

# The effects of sustainable development on firms' financial performance – an empirical approach<sup>†</sup>

Dong-shang Chang , Li-chin Regina Kuo

First published: 14 January 2008

<https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.351>

<sup>†</sup> The sustainability score is supplied by SAM Sustainable Asset Management. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of SAM Group. All the corporate sustainability indicators used in the present study have been independently elaborated by the authors of this article from the original data provided by SAM Group. Any possible error in the interpretation of such data remains the sole responsibility of the authors.



## Abstract

This research studies firms' sustainable development in term of economic, environmental and social dimensions and their financial performance, which includes a broader coverage of stakeholder engagement of both sustainability and profitability in a structural equation model (SEM). The secondary data of 311 firms' sustainability scores are analyzed and our observations reveal that (1) the better sustainability performers may have a tendency of positive influence on firm profitability in the same and later periods, (2) a positive reciprocal causality may exist between sustainability and profitability among the better sustainability group, (3) profitability affects corporate sustainability positively in both higher and lower sustainability groups and (4) sustainability influences firm profitability negatively in the lower sustainability group. Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd and ERP Environment.

## REFERENCES



This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)



Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

---

Bansal P. 2005. Evolving sustainably: a longitudinal study of corporate sustainable development. *Strategic Management Journal* 26: 197-218.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Brammer S, Millington A. 2005. Corporate reputation and philanthropy – an empirical analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics* 61: 29-44.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Bollen KA. 1989. *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*. Wiley: New York.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Buchholtz AK, Amason AC, Rutherford MA. 1999. Beyond resources: the mediating of top management discretion and values on corporate philanthropy. *Business and Society* 38(2): 167-187.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Carroll A. 1979. A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *The Academy of Management Review* 4(000004): 497-505.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Chen KH, Metcalf RW. 1980. The relationship between pollution control record and financial indicators revisited. *The Accounting Review* 55(1): 168-177.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Christmann P. 2000. Effects of 'best practices' of environmental management on cost advantage: the role of complementary assets. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(4): 663-680.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Cochran PL, Wood RA. 1984. Corporate social responsibility and financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 27(000001): 42-56.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Corbett CJ, Wassenhove LNV. 1993. The green fee: internalizing and operationalizing environmental issues. *California Management Review* 36(1): 116-135.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Cottrill MT. 1990. Corporate social responsibility and the marketplace. *Journal of Business Ethics* 9: 723-729.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Daily BF, Huang SC. 2001. Achieving sustainability through attention to human resource factors in environmental management. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management* 21(12): 1539-1552.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

de Burgos Jiménez J, Lorente JJC. 2001. Environmental performance as an operations objective. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management* 21(12): 1553-1572.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

de Geus A. 1997. The living company. *Harvard Business Review* 75(2): 51-59.

[PubMed](#)  | [Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Diltz DJ. 1995. The private cost of socially responsible investing. *Applied Financial Economics* 5(2): 69-77.

[Google Scholar](#) 

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Elkington J. 1994. Towards the sustainable corporation: win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development. *California Management Review* 36(2): 90-100.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Elkington J. 1999. Triple bottom-line reporting: looking for balance. *Australian CPA* 69(2): 18-21.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Fogler HR, Nutt F. 1975. A note on social responsibility and stock valuation. *Academy of Management Journal* 18(000001): 155-160.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Frooman J. 1997. Socially irresponsible and illegal behavior and shareholder wealth, a meta-analysis of event studies. *Business and Society* 36(3): 221-249.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Griffin JJ, Mahon JF. 1997. The corporate social performance and corporate financial performance debate: twenty-five years of incomparable research. *Business and Society* 3(1): 5-31.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Hair JF Jr, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, Black WC. 2006. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice-Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Hart SL. 1997. Beyond greening: strategies for a sustainable world. *Harvard Business Review* 75(1): 66-76.

