). Feminist inquiries into business ethics. In A. Larson & E. Freeman (Eds.), *Women’s studies and business ethics. Towards a new conversation*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (2006). From the “Woman’s Point of View” ten years later: Towards a feminist organization studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, W. Nord & T. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (2nd edition). London: Sage.

- Campbell, J. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 946–967.
- Carroll, A. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497–505.
- Coleman, G. (2002). Gender, power and post-structuralism in corporate citizenship. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 5(Spring), 17–25.
- Coleman, G. & Rippin, A. (2000). Putting feminist theory to work: Collaboration as a means towards organizational change. *Organization*, 7(4), 573–587.
- Collinson, D. & Hearn, J. (1994). Naming men as men: Implications for work, organization and management. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 1(1), 2–22.
- Crane, A., & Ruebottom, T. (2011). Stakeholder theory and social identity: Rethinking stakeholder. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(1), 77–87.
- Crane, A., Henriques, I., Husted, B., & Matten, D. (2016). What constitutes a theoretical contribution in the business and society field? *Business and Society*, 55(6), 783–791.
- Crane, A., Matten, D., & Moon, J. (2008). *Corporations and citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crane, A., McWilliams, A., Matten, D., Moon, J., & Siegel, D. (2008). The corporate social responsibility agenda. In A. Crane, A. McWilliams, D. Matten, J. Moon & D. Siegel. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, K. (1973). The case for and against business assumption of social responsibilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16(2), 312–322.
- del Mar Alonso-Almeida, M., Perramonb, J. & Bagur, L. (2015). Women managers and corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Spain: Perceptions and drivers. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 50, 47–56.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. London: Routledge.
- Derry, R. (1996). Toward a feminist firm. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 6(1), 101–109.
- Derry, R. (1999). Feminist theory and business ethics. In R. E. Frederick (Ed.), *A companion to business ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Derry, R. (2012). Reclaiming marginalized stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(2), 253–264.
- Dolan, C., & Scott, L. (2009). Lipstick evangelism: Avon trading circles and gender empowerment in South Africa. *Gender & Development*, 17(2), 203–218.
- Dolan, C., Johnstone-Louis, M., & Scott, L. (2012). Shampoo, saris and SIM cards: Seeking entrepreneurial futures at the bottom of the pyramid. *Gender & Development*, 20(1), 33–47.
- Donaldson, T., & Dunfee, T. (1994). Toward a unified conception of business ethics: Integrative social contracts theory. *The Academy of Management Review*, 19(2), 252–284.
- Elias, J. (2008). Hegemonic masculinities, the multinational corporation, and the developmental state: Constructing gender in “Progressive” firms. *Men and Masculinities*, 10(4), 405–421.
- Elson, D. (2016). Plan F: Feminist plan for a caring and sustainable economy. *Globalizations*, 13(6), 919–921.

