Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

Integrating ESG Criteria in Corporate Strategies: Determinants and Implications for Performance

Houda Alhoussari[1]

Abstract

This study explores the integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into corporate practices, focusing on the methodologies used for their evaluation and the factors influencing their adoption. Through a qualitative and comparative analysis of European and Saudi Arabian contexts, the research examines how companies align their strategies with ESG requirements in diverse regulatory and cultural environments. Data is drawn from established ESG rating agencies, corporate sustainability reports, and case studies, allowing for a thorough investigation of internal and external evaluation processes and their implications for ESG scores. The study identifies key challenges in ESG implementation, including ambiguities in definitions, resource disparities, sector-specific considerations, and resistance due to cost or unfavorable ratings. It also highlights the role of legal and regulatory frameworks, such as the ESG Disclosure Guidelines introduced by the Saudi Capital Market Authority and global standards like the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), in shaping corporate ESG practices. Recommendations emphasize the need for standardized evaluation criteria, targeted support for smaller enterprises, and stronger legal frameworks to promote transparency and compliance. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of ESG dynamics and provide actionable insights for advancing corporate sustainability on a global scale.

Keywords: *Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG), Corporate Sustainability, Corporate Accountability and Transparency, Evaluation Methodologies, Companies.*

Introduction

Corporate sustainability is increasingly recognized as a multidimensional concept that encompasses environmental, social, and economic factors. While historically associated with environmental considerations, corporate sustainability now extends to broader issues such as economic stability and social responsibility. In this context, ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) criteria have emerged as a key framework to reconcile financial performance with sustainable development.

ESG, a widely adopted acronym within the financial community, serves as a standard for assessing non-financial aspects of corporate operations. These criteria form the three pillars of extra-financial analysis, allowing stakeholders to evaluate a company's responsibility towards the environment, society, and governance structures. Over recent years, the integration of ESG principles has gained momentum as investors increasingly prioritize sustainability in their decision-making processes (Lin et al., 2021). Consequently, businesses have begun embedding ESG considerations into their strategies and operations to align with stakeholder expectations and regulatory demands.

Despite this progress, measuring ESG performance remains complex due to diverse definitions, evaluation methodologies, and the variability of extra-financial rating agencies. This study seeks to address critical questions such as: *How do companies understand ESG factors? How are these factors integrated into corporate strategies? What methodologies are employed to assess ESG performance?*

By exploring these questions, the research aims to provide insights into the determinants of ESG ratings and their implications for corporate performance.

[1] Assistant Professor of Commercial Law, College of Law – Prince Sultan University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, Email: hhoussari@psu.edu.sa & Researcher at the Western Institute: Law and Europe, Rennes University, France

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

Literature Review

Conceptual Framework

When discussing Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG), it is essential to consider related concepts such as Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and impact investing. While these concepts are interconnected, they differ in their definitions and objectives.

CSR and Impact Investing

ESG, CSR, and impact investing are interrelated yet distinct concepts, each with specific objectives and applications. CSR emphasizes a company's ethical and moral obligations toward society and the environment by adopting practices aimed at improving its overall impact on stakeholders, including employees, customers, and communities. (Elbasha & Avetisyan, 2018)

In contrast, impact investing seeks to generate measurable, positive social or environmental outcomes alongside financial returns, often targeting specific sectors like renewable energy or energy transition initiatives. ESG, however, stands apart as a broader framework that integrates environmental, social, and governance factors into investment decisions, enabling the evaluation of risks and opportunities related to ESG performance across companies of all sizes and industries. (Dejean et al, 2004)

While CSR focuses on a company's societal and environmental contributions and impact investing prioritizes measurable change in targeted areas, ESG assesses the financial and operational implications of sustainability efforts, offering a comprehensive approach to risk management and value creation (Melka, 2022).

Despite their differences, these concepts complement one another, fostering sustainable development and aligning corporate strategies with long-term societal and environmental goals. (Hamed et al, 2024).

Gaps in the Literature

Prior research has focused predominantly on environmental aspects, with limited attention to social and governance dimensions. Additionally, the methodologies used to assess ESG ratings remain underexplored, particularly in a cross-regional context.

