

SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS STRATEGY AND MARKET COMPETITIVENESS IN EMERGING ECONOMIES

Nazhira Nindya Padma Hanuun, SH

Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas

nazhiranindya@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Sustainability becomes strategically relevant when it changes cost, risk, innovation or market access. In emerging economies, that connection is especially visible because firms often face resource constraints at the same time that buyers, regulators and lenders ask for stronger environmental and social performance. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including IFRS Foundation (2023b); UNCTAD (2025). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. A sustainability programme that is disconnected from operating economics can become a reporting exercise. Competitive advantage is more likely when environmental and social priorities are linked to product design, resource productivity, supply reliability and stakeholder trust. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for firms in emerging economies that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Sustainable Strategy, Competitiveness, Emerging Economies, Resource Efficiency, Stakeholders, Innovation*

Introduction

Sustainability becomes strategically relevant when it changes cost, risk, innovation or market access. In emerging economies, that connection is especially visible because firms often face resource constraints at the same time that buyers, regulators and lenders ask for stronger environmental and social performance. This question is timely for business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers. Recent institutional and research sources such as IFRS Foundation (2023a); IFRS Foundation (2023b) provide the broader context for the discussion.

A sustainability programme that is disconnected from operating economics can become a reporting exercise. Competitive advantage is more likely when environmental and social priorities are linked to product design, resource productivity, supply reliability and stakeholder trust. For firms in emerging economies, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. IPCC (2023); IEA (2024b) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Firms in emerging economies do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial for one organization and

premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for firms in emerging economies. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. OECD (2023); IFRS Foundation (2023a); GRI (2021) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for firms in emerging economies because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. GRI (2021); IFRS Foundation (2023b) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Resource efficiency and cost position	energy, water, materials and waste affect both environmental performance and unit cost	efficiency projects can be overlooked when firms evaluate them only through short annual budgets
Innovation and market differentiation	sustainability can open product niches, improve design and support access to demanding supply chains	green claims without customer value rarely sustain a price premium
Supply-chain resilience	local sourcing, supplier capability and traceability influence both sustainability and continuity	pressuring suppliers without capability support can shift risk rather than reduce it
Capital, disclosure and credibility	lenders and investors increasingly expect consistent sustainability information	small firms can face reporting burdens that exceed their current data capacity
Stakeholder trust and legitimacy	community, employee and customer relationships affect a firm's ability to operate and grow	symbolic initiatives can damage trust when practice and communication diverge
Institutional context in emerging markets	policy quality, infrastructure and enforcement shape the economics of sustainable investment	strategies imported from advanced economies may not fit local energy, labour or supplier conditions

Research Method

The article adopts a policy-and-management evidence review. Sources are included when they contribute to the causal logic, implementation conditions, or measurement of the issue rather than merely repeating a broad definition.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
OECD (2024a)	structural conditions and policy issues in Indonesia	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
UNCTAD (2025)	investment trends and policy environment	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2023)	SME networks, resilience, trade, skills and technology	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
IFRS Foundation (2023a)	general sustainability-related financial disclosures	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
IFRS Foundation (2023b)	climate-related financial disclosure requirements	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
GRI (2021)	impact-oriented sustainability reporting standards	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Resource efficiency and cost position

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Energy, water, materials and waste affect both environmental performance and unit cost. That distinction matters because efficiency projects can be overlooked when firms evaluate them only through short annual budgets. In business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IEA (2024b); IPCC (2023), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For firms in emerging economies, the practical response is to use total-cost and lifecycle analysis for operational investments. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Energy, water, materials and waste affect both environmental performance and unit cost, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Efficiency projects can be overlooked when firms evaluate them only through short annual budgets. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. IFRS Foundation (2023a) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use total-cost and lifecycle analysis

for operational investments, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Energy, water, materials and waste affect both environmental performance and unit cost should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, efficiency projects can be overlooked when firms evaluate them only through short annual budgets. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2024a); IPCC (2023) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use total-cost and lifecycle analysis for operational investments. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Innovation and market differentiation

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Sustainability can open product niches, improve design and support access to demanding supply chains. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: green claims without customer value rarely sustain a price premium. In business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IFRS Foundation (2023b); OECD (2023), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For firms in emerging economies, the practical response is to translate environmental attributes into verifiable product benefits. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Sustainability can open product niches, improve design and support access to demanding supply chains, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Green claims without customer value rarely sustain a price premium. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. UNCTAD (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to translate environmental attributes into verifiable product benefits, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Sustainability can open product niches, improve design and support access to demanding supply chains should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, green claims without customer value rarely sustain a price premium. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by IFRS Foundation (2023a); OECD (2024a) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: translate environmental attributes into verifiable product benefits. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Supply-chain resilience

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Local sourcing, supplier capability and traceability influence both sustainability and continuity. The point is especially relevant where pressuring suppliers without capability support can shift risk rather than reduce it. In business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps,

climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IFRS Foundation (2023a); GRI (2021), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For firms in emerging economies, the practical response is to combine standards with supplier development and risk-based segmentation. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Local sourcing, supplier capability and traceability influence both sustainability and continuity, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Pressuring suppliers without capability support can shift risk rather than reduce it. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. UNCTAD (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to combine standards with supplier development and risk-based segmentation, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Local sourcing, supplier capability and traceability influence both sustainability and continuity should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, pressuring suppliers without capability support can shift risk rather than reduce it. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by UNCTAD (2025); GRI (2021) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: combine standards with supplier development and risk-based segmentation. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Capital, disclosure and credibility

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Lenders and investors increasingly expect consistent sustainability information. The reason is practical: small firms can face reporting burdens that exceed their current data capacity. In business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IFRS Foundation (2023a); OECD (2023), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For firms in emerging economies, the practical response is to prioritize material metrics and build controls before expanding disclosure. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Lenders and investors increasingly expect consistent sustainability information, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Small firms can face reporting burdens that exceed their current data capacity. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to prioritize material metrics and build controls before expanding disclosure, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Lenders and investors increasingly expect consistent sustainability information should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, small firms can face reporting burdens that exceed their current data capacity. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by IEA (2024b); OECD (2023) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: prioritize material metrics and build controls before expanding disclosure. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Stakeholder trust and legitimacy

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Community, employee and customer relationships affect a firm's ability to operate and grow. For managers, the consequence is immediate: symbolic initiatives can damage trust when practice and communication diverge. In business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IFRS Foundation (2023b); OECD (2024a), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For firms in emerging economies, the practical response is to use transparent targets, grievance channels and evidence-based claims. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Community, employee and customer relationships affect a firm's ability to operate and grow, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Symbolic initiatives can damage trust when practice and communication diverge. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. IFRS Foundation (2023b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use transparent targets, grievance channels and evidence-based claims, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Community, employee and customer relationships affect a firm's ability to operate and grow should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, symbolic initiatives can damage trust when practice and communication diverge. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2023); IFRS Foundation (2023a) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use transparent targets, grievance channels and evidence-based claims. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Institutional context in emerging markets

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Policy quality, infrastructure and enforcement shape the economics of sustainable investment. In operational terms, strategies imported from advanced economies may not fit local energy, labour or supplier conditions. In business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of

policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including IEA (2024b); OECD (2023), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For firms in emerging economies, the practical response is to adapt global principles to local constraints without lowering accountability. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Policy quality, infrastructure and enforcement shape the economics of sustainable investment, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Strategies imported from advanced economies may not fit local energy, labour or supplier conditions. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. IPCC (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to adapt global principles to local constraints without lowering accountability, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Policy quality, infrastructure and enforcement shape the economics of sustainable investment should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, strategies imported from advanced economies may not fit local energy, labour or supplier conditions. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by UNCTAD (2025); OECD (2024a) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: adapt global principles to local constraints without lowering accountability. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that sustainable business strategy and market competitiveness in emerging economies cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by GRI (2021); IPCC (2023); UNCTAD (2025).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Firms in emerging economies with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For firms in emerging economies, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including OECD (2023); GRI (2021), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Use total-cost and lifecycle analysis for operational investments	Efficiency projects can be overlooked when firms evaluate them only through short annual budgets
2	Translate environmental attributes into verifiable product benefits	Green claims without customer value rarely sustain a price premium
3	Combine standards with supplier development and risk-based segmentation	Pressuring suppliers without capability support can shift risk rather than reduce it
4	Prioritize material metrics and build controls before expanding disclosure	Small firms can face reporting burdens that exceed their current data capacity
5	Use transparent targets, grievance channels and evidence-based claims	Symbolic initiatives can damage trust when practice and communication diverge
6	Adapt global principles to local constraints without lowering accountability	Strategies imported from advanced economies may not fit local energy, labour or supplier conditions

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to business environments where growth opportunities coexist with infrastructure gaps, climate exposure, financing constraints and increasingly demanding customers.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how long capability building took, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for sustainable business strategy and market competitiveness in emerging economies would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish resource efficiency and cost position from innovation and market differentiation and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with supply-chain resilience may not transfer directly to settings dominated by capital, disclosure and credibility, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of sustainable business strategy and market competitiveness in emerging economies, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of sustainable business strategy and market competitiveness in emerging economies should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined sustainable business strategy and market competitiveness in emerging economies through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: a sustainability programme that is disconnected from operating economics can become a reporting exercise. Competitive advantage is more likely when environmental and social priorities are linked to product design, resource productivity, supply reliability and stakeholder trust. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by firms in emerging economies.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes

the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- OECD. (2024). OECD Economic Surveys: Indonesia 2024. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- UN Trade and Development. (2025). World Investment Report 2025. Geneva: United Nations.
- OECD. (2023). OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>
- IFRS Foundation. (2023). IFRS S1 General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information. London: IFRS Foundation.
- IFRS Foundation. (2023). IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures. London: IFRS Foundation.
- Global Reporting Initiative. (2021). GRI Universal Standards 2021. Amsterdam: Global Reporting Initiative.
- International Energy Agency. (2024). Energy Efficiency 2024. Paris: IEA.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Geneva: IPCC.