- Evan, W., & Freeman, E. (1988). *Ethical theory and business*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ferguson, K. E. (1997). Postmodernism, feminism, and organizational ethics: Letting difference be. In A. L. Larson & R. E. Freeman (Eds.) *Women's studies and business ethics. Towards a new conversation*. New York & London: Oxford University Press.
- Fernandez-Feijoo, B., Romero, S., & Ruiz-Blanco, S. (2014). Women on boards: Do they affect sustainability reporting? *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 21(6), 351–364.
- Fleming, P. & Jones, M. C. (2013). *The end of corporate social responsibility*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Fletcher, J. K. (1994). Castrating the female advantage: Feminist standpoint research and management science. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 3(1), 74–82.
- Fletcher, J. K. (1998). Relational practice: A feminist reconstruction of work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7(2), 163–186.
- Fletcher, J. K. (2004). The paradox of postheroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(5), 647–661.
- Fotaki, M., Metcalfe, B. D., & Harding, N. (2014). Writing materiality into management and organization studies through and with Luce Irigaray. *Human Relations*, 67(10), 1239–1263.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. London: Random House.
- Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., & Wicks, A. C. (2007). *Managing for stakeholders. Survival, reputation, and success*. New Haven, CT & London: Yale University Press.
- Garriga, M., & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1), 51–71.
- Gherardi, S. (1995). *Gender, symbolism and organizational cultures*. London: Sage Publications; New Delhi: Thousand Oaks.
- Gherardi, S. (2010). Feminist theory and organization theory: A dialogue on new bases. In H. Tsoukas & C. Knudsen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organization theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gond, J. P., Kang, N., & Moon, J. (2011). The government of self regulation: On the comparative dynamics of corporate social responsibility. *Economy and Society*, 40(4), 640–671.
- Grosser, K. (2009). CSR and gender equality: Women as stakeholders and the EU sustainability strategy. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 18(3), 290–307.
- Grosser, K. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and multi-stakeholder governance: Pluralism, feminist perspectives and women's NGOs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(1), 65–81.
- Grosser, K., & Moon, J. (2005a). Gender mainstreaming and corporate social responsibility: Reporting workplace issues. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62(4), 327–340.
- Grosser, K., & Moon, J. (2005b). The role of corporate social responsibility in gender mainstreaming. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7(4), 532–554.

- Grosser, K., & Moon, J. (2008). Developments in company reporting on workplace gender equality? A corporate social responsibility perspective. *Accounting Forum*, 32(3), 179–198.
- Grosser, K., McCarthy, L., & Kilgour, M. (Eds.) (2016). *Gender equality and responsible business: Expanding CSR horizons*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Habermas, J. (1998). *The inclusion of the other: Studies in political theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hale, A., & Opondo, M. (2005). Humanising the cut flower chain: Confronting the realities of flower production for workers in Kenya. *Antipode*, 37(2), 301–323.
- Hale, A., & Wills, J. (2007). Women working worldwide: Transnational networks, corporate social responsibility and action research. *Global Networks*, 7(4), 453–476.
- Hamington, M., & Sander-Staudt, M. (2011). *Applying care ethics to business*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hartman, E. 2013. *Virtue in business: Conversations with Aristotle*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayhurst, L. (2014). The “Girl Effect” and martial arts: Social entrepreneurship and sport, gender and development in Uganda. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 21(3), 297–315.
- Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory*, 5(1), 609–624.
- Holgersson, C. (2011). ‘When in Rome...’? On multinational companies, codes of conduct and commercial sex. In A. Biricik & J. Hearn (Eds.), *GEXcel Work in Progress Report Volume XV*, Proceedings from GEXcel Theme 9: Gendered Sexualed Transnationalisations, Deconstructing the Dominant: Transforming Men, “Centres” and Knowledge/Policy/Practice, Spring 2011. Linköping, Sweden: Tema Genus Report Series No. 21.
- Holgersson, C., & Thögersen, S. (2016). Corporate sexual responsibility: How companies can act against the purchasing of sex. In K. Grosser, L. McCarthy & M. Kilgour (2016). *Gender equality and responsible business: Expanding CSR horizons*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Holvino, E. (2010). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(3), 248–277.
- International Finance Corporation (2007). *Stakeholder engagement: A good practice handbook for companies doing business in emerging markets*. Washington: International Finance Corporation.
- Jackson, G., & Bartosch, J. (2016) *Corporate responsibility in different varieties of capitalism: Exploring the role of national institutions*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Foundation.
- Johnstone-Louis, M. (forthcoming). Corporate social responsibility and women’s entrepreneurship: Towards a more adequate theory of work. *Business Ethics Quarterly*.
- Kabeer, N. (2004). Globalization, labour standards and women’s rights: Dilemmas of collective (in)action in an interdependent world. *Feminist Economics*, 10(1), 3–35.
- Karam, C., & Jamali, D. (2013). Gendering CSR in the Arab Middle East: An institutional perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23(1), 31–68.

