Quest Journals
Journal of Research in Business and Management
Volume 3 ~ Issue 8 (August 2015) pp: 103-109
ISSN(Online):2347-3002
www.questjournals.org

Research Paper

Sustainable Business Practices and Their Strategic Impact on Firm Reputation and Profitability: An Integrative Analysis of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Drivers in the Service Sector

Dr Suresh Kumar Sharma
Associate Professor, Deptt of ABST
Seth RN Ruia Government College, Ramgarh Shekhawati (Sikar) Rajasthan

Abstract
Sustainable business practices (SBPs) have emerged as a strategic imperative for service-sector firms seeking competitive advantage in a global economy increasingly governed by environmental consciousness, ethical responsibility, and stakeholder transparency. This paper examines how sustainability, framed through environmental, social, and governance (ESG) dimensions, enhances firm reputation and, through that reputational capital, improves financial performance. Drawing from stakeholder theory, the triple bottom line (TBL), and the resource-based view (RBV), the study conceptualizes a mediating model in which reputational enhancement acts as the critical conduit linking sustainability initiatives to profitability outcomes. Through synthesis of empirical findings and theoretical contributions prior to 2015, the paper highlights that firms embracing responsible environmental management, equitable labor relations, and transparent governance mechanisms tend to cultivate stakeholder trust, loyalty, and brand legitimacy. These factors subsequently translate into market differentiation and higher profitability. The conceptual framework presented contributes to strategic management literature by elucidating the indirect yet powerful relationship between sustainability and financial success, particularly in service-oriented organizations where intangible assets and stakeholder perceptions predominate.
Keywords: *Sustainable business practices; firm reputation; profitability; service sector; stakeholder theory; ESG framework.*

I. Background of the Study

The rapid evolution of global markets during the early twenty-first century positioned sustainability as one of the most significant strategic imperatives for business organizations. Sustainable business practices refer to organizational policies and actions that integrate economic growth with environmental stewardship and social equity (Elkington, 1997). Although sustainability initially emerged within manufacturing and extractive industries due to their direct environmental impact, service sector firms—such as banks, hospitality providers, educational institutions, healthcare systems, and information technology enterprises—have increasingly recognized their responsibility toward environmental and social performance (Porter & Kramer, 2006). The globalization of services and the rise of consumer awareness have intensified the pressure for transparent and responsible business conduct (Bhattacharya, Korschun, & Sen, 2009). By 2015, sustainability had evolved from a philanthropic add-on to a central component of corporate strategy. The service economy accounts for more than 60 percent of global GDP and employs the majority of the workforce in both developed and emerging economies (World Bank, 2014). The intangible nature of service products—reliant on customer perception and trust—makes reputation a critical strategic asset (Fombrun & Van Riel, 2004). Thus, the integration of sustainable practices has been viewed as a pathway to strengthen reputational capital and achieve long-term profitability (Orlitzky, Schmidt, & Rynes, 2003). Sustainable business practices encompass environmental initiatives such as energy conservation, waste reduction, green procurement, and digitalization; social practices like employee welfare, diversity, and community engagement; and governance measures ensuring ethics and transparency (Carroll & Shabana, 2010). These dimensions collectively form the **Triple Bottom Line (TBL)**—people, planet, and profit (Elkington, 1997). For service organizations, the intangible outcomes of sustainability—brand image, employee morale, and stakeholder trust—often outweigh immediate cost implications. Empirical studies before 2015 consistently suggested that sustainability and reputation are positively correlated (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006; Pérez & del Bosque, 2013). A favorable reputation can, in turn, attract customers, investors, and talented employees, indirectly enhancing profitability (Fombrun, 2005).

The emergence of international reporting standards, such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and ISO 26000, further institutionalized sustainability within the corporate agenda (GRI, 2013). Service firms increasingly disclosed their environmental and social performance to meet stakeholder expectations and regulatory frameworks (Clarkson et al., 2011). The Indian service sector, in particular, witnessed a surge in corporate social responsibility (CSR) reporting following the Companies Act 2013, which mandated CSR expenditure for qualifying firms (Gupta & Sharma, 2014). Hence, sustainability became both a moral and a legal expectation, influencing reputation and profitability simultaneously. Despite the intangible nature of service outputs, sustainability offers tangible benefits in customer retention, employee satisfaction, risk mitigation, and long-term financial stability (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006). Consequently, understanding the link between sustainable practices, firm reputation, and profitability remains central to contemporary service management research.

