Does corporate social responsibility help the longevity of centenarian family firms in Europe?

Francesco Gangi[*], *Eugenio D'Angelo*[**], *Lucia Michela Daniele*[***], *Maria Coscia*[****]

Received 11 May 2022 – Accepted 28 June 2022

Abstract

Using a sample of 21 centenarian family firms from European countries over the 2008–2020 study period, we verify if corporate social responsibility (CSR) engagement can help the longevity of the centenarian family firms. In particular, consistent with the stakeholder theory and resource-based view, we find that the corporate social performance (CSP) has a positive impact on the corporate financial performance of family firms, even during a period affected by international financial crisis that stressed the survival of firms. Hence, based on the concept of CSR as a co-specialized asset that improves other assets, such as resilience, corporate identity, reputation and stakeholder influence capability, our results show that CSR engagement represents a key to longevity and a solution to the potential trade-off between the socioemotional wealth and the financial performance of centenarian family firms.

Key words: Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Social Performance, Longevity, Centenarian Family Firms, Corporate Financial Performance.

[*] Professore Ordinario di Economia e Gestione delle Imprese. Dipartimento di Economia, Università degli Studi della Campania, Luigi Vanvitelli. francesco.gangi@unicampania.it

[**] Professore Associato di Economia e Gestione delle Imprese, Università Telematica Pegaso. eugenio.dangelo@unipegaso.it

[***] Ricercatore di Economia e Gestione delle Imprese. Dipartimento di Economia, Università degli Studi della Campania, Luigi Vanvitelli. luciamichela.daniele@unicampania.it

[****] PhD Student in Innovazione e Imprenditorialità. Università degli Studi di Napoli Parthenope. maria.coscia001@studenti.uniparthenope.it

Corporate Governance and Research & Development Studies, n. 1-2022
(ISSN 2704-8462-ISSNe 2723-9098, DOI: 10.3280/cgrds1-2022oa13806)

Sommario

Considerando un campione di 21 family firms europee centenarie, osservate nel periodo 2008-2020, verifichiamo se la responsabilità sociale d'impresa (CSR) può rappresentare un driver di longevità di tali imprese. In particolare, coerentemente con la teoria degli stakeholder e la prospettiva della resource-based view, i risultati del presente studio evidenziano che la Corporate Social Performance (CSP) ha un impatto positivo sulla performance finanziarie delle imprese familiari centenarie, anche in periodi di forte turbolenza, come quelli segnati dalle recenti crisi finanziarie che hanno messo a dura prova la sopravvivenza delle imprese. Pertanto, considerando la CSR come un asset co-specializzato che migliora altri asset, quali la legittimità, la reputazione ed il capitale sociale, i risultati ottenuti evidenziano come il coinvolgimento in attività di CSR rappresenti una chiave per la longevità e una soluzione al potenziale trade-off tra ricchezza socio emotiva e performance finanziaria delle imprese familiari centenarie.

Parole chiave: Responsabilità sociale d’impresa, Performance sociali, Longevità, Imprese Familiari Centenarie, Performance finanziarie.

1. Introduction

Over the past decades, CSR has increasingly attracted the interest of managers and academics. As a result of the growth of environmental risks (Carroll, 2016) and the ethical dimension of the financial crises of the new millennium (Gangi and Trotta, 2015), CSR has increasingly become an integral part of corporate strategies, by orienting social, environmental, ethical and human rights concerns into business operations in close collaboration with stakeholders (European Commission, 2011). Consistent with Carroll (2016, 3) “in today’s hypercompetitive global business environment, economic performance and sustainability have become urgent topics”. Accordingly, academic research has shown a growing interest in the impact of CSR on corporate competitiveness (e.g., Orlitzky *et al.*, 2003; Margolis *et al.*, 2007; Oikonomou *et al.*, 2014; Cheng *et al.*, 2014), with results not always converging. As Adhikary (2016) argued, despite the number of studies, the debate on whether CSR is beneficial to shareholders and other stakeholders, both financial and non-financial ones, or represents an agency problem is far from settled, despite several evidence of a positive link between the financial and social performance of the firm (e.g., Deng *et al.*, 2013; Servaes and Tamayo, 2013; Gangi et al., 2020a; Gangi et al., 2020b). Accordingly, the link between CSR and financial performance is still a topical theme. In this field, a partially investigated question is the relationship between CSR and the financial performance of so-called family businesses or family-controlled businesses, which are the subject of multiple definitions, also depending on the reference context. Based on earlier literature (e.g. Andres, 2008; Cambrea *et al.*, 2021), we define a family firm as a firm in which the individual shareholder (founder and/or family members) or entity holds more than the 25% of shares. Furthermore, even if frequently an overlapping exists, we do not identify family firms with Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). This is consistent with the description and classification of family firms we find in earlier literature that we adopt in the current study (e.g., Gomez-Mejia *et al.*, 2018; Kotlar *et al.*, 2018).

Prior literature argued that family firms often face a trade-off between socioemotional wealth (SEW) and financial wealth (Gomez-Mejia *et al.* 2007, 2018; Berrone *et al.*, 2012; Luis *et al.*, 2018). From this perspective, family firms should more be oriented toward non-financial performance in the long run rather short termism financial performance (Breton-Miller and Breton, 2016; Esposito and Mirone, 2019; Lödhe *et al.*, 2020). A "dilemma" (Gomez-Mejia *et al.*, 2018, p. 1369) that has significant similarities with the still opened debate (e.g., Margolis *et al.*, 2007; Tang *et al.*, 2012; Oikonomou *et al.*, 2014; Zou *et al.*, 2015; Martínez-Ferrero and Frías-Aceituno, 2015) on the impact of CSP on CFP. Indeed, SEW refers to the non-financial aspects of the family firms in the long run, including social needs, family imagine, family identity, and the ability of the family to exert its influence and the perpetuation of the family dynasty (Gómez-Mejía *et al.*, 2007). Several of these elements are consistent with strategic expectations from the investment in CSR as a co-specialized asset that increases the value of other assets, such as reputation (McWilliams and Siegel, 2011; Melo and Garrido-Morgado, 2012; Gangi et al., 2020a), social legitimacy (Carroll, 2016) and the accruing of stakeholder influence capacity (Barnett and Salomon, 2012). Hence, the conceptual overlap between the research strands on the potential trade-off between SEW and financial performance on the one hand, and the link between CSP and CFP, on the other hand, justifies the increasing research demand on the role of CSR as a driver of family firm objectives, competitivity and continuity (Mariani *et al.*, 2021).

Furthermore, thanks to an extraordinary longevity, a specific category of family firms is represented by organizations that have reached or exceeded the age of 100 years since their foundation. Despite their relevance, the so-called centenarian family firm is not an economic and social phenomenon adequately investigated. Empirical evidence on drivers of centenarian longevity is still scant. Consistent with Napolitano and Marino (2015), the search for the "elixir" of longevity is an ambitious but crucial objective to investigate how centenarian companies have been able to transform the threat of time into an opportunity to meet contemporary challenges. Historic family businesses are a cultural and relational heritage built up over time and projected into the future. Accordingly, the search for key drivers of longevity among centenarian family firms is an open question. The latter received a renewed academic interest due to the financial constraints linked to frequent crises of the new millennium (Gangi and Trotta, 2015) and the new challenges deriving from to the social and environmental responsibility of corporations (Carroll, 2001; 2016).