- Karam, C. M., & Jamali, D. (2015). A cross-cultural and feminist perspective on CSR in developing countries: Uncovering latent power dynamics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, DOI:10.1007/s10551-015-2737-7.
- Kemp, D., Keenan, J., & Gronow, J. (2010). Strategic resource or ideal source? Discourse, organizational change and CSR. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 23(5), 578–594.
- Keenan, J., Kemp, D., & Ramsay, R. (2014). Company–community agreements, gender and development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(4), 607–615.
- Kilgour, M. A. (2007). The UN Global Compact and substantive equality for women: Revealing a ‘well hidden’ mandate. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(4), 751–773.
- Kilgour, M. A. (2013). The Global Compact and gender inequality: A work in progress. *Business and Society*, 52(1), 105–134.
- Kim, C. & Moon, J. (2015) Dynamics of corporate social responsibility in Asia: Knowledge and norms. *Asian Business and Management*, 14(5), 349–382.
- Knights, D., & Tullberg, M. (2012). Managing masculinity/mismanaging the corporation. *Organization*, 19(4), 385–404.
- Knudsen, J. S., Moon, J., & Slager, R. (2015) Government policies for corporate social responsibility in Europe: Institutionalisation and structured convergence? *Policy and Politics*, 43(1) 81–99.
- Kuhn, T., & Deetz, S. (2008). Critical theory and corporate responsibility: Can/should we get beyond cynical reasoning? In A. Crane, A. McWilliams, D. Matten, J. Moon & D. Siegel (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lahiri-Dutt, K., & Macintyre, M. (2006). *Women miners in developing countries: Pit women and others*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Larrieta-Rubín de Celis, I., Velasco-Balmaseda, E., Fernández de Bobadilla, S., & del Mar Alonso-Almeida, M. (2015). Does having women managers lead to increased gender equality practices in corporate social responsibility? *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 24(1), 91–110.
- Lauwo, S. (2016). Challenging masculinity in CSR disclosures: Silencing of women’s voices in Tanzania’s mining industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, DOI 10.1007/s10551-016-3047-4.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.) (2006) *Handbook of organization studies*, 2nd Edition. London: Sage.
- Liedtka, J. (1996). Feminist morality and competitive reality: A role for an ethic of care? *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 6(2), 179–200.
- Lockett, A., Moon, J., & Visser, W. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in management research: Focus, nature, salience and sources of influence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 115–136.
- Loconto, A. (2015). Can certified-tea value chains deliver gender equality in Tanzania? *Feminist Economics*, 21(3), 191–215.
- Machold, S., Ahmed, P., & Farquhar, S. (2008). Corporate governance and ethics: A feminist perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(3), 665–678.
- Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(2), 268–305.

- Marshall, J. (1995). *Women managers moving on*. London: Thomson.
- Marshall, J. (2007). The gendering of leadership in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(2), 165–181.
- Marshall, J. (2011). En-gendering notions of leadership for sustainability. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(3), 263–280.
- Martin, J. (1994). The organization of exclusion: Institutionalization of sex inequality, gendered faculty jobs and gendered knowledge in organizational theory and research. *Organization*, 1(2), 401–431.
- Martin, J. (2000). Hidden gendered assumptions in mainstream organizational theory and research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 207–216.
- Martin, J., & Knopoff, K. (1997). The gendered implications of apparently gender-neutral theory: Rereading Max Weber. In A. L. Larson & R. E. Freeman (Eds.), *Women's studies and business ethics. Towards a new conversation*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Matten, D. & Moon, J. (2008). “Implicit” and “Explicit” CSR: A conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Management Review*, 33(2), 404–424.
- Maxfield, M. (2007). Linking business's gender and diversity practices with corporate citizenship: Implications for Latin America. *Academia, Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 38, 65–80.
- McBarnet, D., Voiculescu, A., & Campbell, T. (2007). *The new accountability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, L. (2015). Organising CSR for gender equality: Institutional work in the cocoa value chain. Unpublished Doctoral thesis. University of Nottingham.
- McCarthy, L. & Muthuri, J. (forthcoming). ‘Engaging fringe stakeholders in business and society research: Applying visual participatory research methods’. *Business and Society*.
- Metcalf, D., & C. Woodhams. (2012). Introduction: New directions in gender, diversity and organization theorizing – Re-imagining feminist post-colonialism, transnationalism and geographies of power. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(2), 123–140.
- Meyerson, D. E. & D. M. Kolb. (2000). Moving out of the “Armchair”: Developing a framework to bridge the gap between feminist theory and practice. *Organization* 7(4): 553–571.
- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853–888.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). “Under Western Eyes” revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Signs*, 28(2 (Winter)), 499–535.
- Moon, J. (2002). The social responsibility of business and new governance. *Government and Opposition*, 37 (3), 385–408.
- Moon, J. & Vogel, D. (2008). CSR, government and civil society. In A. Crane, A. McWilliams, D. Matten, J. Moon & D. Siegel (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