II. Rationale of the Study

The rationale for examining sustainable business practices in the service sector stems from the increasing convergence between corporate responsibility and competitive advantage. In the 1990s and early 2000s, sustainability discussions were primarily confined to manufacturing or heavy industries. However, by the 2010s, service organizations realized that intangible value drivers—trust, brand equity, and social legitimacy—are equally influenced by sustainability (Sen & Bhattacharya, 2001). Customers have become more conscious of ethical consumption, preferring firms that align profit motives with social and environmental considerations (Green & Peloza, 2011). Investors, too, have begun to integrate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria into decision-making, reinforcing the market relevance of sustainability (Dhaliwal, Li, Tsang, & Yang, 2011). Furthermore, service firms rely heavily on human capital and customer interactions; hence, socially responsible HRM and ethical service delivery directly affect organizational outcomes (Turker, 2009).

From a managerial viewpoint, the rationale also lies in mitigating risks associated with reputational damage. Scandals, unethical advertising, or employee mistreatment can erode public trust rapidly in the digital era (Bebbington, Larrinaga, & Moneva, 2008). Conversely, firms that demonstrate responsible behavior earn goodwill that cushions them against crises. Scholars like Freeman (1984) argued that balancing stakeholder interests ensures long-term survival. Thus, sustainability becomes not merely an ethical obligation but a strategic necessity. Another compelling rationale is the need for empirical clarification. Though conceptual arguments linking sustainability with profitability abound, empirical evidence—especially within service industries—has been relatively fragmented. Variations in measurement, reporting standards, and time horizons complicate causal assessments (Margolis & Walsh, 2003). This study therefore aims to contribute to the body of evidence by synthesizing theory and data to evaluate how sustainable practices influence both reputation and profitability in service-based enterprises.

III. Problem Statement

While sustainable business practices have gained prominence in organizational discourse, the extent to which they translate into enhanced reputation and profitability in service sector firms remains inadequately examined. Most pre-2015 research focused on manufacturing contexts or large multinational corporations, with limited exploration of service-specific dynamics (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006). The intangible and human-centric nature of services implies that sustainability manifests differently, yet measurement tools are often borrowed from manufacturing paradigms (Lantos, 2001). Furthermore, service firms face the challenge of quantifying the financial impact of sustainability. Although improved reputation is often assumed to lead to better financial outcomes, the direct relationship remains ambiguous due to intervening variables such as customer loyalty, brand positioning, and operational efficiency (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006). This ambiguity creates a critical gap between theoretical advocacy and managerial implementation. Consequently, there is a pressing need to investigate how and to what extent sustainable practices influence firm reputation and profitability in the service sector.

IV. Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to explore the relationship between sustainable business practices, firm reputation, and profitability within service sector firms. The specific objectives are:

1. To identify the key sustainable business practices adopted by service sector firms up to 2015.
2. To analyze the influence of sustainability initiatives on corporate reputation among stakeholders.
3. To examine the relationship between firm reputation and profitability as mediated by sustainability performance.
4. To evaluate variations in sustainability–profitability linkages across different service industries.

5. To suggest managerial strategies for integrating sustainability into the core business model for long-term competitive advantage.

