

Index

Academy of Management, 3 managerial drivers/values, 155 activist investors, 81 multi-/later-generation family firms, 37–38, 43–44, 68–69 agency theory, 12 agents of change, 220-222 non-family/corporate firms, 38-39, Agriculture Biologique (AB) certification of France, 29 organic viticulture, 69-70, 72-73, 129-130, 177, 178, 220-221 altruism, 17 anchoring bias, 160-161 proactive environmental strategies, Appellation d'origine contrôlée (AOC), 39-44, 68, 207 supervisory influences, 170-171 transmission of knowledge, 204-206 Berkshire Hathaway, 14 capability deployment of PES, 126-137, 207 Best Available Control Technology Carbon Reduction Institute, 45 (BACT), 61-62Best Available Technology Not Carson, Rachel, 61 entailing Excessive Economical chemical emissions/effluents, 71 Costs (BATNEEC), 62 Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), 14 bifurcation bias, 195 Chilean wine industry biodynamic viticulture anchoring bias, 161 Canadian wine industry, 42 family firms, 70-71, 199 certification, 40 family values, 174 French wine industry, 71–72, 102, introduction to, 44-45 112, 135, 171, 178 managerial drivers/values, 155 nature of, 28-29 multi-/later-generation family firms, boards and environmental practices, 45-46 83-84, 104-105 performance evaluation metrics, 177 Business Council for Sustainable proactive environmental strategies, Development (BCSD), 115 45-46 business education, 224 clean technologies, 162 coercive forces, 59, 74 California wine industry, 133-134 cognitive frames and biases, 150, Canadian forestry industry, 76 156-167, 164-166t Canadian wine industry collective good, 187 biodynamic viticulture, 42 competitive advantage, 117, 195 familiness, 132 competitive imagination, 78 family firms, 34, 67-68, 199 complementary assets, 124 first generation family firms, 36–37, compliance vs. voluntary 40-43, 69-70 beyond-compliance, 119 halo bias, 160 control systems, 127 introduction to, 26, 31–35 corporate citizenship, 3, 7



234 Index

corporate environmental sustainability development/deployment of PES capabilities, 126-137, 211-212 strategy defined, 2-3, 8-9 differentiated environmental strategies, exogenous drivers, 57-58 family firms in, 195-201 discretionary slack, 179-181 family vs. non-family firms, 74 disruptive innovation, 78 institutional influences, 58-67 dominant coalition (DC) corporate environmental strategies, corporate governance, 13-14 corporate greening, 7-8 corporate identity, 127 decision-making, 151, 206 corporate philanthropy, 4 decision-making by, 151 corporate proactive environmental in family firms, 10, 107-115, 128, strategy 129, 137, 210 board of directors, 104-105 in family vs. non-family firms, 16, 17, corporate governance, 101 19, 203 top management team, 17, 203, 217 dominant coalition in family firms, 107-115 Dupont, 176-177 institutional ownership, 101–103, dynamic random access memory (DRAM), 12 209 organizational drivers, 98-101, 200, 2.10 eco-centric orientation, 168 ownership influences, 101-105 economic value maximization shareholder activists, 103 paradigm, 168 top management influences, 106-115 Elkington, John, 2 corporate social responsibility (CSR) employee empowerment, 127, 212 board of directors, 104-105 energy usage reductions, 35 defined, 3, 6-7entitlement nepotism, 195 by family firms, 127, 136 entrepreneurship, 63, 72–74, 152 environmental capabilities, 125 managerial interpretations of, 113 social justice and ethics, 99 environmental groups, 80 top management team, 106-107 environmental impact of wineries. see corporate sustainability, 2, 64 winery industry environmental cross-functional integration, 124 environmental innovation, 65 Danish Klundborg Symbiosis, 9 Environmental Management Systems DDT regulation, 61 (EMS), 125 decision-making environmental NGOs, 85 by dominant coalition members, 151, environmental sustainability strategies 206 boards and, 83-84 by external stakeholders, 172 family firms vs. non-family firms, 25, intergenerational decision-making/ 54-55 interdependence, 133 legitimization of, 172-175, 208, 212 managerial drivers/values, 185 local community and, 84, 87 sustainability practices, 153 managerial drivers/values, 150-153, top management team, 19, 206 199-200 transmission of knowledge, 203 media and, 82, 87 Demeter (Biodynamic), 42, 43 opportunity framing of Department of Agriculture's Organic environmental issues, 167-183 Wine certification in USA, 29 regulators and, 82-83