- Moon, J., Crane, A., & Matten, D. (2011). Corporations and citizenship in new institutions of global governance. In C. Crouch & C. MacLean (Eds.) *The responsible corporation in a global economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newell, P. (2005). Citizenship, accountability and community: The limits of the CSR agenda. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 541–557.
- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies*, 24(3), 403–444.
- Pearson, R. (2007). Beyond women workers: Gendering csr. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(4), 731–749.
- Phillips, M. (2014). Re-writing organizational environmentalism: Ecofeminism, corporeality and the language of feeling. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 21(5), 443–458.
- Plumwood, V. (1993). *Feminism and the mastery of nature*. London: Routledge
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer M. R. (2011) Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62–77.
- Preston, L., & Post, J. (1981). Private management and public policy. *California Management Review*, 23(3), 56–62.
- Prieto-Carrón, M. (2004). Is there anyone listening? Women workers in factories in Central America, and corporate codes of conduct. *Development*, 47(3), 101–105.
- Prieto-Carrón, M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in Latin America: Chiquita, women banana workers and structural inequalities. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 21, 85–94.
- Prieto-Carrón, M. (2008). Women workers, industrialization, global supply chains and corporate codes of conduct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(1), 5–17.
- Prügl, E. (2015). Neoliberalising feminism. *New Political Economy*, 20(4), 614–631.
- Prügl, E., & True, J. (2014). Equality means business? Governing gender through transnational public-private partnerships. *Review of International Political Economy*, 21(6), 1137–1169.
- Pullen, A. (2006). Gendering the research self: Social practice and the corporeal multiplicity in the writing of organization research. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13(3), 277–298.
- Rasche, A., de Bakker, F., & Moon, J. (2013). Complete and partial organizing for corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(4), 651–663.
- Rio Tinto. (2009). *Why gender matters. A resource guide for integrating gender considerations into communities work at Rio Tinto*. Melbourne: Rio Tinto.
- Roberts, A. (2012). Financial crisis, financial firms... and financial feminism? The rise of “transnational business feminism” and the necessity of Marxist-Feminist IPE. *Socialist Studies / Études socialistes*, 8(2), 85–108.
- Roberts, A. (2015). The political economy of “Transnational Business Feminism”. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 17(2), 209–231.
- Rottenberg, C. (2014). The rise of neoliberal feminism. *Cultural Studies*. 28(3), 418–437.
- Rowley, T. (1997). Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 887–910.
- Saussure, F. de (1996). *Course in general linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Scherer, A., & Palazzo, G. (2007). Toward a political conception of corporate responsibility: Business and society seen from a Habermasian perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1096–1120.

