

## Index

- Academy of Management*, 3  
 activist investors, 81  
 agency theory, 12  
 agents of change, 220–222  
 Agriculture Biologique (AB)  
   certification of France, 29  
 altruism, 17  
 anchoring bias, 160–161  
 Appellation d'origine contrôlée (AOC),  
   50
- Berkshire Hathaway, 14  
 Best Available Control Technology  
   (BACT), 61–62  
 Best Available Technology Not  
   entailing Excessive Economical  
   Costs (BATNEEC), 62  
 bifurcation bias, 195  
 biodynamic viticulture  
   Canadian wine industry, 42  
   certification, 40  
   French wine industry, 71–72, 102,  
   112, 135, 171, 178  
   nature of, 28–29  
 boards and environmental practices,  
   83–84, 104–105  
 Business Council for Sustainable  
   Development (BCSD), 115  
 business education, 224
- California wine industry, 133–134  
 Canadian forestry industry, 76  
 Canadian wine industry  
   biodynamic viticulture, 42  
   familiness, 132  
   family firms, 34, 67–68, 199  
   first generation family firms, 36–37,  
   40–43, 69–70  
   halo bias, 160  
   introduction to, 26, 31–35  
   managerial drivers/values, 155  
   multi-/later-generation family firms,  
   37–38, 43–44, 68–69  
   non-family/corporate firms, 38–39,  
   46  
   organic viticulture, 69–70, 72–73,  
   129–130, 177, 178, 220–221  
   proactive environmental strategies,  
   39–44, 68, 207  
   supervisory influences, 170–171  
   transmission of knowledge, 204–206  
 capability deployment of PES,  
   126–137, 207  
 Carbon Reduction Institute, 45  
 Carson, Rachel, 61  
 chemical emissions/effluents, 71  
 Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), 14  
 Chilean wine industry  
   anchoring bias, 161  
   family firms, 70–71, 199  
   family values, 174  
   introduction to, 44–45  
   managerial drivers/values, 155  
   multi-/later-generation family firms,  
   45–46  
   performance evaluation metrics, 177  
   proactive environmental strategies,  
   45–46  
 clean technologies, 162  
 coercive forces, 59, 74  
 cognitive frames and biases, 150,  
   156–167, 164–166*t*  
 collective good, 187  
 competitive advantage, 117, 195  
 competitive imagination, 78  
 complementary assets, 124  
 compliance *vs.* voluntary  
   beyond-compliance, 119  
 control systems, 127  
 corporate citizenship, 3, 7

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

- 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-/later-generation 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, 218
  - long-term temporal orientation, 134–135, 202–203, 213
  - market and competitive strategies, 115–126
  - natural 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, 226
  - transgenerational longevity/success, 73
- 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, 211
  - overview of, 16, 18*f*, 54
  - performance evaluation metrics, 179
  - proactive environmental strategy, 137, 195, 205*t*, 222–224
  - shared characteristics, 202–208, 205*t*
- 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

- 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, 49–51
  - non-family/corporate firms, 48–49, 51–52
  - organic 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
- 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 Environnementale), 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, 214*f*
- 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

- long-term sustainability targets, 176, 218
- long-term temporal orientation, 134–135, 202–203, 213
- loss bias, 161–163
- majority shareholders, 16
- managerial drivers/values
  - anchoring bias, 160–161
  - championing/selling ideas/innovations, 183–185
  - cognitive frames and biases, 156–167, 164–166*t*, 212
  - discretionary slack, 179–181
  - environmental sustainability strategies, 150–153, 199–200
  - family business advantage, 185–188
  - halo bias, 159–160
  - influence of, 153–156
  - information flow, 181–183
  - leadership influences, 167–169
  - legitimization of environmental sustainability, 172–175
  - loss bias, 161–163
  - opportunity framing of environmental issues, 167–183
  - organizational context and design, 171–172, 200
  - performance evaluation metrics, 175–179
  - supervisory influences, 169–171
- managerial incentives/influences, 82, 212–213, 214*f*
- market and competitive strategies
  - family firms, 115–126
  - family firms *vs.* non-family firms, 211
  - financial performance and, 120–121
  - regulatory responses, 117–119
  - sustainability/generic business strategy, 119–120
- material usage reductions, 35
- McKinsey Quarterly*, 197
- media and environmental practices, 82, 87
- micro-entrepreneurship, 43
- middle management, 183
- mimetic forces, 59–60, 74, 209
- minority shareholders, 16
- Monsanto, 117
- moral arguments, 75
- multi-/later-generation family firms
  - Canadian wine industry, 37–38, 43–44, 68–69
  - Chilean wine industry, 45–46
  - French wine industry, 49–51
- multinational enterprises (MNEs), 117
- Mutuelle d'Assurances du Corps de Santé Français (MACSF), 49
- natural resource-based view, 121–126, 138–139
- Natural Step Framework, 1
- New World wineries, 27, 30, 31
- non-family/corporate firms
  - Canadian wine industry, 38–39, 46
  - family firms *vs.*, 16, 18*f*, 54
  - French wine industry, 48–49, 51–52
  - leadership of, 154
  - proactive environmental strategy, 137
  - shared value, 173–174
  - top management team, 106–107
- non-governmental organizations (NGOs)
  - collaboration with, 85
  - environmental impacts and, 80
  - imposing of fines by, 78
  - instrumental importance, 76
  - ISO 14001 standards, 87
  - not-for-profit, 126
  - proactive *vs.* reactive environmental strategies, 210
  - role of, 222
  - social NGOs, 85
- non-organic viticulture, 28
- nonprofit environmentalist organizations, 168
- normative arguments, 75
- normative forces, 59, 209
- oligarchic family control, 73
- opportunity framing of environmental issues, 167–183
- organic viticulture
  - Canadian wine industry, 69–70, 72–73, 129–130, 177, 178, 220–221
  - defined, 28, 39
  - education program in, 135