Index 235

stakeholder influences, 75–90
Espinoza, Alvaro, 45
exogenous drivers of corporate
environmental sustainability,
57–58
external stakeholders, 172
Exxon Valdez oil spill, 60

familiness, 130-132, 202, 208 family as stakeholder, 201 Family Firm Institute (FFI), 196–197 family firms. see also multi-/latergeneration family firms beliefs/values of, 108 business advantage of, 185-188 Canadian wine industry, 36-37, 40-43, 67-68, 69-70 characteristics of, 201-202 Chilean wine industry, 70-71 corporate social responsibility by, 127, 136 creditors and, 16 development/deployment of PES capabilities, 126-137 dominant coalition in, 107-115, 128, 129, 137 familiness, 130-132 French wine industry, 70 identity in, 112-115, 135-137, 172-175, 201-202, 210 influence on stakeholders, 86-88 institutional influences, 67-72 knowledge transmission, 203-204, 218 long-term patient investments, 66, 74, 100, 152, 198, 209, 225-226 long-term sustainability targets, 176, 2.18 long-term temporal orientation, 134–135, 202–203, 213 market and competitive strategies, 115 - 126natural resource-based view, 121-126, 138-139 oligarchic family control, 73 research implications, 214-215 shared sustainability vision, 128-130 socioemotional wealth, 86-87, 90, 110, 162, 196, 201

stewardship orientation, 132-134 strategic management research, 109, 219-220 succession process in, 186-187, 188, transgenerational longevity/success, family firms vs. non-family firms. see also non-family/corporate firms bifurcation bias, 195 business system goals, 108 cognitive biases, 163, 212 commitment to environmental preservation, 170, 171 corporate environmental sustainability strategy, 98 development/deployment of PES capabilities, 126-137, 211-212 discretionary slack, 181 dominant coalition, 16, 17, 19, 203 environmental sustainability strategies, 25, 54-55 information flow, 183 legitimization of environmental sustainability, 172-175, 208, 212 long-term temporal orientation, 134-135, 202-203, 213 manager vision for, 208 managerial drivers, 167 market and competitive strategies, overview of, 16, 18f, 54 performance evaluation metrics, 179 proactive environmental strategy, 137, 195, 205t, 222-224 shared characteristics, 202-208, family identity within firm, 112-115, 135–137, 172–175, 201–202 family-of-origin, 107-108, 154 family shareholders, 16 family values, 74, 174, 203, 206 FIBER dimensions, 86-87 field transparency, 72 financial crisis (2008), 11 financial performance and market/ competitive strategies, 120-121 First Nations, 79, 80 for-profit firms, 126



236 Index

Forestry Stewardship Council Certification, 79 founding generation, 113 French wine industry biodynamic viticulture, 71-72, 102, 112, 135, 171, 178 familiness, 132 family firms, 70, 199 family values, 174 halo bias, 159-160 introduction to, 47–48 managerial drivers/values, 155-156 multi-/later-generation family firms, 49 - 51non-family/corporate firms, 48-49, 51 - 52organic viticulture, 71-72, 73, 102, 112, 178 performance evaluation metrics, 178 proactive environmental strategies, 49-52, 71, 207 reactive environmental strategies, 48-49 stakeholder orientation, 134 supervisory influences, 171 sustainable viticulture and, 221-222 Friedman, Thomas, 12 future-focused firms, 110 generic business strategy, 119–120 geographical contexts of viticulture, 26 - 27

geographical contexts of viticulture, 26–27 Global Impact Investing Network (GIIN), 4–6 governance structures, 26

halo bias, 159–160 herbicide use, 68, 114 heterogeneous strategies, 73 higher-order learning, 124 Holliday, Chad, 176–177 human capital resources, 181 HVE 3 (Haute Valeur Environmentale), 48, 221

identity corporate identity, 127 family identity within firm, 112–115, 135–137, 172–175, 201–202, 210 shared identity in family firms, 136

unified identity, 113 impact investing, 4-6 individual/managerial influences, 82, 212-213, 214f Industrial Revolution, 6 industrial waste emissions, 61 information exchange, 127 information flow, 181-183 innovative thinking, 158 Institute for Marketecology (IMO), 46 institutional entrepreneurs, 72-74 institutional influences agents of change, 220-222 corporate environmental sustainability, 58-67 by entrepreneurs, 72-74 regulatory approaches, 62-67 response by family firms, 67–72 stakeholder influences, 75-90 summary of, 209 institutional investors, 14, 81-82, 86, 111 institutional isomorphism, 58-59, 64-65, 67 institutional ownership, 101-103 instrumentalism, 76 interface of sustainability, 185 intergenerational decision-making/ interdependence, 133 International Labor Organization (ILO), 6, 61 investment fund managers, 81