- Scherer, A., & Palazzo, G. (2011). The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance, and democracy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(4), 899–931.
- Scherer, A. G., Rasche, A., Palazzo, G., & Spicer, A. (2016) Managing for political corporate social responsibility: New challenges and directions for PCSR 2.0. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(3), 273–298.
- Scholte. (2005). *Globalisation: A critical introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shamir, R. (2005). Mind the gap: The commodification of corporate social responsibility. *Symbolic Interaction*, 28(2), 229–253.
- Shamir, R. (2008). The age of responsabilization: On market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society*, 37(1), 1–19.
- Shanley, M. L., & Pateman, C. (1991). *Feminist interpretations and political theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Singh, V., & Point, S. (2006). Strategic responses by European companies to the diversity challenge: An online comparison. *Long Range Planning*, 37(4), 295–318.
- Slager, R., Gond, J. P., & Moon, J. (2012). Standardization as institutional work: The regulatory power of a responsible investment standard. *Organization Science*, 33(5-6), 763–790.
- Spence, L. J. (2016a). Small business social responsibility: Expanding core CSR theory. *Business & Society*, 55(1), 23–55.
- Spence, L. J. (2016b). The obfuscation of gender-awareness and feminism in CSR research and the academic community: An essay. In K. Grosser, L. McCarthy, & M. A. Kilgour (Eds.), *Gender equality and responsible business: Expanding CSR horizons*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Standing, G. (1999). Global feminization through flexible labor: A theme revisited. *World Development*, 27(3), 583–602.
- Terjesen, S., Aguilera, R., & Lorenz, R. (2015). Legislating a woman's seat on the board: Institutional factors driving gender quotas for boards of directors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(2), 233–251.
- Thompson, L. (2008). Gender equity and corporate social responsibility in a post-feminist era. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 17(1), 87–106.
- Tornhill, S. (2016). The wins of corporate gender equality politics: Coca-Cola and female micro entrepreneurship in South Africa. In K. Grosser, L. McCarthy & M. Kilgour (Eds.), *Gender equality and responsible business: Expanding CSR horizons*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishing.
- UN Sustainable Development Goals (2015). United Nations, <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>.
- United Nations. (2011). *Guiding principles on business and human rights: Implementing the United Nations Protect, Respect and Remedy Framework*. A /HRC/17/31.
- Vogel, D. (2005). *The market for virtue: The potential and limits of corporate social responsibility*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Vogel, D. (2008). Private global business regulation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 261–282.
- Votaw, D. (1973). Genius becomes rare. In D. Votaw & S. P. Sethi (Eds.) *The corporate dilemma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Walby, S. (2005). Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. *Social Politics*, 12(3), 321–343.
- Walby, S. (2011). *The future of feminism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Werhane, P. (2007). Women leaders in a globalized world. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74(4), 425–435.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125–151.
- Wicks, A., Gilbert, D. J., & Freeman, E. (1994). A feminist reinterpretation of the stakeholder concept. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 4(4), 475–497.
- Williams, R. (2003). Women on corporate boards of directors and their influence on corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 42(1), 1–10.
- Windsor, D. 2001. The future of corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9(3), 225–256.
- Yancey-Martin, P. (2004). Gender as social institution. *Social Forces*, 82(4), 1249–1273.

Table 1a Feminist theoretical perspectives on management and organizations: ‘Women’s issues’