The current study aims to fill the aforementioned gaps. In the frame of our analysis we focus on key drivers of longevity with reference to large and listed FFs, that have been proved to be longeval over one hundred years. In particular, we address dual and related research questions, that are: what is the impact of CSP engagement on CFP of centenarian family firms? If the link is positive, can business effects of CSR be interpreted as factors that help the longevity of centenarian family firms?

To answer the above questions, we adopt both a theoretical and empirical approach. At theoretical level, we first refer to the concept of longevity (e.g., Ahn and Park, 2018; Ahmad *et al.*, 2019) and why it is a topical theme for the study of family firms. Second, we refer to the stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1986) and the resource-based view (Barney, 1991) that supports the positive link between CSP and CFP. Third, we focus on the synergic relationship between the positive impact of CSP on firm competitiveness that may incentive CSR engagement in the light of SEW perspective.

At the empirical level, we analyze the impact of CSP on CFP of 21 European centenarian family firms over 2008-2020 study period, for 273 firm-year observation. The sampled firms are extracted from the database provided by Family Capital platform, and all the firms maintain the characteristic to be founded from more than 100 years throughout the time span. The choice of the time horizon is consistent with the opportunity to include in our analysis the two severe financial crises of new millennium, that is the sub-prime bubble in 2008 and the crisis of sovereign debt in Europe in 2011 that have theoretically stressed the longevity of firms. Indeed, consistent with Sahut *et al.* (2012), the multiplication of crises (financial, social and climate) has warned that the continuity and welfare of family firms cannot be separated from the social and environmental contexts. From this perspective, the longevity of centenarian family firms may be affected by the resilience capability and the link between CSR engagement and corporate performance.

Our findings confirm a positive impact of CSP on CFP of centenarian family firms. The CSR engagement improves the resilience of these type of companies, even during periods of more complexity due to extraordinary crises and consequent financial constraints. Accordingly, we can confirm a positive impact of social and environmental sustainability on firm longevity.

The current paper advances prior literature in several ways. First, we demonstrate the positive link between CSP and CFP of family firms. Second, we highlight how centenarian family firms reach their results. In this sense, the focus on the root of best corporate financial performance sheds new light on the key of longevity of centenarian family firms. Third, due to the nature of long-term investment and co-specialized asset of CSR that improves family identity, family imagine and reputation, we demonstrate that CSR engagement solves the potential trade-off between SEW and the financial performance of family firms. Summarizing, we can consider CSR engagement as a bridge between SEW and competitivity of centenarian family firms.

Therefore, the remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, we provide a literature review and our hypotheses in the next section. After we present the design of the empirical study, we outline the empirical results and then discuss them in more detail. Finally, in concluding this study, we propose implications of our analysis and limitations for a further research agenda.

2. Theoretical Background

In this section, we start by examining the relationship between longevity and Family Firms (FFs). Next, we explore the link between Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility (CSER) and CFP, in order to verify if the first might represent a driver of centenarian FF' long-term survival. Both the aforementioned relationships have been poorly investigated, requiring more in-depth consideration. From one side, the literature (e.g., Napolitano and Marino, 2015; Esposito and Mirone, 2019) highlights that the topic of centenarian firms deserves more research to advance knowledge on factors driving their longevity. From the other, the link between the CSP and the CFP has been scarcely studied in the domain of centenarian FFs (e.g., Esposito De Falco and Vollaro, 2015; Mariani *et al.*, 2021). As a result, few studies considered whether the CSR engagement can contribute to supporting the FF's efforts to constantly preserve the family business from generation to generation while adapting to external changes.

The social and environmental dimensions of CSR are often employed as measures of CSP (Gangi et al., 2020c). Following Tang *et al.* (2012), we define the CSER as the ways in which firms identify social and environmental opportunities, organize resources to conduct these activities and use the knowledge acquired for commercial outcomes. From this perspective, the CSER concept extends sustainable practices to the employees, the external community, and the natural environment.

Relative to FFs, prior literature (e.g., Ahn and Park, 2018; Esposito and Mirone, 2019; Mariani *et al.*, 2021) showed how these firms are more CSR oriented and effective in the exploitation of the social capital, due to their greater ability to form long-lasting relationships with pivotal groups of stakeholders (Esposito De Falco and Vollero, 2015; Le Breton-Miller and Miller, 2016). The importance of social ties in FFs is also recognized by behavioral agency theory scholars, who suggest that the main feature of these firms is the SEW, linking family business members and the latter with stakeholders. Following prior studies (e.g., Gómez-Mejía *et al.*, 2018; Luis *et al.*, 2018), family business owners face a dilemma when they have to simultaneously manage the protection of the SEW and of the financial performance. However, we will discuss how the CSER engagement can rather relax these attrite, by driving FFs in the exploitation of CSER business effects, that can ultimately foster financial performance. Consistent with the above approach, we focus on companies older than a century, with the aim of investigating if the CSER engagement can represent a driver reinforcing their longevity.

2.1. Longevity and Family Firms

The term longevity, for all living beings, is generally understood, in both absolute and a relative sense. In the first case, it is conceived as the long-life span and, in a relative sense, as a longer life span than expected. With reference to firms, in management studies, scholars have often borrowed the concept of longevity from living organisms' conceptualizations (Gatti and Golinelli, 2000). Then, longevity has been measured, in an absolute sense, by the time elapsed since the date of foundation and, in a relative sense, by measuring the difference between the years the firm has been alive and the life expectancy one would have had about it. Therefore, although there is still much research to do on when it comes to longevity (Ahn & Park, 2016), scholars have made their efforts to estimate what the life expectancy of firms is, in order to be able to measure it relatively.

On this point, longevity is usually measured as the difference from the average life expectancy (Williams & Jones, 2010). Accordingly, some studies, through historical long-life analyses, have made attempts to define the average life expectancy of firms at a global level (De Geus, 1997). However it is common opinion, among management scholars, that the life expectancy of firms is extremely dependent, besides internal factors, on some external factors, such as, for instance, the structure of the sector in which they operate and the country of origin (Becsi, 2002; Ibrahim *et al.*, 2009; Williams & Jones, 2010) and, of course, this latter circumstances makes it extremely complex to talk about longevity in a transversal sense.

On the other hand, the ability of firms to survive longer than expected considerably reduced, due to nowadays dramatic turbulences, causing a contraction in the average lifespan of firms (Ahn, 2018; Cresssy, 2006) and which renewed the interest in the study of factors promoting longevity.

In management studies and, more specifically, in entrepreneurship studies, scholars' efforts have therefore essentially focused on trying to explain the survival of firms, given that among entrepreneurial goals, survival is certainly a central one (Davis, 2014) and highly topical in an increasingly dynamic competitive environment that rapidly erodes rents of position and requires firms to continuously adapt to the complexity they face (Panza *et al.*, 2018; Reeves *et al.*, 2016).

Therefore, the debate has shifted from corporate longevity to the so called "Corporate Sustainable Longevity" (CSL), meaning with it "what enables the firm to achieve longevity" (Ahmad *et al.*, 2019). The theme has been developed with reference to an innumerable series of characteristics that, from a theoretical and empirical point of view, would be able to explain corporate survival, both with reference financial and non-financial elements (Napolitano *et al.*, 2015). On the other hand, only by achieving high financial performance in the short run, although theoretically it would help to ensure the ability to make investments that allow adaptation to the changing environment (Rothaermel & Alexandre, 2009), is not necessarily always able to guarantee long-run survival, especially in highly volatile competitive contexts (Demirbag, *et al.*, 2015).