ESG Issues and Performance

The fundamental ideology of ESG lies in the constant pursuit of a sustainable development model that combines economic growth, social stability, integration, and environmental preservation (Khan & Liu, 2022). Investment methods should not be confined solely to the assessment of a company's financial status. Long-term sustainability requires a specific governance framework that incorporates both social and environmental considerations. This directly impacts the quality of investment decisions made by corporate agents, including directors, managers, and boards of directors.

An organization's ESG ratings and scores can serve as a guide for investment decisions, policy formulation, and strategic planning. ESG also enables companies to identify, organize, analyze, prioritize, and guide decisions regarding various risks—such as climate or social changes affecting corporate activities—aiming to mitigate or avoid their consequences at minimal cost.

These considerations prompt questions regarding the relationship between ESG ratings and scores and corporate performance. Studies by Arayssi & Jizi (2018) and Wolfe & Sauaia (2003) suggest that the effects of ESG differ based on whether a company adopts a long-term or short-term perspective. Research indicates that while ESG may negatively impact short-term corporate performance, its long-term effects are generally positive, contributing to improved financial performance and, consequently, increased corporate value.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

The positive effects of ESG can also yield long-term non-financial benefits, including improved product or service quality, enhanced corporate reputation, stronger brand image, increased customer satisfaction, and greater employee motivation (Khan & Liu, 2022).

To fully understand ESG activities, evaluations, and their relationship with corporate performance, it is crucial to examine each component of ESG comprehensively. Moreover, clarifying the link between ESG and other related concepts is indispensable.

Legal and Regulatory Framework: A Pillar of ESG Reporting

The legal and regulatory environment plays a fundamental role in shaping ESG reporting and compliance, serving as a critical foundation for corporate alignment with sustainability goals. In regions with strong ESG frameworks, companies are more likely to incorporate international standards into their operational and reporting practices, thus enhancing transparency and stakeholder confidence.

Saudi Arabia's ESG Framework

Saudi Arabia has taken significant steps to formalize ESG reporting within its corporate sector. The Capital Market Authority (CMA) introduced the ESG Disclosure Guidelines in 2019, mandating publicly listed companies to disclose ESG-related information as part of their annual reporting. These guidelines aim to foster transparency and accountability, ensuring that companies communicate their environmental, social, and governance initiatives effectively to investors and other stakeholders. Additionally, the Saudi Stock Exchange (Tadawul) launched an ESG index to evaluate and rank companies based on their ESG performance. This index incentivizes improved practices by highlighting leaders in sustainability, thereby enhancing their market visibility and investor appeal.

Global ESG Standards

On a broader scale, international frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) provide standardized guidelines that improve the consistency and comparability of ESG reporting. The GRI emphasizes comprehensive disclosure across all three ESG dimensions, while the SASB focuses on industry-specific materiality, offering tailored guidance for companies in diverse sectors. These frameworks not only enable stakeholders to assess corporate sustainability efforts effectively but also provide companies with a roadmap for aligning their practices with global expectations. (Grant Thornton, 2023).

Research Methodology

This study utilizes a qualitative approach to explore the integration of ESG principles and the methodologies used for their evaluation, with a specific focus on European and Saudi Arabian practices. Through a comparative analysis, the research identifies the key similarities and differences in ESG evaluation processes, providing insights into the factors that shape corporate sustainability practices in distinct regulatory and cultural contexts.

Data sources include reputable ESG rating agencies such as VIGEO, ASSET 4, and SGS Saudi Arabia, along with corporate sustainability reports and case studies that offer a wealth of real-world evidence. The study emphasizes the role of internal and external evaluation methods, analyzing their impact on ESG scores and broader strategic alignment.

By situating ESG practices within the framework of legal, regulatory, and cultural factors, the research aims to uncover patterns and nuances that contribute to a deeper understanding of corporate ESG adoption across diverse regions. This comprehensive approach provides valuable perspectives for advancing ESG integration in global sustainability efforts.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

Analysis and Discussion

Bridging the Gaps: Addressing Social, Governance, and Regional Disparities in ESG Research

Despite the growing prominence of ESG in academic and corporate discourse, several gaps in the literature remain that hinder a comprehensive understanding of its dimensions and applications.