	Feminist perspectives		
Dimensions of analysis	<i>Liberal feminism</i>	<i>Radical feminism</i>	<i>Psychoanalytic feminism</i>
<i>Conceptions of sex/gender</i>	Sex as biological endowment, a binary variable. Sexed human beings are socialized by gender for appropriate behavior and roles.	‘Sex class’ is the condition of women as an oppressed class. Gender is a social construction that ensures women’s subordination to men.	Individuals become sexually identified as part of their psychosexual development. Gender structures a social system of male domination which influences psychosexual development.
<i>Conceptualization of gender / organization: What is the problem?</i>	Organizations (and organization theory) are regarded as gender neutral, established to maintain a rational social order. The problem is conceived of as within those individuals who do not fit in/do well in those organizations.	Organizations are institutionalized by the patriarchal order and created to maintain gender segregation and discrimination in the public domain and sexual oppression in the private domain.	Organizations reproduce patriarchal psychosexual development that helps maintain the dominant system of gender relations and domination.
<i>Solutions to gender challenges in organizations</i>	Solutions lie in human resource development initiatives for women, and structural/legal interventions to advance equal opportunities.	Alternative feminist organizing practices, including separate organizations reflecting feminist values of equality, community, participation, and the empowerment of women.	Focus on valuing women’s differences as beneficial for organizations, and for women themselves (e.g., women’s ways of knowing, leadership, ethics of care, relational skills, ‘interactive leadership’, empathy).
<i>Favoured methodologies</i>	Positivist social science, mostly quantitative.	Female-centred knowledge generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures (e.g., case studies, consciousness raising groups).	Articulation of feminine and masculine values to create more balanced, androgynous organizational cultures.
<i>Use (mostly implicit) in CSR</i>	Visibility/representation: Women and men in management and on corporate boards as	Rarely referenced, although CSR initiatives such as women’s empowerment and entrepreneurship	Reflected in arguments about / literature on business and feminine, or feminist, ethics and

<i>scholarship</i>	part of CSR (e.g., Bear et al. 2010; Fernandez-Feijoo et al. 2014; Larrieta-Rubin de Celis et al. 2015; Williams 2003; Maxfield 2007; Del mar Alonso-Almeida et al. 2015).	are critiqued for not reflecting women's knowledge and participation (Tornhill 2016; Johnstone-Louis forthcoming). Notably McCarthy and Muthuri (forthcoming) emphasize women-centred knowledge.	stakeholder relations (e.g., Derry 1996; Borgerson 2007).
---------------------------	--	--	---

Adapted from Calas and Smircich (2006) and Gherardi (2010)

Table 1b Feminist theoretical perspectives on management and organizations: Gendering

	Feminist perspectives		
Dimensions of analysis	<i>Socialist feminism, and gendered organizations</i>	<i>Poststructuralist/postmodern feminism</i>	<i>Transnational/(post)colonial feminism</i>
<i>Conceptions of sex/gender</i>	Gender is processual and socially constituted through everyday organizational practices, and through intersections of sex, race, class, sexuality, and other experiences of oppression. Includes study of masculinity in organizations.	Sex/gender as discursive practices and social performances that constitute specific subjectivities through power, resistance and the materiality of human bodies.	Considers the constitution of complex subjectivities beyond western conceptions of sex/gender, focusing on gendered aspects of globalization.
<i>Conceptualization of gender /organization: What is the problem?</i>	Organizations are constituted through gendered processes as systems of gender/race/class power relations and practices. Organizations as 'inequality regimes' reproducing and exploiting inequalities (Acker 2006). Hegemonic masculinity is normalized. Organizational theory as gendered (Gherardi 2010).	Organizations as primary signifiers in the general text of our society. Gender and other discourses (race, class, sexualities) constitute organizations' conditions of possibility. Organizing as the discursive mobilization of power/knowledge resources.	Organizations as institutions of the colonizer, existing in historical relations to other people of the world. Transnational corporations/organizations are primary actors perpetuating race/gender/class relations in the globalized economy.
<i>Solutions to gender challenges in organizations</i>	Focus on changing organizations. Identify how organizational processes are gendered, produced and reproduced. Addressing these structural issues (e.g., the relationship between 'productive' and reproductive/care work, and problematize constructions of (hegemonic) masculinity in organizations).	Discourses of 'organization' (in theory and practice) to be denaturalized. 'Gender/race/class/sexualities' as other's subject position. Identify who has been silenced / what is missing, and include a wider variety of voices and perspectives in identifying/defining and solving key organizational issues.	Focus on role of the organization within the global capitalist system of production and distribution. Identify how this system perpetuates or exacerbates gender/race/class inequalities; include a variety of global perspectives including those of the most marginalized voices.
<i>Favoured</i>	Case studies, institutional ethnographies, focus	Text/discourse deconstruction analysis.	Textual analysis, post-colonial