V. Significance of the Study

This study holds multifaceted significance for academia, management practice, and public policy. From an **academic perspective**, it contributes to the growing discourse on corporate sustainability by focusing on an under-researched context—the service sector. The findings aim to extend existing theories like the Triple Bottom Line and Stakeholder Theory by empirically validating their relevance in intangible service settings (Elkington, 1997; Freeman, 1984). From a **managerial perspective**, sustainability is no longer an optional cost but a source of strategic differentiation. Firms that integrate environmental and social goals into their operations build enduring reputations and customer loyalty (Porter & Kramer, 2011). This study provides insights into how managers can leverage sustainability to strengthen brand image and profitability simultaneously. In terms of **policy relevance**, the research supports global and national frameworks promoting responsible business. Governments and international bodies increasingly encourage service industries to disclose their sustainability performance. The study's conclusions can inform the formulation of policies that incentivize transparency and accountability in service firms (GRI, 2013). Lastly, the study has **societal significance**: service industries such as banking, hospitality, healthcare, and education directly affect public welfare. Sustainable practices in these sectors can enhance social equity, reduce ecological footprints, and contribute to inclusive growth (Carroll & Shabana, 2010). Thus, the study not only addresses business outcomes but also the broader agenda of sustainable development.

VI. Scope and Delimitation

The scope of this study encompasses major service sectors—banking, hospitality, healthcare, information technology, and education—operating in emerging and developed economies. The temporal boundary is set around **2005–2015**, a decade that witnessed the institutionalization of sustainability reporting and the mainstreaming of CSR practices. The research focuses on organizational-level initiatives rather than macroeconomic or industry-wide policies. Delimitations include the exclusion of manufacturing and agricultural sectors, as well as the non-consideration of microenterprises or informal service providers due to limited data availability. The analysis primarily relies on secondary literature and published empirical studies prior to December 2015. The study also recognizes that reputation and profitability are multi-dimensional constructs influenced by numerous external factors, which may not be fully isolated in sustainability assessments.

VII. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of this study is grounded in **Stakeholder Theory**, the **Triple Bottom Line (TBL)** approach, and the **Resource-Based View (RBV)** of the firm.

7.1 Stakeholder Theory

Freeman's (1984) Stakeholder Theory posits that firms must create value for all stakeholders—customers, employees, suppliers, communities, and shareholders—to ensure long-term viability. In service industries, where customer interaction and employee engagement are pivotal, stakeholder management becomes integral to business success (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Sustainable business practices represent the operationalization of stakeholder orientation, balancing economic, social, and environmental outcomes. When stakeholders perceive a firm as responsible, its reputation improves, creating a positive feedback loop that enhances profitability (Fombrun & Van Riel, 2004).

7.2 Triple Bottom Line (TBL) Framework

The TBL framework proposed by Elkington (1997) expands performance assessment beyond financial metrics to include social and environmental dimensions. Service firms adopting TBL practices pursue eco-efficiency, community involvement, and equitable human-resource policies. These initiatives generate reputational benefits, as modern consumers reward ethical behavior (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006). Empirical research indicates that firms balancing the three pillars of sustainability often achieve superior long-term profitability compared to those focused solely on short-term financial returns (Hart & Milstein, 2003).

7.3 Resource-Based View (RBV)

According to Barney (1991), firms achieve competitive advantage through valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable resources. Sustainable practices can constitute such strategic resources by fostering trust, legitimacy, and innovation. A strong reputation is itself a valuable intangible asset under RBV logic (Hall, 1992). When sustainability is embedded in corporate culture, it enhances internal capabilities—such as efficient resource use, employee motivation, and innovation—that drive profitability. Thus, sustainability acts both as a differentiator and as a capability enhancer in service industries (Hart, 1995).

7.4 Linking Sustainability, Reputation, and Profitability

Integrating these theories suggests a cyclical relationship: sustainable business practices improve stakeholder satisfaction (Stakeholder Theory), which enhances reputation (RBV perspective), leading to improved financial performance (TBL alignment). Empirical studies have validated elements of this linkage—Orlitzky et al. (2003) found a positive correlation between corporate social performance and financial performance, while Luo and Bhattacharya (2006) demonstrated that firm reputation mediates this relationship. For service firms, where trust and image are core to customer decisions, this link becomes even more pronounced. Moreover, the **Institutional Theory** provides an auxiliary lens, explaining how normative pressures—such as global reporting standards and social expectations—compel firms to adopt sustainable practices to gain legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Institutional legitimacy, in turn, strengthens reputation and stabilizes profitability through stakeholder loyalty and risk reduction (Bebbington et al., 2008).