Journal of Sustainable Finance and Investments, 6

Kahneman, Daniel, 161 Keystone XL Pipeline System, 80 kinship group, 15 knowledge transmission, 203–204, 218

leadership influences, 167–169
legitimization of environmental
sustainability, 172–175, 208, 212
living soil principle, 28
local community and environmental
practices, 84, 87
Local Food Plus, 42, 43
long-term patient investments, 66, 74,
100, 152, 198, 209, 225–226



Index 237

long-term sustainability targets, 176, multi-/later-generation family firms Canadian wine industry, 37–38, 43-44, 68-69 long-term temporal orientation, Chilean wine industry, 45-46 134-135, 202-203, 213 loss bias, 161-163 French wine industry, 49-51 multinational enterprises (MNEs), 117 majority shareholders, 16 Mutuelle d'Assurances du Corps de managerial drivers/values Santé Français (MACSF)., 49 anchoring bias, 160-161 championing/selling ideas/ natural resource-based view, 121-126, innovations, 183-185 138-139 cognitive frames and biases, Natural Step Framework, 1 156-167, 164-166t, 212 New World wineries, 27, 30, 31 discretionary slack, 179-181 non-family/corporate firms environmental sustainability Canadian wine industry, 38-39, strategies, 150-153, 199-200 family business advantage, 185-188 family firms vs., 16, 18f, 54 halo bias, 159-160 French wine industry, 48–49, 51–52 influence of, 153-156 leadership of, 154 information flow, 181-183 proactive environmental strategy, leadership influences, 167-169 legitimization of environmental shared value, 173-174 top management team, 106-107 sustainability, 172-175 loss bias, 161-163 non-governmental organizations opportunity framing of (NGOs) environmental issues, 167-183 collaboration with, 85 organizational context and design, environmental impacts and, 80 171-172, 200 imposing of fines by, 78 performance evaluation metrics, instrumental importance, 76 ISO 14001 standards, 87 175 - 179supervisory influences, 169-171 not-for-profit, 126 managerial incentives/influences, 82, proactive vs. reactive environmental 212-213, 214f strategies, 210 market and competitive strategies role of, 222 family firms, 115-126 social NGOs, 85 family firms vs. non-family firms, 211 non-organic viticulture, 28 financial performance and, 120–121 nonprofit environmentalist regulatory responses, 117-119 organizations, 168 sustainability/generic business normative arguments, 75 strategy, 119-120 normative forces, 59, 209 material usage reductions, 35 McKinsey Quarterly, 197 oligarchic family control, 73 media and environmental practices, 82, opportunity framing of environmental 87 issues, 167-183 micro-entrepreneurship, 43 organic viticulture middle management, 183 Canadian wine industry, 69-70, mimetic forces, 59-60, 74, 209 72–73, 129–130, 177, 178, minority shareholders, 16 220-221 defined, 28, 39 Monsanto, 117 moral arguments, 75 education program in, 135



238 Index

organic viticulture (cont.) French wine industry, 71–72, 73, 102, 112, 178 Organizational Behavior (OB), 3 organizational context and design, 26, 171-172, 200 organizational drivers in corporate proactive environmental strategy, 98-101, 200, 210 Organizations and the Natural Environment (ONE), 3 Our Common Future report, 1 ownership influences on proactive environmental strategy, 101-105 ownership vs. management control, 14-16

paradoxical frame, 156-157 Paris Agreement (2015), 2 past-focused firms, 111 patient capital, 11-13, 105, 137 patient long-term investments. see long-term patient investments performance evaluation metrics, 175-179 personal vs. corporate values, 129 pesticide use, 68 policy implications, 225 political power, 59 pollution prevention of, 64, 124, 162 prevention vs. control, 79, 119 toxic emissions, 83, 84 Polman, Paul, 177, 223 Porter hypothesis, 63, 116 primary stakeholders, 76 priority stakeholders, 78 private enterprise, 16 Pro-Cert Organic Systems, 40, 41, 42, proactive environmental strategy (PES). see also corporate proactive