- 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, 43
- proactive environmental strategy (PES). *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, 205*t*, 222–224
  - French wine industry, 49–52, 71
  - generic business strategies, 119
  - impact of, 10, 17, 27–29
  - individual/managerial influences, 82, 212–213, 214*f*
  - 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

- shared value, 151, 173–174  
 shareholder activists, 103  
 short-term patient investments, 100  
 sibling-run businesses, 131  
*Silent Spring* (Carson), 61  
 social capital, 136  
 Social Issues in Management (SIM), 3  
 social justice, 173  
 social NGOs, 85  
 societal institutions, 59  
 socioeconomic factors, 7, 84  
 socioemotional wealth (SEW), 86–87,  
 90, 110, 162, 196, 201  
 soil composition balance, 28  
 stakeholders  
   classification and salience, 76–81  
   defined, 15  
   external stakeholders, 172  
   family as, 201  
   influence of family firms, 86–88  
   influences on environmental strategy,  
   75–90  
   influences on environmental  
   sustainability strategy, 81–86  
   orientation of, 133  
   primary stakeholders, 76  
   priority stakeholders, 78  
   secondary stakeholders, 76–77  
   summary of, 209–210  
   wine industry engagement, 88–90  
 stewardship orientation, 132–134, 137,  
 207, 227  
 strategic bridge, 111  
 strategic management research, 109,  
 219–220  
 succession process in family firms,  
 186–187, 188, 226  
 supervisory influences, 169–171  
 sustainability, defined, 2  
 sustainable business, 9  
 sustainable development, 1–2, 5*t*  
 Sustainable Development Goals  
 (SDGs), 2  
 sustainable strategy, 9–10, 54–55  
 sustainable viticulture, 221–222  
 Sustainable Winemaking Ontario, 42,  
 43  
 Syndicat de Vignerons en Biodynamie,  
 50  
 Tata Group, 174–175  
 temporal orientation, 10, 109–112,  
 134–135, 220  
 3 M company, 180  
 top management team (TMT)  
   championing/selling ideas/  
   innovations, 183  
   corporate proactive environmental  
   strategy, 106–115  
   decision-making, 19, 206  
   dominant coalition, 17, 203, 217  
   information flow, 182  
   in non-family firms, 106–107  
   strategic goals, 14  
   temporal orientation, 109–112  
 toxic emissions, 83, 84  
 toxic release inventory (TRI), 61  
 transactiveness techniques, 78  
 transgenerational continuity intentions,  
 110, 151–152, 210  
 transgenerational longevity/success, 73  
 transgenerational value creation, 130  
 transmission of knowledge. *see*  
   knowledge transmission  
 unified identity, 113  
 Unilever, 176, 223  
 United Nations Conventions, 2  
 United Nations Global Compact, 167  
 US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 16  
 Viña De Martino in Chile, 30  
 Vintners Quality Alliance (VQA), 29,  
 31–34, 43  
 viticulture, 26–27, 28. *see also* biody-  
   namic viticulture; organic  
   viticulture  
 volatile, uncertain, complex, and  
 ambiguous (VUCA), 172  
 voluntary beyond-compliance, 119  
 Wine Council of St. Émilion, 199,  
 221  
 winery industry environmental impact.  
   *see also* Canadian wine industry;  
   Chilean wine industry; French  
   wine industry  
   data analysis, 53  
   data collection, 52–53

- 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, 32–33*t*  
research summary, 90–91  
stakeholders engagement,  
  88–90  
World Commission on Environment  
and Development (WCED), 1–2,  
  115