7.5 Conceptual Model

Drawing on the preceding theoretical foundations—**Stakeholder Theory** (Freeman, 1984), the **Triple Bottom Line (TBL)** framework (Elkington, 1997), and the **Resource-Based View (RBV)** (Barney, 1991)—the present study develops an integrated conceptual model to explain the interrelationships among **sustainable business practices**, **firm reputation**, and **profitability** within service-sector firms. At its core, the model posits a **causal chain** in which the adoption of *sustainable business practices*—encompassing environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and ethical governance—enhances a firm's **reputational capital**, which subsequently leads to **improved financial performance and profitability**. The link is **indirectly mediated** by reputation because, in service industries, the effects of sustainability are often perceived through stakeholder evaluations rather than through immediate cost savings or operational efficiencies (Luo & Bhattacharya, 2006).

a. Sustainable Business Practices as Antecedents

The model begins with the firm's commitment to sustainability initiatives.

- **Environmental practices** (e.g., energy efficiency, digitalization, and green procurement) signal ecological responsibility.
- **Social practices** (e.g., fair labor policies, community development, customer well-being) communicate ethical integrity.
- **Governance practices** (e.g., transparency, stakeholder dialogue, anti-corruption measures) indicate institutional accountability.

Collectively, these dimensions form the **ESG triad**, aligning with the TBL concept of balancing *people, planet, and profit* (Elkington, 1997). For service organizations—whose operations are largely intangible and people-centric—these practices embody visible indicators of reliability and fairness, fostering positive stakeholder perceptions (Branco & Rodrigues, 2006).

b. Firm Reputation as a Mediating Mechanism

Reputation functions as the **mediating construct** that translates sustainability inputs into financial outcomes. A strong reputation reflects stakeholders' collective judgments of a company's credibility, trustworthiness, and social legitimacy (Fombrun & Van Riel, 2004). When service firms engage in genuine sustainability initiatives, customers and employees develop affective trust and identification with the brand (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). This reputational capital serves multiple roles:

1. It **reduces perceived risk** among consumers, encouraging repeated transactions;
2. It **attracts skilled employees** who prefer ethically responsible employers;
3. It **enhances investor confidence**, thereby lowering the cost of capital; and
4. It **creates reputational insurance**, mitigating the negative effects of potential crises (Godfrey, 2005).

In essence, sustainability enriches the reputational resource base that, according to RBV, is valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (Barney, 1991).

c. Profitability as a Consequence

The final stage of the model asserts that enhanced reputation ultimately **improves profitability** through multiple pathways. Reputed firms can command price premiums, enjoy higher customer retention, and achieve superior market share (Roberts & Dowling, 2002). Sustainability also contributes to **operational efficiency** and **risk reduction**, which indirectly enhance financial performance (Orlitzky et al., 2003). However, the model emphasizes that **profitability arises over the long term**; short-term financial gains may be modest or even offset by initial investment costs. Thus, sustainability should be viewed as a strategic, not tactical, driver of profitability (Porter & Kramer, 2011).

d. Mediated and Moderated Relationships

The conceptual model recognizes that the **sustainability–profitability** relationship is **partially mediated** by reputation. The degree of mediation may vary across industries depending on service tangibility, customer contact, and stakeholder visibility. For example, in hospitality or banking, where public perception is highly salient, the reputational pathway may dominate financial outcomes, whereas in backend IT services, internal efficiency gains may play a stronger role (Pérez & del Bosque, 2013). Furthermore, **moderating variables** such as firm size, market maturity, and cultural context may strengthen or weaken these links. In graphical terms, the model can be expressed as:

Sustainable Business Practices (Environmental + Social + Governance)

Firm Reputation (Stakeholder Trust + Legitimacy)

Firm Profitability (Financial Performance + Long-Term Value Creation)

e. Summary of Conceptual Propositions

1. **P_1:** Service firms that adopt comprehensive sustainable business practices achieve higher reputational standing among stakeholders.
2. **P_2:** Firm reputation positively influences profitability through customer loyalty, employee commitment, and investor confidence.
3. **P_3:** Firm reputation mediates the relationship between sustainable practices and profitability, serving as the principal conduit of value creation.
4. **P_4:** The strength of these relationships may vary according to industry characteristics and stakeholder visibility.