see also corporate proactive environmental strategy
Canadian wine industry, 39–44, 68
capability deployment, 126–137, 207
Chilean wine industry, 45–46
cross-industry contexts, 215–217
development/deployment of,
126–137, 211–212

family firms vs. non-family firms, 137, 195, 205t, 222-224 French wine industry, 49–52, 71 generic business strategies, 119 impact of, 10, 17, 27-29 individual/managerial influences, 82, 212-213, 214f leadership strategies in, 83 long-term patient investments, 66, 74, 100, 152, 198 long-term temporal orientation, 134-135 measuring development, 217–218 natural resource-based view, 121-126, 138-139 NGO collaboration and, 210 non-family/corporate firms, 137 research implications, 214–215 stakeholders engagement, 89, 209-210 successful development of, 151 succession process in family firms, 186-187, 188 summary of, 218-219 temporal orientation, 109-112 problem-solving behavior, 180

radical transactiveness, 78, 124
reactive environmental strategies,
27–29, 35–39, 48–49, 119
Regulation Fair Disclosure, 100
regulators and environmental practices,
82–83
regulatory approaches to institutional
influences, 62–67
regulatory responses in market and
competitive strategies, 117–119
Robèrt, Karl-Henrik, 1

sanction-based prescriptive regulations, 62
Schmidheiny, Stephen, 115
Scientific American, 116
secondary stakeholders, 76–77
sense-making, 172
Shapiro, Robert, 117
shared family sustainability vision, 128–130
shared identity in family firms, 136



Index 239

shared value, 151, 173-174 Tata Group, 174-175 temporal orientation, 10, 109-112, shareholder activists, 103 short-term patient investments, 100 134-135, 220 sibling-run businesses, 131 3 M company, 180 Silent Spring (Carson), 61 top management team (TMT) social capital, 136 championing/selling ideas/ Social Issues in Management (SIM), 3 innovations, 183 social justice, 173 corporate proactive environmental social NGOs, 85 strategy, 106-115 societal institutions, 59 decision-making, 19, 206 socioeconomic factors, 7, 84 dominant coalition, 17, 203, 217 socioemotional wealth (SEW), 86-87, information flow, 182 90, 110, 162, 196, 201 in non-family firms, 106–107 soil composition balance, 28 strategic goals, 14 stakeholders temporal orientation, 109-112 classification and salience, 76-81 toxic emissions, 83, 84 defined, 15 toxic release inventory (TRI), 61 external stakeholders, 172 transactiveness techniques, 78 family as, 201 transgenerational continuity intentions, influence of family firms, 86-88 110, 151-152, 210 influences on environmental strategy, transgenerational longevity/success, 73 75-90 transgenerational value creation, 130 influences on environmental transmission of knowledge. see sustainability strategy, 81-86 knowledge transmission orientation of, 133 unified identity, 113 primary stakeholders, 76 priority stakeholders, 78 Unilever, 176, 223 United Nations Conventions, 2 secondary stakeholders, 76-77 summary of, 209-210 United Nations Global Compact, 167 wine industry engagement, 88-90 US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 16 stewardship orientation, 132–134, 137, 207, 227 Viña De Martino in Chile, 30 strategic bridge, 111 Vintners Quality Alliance (VQA), 29, strategic management research, 109, 31–34, 43 219-220 viticulture, 26-27, 28. see also biodysuccession process in family firms, namic viticulture; organic 186-187, 188, 226 viticulture supervisory influences, 169-171 volatile, uncertain, complex, and sustainability, defined, 2 ambiguous (VUCA), 172 voluntary beyond-compliance, 119 sustainable business, 9 sustainable development, 1-2, 5t Sustainable Development Goals Wine Council of St. Émilion, 199, (SDGs), 2 sustainable strategy, 9-10, 54-55 winery industry environmental impact. sustainable viticulture, 221-222 see also Canadian wine industry; Sustainable Winemaking Ontario, 42, Chilean wine industry; French wine industry Syndicat de Vignerons en Biodynamie, data analysis, 53 data collection, 52–53



240 Index

winery industry (cont.)
family *vs.* non-family controlled,
25–27, 54
first generation family firms, 36–37
proactive environmental impact,
27–29
reactive environmental impact,
27–29, 35–39

research design and case selection, 29–31, 32–33t research summary, 90–91 stakeholders engagement, 88–90
World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), 1–2, 115