Limited Research on the Social and Governance Dimensions of ESG

While much of the existing research on ESG focuses on its environmental dimension, the social and governance aspects have received comparatively less attention. Studies on the environmental impact of corporate practices, such as carbon footprint reduction and energy efficiency, dominate the literature due to their tangible metrics and clear linkages to global sustainability goals. In contrast, the social dimension—encompassing issues like diversity, labor rights, and community engagement—remains underexplored. Similarly, governance practices, including board structure, executive compensation, and transparency, are often overlooked or superficially addressed. This limited focus leaves significant gaps in understanding how social and governance factors contribute to overall ESG performance and their impact on long-term corporate sustainability and financial outcomes.

Need for Comparative Studies on ESG Methodologies Across Regions

Another critical gap lies in the lack of comparative studies examining ESG evaluation methodologies across different regions. ESG standards and practices vary widely due to regional regulatory frameworks, cultural contexts, and market priorities. For instance, European ESG practices often emphasize environmental sustainability and regulatory compliance, while North American approaches may focus more on shareholder value and governance reforms. In contrast, emerging markets like those in Asia or the Middle East may prioritize social development and infrastructure investments. The absence of comparative research makes it difficult to harmonize global ESG standards, understand regional nuances, and create universally applicable evaluation frameworks. Comparative studies are essential to identify best practices, highlight areas for improvement, and foster a more consistent approach to ESG implementation and reporting worldwide.

Integration of ESG into Corporate Strategies

How Companies Operationalize ESG Criteria in Their Activities

According to prior studies and observations of corporate strategies, companies respond to ESG ratings in varied ways.

Respecting the chronological order of studies, it is evident that the results have evolved over time. Adam & Shavit (2008) demonstrated that due to the limited membership lists of sustainability indices, these indices fail to provide sufficient incentives for most excluded companies to invest in CSR. Subsequently, Scalet & Kelly (2009) found that most companies have made minimal efforts to publicly acknowledge or address the negative factors that contributed to their exclusion from prominent CSR league tables. (Clementino & Perkins, 2020)

Using a large sample of U.S. companies, Chatterji and Tofel (2010) observed that firms receiving low environmental evaluation scores improved their performance (e.g., reducing company-wide toxic pollution) more effectively than their peers with higher initial scores. Searcy and Elkhawas (2012), in a survey-based study, reported various measures taken by Canadian companies striving to gain or retain inclusion in the Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI).

Chelli and Gendron (2013) highlighted how ratings foster a "regime of exclusion and inclusion," creating reward systems for high-performing companies (e.g., inclusion in selective indices) while penalizing lower-performing ones (e.g., exclusion). Regarding the indirect effects of ESG ratings, Sharkey and Bromley

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791
(2014) found that rated companies (but not unrated ones) reduced their pollution levels more as an increasing proportion of their peers were rated.

Shvarts & al. (2018) revealed that oil and gas companies in Russia disclosed more environment-related information following the introduction of third-party environmental ratings, with adjustments in their data reporting formats. These findings align with an earlier study on Malaysian firms by Iatridis (2013), which showed that companies adopting waste-reduction initiatives scored higher in environmental information disclosure. (Iatridis, 2013)

Gauthier & Wooldridge (2018) introduced the concept of compensatory tactics, where companies with high scores in certain CSR dimensions offset poor scores in others. Their study suggests that firms may address low CSR scores by investing in less costly and less disruptive non-core business practices instead of altering core practices.

It is essential to note that most previous studies concentrated on the environmental dimension of ESG, while the social and governance aspects have been relatively underexplored. This disparity may arise from stakeholders' heightened sensitivity to the CSR component compared to other ESG dimensions.

Conversely, some companies exhibit limited interest in ESG ratings. Two reasons can be inferred from existing literature. Firstly, unfavorable evaluations can have negative repercussions for both rated companies and their employees (Sauder & Espeland, 2009). Secondly, the financial and operational burden of maintaining high rankings or scores is significant (Tamimi & Sebastianelli, 2017). These pressures can lead organizations to "game" the system. As Espeland & Sauder (2007) explain, "Gaming is about managing appearances and involves efforts to improve ranking factors without improving the underlying characteristics those factors are designed to measure."