Through this model, the study advances the argument that **sustainability is not merely a moral endeavor but a strategic pathway** to long-term economic success. By embedding ethical, environmental, and social considerations into service delivery processes, organizations cultivate reputational capital that sustains profitability in increasingly competitive and transparent markets.

VIII. Conclusion

Sustainability has transcended its earlier perception as a peripheral corporate responsibility initiative to become a strategic core driver of competitive advantage. Within service-sector firms—such as financial institutions, hospitality chains, educational services, and information technology providers—the pursuit of sustainable business practices (SBPs) has emerged as both a moral obligation and a strategic necessity. The findings from literature before 2015 clearly establish that environmentally conscious, socially responsible, and well-governed firms enjoy superior reputational standing, which in turn stimulates long-term profitability. The analysis underscores that the **mediating role of firm reputation** forms the vital bridge between sustainability inputs and financial outputs. Environmental and social actions by themselves may not yield immediate profitability; however, when these practices are effectively communicated, they build stakeholder confidence and trust. Reputation serves as a *reputational buffer*—protecting the firm against crises, attracting high-quality human capital, fostering customer loyalty, and strengthening investor relations. In the intensely competitive service sector—where tangible differentiation is minimal—this reputational capital becomes an invaluable strategic asset.

Furthermore, the theoretical grounding through **Stakeholder Theory** (Freeman, 1984) emphasizes the ethical obligation of firms to balance diverse stakeholder interests rather than pursue shareholder profit alone. When service organizations align their sustainability initiatives with stakeholder expectations—whether customers, employees, suppliers, or communities—they realize synergistic gains in legitimacy and long-term viability. Similarly, the **Triple Bottom Line (Elkington, 1997)** framework broadens the concept of performance evaluation to include *people, planet, and profit,* thus urging firms to pursue holistic metrics beyond financial return. The **Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991)** further strengthens the argument that sustainability-related competencies—such as ethical leadership, social capital, and green innovations—constitute rare, valuable, and inimitable resources that yield sustained competitive advantage. Empirical studies across sectors consistently support this theoretical integration. Research by Orlitzky et al. (2003), Margolis & Walsh (2003), and Surroca et al. (2010) found strong correlations between corporate social performance and financial outcomes, while studies like Luo & Bhattacharya (2006) highlighted the mediating power of customer satisfaction and reputation. Within the service context, reputation assumes even greater significance, as intangible interactions and trust define customer loyalty. Thus, an eco-efficient hotel, a socially conscious bank, or an ethically governed IT firm not only meets stakeholder expectations but also commands price premiums, enhances market share, and sustains profitability over time.

However, the literature also warns that sustainability's financial benefits are **not automatic**. They depend on consistency, authenticity, and transparent communication. Firms engaging in symbolic or "greenwashed" practices often suffer reputational backlash when stakeholders perceive inconsistency between words and actions. Therefore, the long-term profitability of sustainable initiatives is contingent on genuine integration into organizational culture, supported by ethical leadership and governance transparency. In conclusion, sustainable business practices represent a *transformative paradigm* for the service industry. They convert moral imperatives into economic intelligence—linking environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and governance ethics with enduring reputation and profitability. The conceptual model proposed in this study—**Sustainability (ESG) → Firm Reputation → Profitability**—captures the essence of this mediated dynamic. As organizations evolve in response to global challenges such as climate change, resource scarcity, and social inequality, their reputational capital will increasingly determine financial resilience. The pursuit of sustainability is therefore not only ethically desirable but strategically indispensable for value creation in twenty-first-century service enterprises.

References

[1]. Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 38*(4), 932–968.

[2]. Ambec, S., & Lanoie, P. (2008). Does it pay to be green? A systematic overview. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 22*(4), 45–62.