From a theoretical point of view, therefore, the main research streams that has supported empirical analyses are the resource-based perspective (Barney, 1991) and the dynamic capabilities perspective (Teece *et al.*, 1990; Teece *et al.*, 1997), according to which firms may be capable to effectively reconfiguring corporate resources to perpetuate the condition of competitive advantage. From an empirical perspective, on the other hand, several studies have been conducted regarding CSL and the variety of characteristics that may explain variability in corporate survival. Among others, scholars have found important relations between longevity of firms and their strategies (Brito & Brito, 2014; Reeves *et al*., 2016), competencies (Prahaland, 1993), adaptive capacity (Arif *et al.*, 2017), reputation and customer satisfaction (Nicolò, 2015; Kozak, 2018), leadership and human capital (Eldeburg *et al.*, 2018; Oliveira & Roth, 2012; Boga & Ensari, 2009) and corporate governance tools (Ahmad & Omar, 2016).

However, the term longevity, in management studies, has not always been linked to the simple survival of the company compared to the average expectation. In some cases, longevity has also been treated with reference to the relationship between the company and its founder. In this case, longevity has been defined as the firm surviving the lifetime of its founder (Haugh & Talwar, 2010) or the end of the founder's managerial involvement (Sharma & Salvato, 2013). This latter view, obviously, assumes greater relevance when it comes to family firms. The study of survival in family firms' literature is, indeed, a topical issue because it is closely linked to other typical relevant research objectives, such as leadership and ownership transition, from the perspective of transgenerational survival (Chrisman, *et al.*, 2011), leading scholars to state that planning for the generational transition represents one of the most important strategies in determining the survival of family firms (Sharma *et al.*, 2003).

When addressing the issue of family business longevity, scholars have made twofold contributions, both with reference to generational transition and, more generally, without taking this element into account. With reference to generational transition, previous studies have highlighted the importance of the strategic use of resources (Arregle *et al.*, 2007), of the family's entrepreneurial orientation (Zellweger *et al.*, 2012) and of governance mechanisms to regulate roles and responsibilities in the business (Löhde *et al.*, 2020) as being elements capable of favoring the survival of family businesses.

Other factors, not directly related to generational transition, that previous studies have found to be drivers of family business longevity are related to strategic and organizational elements (Daspit *et al.* 2017). However, referring only to generational transition is insufficient to analyze how family firms are able to adapt to the continuous evolution of a highly dynamic and complex external environment. To this end, even for family firms, the ability to continuously readjust their resources to ensure competitive advantage has been explained by drawing on the theory of dynamic capabilities (Jones *et al.*, 2013). Moreover, a recent study that analysed the results of the last 30 years of research on the subject of family business, highlighted how the issue of survival is essential in the analysis of different research directions and in particular with reference to crisis management, since "given the historic moment we are currently experiencing, it is important to understand how family businesses can lever on their peculiarities to manage and survive to the new normal triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic" (Rovelli *et al.*, 2021). In fact, for the family business to survive in the long term, it is essential to analyze how it can cope with the turbulence arising from the external environment. On this topic, for example, Smith (2016) has found that family businesses take greater risks in crisis conditions and that, in order to promote survival, they rely on factors that are not necessarily economic, such as, for example, family business place attachment, family business heritage longevity and, especially, socio-emotional wealth (Gómez-Mejía *et al.*, 2007).

With reference to SEW, Berrone *et al.* (2012) defined it as a system of five elements, such as: family's control and influence, identification with the firm, binding social ties, emotional attachment, and renewal of bonds. Family business scholars have pointed out that firms have also been willing to give up higher short-term financial performance in order to safeguard the SEW (Smith, 2016). The reason for this approach is essentially attributable to the theory of organizational identity (Zellweger *et al.*, 2012), which argues that the image of the organization is crucial in shaping stakeholder perceptions and the ability of the firm to generate superior performance in the long run (Karreman & Rylander, 2008). Among the five elements of SEW, the identification of the family with the company, in particular, gives a dominant role to the issue of corporate reputation. Therefore, family businesses would be inclined to make investments characterized by greater ethicality (Berrone *et al.*, 2010; Dyer & Whetten, 2006) and long term orientation (Le Breton-Miller & Miller, 2006). From this perspective, a prerequisite for the longevity of family firms can be found in their ability to better perform in terms of social responsibility, which is likely to guarantee legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) and reputation.

2.2. The CSER as a driver of Centenarian Family Firms Longevity

Earlier literature attribute to FFs a greater ability in managing sustainable performance (e.g., Berrone *et al.*, 2010; 2012; Le Breton-Miller & Miller, 2006), due to some peculiarities that foster social and environmental engagement (Le Breton-Miller and Breton, 2016; Esposito and Mirone, 2019). First, following the stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), the centenarian FFs are characterized by the presence of a specific stakeholder category, i.e. the business family (Löhde *et al.*, 2020), around which the business and traditions have been established. This implies that for FFs, especially those living more than a century, the preservation of the founding family’s values is a key aspect. This desire to retain family values, deeply rooted local traditions and values (Gomez-Mejia *et al.*, 2018), ensures that FFs' strategic decisions are more aligned with collective sustenance (Esposito and Mirone, 2019). Second, centenarian FFs are guardians of the multigenerational asset of family business reputation (Zellweger *et al.*, 2012; Gomez-Mejia *et al.*, 2018), that all member of the family are committed to protect, with the aim to preserve legitimacy among stakeholders. Furthermore, in line with family business scholars (e.g., Breton-Miller and Breton, 2016; Esposito and Mirone, 2019; Löhde *et al.*, 2020), FFs predominantly focus on long term strategic purposes, rather than on short-term profitability. Accordingly, the centenarian FFs present some characteristics particularly coherent with the CSER engagement and related outcomes time-horizon.

In line with behavioral agency theory scholars, the most important feature distinguishing FFs from counterparts is the socioemotional wealth (SEW), defined as the bundle of relationships and emotional linkages among the members of the founding family and between the latter and stakeholders (Gomez-Meija *et al.*, 2007; Gomez-Meija *et al.*, 2018; Berrone *et al.*, 2012). The SEW defines the "family's stock of social, emotional, and affective endowments vested in the firm, such as the opportunity to pass the business on to future family generations, reputational advantages from being associated with the firm, and the preservation of benevolent ties among family members and with other stakeholders" (Gomez-Mejia *et al.*, 2018, p. 1370). Thus, this concept relates to the non-financial aspects of FFs management aimed to protect and meet the founding family's affective needs (Mariani *et al.*, 2021), which according to Gomez-Mejia *et al.*, (2018) can generate the prevalence of SEW-based strategic decisions over the financial ones.