<i>methodologies</i>	on micro-social activities and practices as they connect to macro-social processes, including the study of ‘men as men’ (Collinson and Hearn 1994) in organizations.	Reflexivity regarding the role of the researcher in knowledge construction. Foucauldian genealogies, queering institutions.	deconstructions/reconstructions, testimonial writings, hybrid representations, to articulate the other’s knowledge. Analysis of intersections of capitalism/imperialism/global economy. Deconstructing ‘development’.
<i>Use (mostly implicit) in CSR scholarship</i>	CSR practice and research as gendered processes (e.g., Coleman 2002; Barrientos et al. 2003; Prieto-Carrón 2006; Grosser and Moon 2005; Marshall 2007, 2011; Kilgour 2007; Pearson 2007; Spence 2016a; Grosser 2016; Loconto 2015; McCarthy 2015). Exploration of dominant/hegemonic masculinity in CSR practice and research (e.g., Marshall 2007, 2011; Knights and Tullberg 2011).	Silences, participation and voice in CSR as political processes. Feminist deconstruction of CSR/sustainability discourses, teaching, and practice (e.g., Coleman 2002; Grosser and Moon 2005a; Marshall 2007, 2011; Kilgour 2007; Grosser 2015; Newell 2005; Hale and Opondo 2005; Prieto-Carrón 2006; Kemp et al. 2010; Kemp and Keenan 2014; Singh and Point 2006; McCarthy 2015; McCarthy and Muthuri forthcoming; Lauwo 2016).	Study of gendered aspects of global value chains, and differential impacts of globalization, and of corporations, upon men and women in developed/developing countries. Deconstructing ‘development’ (e.g., Newell 2005; Pearson 2007; Barrientos et al. 2003; Loconto 2015; McCarthy 2015; Karam and Jamali 2013, 2015; McCarthy and Muthuri forthcoming; Lauwo 2016).

Adapted from Calas and Smircich (2006) and Gherardi (2010)

Table 2 Theories of CSR: Feminist engagements

	CSR perspectives					
Dimensions of analysis	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Instrumental</i>	<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Political</i>	<i>Institutional</i>	<i>Critical</i>
Core	Define the right thing to do.	The business case.	Management of/for those with a stake.	CSR as governance.	Institutional settings and institutional work.	Critical management studies (e.g., power, corporate impacts).
Feminist engagements/contributions	<p>Feminist contributions to business ethics (e.g., Wicks et al. 1994; Burton and Dunn 1996; Liedtka 1996; Derry 1999; Borgerson 2007; Thompson 2008; Machold et al. 2008; Hamington and Sander-Staudt 2011).</p> <p>Definitions of CSR from feminist perspectives (including care issues; ‘corporate sexual responsibility’ (e.g., Ferguson 1997; Holgersson 2011; Grosser 2016; Holgersson and Thögersen 2016).</p>	<p>Feminist scholarship on financial performance / the business case, social performance (e.g., Bear et al. 2010; Larrieta-Rubín de Celis et al. 2014; Fernandez-Feijoo et al. 2014).</p>	<p>Individual women and men as stakeholders.</p> <p>Stakeholders and stakeholder processes as gendered.</p> <p>Feminist critiques of stakeholder theory (e.g., Hale and Oppondo 2005; Hale and Wills 2007; Grosser 2009; Keenan and Kemp 2014; Wicks et al. 1994; Burton and Dunn 1996; Liedtka 1996; Derry 1999, 2012).</p>	<p>Feminist contributions to, and critiques of, political CSR, relating to governance, and deliberative democracy (e.g., Grosser 2016; Keenan et al. 2014).</p>	<p>The relationship between CSR and gender as a social institution (e.g., Karam and Jamali 2013; McCarthy 2015).</p>	<p>Feminist perspectives rarely incorporated into or discussed in CMS CSR literature.</p> <p>Numerous critical engagements/contributions to CSR literature from different feminist theoretical perspectives (see Table 1, final row), not referenced by CMS scholars.</p> <p>Feminist critiques of instrumental CSR; research on the political role of the firm in structuring inequality from FOS (e.g., Acker 2004, 2006) and feminist International Political Economy (e.g., Roberts 2014;</p>