Given these insights, it is imperative to investigate the reasons behind discrepancies in ESG ratings. This understanding could provide greater clarity on how companies navigate and adapt to the challenges and expectations of ESG evaluation.

The Role of Governance Structures and CSR Committees in ESG Implementation

The adoption of ESG principles within companies is significantly influenced by governance structures and the establishment of dedicated CSR committees. These entities provide the organizational framework and oversight necessary to integrate ESG factors into corporate strategies, ensuring alignment with sustainability goals and stakeholder expectations.

Governance Structures: Oversight and Strategic Alignment

Effective governance structures play a crucial role in embedding ESG principles into an organization's culture and operations. Boards of directors, executive leadership teams, and specialized governance committees oversee the formulation and implementation of ESG strategies. Their responsibilities include:

Setting strategic priorities: Boards ensure that ESG objectives align with the company's overall mission and long-term goals.

Risk management: Governance structures identify and mitigate risks related to environmental, social, and governance issues, such as regulatory compliance, reputational damage, and stakeholder dissatisfaction.

Performance monitoring: By establishing KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) and benchmarks, governance structures track progress on ESG initiatives and ensure accountability.

Governance structures are also instrumental in fostering transparency and disclosure. For instance, they guide the development of ESG reports in compliance with international frameworks like the Global

Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB). This enables companies to communicate their ESG efforts effectively to investors, regulators, and the public.

CSR Committees: Operationalizing ESG Initiatives

CSR committees are specialized bodies within an organization tasked with implementing ESG initiatives at the operational level. These committees bridge the gap between strategic oversight provided by governance structures and the practical execution of ESG policies. Their key roles include:

Policy development: CSR committees draft and recommend policies addressing environmental sustainability, social equity, and governance best practices tailored to the organization's needs.

Program implementation: They oversee specific initiatives, such as reducing carbon emissions, promoting diversity and inclusion, and ensuring ethical supply chain practices.

Cross-departmental coordination: CSR committees collaborate with various departments (e.g., HR, operations, finance) to integrate ESG principles across all business functions. (Alwiya & Pinto, 2022).

The Interplay Between Governance Structures and CSR Committees

The effective implementation of ESG principles within corporate frameworks relies significantly on the synergistic interaction between governance structures and Corporate Social Responsibility committees. Governance structures provide strategic oversight, establish corporate priorities, and ensure accountability to stakeholders, while CSR committees operationalize the specific initiatives required to achieve ESG objectives. This interdependence ensures that ESG principles are not isolated but are embedded holistically into the organization's decision-making processes and day-to-day operations.

The interplay between governance structures and CSR committees enhances corporate accountability by integrating ESG principles at every organizational level. Governance structures establish the frameworks for monitoring progress and compliance, ensuring adherence to international and domestic legal and regulatory standards. Meanwhile, CSR committees adapt and implement ESG policies, responding to evolving internal needs and external requirements. This dynamic collaboration strengthens an organization's ability to align its operations with its sustainability goals and legal obligations. (Pinto, 2023)

Empirical studies underscore the critical importance of this collaborative dynamic. Michelon & Parbonetti (2012) demonstrated a positive correlation between the presence of CSR committees and the quality of social and environmental reporting, emphasizing the value of dedicated governance mechanisms in promoting transparency and accountability. Similarly, Arjalies & Mundy (2013) highlighted the role of CSR committees in fostering cross-departmental collaboration, ensuring the seamless integration of ESG principles into corporate strategy and operations.

This growing recognition of ESG as a cornerstone of corporate governance has significant legal and reputational implications. Effective governance structures and CSR committees help companies navigate complex fiduciary duties, comply with evolving regulations, and engage meaningfully with stakeholders. (Onyeka et al, 2023),

Conversely, organizations failing to establish robust ESG governance risk potential liabilities, reputational damage, and loss of stakeholder trust, underscoring the critical nature of this interplay in achieving sustainable and legally compliant corporate practices.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

Comparative Analysis of ESG Methodologies

Differences Between Internal and External Evaluation Methods

International and local ESG best practices require compliance with established standards. To achieve this, various approaches to measuring ESG performance can be divided into two main categories:

Internal Evaluation Methods

The first category involves internal evaluation, conducted by the company itself, either independently or with the assistance of external experts. This evaluation can be managed by a dedicated department responsible for ESG integration. In many cases, CSR committees within companies are tasked with conducting ESG analyses. These committees are entrusted with the responsibility to "formulate, implement, and monitor the CSR strategy within the Group and its entities" (Arjalies & Mundy, 2013).