[PubMed](#)  | [Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

[Web of Science®](#) 

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Holland L. 2003. Can the principle of the ecological footprint be applied to measure the environmental sustainability of business? *Corporate Social-Responsibility and Environmental Management* 10(4): 224-232.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Holliday C. 2001. Sustainable growth, the DuPont way. *Havard Business Review* 79(8): 129-134.

[CAS](#)  | [PubMed](#)  | [Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Jones TM. 1983. An integrating framework for research in business and society: a step toward the elusive paradigm? *The Academy of Management Review* 8(000004): 559-564.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Keim GD. 1978. Corporate social responsibility: an assessment of the enlightened self-interest model. *The Academy of Management Review* 3(000001): 32-39.

[PubMed](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Kuo LC. 2005. The Causal Relationship of Corporate Sustainability and Profitability, working paper, Department of Business Administration, National Central University, Taiwan.

[Google Scholar](#) 


---

Litz RA. 1996. A resource-based-view of the socially responsible firm: stakeholder interdependence, ethical awareness, and issue responsiveness as strategic assets. *Journal of Business Ethics* 15(12): 1355-1363.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Margolis JD, Walsh JP. 2001. *People and Profits? The Search for a Link Between a Company's Social and Financial Performance*. Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ.

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#) 

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

Maxwell J, Rothenberg S, Briscoe F, Marcus A. 1997. Green schemes: corporate environmental strategies and their implementation. *California Management Review* 39(3): 118-120.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

McWilliams A, Siegel D. 2000. Research notes and communications. Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: correlation or misspecification? *Strategic Management Journal* 21(5): 603-609.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

McWilliams A, Siegel D. 2001. Note. Corporate social responsibility: a theory of the firm perspective. *The Academy of Management Review* 26(1): 117-127.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Mill GA. 2006. The financial performance of a socially responsible investment over time and a possible link with corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 63: 131-148.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Mitchell RK, Agle BR, Wood DJ. 1997. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. *The Academy of Management Review* 22(4): 853-886.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Molnar E, Mulvihill PR. 2003. Sustainability-focused organizational learning: recent experiences and new challenges. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 46(2): 167-176.

[Google Scholar](#)

Moon J. 2007. The contribution of corporate social responsibility to sustainable development. *Sustainable Development* 15(5): 296.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

---

Oktem U, Lewis P, Donovan D, Hagan JR, Pace T. 2004. EMS and sustainable development. A model and comparative studies of integration. *Greener Management International* 46: 11-28.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Orlitzky M. 2001. Does firm size confound the relationship between social performance and firm financial performance? *Journal of Business Ethics* 33(2): 167-180.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Orlitzky M, Benjamin JD. 2001. Corporate social performance and firm risk: a meta-analytic review. *Business and Society* 40(4): 369-396.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Palmer K, Oates WE, Portney PR. 1995. Tightening environmental standards: the benefit-cost or the no-cost paradigm? *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9(4): 119-132.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Pava ML, Krausz J. 1996. The association of CSR and financial performance: the paradox of social cost. *Journal of Business Ethics* 15(3): 321-357.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---


Porter ME, van der Linde C. 1995. Green and Competitive - Ending the Stalemate. *Harvard Business Review* 73(5): 120-134.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Reinhardt F. 1998. Environmental product differentiation: implications for corporate strategy. *California Management Review* 40(4): 43-73.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#) 

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Rowley TJ. 1997. Moving beyond dyadic ties: a network theory of stakeholder influences. *The Academy of Management Review* 22(4): 887–910.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Rugman AM, Verbeke A. 1998. Corporate strategies and environmental regulations: an organizing framework. *Strategic Management Journal* 19(4): 363–375.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Russo MV, Fouts PA. 1997. A resource-based perspective on corporate environmental performance and profitability. *Academy of Management Journal* 40(3): 534–559.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Salzmann O, Ionescu-Somers A, Steger U. 2005. The business case for corporate sustainability: literature review and research options. *European Management Journal* 23(1): 27–36.