	Critiques of masculine norms in CSR practice and research (e.g., Holgerson 2011; Spence 2016b).					Prügl and True 2014). See also Lauwo (2016).
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Table 3 A theoretical framework for the analysis of gender issues in CSR

	CSR perspectives					
Feminist perspectives	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Instrumental</i>	<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Political</i>	<i>Institutional</i>	<i>Critical</i>
<i>Liberal feminism</i>	Equal opportunities for women and men in ethical decision making.	The business case for women's equality and empowerment in the workplace (women in management and on boards), in the marketplace (supply chain and consumers) and as entrepreneurs.	Stakeholders as individual women and men, and equal opportunities.	Focus on equal opportunities for women and men in CSR governance processes.	Research on equal opportunities within institutional settings of CSR.	Equal opportunities for women and men in critical CSR research.
<i>Radical feminism</i>	Ethics relating to feminist organizing. Inclusion of female-centred knowledge generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures.	To be explored.	Inclusion of female-centred knowledge generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures, via women-only focus groups, for example.	Inclusion of female-centred knowledge generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures.	To be explored.	Inclusion of female-centred knowledge generated as far as possible outside patriarchal structures.

<i>Psychoanalytic feminism</i>	Essentialist studies of differences between men and women's ethical behavior, and ethics of care. Articulation of feminine and masculine values for more balanced organizations.	Valuing women's differences as beneficial for organizations (e.g., ethics of care, women's relational skills).	Feminist critiques of, and contributions to, stakeholder theory based on a feminist ethics of care approach.	To be explored.	Investigation of differing expectations regarding men's and women's roles and behaviours in institutional contexts of CSR.	To be explored.
<i>Socialist feminism / gendered organizations</i>	Ethical analysis of organizations as gendered.	Investigation of instrumental CSR research and practice as a gendered domain (e.g., the gendered nature of corporate supply chains, corporate community impacts, masculinity in CSR).	Gender analysis of CSR stakeholder concepts and processes.	Gendered analysis of CSR as a multi-stakeholder process of governance.	Analysis of gender as an institution and CSR.	Investigation of critical CSR research as a gendered domain (e.g., gender blindness, hegemonic masculinity).
<i>Poststructuralist/postmodern feminism</i>	Emphasis on inclusive participation in ethical decision making. Feminist deconstruction of business ethics.	Missing voices and instrumental CSR. Feminist deconstruction of instrumental CSR theory and cases.	Gender and missing stakeholders. Feminist deconstruction of stakeholder concept.	Explores and addresses missing voices in CSR governance processes. Feminist deconstruction of 'political CSR'.	Feminist deconstruction analysis of CSR and institutional theory.	Feminist deconstruction of critical (CMS) CSR.

<i>Transnational/ (post)colonial feminism</i>	Inclusion of Third World women's perspectives in defining ethical norms.	Representation and analysis of Third World women in instrumental CSR (e.g., women workers and entrepreneurs), and critiques of instrumental CSR from this perspective.	Acknowledgement of and focus on knowledge creation regarding different global stakeholders and their interests, including Third World women from a variety of countries.	Research that brings Third World women's voices and perspectives to CSR as a process of governance.	Focus on gender in global institutionalization of CSR, and on gendered resistance, particularly in Third World contexts.	Feminist deconstruction focused on the extent to which Third World women's perspectives are included in critical CSR research.
--	--	--	--	---	--	--