Coherently with the centrality attributed within the stakeholder theory framework to the stable relationships with business-related actors (Barnett and Salomon, 2012), the SEW concept goes beyond the socioemotional values linking the family members, rather encompasses also local communities and stakeholders. The FFs nurture socioemotional value through strong and reciprocal support and collaboration with local communities (Berrone *et al.*, 2012; Gomez-Mejia *et al.*, 2018). In this perspective, family business members, might be more oriented toward the protection of SEW (Berrone *et al.*, 2012), even if this can realize at the expense of other shareholders. Then, the presence and the influence, of a funding family committed to preserving SEW might not represent a factor that necessarily limits or reduces the exploitation of the CSER engagement's business effect. On the contrary, it is also likely that the strong reciprocal bonds between the business family and the community members, ensure FFs' longevity through resources exchanges, supporting FFs in limiting risk to reduce the CSR engagement due to the family ownership and involvement1. This is also coherent with FFs scholars,

[1] See Le Breton-Miller and Miller (2016) and Esposito and Mirone (2019) for a discussion of negative and positive linkages potentially affecting the CSR engagement in FFs.

considering the SEW one of the drivers allowing FFs to adopt CSR practices (Vazquez, 2018; Mariani *et al.*, 2021). Coherently with these premises, prior studies observed how FFs are more environmentally oriented (e.g. Berrone *et al.*, 2010; Abeysekera and Fernando, 2020), or invest more in sustainable engagement (Madden *et al.*, 2020).

Indeed, the CSER engagement can support centenarian FFs to manage the "temporal symbiosis" (Erdogan *et al.*, 2019) they live, being constantly engaged to simultaneously preserve the funding family's core values while pursuing profitability to remain longeval. More specifically, the CSER engagement offers FFs the opportunity to balance long-term strategic orientation and the SEW preservation, with the ability to remain flexible to market turbulence. In the first place, due to the strong link between stakeholders' support and business family firms' reputation and social prestige, the binding social ties linking centenarian FFs with stakeholders provide collective benefits such as social capital, relational trust and feeling of solidarity (Berrone *et al.*, 2010; 2012). These stable and durable relationships can be further reinforced by engaging stakeholders in social and environmental business solutions, that in turn reinforce strategic assets such as reputation and legitimacy (Surroca *et al.*, 2010; Gangi et al., 2020a). In this perspective, Ahn and Park (2018), observing a sample of Korean companies old on average 85 years, demonstrate how CSR strategic approach fosters companies' survival by reinforcing social capital and legitimacy among stakeholders.

Furthermore, in line with the RBV perspective, the CSER engagement configures a "process of accumulating knowledge and experience" (Tang *et al.*, 2012), that fosters innovation, and then firms' performance (Martinez-Conesa *et al.* Gangi et al., 2020c). Indeed, prior literature discuss how innovation positively mediate the link between CSER and CFP, by providing opportunities to create new ways to develop new products, services, processes and practices (Gallego-Alvarez *et al.*, 2011; Preus, 2011), that help firms to complement their internal sustainable knowledge with those of external actors. This process of "absorptive capacity" (Tang *et al.*, 2012) can support the conversion of external CSER knowledge resources into organizational capital, thus fostering innovation and firm performance (Ferreira and Fernandes, 2017). Indeed, as highlighted by prior studies (e.g., Lorenzo *et al.* 2022; Núñez-Cacho and Lorenzo, 2020) FFs can be affected, in their innovation processes, by limited managerial discretion or family conservative attitudes. The CSER engagement can support FFs to open to stakeholders' insights and knowledge, thus lowering barriers to innovation.

Accordingly, centenarian FFs can employ the CSER engagement as a leverage of longevity, by shifting the strong communitarian engagement that characterize them, from a non-market activity to a social and environmental oriented market activity (Werther and Chandler, 2010). Following Sahut *et al.*, (2012, 9), indeed, the longevity concept strongly overlaps with that of sustainable management, as both deal with a strong corporate culture based on values, a relevant and fair valuation of human capital, strategic and financial prudence, alliances with the stakeholders and good governance systems. Relative to centenarian FFs, the CSER engagement can foster longevity by both reducing crises and unfair stakeholders' treatment (Sahut *et al.*, 2012), while fostering corporate financial performance. This is coherent with the Transgenerational Sustainability Model proposed by Esposito De Falco and Vollero (2015), suggesting that the FFs sustainability over time is the result of three different outcomes, namely, financial stability ensuring longevity, family business longevity and the quality of communitarian values and social ties with local communities.

Then, in line with the stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) and the RBV perspective (Barney, 1991), we suggest that CSER strengths centenarian FFs' longevity, as the first works as an intangible co-specialized asset contributing to solving the trade-off between the socioemotional and financial goals. Thus, we pose the following hypothesis:

H.1. The corporate social and environmental engagement positively impact the corporate financial performance of centenarian family firms.

3. Methodology

3.1 Sample construction and data collection

The empirical analysis is based on a sample of family-owned firms extracted from the World's Top 750 Family Businesses ranking surveyed by Family Capital Analytics, a leading online publishing company dedicated to the global family enterprise sector.

Consistent with the objective of the analysis, the sampling procedure started by selecting all public family-owned enterprises by focusing on the European context, where a high level of family ownership concentration can be observed (Jara and Lopez, 2011; Muñoz-Bullon *et al.*, 2018).

Accordingly, European FFs were identified following the criteria of ownership and control proposed by prior studies (i.e. Andres, 2008; Cambrea *et al.*, 2021). In detail, we only selected FFs in which the individual shareholder (i.e. founder and/or family members) owns more than 25% of the shares. The current procedure leads us to an initial sample of 121 FFs.

At this stage, as our empirical analysis focuses on centenarian FFs, we only encompass within our sample family companies that are at least 100 years old during the entire observation period. As consequence, we exclude all the family enterprises that will reach the age of 100 years since the foundation during or after the time-horizon of the analysis (2008-2020). In this way, we reduced the sample size to 44 centenarian FFs.

To test the prediction that CSER activism is valuable for improving CFP of centenarian FFs, we collect data on social and environmental engagement from Refinitiv Eikon Asset4. This database has been widely adopted by previous studies on CSR and CFP relationship, as it generates transparent, auditable and comparable information for the evaluation of ESG performance (e.g., Cheng *et al.*, 2014; El Ghoul *et al.*, 2017; Luo and Du, 2015; Ferrero-Ferrero *et al.*, 2015).

In order to collect data from Refinitiv Eikon, we need the sampled companies' Refinitiv Identifier Code (RIC), which is a ticker-like code employed by Refinitiv to identify ESG and financial data. Hence, we proceeded, first, by gathering the RIC for each FFs within the sample. After this stage, we collected ESG data and excluded firms for which Refinitiv does not report any social and environmental engagement information during 2008-2020. Then, we matched the ESG data with other two databases, namely Refinitiv "Worldscope" for financial data and the World bank database for country level data. Finally, merging the aforementioned databases, we achieved a final sample of 21 centenarian FFs from 9 European countries (total of 273 firm-year observations). For comparison with similar studies, Esposito and Mirone (2019) examine sustainability orientation within 25 long-lived FFs. Lohe *et al.* (2021) adopted a sample of 9 large FFs based in Germany for exploring the push and pull factors in FFs' internationalization, while Ahn and Park (2018) analyzed 8 representative long-lived companies in Korea and examine how they overcome crises and survive by implementing CSR actions. Hence, our sample size appears consistent with the prior literature.

3.2 Variable operationalization

To proxy centenarian FFs' CFP, we refer on return on investment (ROI) and the ratio of earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA %) to total assets. ROI has been already adopted in FFs' studies as financial performance measure (Gordini, 2016), while we adopt the EBITDA as a CFPS measure, as it less subject to accounting policies (Michelon *et al.*, 2013).

In line with our hypothesis, we measure the social and environmental engagement through the average of the social and environmental scores (CSER) provided by Refinitiv. The social and environmental scores are both discrete quantitative variables that takes on values between 0 and 100. Specifically, the social score measures the company propensity to being a good citizen by respecting fundamental human rights conventions in internal and external communities. The environmental score reflects the company environmental commitment in terms of emission reduction, socially responsible use of resources and environmental orientation for both innovation products and processes. Thus, differently from prior studies adopting text-based analyses of sustainability reporting disclosed by the same companies (e.g., Esposito and Mirone, 2019), we collect and adopt both hard and soft indicators proxying the level of ESG performance of the centenarian FFs.

Finally, to avoid model misspecification, we control for several variables that could influence the relationship between CSER and CFP. In particular, based on previous studies (Reguera-Alvarado *et al.*, 2017; Liu *et al.*, 2015), we rely on a set of board and CEO characteristics. First, we employ board independence (BINDEP) as the percentage of independent directors on board. Second, the study adopts the board size (BSIZE) measured by the total number of directors on board. Third, we include a dummy variable to determine whether managerial compensation is linked to total shareholder return (CEOCOMP). Fourth, we consider the CEO separation (CEOSEP) by introducing a dummy variable equal to 1 if the CEO simultaneously chairs the board or has been the chairman of the board and 0 otherwise. Furthermore, additional controls regard the company size, measured by the natural logarithm of total assets (logTA); the year-over-year sales growth (Sgrowth); the percentage of total shares in issue available to ordinary investors (FreeFloat); the gross domestic product (GDPper), measured using a per capita GDP indicator; and, finally, years, measured as the time effect (Year) with thirteen (n-1) dummy variables.

3.3 Empirical Strategy

Consistent with the aim of the study, we employ a panel data analysis that is one of the most powerful empirical approaches for both cross-sectional and longitudinal data (Baltagi, 2008; Gujarati, 2003). In line with our empirical framework, we estimate whether and to what extent higher level of CSER engagement predicts better financial performance of centenarian FFs (H1) by adopting ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis. Moreover, we asses this relationship by employing lagged CSER and control variables. Consistent with our hypothesis, the equation model is as follows:

$$(1) \quad CFP_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta CSER_{i,t-1} + \gamma X_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_i$$

where CFPt refers to the measures of the financial performance (i.e. ROI and EBITDA) of centenarian FF i at time t, CSERt-1 is the score of centenarian firm i at time t-1, X is a vector of the control variables, and ε is a random error term.

4. Results

Table 1 contains the sample distribution by country, Table 2 provides the sample descriptive statistics, and Table 3 reports the Pearson pair-wise correlation and variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis. All variables have correlation coefficients below the conventional threshold of 0.70 (Ratner, 2009) and present average VIFs (2.01) far from the threshold of 10 (McDonald and Moffitt, 1980). Hence, the study estimates are not biased by multicollinearity.

Table 4 displays the results of the lagged OLS regression analysis regarding the relationship between CSER and CFP. Models 1 and 2 present ROI and EBITDA as dependent variables, both at time t. The empirical analysis reveals that corporate social and environmental responsibility positively impacts on ROI and EBITDA (Models 1 and 2), at a level of confidence ranging from 1 to 5 %, thus confirming H1. These findings suggest that the centenarian FFs' higher commitment in CSER practices lead to better financial performance that, in turn, may support FFs' longevity. Furthermore, the results are consistent with prior studies (Wu *et al.*, 2012; Singal, 2014), which indicate that higher CSR engagement of FFs has a positive effect on financial performance. Regarding the control variables, with reference to the board mechanisms and CEO characteristics, Model 1 shows that ROI is negatively and statistically affected by board size and CEO compensation policy at the 5 % significance level. Hence, the larger the adoption of the aforementioned corporate governance mechanisms is, the lower ROI of centenarian FFs is. Moreover, Model 2 displays that the percentage of independent directors positively influence the EBITDA (5% significance level). Finally, the company size (logTA) has a negative impact on ROI (Model 1) at a significance level of 10%.

Table 1. Sample distribution by country

Country	N.	Percentage
Belgium	6	28.57
Denmark	1	4.76
France	4	19.05
Germany	2	9.52
Italy	1	4.76
Portugal	1	4.76
Sweden	1	4.76
Switzerland	3	14.29
United Kingdom	2	9.52
Total	21	100.00

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

Variables	Obs	Mean	Median	SD
EBITDA (%)	273	0.319	0.083	0.612
ROI	273	9.752	8.82	8.156
CSER	273	56.034	58.315	25.892
BSIZE	247	11.798	11	3.566
BINDEP	201	41.318	42.86	21.250
CEOCOMP	221	0.154	0	0.362
CEOSEP	221	0.357	0	0.480
logTA	273	16.465	16.268	1.218
Sgrowth	270	57.2	50	20.795
FreeFloat	272	7.424	5.41	44.095
GDPper	273	47,624.17	43,011.26	21,458.92

Table 3. Pearson pair-wise correlation and variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	VIF
1	CSER	1.000									1.88
2	BSIZE	0.509***	1.000								2.97
3	BINDEP	-0.162**	-0.162**	1.000							1.46
4	CEOCOMP	0.214**	0.051	-0.012	1.000						1.08
5	CEOSEP	0.262**	-0.141**	-0.011	0.022	1.000					1.60
6	logTA	0.261***	0.284***	0.137*	-0.031	-0.113*	1.000				1.61
7	Sgrowth	0.218**	0.060	-0.439***	0.105	-0.158**	0.320***	1.000			2.23
8	FreeFloat	-0.101*	-0.041	0.010	-0.094	-0.024	-0.040	-0.009	1.000		1.05
9	GDPper	0.041	-0.473***	-0.157**	-0.098	-0.339***	0.428***	0.460***	-0.036	1.000	4.22

***, **, * Statistical significance at 1%, 5% and at 10% level, respectively.

Table 4. OLS regression analysis

Variables	(1) ROI (t)	(2) EBITDA (%) (t)
CSER (t-1)	0.073**	0.010***
	(2.41)	(4.10)
BSIZE (t-1)	-0.557**	-0.014
	(-2.23)	(-0.72)
BINDEP (t-1)	0.022	0.008**
	(0.60)	(2.42)
CEOCOMP (t-1)	-3.767**	-0.059
	(-3.24)	(-0.81)
CEOSEP (t-1)	2.101*	0.026
	(1.82)	(0.32)
logTA (t-1)	-1.794**	0.073
	(-2.48)	(0.92)
Sgrowth (t-1)	0.014	-2.11
	(0.39)	(-0.00)
FreeFloat (t-1)	0.001	-0.005**
	(0.03)	(-2.93)
GDPper (t-1)	0.000	7.620
	(0.41)	(0.97)
Year	Yes	Yes
_cons	32.776**	-2.054
	(2.98)	(-1.52)
No. of Obs.	182.00	182.00
R-squared	0.35	0.30
Wald chi2	92.64***	56.84***

Notes: This table presents the results of the OLS estimations including the CSER as the independent variable. *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10, 5 and 1% levels, respectively.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The unidimensional assumption according to which profitability is the main driver of longevity has been largely passed since various researches contributed to highlighting how non-economic dimensions play a significant role in firms' survivorship likelihood (Ahn and Park, 2018). Indeed, recent crises demonstrate that even the most performing firms can disappear when an important loss in legitimacy realizes in the eyes of society. This suggests that firm longevity is hard to achieve, and can become even more difficult as external conditions and paradigms dramatically shift, as during crisis times.

The increasing interest in CSR and the body of studies concerning its positive link with firms' CFP and competitiveness are contributing to revealing the underlying mechanisms characterizing corporate responsible behavior as a pillar of firms' longevity (Sahut *et al.*, 2012; Ahn and Park, 2018). Indeed, the CSER engagement emerged as a concept embracing the relationship between firms' long-term viability and business sustainability. However, despite their relevance, the literature paid little attention to CSER engagement of centenarian FFs as a driver of longevity, as well as, to the link between CSP and CFP in these firms. Therefore, the current study aimed to fill these gaps.

Relying on the stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) and the resource-based view (Barney, 1991), our results confirm that CSER engagement can positively affect the financial performance of FFs, by balancing the long-term orientation and social capital protection, with financial stability ensuring longevity. Consistent with the theoretical framework discussed, then, we can respond to our first research question, confirming that the CSP engagement of centenarian FFs positively affects their CFP. In particular, by improving their strategic orientation toward environmental and social issues, centenarian FFs may protect their multigenerational reputation, while improving stakeholders' loyalty and support. Due to its ability to work as a co-specialized asset, the social and environmental engagement helps companies to increase the value of critical intangible assets, such as reputation, legitimation, innovative knowledge and trustful stakeholders' relationship (McWilliams and Siegel, 2011; Melo and Garrido-Morgado, 2012; Barnett and Salomon, 2012; Lorenzo *et al.* 2022; Núñez-Cacho and Lorenzo, 2020). In turn, better stakeholder management and innovative solutions coming from CSER engagement with suppliers, clients, employees, as well as, local communities, contribute to robust competitivity, thus fostering financial performance.

Additionally, our findings suggest that CSER engagement, because it improves stakeholders' trust and reduces firms' exposure to social and environmental risks, can potentially contribute to relax the tradeoff residing in the contraposition between SEW endowment and profitability in FFs management. Indeed, the CSER engagement support the creation of mutual dependence and strong collaboration between the family business and stakeholders, generating opportunities to integrate sustainability issues, with business strategic decisions ensuring profitability. From this perspective, our study suggests that the CSER engagement represents a factor leading FFs to remain longeval.

Thus, the study confirms a positive link between CSER engagement and CFP of centenarian FFs, advancing the prior literature in several ways.

First, this study complements the ongoing debate on the positive relationship between CSER and CFP, by investigating the specific setting of centenarian FFs. Second, by observing the relationship between CSER and CFP, this study also considers the theoretical overlapping between the SEW concept and the CSER attributes. Third, this study expands the current literature on FFs' longevity and its link with CSER during turbulent times. Indeed, we investigated this link considering a time horizon encompassing two severe crises, that hardly affected the worldwide economies. Then our results suggest that, even in a period of strong uncertainty, the CSER confirm its ability to distress constraints, supporting the longevity of FFs. Practically speaking, our findings suggest that CSER engagement should help centenarian FFs to address better current and future challenges to be profitable and socially oriented. These findings are particularly relevant for centenarian FFs that are extensively exposed to the support from stakeholders, to protect their prestige and relevance associated with the funding family.

The current study presents also some limitations. First, the empirical analysis focuses on a limited sample of centenarian FFs surveyed by Family Capital database. Notwithstanding the dimension of our sample is in line with prior studies (e.g., Esposito and Mirone, 2019; Lohe *et al.*, 2021; Ahn and Park, 2018) we encourage scholars to deepen our empirical investigations by adopting larger sample of centenarian FFs available from other informative sources and located in other contexts than Europe. Indeed, a second limit of our study is that we have considered only European centenarian FFs that impacts on the generalizability of results. Moreover, we consider as a proxy of CSP only the social and environmental engagement. Accordingly, future studies may more deeply analyze other firm-specific characteristics, such as the corporate governance mechanisms and their link with CSER engagement in FFs.

References

Argote L., Greve H.R. (2007). A behavioral theory of the firm-40 years and counting: Introduction and impact, *Organization Science*, 18(3): 337-349. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.1070.0280

Abeysekera A.P., Fernando C.S. (2020). Corporate social responsibility versus corporate shareholder responsibility: A family firm perspective. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 61, 101370. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2018.05.003.

Adhikari B.K., 2016. Causal effect of analyst following on corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 41: 201-216. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2016.08.010

Ahmad S., Omar R. (2016). Basic corporate governance models: A systematic review.

International Journal of Law and Management, 58: 73-107. DOI: 10.1108/IJLMA-10-2014-0057

Ahmad S., Omar R., Quoquab F. (2019). Corporate sustainable longevity: scale development and validation. *SAGE Open*, 9(1). DOI: 10.1177/2158244018822379

Ahn S.Y., Park D.J. (2018). Corporate social responsibility and corporate longevity: The mediating role of social capital and moral legitimacy in Korea. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(1): 117-134. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-016-3161-3

Ahn S.Y. (2018). Founder succession, the imprint of founders' legacies, and long-term corporate survival. *Sustainability*, 10(5): 1485. DOI: 10.3390/su10051485

Andres C. (2008). Large shareholders and firm performance. An empirical examination of founding-family ownership. *Journal of corporate finance*, 14(4): 431-445. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2008.05.003

Arif I., Iqbal A., Ali S.F., Sohail A. (2017). International stock market diversification among BRICS-P: A cointegration analysis. *Journal of Management Sciences,* 4(2): 269-285. DOI: 10.20547/jms.2014.1704208

Arregle J.-L., Hitt M.A., Sirmon D.G., Very P. (2007). The development of organizational social capital: Attributes of family firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44: 72–95. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00665.x

Baltagi B. (2008). *Econometric analysis of panel data* (4th ed.). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Barnett M.L. Salomon R.M. (2012). "Does it pay to be really good? Addressing the shape of the relationship between social and financial performance", *Strategic Management Journal*, 33: 1304-1320. DOI: 10.1002/smj.1980

Barney J. (1991). 'Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage', *Journal of Management,* 17(1): 99–120. DOI: 10.1177/014920639101700108.

Becsi Z. (2002). Endogenous longevity and the value-maximizing firm. *Economics Bulletin*, 5(7): 1-7. Available at: http://www.economicsbulletin.com/2002/volume5/EB-02E20004A.pdf

Berrone P., Cruz C., Gómez-Mejía L.R. (2012). Socioemotional wealth in family firms: Theoretical dimensions, assessment approaches, and agenda for future research. *Family Business Review*, 25(3): 258–279. DOI: 10.1177/0894486511435355

Berrone P., Cruz C., Gomez-Mejia L.R., Larraza-Kintana M. (2010). Socioemotional wealth and corporate responses to institutional pressures: Do family-controlled firms pollute less? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55(1): 82–113. DOI: 10.2189/asqu.2010.55.1.82

Boga I., Ensari N. (2009). The role of transformational leadership and organizational change on perceived organizational success. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal,* 12: 235-251. DOI: 10.1080/10887150903316248

Brito R.P., Brito L.A.L. (2014). Dynamics of competition and survival. *Brazilian Administration Review*, 11: 64-85. DOI: /10.1590/S1807-76922014000100005

Carroll A.B., 2016. Stakeholder thinking in three models of management morality: a perspective with strategic implications. In *The Corporation and its Stakeholders* (139-170). University of Toronto Press.

Cheng B., Ioannou I., Serafeim G. (2014). Corporate social responsibility and access to finance. *Strategic management journal*, 35(1): 1-23. DOI: 10.1002/smj.2131
Chrisman J.J., Chua J.H., Steier L.P. (2011). Resilience of family firms: An introduction. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(6): 1107–1119. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00493.x
Cressy R. (2006). Why do most firms die young? *Small Business Economics*, 26: 103-116. DOI: 10.1007/s11187-004-7813-9
Daspit J.J., J.J. Chrisman, P. Sharma, A.W. Pearson, R.G. Long (2017). "A Strategic Management Perspective of the Family Firm: Past Trends, New Insights, and Future Directions". *Journal of Managerial Issues* 29(1): 6–29. https://www.jstor.org/stable/45176532
Davis I. (2014). Reections on corporate longevity. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 3(3): 118-122.
De Geus A. (1997). *The Living Company: Habits for Survival in a Turbulent Business Environment*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
Demirbag M., Mc Guinness M., Wood G., Bayyurt N. (2015). Context, law and reinvestment decisions: Why the transitional periphery differs from other post-state socialist economies. *International Business Review*, 24 (6): 955-965. DOI: 10.1016/j.ibusrev.2015.03.003
Deng X., Kang J.K. Low B.S. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and stakeholder value maximization: Evidence from mergers. *Journal of financial Economics*, 110(1): 87-109. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.04.014
Di Maggio P.J., Powell W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2): 147–160. DOI: 10.2307/2095101
Dyer W.G., Jr., Whetten D.A. (2006). Family firms and social responsibility: Preliminary evidence from the S&P 500. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(6): 785–802. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00151.x
El Ghoul S., Guedhami O., Kim Y. (2017). Country-level institutions, firm value, and the role of corporate social responsibility initiatives. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 48(3): 360–385. DOI: 10.1057/jibs.2016.4
Eldenburg L.G., Price III R.A., Román F.J. (2019). An exploratory study of factors affecting the longevity of manufacturing operations offshore. Accounting, *Organizations and Society*, 75: 59-78. DOI: 10.1016/j.aos.2018.10.002
Erdogan I., Rondi E. and De Massis A. (2020). Managing the tradition and innovation paradox in family firms: A family imprinting perspective. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 44(1): 20-54. DOI: 10.1177/1042258719839712
Esposito De Falco S., Vollero, A. (2015). Sustainability, longevity and transgenerational value in family firms. The case of Amarelli. *Sinergie Italian Journal of Management,* 33(May-Aug): 291-309. DOI: 10.7433/s97.2015.18
Esposito E. and Mirone F. (2019). The influence of generational shift on sustainability practices: A preliminary analysis based on text-analysis of "I Centenari's" websites. In: *New Challenges in Corporate Governance: Theory and Practice*, 236-256.
Ferreira J. and Fernandes C. (2017), "Resources and capabilities' effects on firm

performance: what are they?", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 21(5): 1202-1217, DOI: 10.1108/JKM-03-2017-0099.

Ferrero-Ferrero I., Fernández-Izquierdo M.Á., Muñoz-Torres M.J. (2015). Integrating sustainability into corporate governance: An empirical study on board diversity. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 22(4): 193–207. DOI: 10.1002/csr.1333

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

Gallego-Álvarez I., Prado-Lorenzo J.M. and García-Sánchez I.M., 2011. Corporate social responsibility and innovation: A resource-based theory. *Management Decision*, 49(10): 1709-1727. DOI: 10.1108/00251741111183843

Gangi, F. and Trotta, C., 2015. The ethical finance as a response to the financial crises: An empirical survey of European SRFs performance. Journal of Management & Governance, 19(2), pp.371-394. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-013-9264-7

Gangi, F., D'Angelo, E., Daniele, L.M. and Varrone, N., 2020c. The impact of corporate governance on social and environmental engagement: what effect on firm performance in the food industry?. British Food Journal, 123(2): 610-626. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-02-2020-0140

Gangi, F., Daniele, L.M. and Varrone, N., 2020. How do corporate environmental policy and corporate reputation affect risk-adjusted financial performance?. Business Strategy and the Environment, 29(5), pp.1975-1991. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2482

Gangi, F., Meles, A., Monferrà, S., & Mustilli, M., 2020b. Does corporate social responsibility help the survivorship of SMEs and large firms?. Global Finance Journal, 43, 100402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfj.2018.01.006

Gatti M., Golinelli G.M. (2000). L'impresa sistema vitale. Il governo dei rapporti inter-sistemici, *Symphonya,* 2: 1-29.

Gómez-Mejía L.R., Haynes K.T., Núñez-Nickel M., Jacobson K.J., Moyano-Fuentes J. (2007). Socioemotional wealth and business risks in family-controlled firms: Evidence from Spanish olive oil mills. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(1): 106-137. DOI: 10.2189/asqu.52.1.106

Gomez-Mejia L.R., Patel P.C., Zellweger T.M. (2018). In the horns of the dilemma: Socioemotional wealth, financial wealth, and acquisitions in family firms. *Journal of Management*, 44(4): 1369-1397. DOI: 10.1177/0149206315614375

Gordini N. (2016). Does the family status of the CFO matter to enhance family firm performance? Evidence from a sample of small and medium-sized Italian family firms. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 28(1): 36-57. DOI: 10.1504/ijesb.2016.075681

Gujarati D. (2003). *Basic econometrics* (Forth ed.). Singapura: McGraw-Hill.

Haugh H.M., Talwar A. (2010). How do corporations embed sustainability across the organization? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(3): 384-396. DOI: 10.5465/amle.2010.53791822

Ibrahim A.B., McGuire J., Soufani K. (2009). An empirical investigation of factors contributing to longevity of small family firms. *Global Economics & Finance Journal*, 2(2): 1-21.

Jara M., López-Iturriaga F.J. (2011). Earnings management and contests for control: An analysis of European family firms. *Journal of Centrum Cathedra*, 4(1): 100-120. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1807171

Jones O., Ghobadian A., O'Regan N. and Antcliff V. (2013). Dynamic capabilities in a sixth-generation family firm: Entrepreneurship and the Bibby Line. *Business History*, 55(6): 910–941. DOI: 10.1080/00076791.2012.744590

Karreman D., Rylander A. (2008). Managing meaning through branding. The case of a consulting firm. *Organization Studies*, 29(1): 103–125. DOI: 10.1177/0170840607084573

Kozak M. (2018). Determinants of business survivability: Literature review. *International Journal of Synergy and Research*, 6:183-191. DOI: 10.17951/ijsr.2017.0.6.183

Le Breton-Miller I. and Miller D., 2011. Commentary: Family firms and the advantage of multitemporality. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(6): 1171-1177. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00496.x

Le Breton-Miller I., Miller D., 2016. Family firms and practices of sustainability: A contingency view. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 7(1): 26-33. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfbs.2015.09.001

Le Breton-Miller I., Miller D. (2006). Why do some family businesses out-compete? Governance, long-term orientations, and sustainable capability. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(6): 731–746. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00147.x

Liu Y., Miletkov M.K., Wei Z., Yang T. (2015). Board independence and firm performance in China. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 30: 223–244. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2014.12.004

Löhde A.S.K., Calabrò A. and Torchia M., 2020. Understanding the main drivers of family firm longevity: the role of business family learning. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 50(2): 130-152. DOI: 10.1080/00208825.2020.1758421

Lorenzo D., Núñez-Cacho P., Akhter N. and Chirico F., 2022. Why are some family firms not innovative? Innovation Barriers and Path Dependence in Family Firms. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 38(1): 101182. DOI: 10.1016/j.scaman.2021.101182