[Google Scholar](#) 

---

Schaefer A. 2004. Corporate sustainability – integrating environmental and social concerns? *Corporate Social-Responsibility and Environmental Management* 11(4): 179–187.

[Google Scholar](#) 


---

Schuler DA, Cording M. 2006. A corporate social performance–corporate financial performance behavioral model for consumers. *The Academy of Management Review* 31(3): 540–558.

[Web of Science®](#)  | [Google Scholar](#) 

---

Sethi SP. 1979. A conceptual framework for environmental analysis of social issues and evaluation of business response patterns. *The Academy of Management Review* 4(000001): 63–74.

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#) 

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

Stanwick PA, Stanwick SD. 1998a. The relationship between corporate social performance, and organizational size, financial performance, and environmental performance: an empirical examination. *Journal of Business Ethics* 17(2): 195-204.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Stanwick PA, Stanwick SD. 1998b. Corporate social responsiveness: an empirical examination using the environmental disclosure index. *International Journal of Commerce and Management* 8(3/4): 26-40.

[Google Scholar](#)

Strand R. 1983. A systems paradigm of organizational adaptations to the social environment. *The Academy of Management Review* 8(000001): 90-96.

[PubMed](#) | [Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Sturdivant FD, Ginter JL. 1977. Corporate social responsiveness. Management attitudes and economic performance. *California Management Review* 19(000003): 30-39.

[Google Scholar](#)

Thorpe J, Prakash-Mani K. 2003. Developing value. The business case for sustainability in emerging markets. *Greener Management International* 44(44): 17-32.

[Google Scholar](#)

Tuzzolino F, Armandi BR. 1981. A need-hierarchy framework for assessing corporate social responsibility. *The Academy of Management Review* 6(000001): 21-28.

[Google Scholar](#)

Verschoor CC, Murphy EA. 2002. The financial performance of large U.S. firms and those with global prominence: how do the best corporate citizens rate? *Business and Society Review* 107(3): 371-380.

[Google Scholar](#)

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

---

Waddock SA, Graves SB. 2000. Performance characteristics of social and traditional investments. *Journal of Investing* 9(2): 27-38.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Wagner M. 2005. Sustainability and competitive advantage: empirical evidence on the influence of strategic choices between environmental management approaches. *Environmental Quality Management* 14(3): 31-48.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Wagner M, Schaltegger S. 2004. The effect of corporate environmental strategy choice and environmental performance on competitiveness and economic performance: an empirical study of EU manufacturing. *European Management Journal* 22(5): 557-572.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Wagner M, Van Phu N, Azomahou T, Wehrmeyer W. 2002. The relationship between the environmental and economic performance of firms: an empirical analysis of the European paper industry. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 9(3): 133-146.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Walley N, Whitehead B. 1994. It's not easy being green. *Harvard Business Review* 72(3): 46-52.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Wartick SL, Cochran PL. 1985. The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *The Academy of Management Review* 10(000004): 758-769.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

Wood DJ. 1991. Corporate social performance revisited. *The Academy of Management Review* 16(4): 691–718.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Zenisek TJ. 1979. Corporate social responsibility: a conceptualization based on organizational literature. *The Academy of Management Review* 4(000003): 359–368.

[Google Scholar](#)

## Citing Literature



[Download PDF](#)

### ABOUT WILEY ONLINE LIBRARY

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

[About Cookies](#)

[Manage Cookies](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Wiley Research DE&I Statement and Publishing Policies](#)

### HELP & SUPPORT

[Contact Us](#)

[Training and Support](#)

[DMCA & Reporting Piracy](#)

[Sitemap](#)

### OPPORTUNITIES

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)



[Manage Preferences](#)

[Accept All](#)

[Reject Non-Essential](#)

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. [Privacy Policy](#)



Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential