

Bridging the Sustainability Capability Gap: How Innovation Intensity and Disclosure Drive Substantive Environmental Performance

Abstract

Background: As corporations face mounting pressure to address climate change and social challenges, a fundamental question emerges in sustainability strategy: what organizational capabilities enable firms to move beyond symbolic environmental commitments to achieve substantive sustainability outcomes? The persistent gap between corporate sustainability pledges and actual environmental performance highlights the need for understanding the strategic resources that drive authentic sustainability transitions.

Aim: Drawing on the resource-based view and sustainability strategy literature, this study investigates how innovation intensity and sustainability disclosure function as strategic capabilities that enable substantive environmental and social performance and subsequently create long-term market value. We propose that innovation serves as the fundamental "sustainability capability" that distinguishes firms achieving genuine environmental outcomes from those engaged in symbolic greenwashing.

Methodology: We employ a two-way fixed effects regression framework analyzing 21,578 firm-year observations across 15 years (2009-2023). Using lagged independent variables and firm-year fixed effects, we examine how corporate strategic investments in innovation and transparency translate into measurable sustainability performance and financial outcomes.

Findings: Our results demonstrate that innovation intensity and sustainability disclosure are powerful deterministic drivers of substantive sustainability performance, explaining 83% of its variance ($R^2 = 0.8278$). Mediation analysis reveals that sustainability performance serves as the critical mechanism linking strategic investments to dual financial outcomes: enhanced operational efficiency (ROA) and significant long-term market valuation premiums (Tobin's Q). We identify an "Innovation-Sustainability Paradox" where R&D investments create short-term costs but generate the technological capabilities essential for long-term environmental legitimacy and market value.

Implications: This research provides rigorous empirical evidence for sustainability strategy by demonstrating that environmental performance is not serendipitous but results from systematic strategic resource allocation. For sustainability managers, our findings indicate that innovation capability—not just environmental intentions—determines a firm's ability to achieve substantive sustainability outcomes. The results suggest that corporate sustainability strategy must be grounded in technological capability building rather than relying solely on disclosure and reporting mechanisms.

Keywords: Sustainability Strategy, Innovation Capability, Corporate Environmental Performance, Resource-Based View, Greenwashing, Environmental Management, Strategic Sustainability

1. Introduction

The global imperative for corporate sustainability has fundamentally transformed business strategy, with firms increasingly required to integrate environmental and social considerations into their core operations (Porter & Kramer, 2011). However, despite widespread corporate commitments to sustainability goals—exemplified by the over 3,000 companies setting science-based targets—significant gaps persist between environmental pledges and actual performance outcomes (Science Based Targets Initiative, 2023). This disconnection between sustainability commitment and achievement represents a critical challenge for both corporate strategy and environmental management.

Central to this challenge is what we term the "sustainability capability gap"—the difference between firms that achieve substantive environmental improvements and those that remain confined to symbolic sustainability initiatives. While the business and environmental literature has extensively documented the relationship between sustainability practices and financial performance, considerably less attention has been devoted to understanding the organizational capabilities that enable firms to translate sustainability commitments into measurable environmental outcomes.

We argue that this capability gap is bridged by two distinct but complementary strategic resources within the sustainability strategy framework. First, innovation intensity represents the technological foundation that enables firms to develop cleaner processes, sustainable products, and resource-efficient operations. Innovation serves as what we conceptualize as a "sustainability capability"—the technical capacity to solve environmental challenges through technological advancement. Second, sustainability disclosure functions as a strategic commitment mechanism that creates organizational accountability for environmental outcomes and stakeholder transparency.

Despite the intuitive connection between innovation and environmental performance, empirical evidence remains fragmented, with studies often failing to distinguish between the immediate costs of environmental investments and their long-term value creation potential. Moreover, the relationship between disclosure practices and actual sustainability performance continues to generate debate, with some research suggesting that disclosure enables "greenwashing" while other studies indicate it drives substantive improvement.

This study addresses these gaps by proposing and testing a mediation model examining how innovation and disclosure drive sustainability performance, which in turn generates financial value across two time horizons: operational efficiency (return on assets) and long-term market valuation (Tobin's Q). Using comprehensive panel data spanning 21,578 observations over 15 years (2009-2023), we move beyond simple correlational analyses to investigate the strategic mechanisms through which environmental commitments translate into both sustainability outcomes and economic value.

Our research contributes to sustainability strategy literature by demonstrating

that environmental performance is not an unpredictable outcome but rather the result of systematic strategic resource allocation. We provide empirical evidence that innovation serves as the fundamental capability enabling corporate sustainability transitions, while disclosure functions as an accountability mechanism that reinforces rather than substitutes for substantive performance. These findings have significant implications for corporate environmental strategy, suggesting that sustainable competitive advantage increasingly derives from firms' technological capacity to solve environmental challenges.

2. Theoretical Background and Hypothesis Development

2.1 Innovation as Sustainability Capability: Resource-Based View in Environmental Strategy

The Resource-Based View provides a robust theoretical framework for understanding how firms develop sustainable competitive advantage through unique, valuable, and inimitable resources and capabilities (Barney, 1991). Within the sustainability strategy context, we propose that innovation intensity represents a fundamental "sustainability capability"—a higher-order dynamic capability that enables firms to reconfigure their operations, products, and processes to address environmental challenges.

Sustainability capabilities differ from traditional competitive capabilities in their dual nature: they simultaneously address environmental externalities while creating economic value. Innovation intensity, measured through R&D investment, represents the firm's absorptive capacity to identify, develop, and implement environmentally superior technologies and processes (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). This technological foundation is essential for achieving substantive environmental improvements rather than relying solely on symbolic sustainability initiatives (Pereira et al., 2025).

From a natural resource-based view perspective (Hart, 1995), firms with superior innovation capabilities possess the technical capacity to develop pollution prevention technologies, product stewardship initiatives, and sustainable development strategies. These capabilities enable firms to move beyond end-of-pipe solutions toward fundamental process innovations that simultaneously reduce environmental impact and operational costs.

Empirical research in environmental management supports this capability-based perspective. Porter and van der Linde's (1995) pollution prevention hypothesis suggests that properly designed environmental regulations trigger innovation that offsets compliance costs. This innovation-driven environmental improvement requires substantial R&D investment to develop cleaner technologies and more efficient processes.

Recent sustainability strategy research has reinforced the critical role of innovation in environmental performance. Firms investing heavily in environmental R&D demonstrate superior environmental outcomes compared to firms relying primarily on operational adjustments or end-of-pipe solutions (Aragón-Correa

& Sharma, 2003). This evidence suggests that innovation capability serves as the technological foundation for substantive sustainability performance.

H1: Innovation intensity is positively associated with subsequent sustainability performance.

2.2 Sustainability Disclosure as Strategic Commitment and Accountability Mechanism

Sustainability disclosure represents a second critical strategic resource in corporate environmental strategy. Moving beyond signaling theory's traditional focus on information asymmetry reduction, we position sustainability disclosure as a strategic commitment mechanism that creates organizational accountability for environmental outcomes.

The sustainability strategy literature increasingly recognizes disclosure as more than symbolic communication. In the contemporary institutional environment characterized by stakeholder capitalism and ESG investing, sustainability disclosure functions as what we term an "accountability mechanism" (Gray et al., 1995). By publicly committing to specific environmental targets and reporting frameworks, firms create external pressure for substantive performance improvement.

This accountability effect is particularly pronounced in the post-2015 institutional landscape, following the Paris Agreement and the proliferation of standardized sustainability reporting frameworks such as TCFD, SASB, and GRI. These developments have transformed sustainability disclosure from voluntary communication to institutionalized accountability, raising the reputational and financial costs of "decoupling" between environmental commitments and actual performance (ISS-Corporate, 2025; ECD, 2025).

Recent empirical research supports this accountability perspective. Firms with higher sustainability disclosure scores demonstrate improved environmental performance over time, suggesting that transparency creates internal pressure for operational improvement (Cho & Patten, 2007). This accountability mechanism is particularly effective for large corporations facing intensive stakeholder scrutiny and institutional investor pressure.

However, the effectiveness of disclosure as an accountability mechanism depends critically on the firm's underlying capability to deliver environmental improvements. Disclosure without corresponding sustainability capability may lead to "greenwashing" accusations and stakeholder backlash. This suggests that disclosure and innovation capability function as complementary strategic resources in corporate sustainability strategy.

H2: Sustainability disclosure is positively associated with substantive sustainability performance.

2.3 The Mediation Model: From Strategic Inputs to Dual Financial Value Creation

The core theoretical contribution of our study lies in proposing a mediation model that explains how sustainability strategic inputs translate into financial value through the mechanism of substantive environmental performance. This model advances beyond simple input-output correlations to examine the strategic process through which environmental capabilities create economic value.

Our mediation model operates through two sequential stages. In the capability-building stage, innovation (technological resource) and disclosure (commitment mechanism) combine to drive measurable sustainability performance. This stage represents the conversion of strategic environmental investments into substantive environmental outcomes. In the Value Realization stage, achieved sustainability performance generates what we term "sustainability capital"—the market's recognition of the firm's environmental legitimacy and reduced long-term risk profile.

The sustainability strategy literature suggests this value creation occurs across two distinct time horizons, reflecting different mechanisms through which environmental performance creates economic value:

Short-term Operational Value (ROA): Superior sustainability performance drives operational efficiency through resource optimization, waste reduction, and stakeholder relationship improvement. Environmental innovations often generate immediate cost savings through improved resource efficiency and reduced regulatory compliance costs. Additionally, strong environmental performance enhances employee productivity and reduces litigation risks, contributing to improved operational profitability.

Long-term Strategic Value (Tobin's Q): For institutional investors and market analysts, sustainability performance serves as a proxy for management quality, operational excellence, and long-term risk management capability. Firms with superior environmental performance benefit from lower cost of capital, reduced regulatory risk, and enhanced stakeholder relationships that protect market value during environmental crises or regulatory changes.

This dual value creation mechanism reflects the temporal nature of sustainability investments, where environmental capabilities require upfront investment but generate sustained competitive advantage through both operational efficiency and strategic positioning.

H3a: Sustainability performance mediates the relationship between strategic inputs (innovation and disclosure) and short-term financial performance (ROA).

H3b: Sustainability performance mediates the relationship between strategic inputs (innovation and disclosure) and long-term financial performance (Tobin's Q).

3. Methodology

3.1 Data Sources and Sample Construction

This study employs a comprehensive multi-source panel dataset combining financial, market, and environmental performance metrics to examine the relationships between innovation, disclosure, sustainability performance, and financial outcomes. Our approach follows established practices in sustainability strategy research by integrating multiple data sources to capture the complexity of corporate environmental performance.

The primary sample draws from the Compustat Annual Fundamental database for firm-level financial metrics and CRSP (Center for Research in Security Prices) for market-based equity valuations. These established financial databases were integrated with LSEG Refinitiv (formerly ASSET4), which provides comprehensive, audited ESG performance data widely used in sustainability strategy research.

Our initial sample included all publicly traded U.S. firms from 2009 to 2023, representing a period of significant evolution in corporate sustainability practices and institutional expectations. We implemented systematic filtering procedures to ensure data quality and analytical validity: (1) exclusion of financial institutions (SICs 6000-6999) and regulated utilities (SICs 4900-4999) due to their unique regulatory environments and capital structures; (2) removal of firm-years with missing or negative assets and sales to ensure valid efficiency calculations; and (3) requirement of at least two consecutive years of data to enable lagged variable implementation for causal inference.

The final balanced panel consists of 21,578 firm-year observations, representing broad cross-industry coverage of the modern economy and sufficient statistical power for our complex mediation analyses. This sample size substantially exceeds typical sustainability strategy studies and provides a robust statistical foundation for examining the innovation-sustainability-value nexus.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

This table provides the fundamental characteristics of the sample. All financial ratios and performance metrics were winsorized at the 1st and 99th percentiles to mitigate the influence of extreme outliers.

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
1. ROA (Short-term)	21,578	0.0156	0.1297	- 0.6122	0.2800
2. Tobin's Q (Long-term)	21,578	1464.79	1704.89	51.74	9485.13
3. Sust. Performance (Mediator)	21,578	0.4266	0.1893	0.0941	0.8579
4. Lag Innovation (IV)	21,578	0.2071	1.0929	0.0000	9.3723
5. Lag Disclosure (IV)	21,578	0.3928	0.1772	0.0840	0.8231

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
6. Firm Size (Control)	21,578	8.1847	1.7402	4.1583	12.6607

Note: Lag Innovation values of 0.0000 represent firm-year observations without reported R&D expenditures. Following established literature, missing R&D values were treated as zero to maintain a broad, representative sample of 21,578 observations across diverse industries. These firms serve as the baseline for assessing the incremental impact of 'absorptive capacity' on sustainability performance.

3.2 Variable Operationalization

Our variable construction follows established practices in sustainability strategy and environmental management research:

Innovation Intensity (Independent Variable): Following environmental management literature (McWilliams & Siegel, 2001; Aragón-Correa & Sharma, 2003), we measure innovation capability through R&D intensity calculated as the ratio of R&D expenditure to total sales (xrd/sale). This metric captures the firm's commitment to technological advancement and serves as a proxy for sustainability capability development. R&D intensity represents the technological foundation enabling environmental innovation and process improvement.

Sustainability Disclosure (Independent Variable): We utilize the LSEG ESG Combined Score (lagged one year) to capture the firm's strategic commitment to sustainability transparency and stakeholder communication. This comprehensive metric reflects the volume, quality, and transparency of corporate sustainability reporting, serving as our measure of disclosure-based accountability mechanisms.

Sustainability Performance (Mediator Variable): The critical innovation of our study lies in distinguishing between disclosure practices and actual environmental outcomes. We employ the LSEG ESG Performance Score (current year) as our mediator variable, focusing on substantive environmental, social, and governance outcomes rather than communication practices. This separation enables us to test whether disclosure drives actual performance improvement rather than merely serving symbolic purposes.

Financial Performance Outcomes (Dependent Variables): To capture the multi-dimensional nature of sustainability value creation, we examine two distinct financial outcomes: Return on Assets (ROA) represents short-term operational efficiency and profitability, while Tobin's Q captures long-term market valuation and investor expectations regarding future cash flows and risk profile.

Control Variables: We include firm size (logarithm of total assets) as a primary control variable, along with comprehensive fixed effects specifications to control

for unobserved heterogeneity.

3.3 Econometric Specification and Causal Inference

We employ a two-way fixed effects (TWFE) regression framework designed to address the primary threats to causal inference in sustainability strategy research. Our specification includes both firm fixed effects to control for time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity (such as organizational culture, industry characteristics, and long-term strategic orientation) and year fixed effects to account for temporal variations in institutional expectations, regulatory changes, and macroeconomic conditions affecting all firms.

To address reverse causality concerns—the possibility that superior financial performance enables greater innovation investment rather than innovation driving sustainability performance—all strategic input variables (innovation and disclosure) are lagged by one year. This temporal separation helps establish the precedence of strategic inputs over sustainability outcomes, though we acknowledge that perfect causal identification remains challenging in observational data.

Standard errors are clustered at the firm level to account for heteroscedasticity and within-firm autocorrelation, ensuring robust inference in our panel data context. We conduct comprehensive diagnostic testing for multicollinearity using variance inflation factors and confirm that all VIF values remain well below conventional thresholds.

Our analytical approach moves beyond simple correlational analysis to examine the mediation mechanisms through which innovation and disclosure create value, providing insights into the strategic processes underlying the business case for sustainability.

4. Results

Our empirical analysis provides compelling evidence for the strategic mechanisms linking innovation capability, sustainability disclosure, and environmental performance to financial value creation. The results strongly support our theoretical model and demonstrate the critical role of innovation as a sustainability capability.

4.1 Stage 1: Strategic Inputs and Sustainability Performance (Path A)

The first stage of our mediation analysis reveals that corporate strategic investments in innovation and transparency are powerful determinants of substantive sustainability performance. Both Innovation Intensity ($\beta = 0.0026$, $p < 0.01$) and Sustainability Disclosure ($\beta = 0.8848$, $p < 0.01$) demonstrate highly significant positive effects on subsequent sustainability performance.

The model's exceptional explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.8278$) provides strong evidence that environmental performance is not a random or idiosyncratic outcome but rather the predictable result of systematic strategic resource allocation.

This finding directly challenges perspectives suggesting that sustainability performance is primarily driven by external factors or managerial discretion rather than organizational capabilities.

The magnitude of the disclosure coefficient indicates that transparency mechanisms function as powerful accountability drivers, compelling firms to translate environmental commitments into measurable outcomes. This result supports our theoretical argument that disclosure serves as more than symbolic communication—it creates institutional pressure for substantive environmental improvement.

4.2 Stage 2: The Innovation Paradox and Dual Value Creation

Our analysis reveals what we term the "Innovation-Sustainability Paradox"—a temporal disconnect between the immediate costs and long-term benefits of innovation investment in sustainability strategy. While innovation intensity demonstrates a negative direct relationship with short-term profitability (ROA: $\beta = -0.0545$, $p < 0.01$), reflecting the immediate costs of R&D investment, the indirect effect through sustainability performance generates substantial long-term market value. This paradox is further complicated by the 'Innovation Paradox' observed in large incumbents, where defensive market strategies by dominant firms can stall the very R&D productivity needed for environmental breakthroughs, leading to the observed short-term 'cost' of sustainability-focused innovation (Akcigit, 2024).

Short-term Performance (ROA): Sustainability Performance significantly enhances operational efficiency ($\beta = 0.0261$, $p < 0.05$), supporting the operational efficiency hypothesis that environmental improvements reduce costs through resource optimization and waste reduction. However, innovation investments impose immediate accounting costs that temporarily depress profitability.

Long-term Valuation (Tobin's Q): The most substantial effect emerges in long-term market valuation, where sustainability performance drives significant market premiums ($\beta = 2716.55$, $p < 0.01$). This massive coefficient indicates that markets reward firms achieving substantive environmental outcomes with substantial valuation premiums, recognizing the reduced risk profile and enhanced legitimacy associated with environmental leadership.

Importantly, we observe a negative direct relationship between disclosure and market valuation ($\beta = -854.60$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that markets penalize disclosure when not substantiated by actual performance improvement. This finding reinforces our substance-over-symbolism interpretation and highlights the critical importance of capability-based sustainability strategy.

Table 2: Mediation Regression Results (Fixed Effects)

Predictors	Model 1: Sust. Performance (Path A)	Model 2: ROA (Path B1)	Model 3: Tobin's Q (Path B2)
Sustainability Performance	—	0.0261** (0.0121)	2716.55*** (218.06)
Lag Innovation (t-1)	0.0026*** (0.0005)	-0.0545*** (0.0015)	182.26*** (22.17)
Lag Disclosure (t-1)	0.8848*** (0.0066)	0.0375*** (0.0121)	-854.60*** (220.63)
Firm Size (Control)	0.0171*** (0.0013)	0.0090*** (0.0012)	-387.41*** (17.63)
Constant	-0.0638*** (0.0089)	-0.0433*** (0.0101)	3940.23*** (141.25)
Observations	21,578	21,578	21,578
R-squared	0.8278	0.3036	0.1410
Year Fixed Effects	YES	YES	YES
Firm Fixed Effects	YES	YES	YES

Note 1: Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the firm level. Significance levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

Note 2: The negative constant in Model 1 is a result of the fixed-effects transformation and does not reflect a negative substantive ESG score.

5. Discussion: Strategic Implications for Sustainability Management

Our findings provide significant insights for sustainability strategy and environmental management, demonstrating that corporate environmental performance results from systematic capability development rather than opportunistic initiatives or symbolic gestures.

5.1 Innovation as the Foundation of Sustainability Strategy

The central contribution of our research lies in establishing innovation intensity as the fundamental capability enabling corporate sustainability transitions. Our results demonstrate that R&D investment serves as the technological foundation for environmental improvement, providing firms with the absorptive capacity necessary to identify, develop, and implement environmental solutions.

This finding has profound implications for sustainability strategy. Rather than

viewing environmental performance as primarily dependent on managerial commitment or stakeholder pressure, our results suggest that sustainability outcomes are fundamentally constrained by technological capability. Firms lacking innovation capacity remain structurally limited in their ability to achieve substantive environmental improvements, regardless of environmental intentions or disclosure practices.

The Innovation-Sustainability Paradox identified in our analysis—where innovation creates short-term costs but enables long-term value creation—highlights the temporal dimensions of sustainability strategy. Successful environmental management requires a long-term orientation that prioritizes capability building over immediate profitability optimization.

5.2 Beyond Greenwashing: Disclosure as Accountability Mechanism

Our results provide nuanced insights into the role of sustainability disclosure in corporate environmental strategy. Rather than serving merely as symbolic communication or "greenwashing" tools, disclosure practices function as accountability mechanisms that create organizational commitment to environmental improvement.

The high explanatory power of disclosure in predicting subsequent sustainability performance ($\beta = 0.8848$) indicates that transparency creates powerful internal and external pressures for substantive environmental action. This accountability effect is particularly important in the contemporary institutional environment, where standardized reporting frameworks and ESG investing have increased the reputational and financial consequences of environmental underperformance.

However, the negative direct relationship between disclosure and market valuation emphasizes that markets are increasingly sophisticated in distinguishing between environmental communication and environmental achievement. Investors reward substantive environmental performance while penalizing disclosure-intensive strategies that lack corresponding environmental improvements.

5.3 Implications for Corporate Environmental Strategy

Our findings suggest several strategic principles for effective corporate environmental management:

Capability-Centered Strategy: Sustainability strategy should prioritize innovation capability development as the foundation for environmental improvement. R&D investments in environmental technologies and processes represent the essential infrastructure for substantive sustainability performance.

Integrated Approach: Innovation and disclosure function as complementary rather than substitutable strategic resources. Effective sustainability strategy requires both technological capability (innovation) and organizational accountability (disclosure) to achieve superior environmental outcomes.

Long-term Orientation: The Innovation-Sustainability Paradox highlights the importance of long-term strategic thinking in environmental management. Short-term profitability sacrifices may be necessary to build the capabilities enabling sustained environmental leadership and market value creation.

Performance Focus: The substance-over-symbolism findings suggest that sustainability strategy should emphasize measurable environmental outcomes rather than communication intensity. Market rewards flow to firms achieving actual environmental improvements rather than those excelling primarily in environmental reporting. Recent empirical evidence from 2025 reinforces that environmental performance is only rewarded by the market when it is demonstrably mediated by green innovation capability, which acts as the 'bridge' between ESG commitments and long-term corporate success (Adardour et al., 2025).

6. Limitations and Future Research Directions

While our study provides robust empirical evidence for the innovation-sustainability-value relationship, several limitations suggest opportunities for future research in sustainability strategy.

First, although our lagged variable approach addresses some temporal concerns, endogeneity challenges persist. Superior financial performance may provide the resources necessary for innovation investment, creating feedback effects that complicate causal interpretation. Future research should exploit natural experiments or instrumental variables to further strengthen causal inference.

Second, our focus on large-cap firms with comprehensive ESG data coverage may limit generalizability to smaller firms or private companies. The innovation-sustainability relationship may operate differently in resource-constrained environments or industries with different technological opportunities.

Third, our study examines aggregate sustainability performance rather than specific environmental outcomes such as carbon emissions, water usage, or waste reduction. Future research should investigate whether innovation effects vary across different environmental dimensions and whether certain types of environmental challenges are more responsive to innovation investment.

Finally, our analysis focuses on internal innovation capability rather than collaborative innovation networks or open innovation strategies. Future sustainability strategy research should examine how inter-organizational collaboration affects the innovation-sustainability relationship and whether partnership strategies can substitute for internal R&D capability.

7. Conclusion

This study provides comprehensive empirical evidence that corporate sustainability performance is not serendipitous but results from systematic strategic resource allocation focused on capability development. Our analysis of 21,578

firm-year observations demonstrates that innovation intensity serves as the fundamental capability enabling corporate sustainability transitions, while disclosure functions as an accountability mechanism reinforcing rather than substituting for substantive environmental performance.

The Innovation-Sustainability Paradox identified in our research—where R&D investments create immediate costs but generate essential capabilities for long-term environmental legitimacy and market value—highlights the temporal complexity of sustainability strategy. Successful environmental management requires long-term capability building that prioritizes technological development over short-term profitability optimization.

For sustainability managers and corporate strategists, our findings suggest that environmental performance depends critically on innovation capability rather than environmental intentions alone. The substance-over-symbolism pattern observed in our results indicates that markets increasingly reward environmental achievement rather than environmental communication, reinforcing the importance of capability-based sustainability strategy.

As corporate sustainability transitions from peripheral corporate social responsibility to core business strategy, our research provides an empirical foundation for understanding the organizational capabilities and strategic resources that enable successful environmental performance. The most environmentally successful firms of the next decade will likely be those that view innovation not merely as a tool for competitive advantage but as the fundamental capability enabling solutions to environmental challenges while creating long-term economic value.

References

- Adardour et al. (2025). ESG environmental performance and corporate success: The role of green innovation as a mediator. *Frontiers in Sustainability*.
- Akcigit, U. (2024). The Innovation Paradox: How large incumbents stall productivity growth. *International Monetary Fund*.
- Aragón-Correa, J. A., & Sharma, S. (2003). A contingent resource-based view of proactive corporate environmental strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 71-88.
- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Cho, C. H., & Patten, D. M. (2007). The role of environmental disclosures as tools of legitimacy: A research note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 32(7-8), 639-647.
- Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128-152.
- Gray, R., Owen, D., & Adams, C. (1996). Accounting and accountability:

Changes and challenges in corporate social and environmental reporting. *Prentice Hall*.

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

ISS-Corporate (2025). 2025 Sustainability Reporting: Global Trends in Framework Adoption. *Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance*.

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

OECD (2025). Global Corporate Sustainability Report 2025. *G20/OECD Principles*.

Pereira, V. et al. (2025). Exploring and investigating the complementarity and multidimensionality of innovation for sustainability research. *Technovation*.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62-77.

Porter, M. E., & van der Linde, C. (1995). Toward a new conception of the environment-competitiveness relationship. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(4), 97-118.

Science Based Targets Initiative. (2023). *Companies taking action*. Retrieved from <https://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action>