Luo X., Du S. (2015). Exploring the relationship between corporate social responsibility and firm innovation. *Marketing Letters*, 26(4): 703–714. DOI: 10.1007/s11002-014-9302-5

Madden L., McMillan A., Harris O. (2020). Drivers of selectivity in family firms: Understanding the impact of age and ownership on CSR. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 11(2): 100335. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfbs.2019.100335

Margolis J.D., Elfenbein H.A., Walsh J.P., 2007. Does it pay to be good? A meta-analysis and redirection of research on the relationship between corporate social and financial performance (March 1, 2009). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1866371 or DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1866371

Mariani M.M., Al-Sultan K., De Massis A., 2021. Corporate social responsibility in family firms: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 1-55. DOI: 10.1080/00472778.2021.1955122

Martinez-Conesa I., Soto-Acosta P., Carayannis E.G., 2017. On the path towards open innovation: Assessing the role of knowledge management capability and environmental dynamism in SMEs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 21(3): 553-570. DOI: 10.1108/JKM-09-2016-0403

Martinez-Conesa I., Soto-Acosta P., Palacios-Manzano M. (2017), "Corporate social responsibility and its effect on innovation and firm performance: an empirical research in SMEs", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 142: 2374-2383. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.11.038

Martínez-Ferrero J., Frias-Aceituno J.V., 2015. Relationship between sustainable development and financial performance: international empirical research. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 24(1): 20-39. DOI: 10.1002/bse.1803

McDonald J.F., Moffitt R.A. (1980). The uses of Tobit analysis. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 62(2): 318–321. DOI: 10.2307/1924766

McWilliams A., Siegel D.S., 2011. Creating and capturing value: Strategic corporate social responsibility, resource-based theory, and sustainable competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 37(5): 1480-1495. DOI: 10.1177/0149206310385696

McWilliams A., Siegel D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 117–127. DOI: 10.5465/amr.2001.4011987

McWilliams A., Siegel D.S., Wright P.M. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: Strategic implications. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43: 2–18. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00580.x

Melo T., Garrido-Morgado A. (2012), Corporate reputation: a combination of social responsibility and industry, *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management,* 19: 11-31. DOI: 10.1002/csr.260

Michelon G., Boesso G., Kumar K. (2013), "Examining the link between strategic corporate social responsibility and company performance: an analysis of the best corporate citizens", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 20(2): 81-94. DOI: 10.1002/csr.1278

Muñoz-Bullon F., Sanchez-Bueno M.J., Suárez-González I. (2018). Diversification decisions among family firms: The role of family involvement and generational stage. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly,* 21(1): 39-52. DOI: 10.1016/j.brq.2017.11.001

Napolitano M.R., Marino V. Ojala J. (2015), In search of an integrated framework of business longevity, *Business History*, 57(7): 955-969. DOI: 10.1080/00076791.2014.993613

Nicolò D. (2015). Towards a theory on corporate reputation and survival of young firms. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 22: 296-303. DOI: 10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00289-0

Núñez Cacho P., Lorenzo Gómez J.D. (2020). Temporary factors that condition innovation: comparison between family and non-family businesses. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 7(3): 1740-1759. DOI: 10.9770/jesi.2020.7.3(20)

Oikonomou I., Brooks C., Pavelin S. (2014). The effects of corporate social performance on the cost of corporate debt and credit ratings. *Financial Review*, 49(1): 49-75. DOI: 10.1111/fire.12025

Oliveira P., Roth A.V. (2012). Service orientation: The derivation of underlying constructs and measures. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management,* 32: 156-190. DOI: 10.1108/01443571211208614

Orlitzky M., Schmidt F.L. Rynes S.L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization studies*, 24(3): 403-441. DOI: 10.1177/0170840603024003910

Panza L., Ville S., Merrett D. (2018). The drivers of firm longevity: Age, size, profitability and survivorship of Australian corporations, 1901–1930. *Business History,* 60: 157-177. DOI: 10.1080/00076791.2017.1293041

Prahalad C.K. (1993). The role of core competencies in the corporation. *Research-Technology Management*, 36(6): 40-47. DOI: 10.1080/08956308.1993.11670940

Preuss L. (2011). Innovative CSR: A framework for anchoring corporate social responsibility in the innovation literature. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 42: 17-33. DOI: 10.9774/gleaf.4700.2011.su.00004

Ratner B. (2009). The correlation coefficient: Its values range between +1/−1, or do they? *Journal of targeting, measurement and analysis for marketing*, 17(2): 139-142. DOI: 10.1057/jt.2009.5

Reeves M., Levin S., Ueda D. (2016). The biology of corporate survival. *Harvard Business Review*, 94. 46-55.

Reguera-Alvarado N., de Fuentes P., Laffarga J. (2017). Does board gender diversity influence financial performance? Evidence from Spain. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141(2): 337–350. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-015-2735-9

Rothaermel F.T., Alexandre M.T. (2009). Ambidexterity in technology sourcing: The moderating role of absorptive capacity. *Organization Science*, 20(4): 759-780. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.1080.0404

Rovelli P., Ferasso M., De Massis A., Kraus S. (2021). Thirty years of research in family business journals: Status quo and future directions. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 100422. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfbs.2021.100422

Sahut J.M., Boulerne S., Mili M., Teulon F. (2012). What relation exists between CSR and longevity of firms? *International Journal of Business*, 17. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1760569

Servaes H., Tamayo A. (2013). The impact of corporate social responsibility on firm value: The role of customer awareness. *Management science*, 59(5): 1045-1061. DOI: 10.1287/mnsc.1120.1630

Sharma P., Salvato C. (2013). *Family firm longevity: A balancing act between continuity and change*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press

Sharma P., J.J. Chrisman, J.H. Chua. (2003). "Predictors of Satisfaction with the Succession Process in Family Firms." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(5): 667–687. DOI: 10.1016/s0883-9026(03)00015-6

Singal M. (2014). Corporate social responsibility in the hospitality and tourism industry: Do family control and financial condition matter? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36: 81–89. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.08.002

Smith C. (2016). Environmental jolts: Understanding how family firms respond and why. *Family Business Review*, 29(4): 401-423. DOI: 10.1177/0894486516673906

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. DOI: 10.1002/smj.820

Tang Z., Hull C.E., Rothenberg S. (2012), How corporate social responsibility engagement strategy moderates the CSR–financial performance relationship, *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(7): 1274-1303. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01068.x

Teece D.J., G. Pisano, A. Shuen (1990). *Firm capabilities, resources, and the concept of strategy*. CCC Working paper No. 90-8. Berkeley: Center for Research in Management, University of California, Berkeley

Teece D.J., G. Pisano, A. Shuen (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7): 509–533. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z

Vazquez P. (2018). Family business ethics: At the crossroads of business ethics and family business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(3): 691–709. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-016- 3171-1

Werther Jr W.B., Chandler D. (2010). *Strategic corporate social responsibility: Stakeholders in a global environment*. Sage.

Williams D., Jones O. (2010). Factors associated with longevity of small, family-owned firms. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 14: 37-57.

Wu S., Lin. F., Wu C. (2012). A study on Taiwanese corporate social responsibility and ownership structures. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 9(3): 111–122. DOI: 10. 22495/cocv9i3art9

Zellweger T.M., Kellermanns F.W., Eddleston K., Memili E. (2012). Building a family firm image: How family firms capitalize on their family ties. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 3(4): 239-250. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfbs.2012.10.001