[3]. Aras, G., & Crowther, D. (2009). Corporate sustainability reporting: A study in disingenuity? *Journal of Business Ethics, 87*(S1), 279–288.

[4]. Bansal, P. (2005). Evolving sustainably: A longitudinal study of corporate sustainable development. *Strategic Management Journal, 26*(3), 197–218.

[5]. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120.

[6]. Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review, 47*(1), 9–24.

[7]. Brammer, S., & Millington, A. (2008). Does it pay to be different? An analysis of the relationship between corporate social and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 29*(12), 1325–1343.

[8]. Branco, M. C., & Rodrigues, L. L. (2006). Corporate social responsibility and resource-based perspectives. *Journal of Business Ethics, 69*(2), 111–132.

[9]. Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society, 38*(3), 268–295.

[10]. Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(1), 92–117.

[11]. Delmas, M. A., & Toffel, M. W. (2008). Organizational responses to environmental demands. *Strategic Management Journal, 29*(10), 1027–1055.

[12]. Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 11*(2), 130–141.

[13]. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business.* Oxford: Capstone.

[14]. Fombrun, C. J., & Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(2), 233–258.

[15]. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Boston: Pitman.

[16]. Galbreath, J. (2009). Building corporate social responsibility into strategy. *European Business Review, 21*(2), 109–127.

[17]. González-Benito, J., & González-Benito, Ó. (2005). Environmental proactivity and business performance. *Omega, 33*(1), 1–15.

[18]. Hart, S. L. (1995). A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(4), 986–1014.

[19]. Harrison, J. S., Bosse, D. A., & Phillips, R. A. (2010). Managing for stakeholders, stakeholder utility functions, and competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal, 31*(1), 58–74.

[20]. Jensen, M. C. (2002). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 12*(2), 235–256.

[21]. Kaptein, M., & Wempe, J. (2001). *The balanced company: A theory of corporate integrity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[22]. Luo, X., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2006). Corporate social responsibility, customer satisfaction, and market value. *Journal of Marketing, 70*(4), 1–18.

[23]. Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(2), 268–305.

[24]. McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(1), 117–127.

[25]. Miles, M. P., & Covin, J. G. (2000). Environmental marketing: A source of reputational, competitive, and financial advantage. *Journal of Business Ethics, 23*(3), 299–311.

[26]. Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies, 24*(3), 403–441.

[27]. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review, 84*(12), 78–92.

[28]. Rao, P., & Holt, D. (2005). Do green supply chains lead to competitiveness and economic performance? *International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 25*(9), 898–916.

[29]. Roberts, P. W., & Dowling, G. R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 23*(12), 1077–1093.

[30]. Russo, M. V., & Fouts, P. A. (1997). A resource-based perspective on corporate environmental performance and profitability. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(3), 534–559.

[31]. Saeidi, S. P., Sofian, S., Saeidi, P., Saeidi, S. P., & Saaeidi, S. A. (2015). How does corporate social responsibility contribute to firm financial performance? The mediating role of competitive advantage, reputation, and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research, 68*(2), 341–350.

[32]. Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Does doing good always lead to doing better? *Journal of Marketing Research, 38*(2), 225–243.

[33]. Sharma, S., & Henriques, I. (2005). Stakeholder influences on sustainability practices in the Canadian forest products industry. *Strategic Management Journal, 26*(2), 159–180.

[34]. Surroca, J., Tribó, J. A., & Waddock, S. (2010). Corporate responsibility and financial performance: The role of intangible resources. *Strategic Management Journal, 31*(5), 463–490.

[35]. Van Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and definitions of CSR and corporate sustainability: Between agency and communion. *Journal of Business Ethics, 44*(2–3), 95–105.

[36]. Waddock, S. A., & Graves, S. B. (1997). The corporate social performance–financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(4), 303–319.

[37]. Wartick, S. L. (2002). Measuring corporate reputation: Definition and data. *Business & Society, 41*(4), 371–392.

[38]. Werther, W. B., & Chandler, D. (2006). *Strategic corporate social responsibility: Stakeholders in a global environment.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[39]. Wood, D. J. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(4), 691–718.