The presence of such committees significantly influences the quantity and quality of social reporting, which directly correlates to ESG reporting (Michelon & Parbonetti, 2012). One of the main advantages of internal evaluation is the reduced cost compared to relying on external ESG rating agencies. However, this approach has a notable drawback: the reliability of the company's self-reported activities may be questioned, as internal evaluations can lack objectivity.

External Evaluation Methods

External evaluation is carried out by independent rating agencies, offering third-party assessments of ESG performance. This study examines European agencies such as VIGEO, ASSET 4, and SRI Asset Management Company (Bardinet-Evraert, 2018), alongside Saudi Arabian agencies like Grant Thornton Advisory and SGS Saudi Arabia.

We noted several approaches used by these agencies:

VIGEO and ASSET 4 exhibit strong correlation in their social and environmental ratings but treat governance separately from CSR performance.

SRI Asset Management Company adopts an integrated approach, recognizing ESG criteria as a unified extra-financial dimension while incorporating financial valuation objectives.

Saudi Arabian agencies like SGS Saudi Arabia analyze the three ESG components—environmental, social, and governance—individually. Their methods include gathering documentation, conducting management interviews, and benchmarking against competitors.

Advantages and Limitations of ESG Evaluation Methods

Category	Advantages	Limitations
Internal Evaluation	Cost-efficiency: Reduces the expenses associated with third-party evaluations. Customization: Tailors the process to company-specific goals and industry needs.	Reliability Concerns: Lack of objectivity in self-reported data. Lack of Standardization: May not adhere strictly to global ESG frameworks.
External Evaluation	Objectivity: Perceived as impartial, enhancing credibility among stakeholders. Comparability: Standardized methods enable benchmarking across industries and regions.	High Costs: Engaging external agencies can be financially burdensome. Methodological Variability: Different frameworks may result in inconsistent ESG ratings.

Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

Internal and external ESG evaluation methods serve different but complementary roles in assessing corporate sustainability. Internal evaluations offer cost-effective and customizable solutions, albeit with challenges in objectivity and comparability. External evaluations provide standardized and credible assessments, but their variability in methodologies and associated costs present notable drawbacks. Understanding these differences is crucial for businesses aiming to balance stakeholder expectations, regulatory compliance, and operational efficiency in their ESG reporting practices.

Factors Influencing ESG Ratings

The determination of ESG ratings is influenced by several critical factors, including valuation methodology, resource availability, sector-specific characteristics, company size, and the legal and regulatory environment.

Valuation Methodology

The valuation methodology employed by ESG rating agencies significantly impacts how a company's performance is assessed. There are two primary methodological approaches:

- **Correlative Method:** This approach views ESG criteria as representative of a single, integrated extra-financial dimension. The analysis incorporates ESG information into a broader evaluation, often as a precursor to financial assessments.

- **Stand-Alone Method**: This method treats environmental, social, and governance dimensions as distinct categories. It enables more granular insights into each aspect, separating social and environmental issues from governance practices.

The chosen methodology affects not only the weight assigned to different ESG factors but also the comparability of scores across companies and sectors. For instance, governance scores are often positively correlated with strong investor protections and negatively associated with ownership concentration (Bardinet- Evraert, 2018). Furthermore, regional variations in the valuation process can lead to inconsistencies, highlighting the need for harmonized global standards.

Resources Held by the Company

The availability of resources is a crucial determinant of ESG ratings, as companies with substantial resources are better equipped to measure, collect, and report the data required by rating agencies (Slager et al., 2012). Larger resource pools enable firms to invest in advanced technologies and expert teams to gather accurate ESG-related data, ensuring comprehensive and reliable reporting. Additionally, resource-rich companies can allocate funds to refine their policies and practices, aligning them with ESG benchmarks and enhancing their overall performance. Conversely, smaller firms often face challenges due to limited budgets, which may hinder their ability to meet the extensive reporting and compliance requirements, leading to lower ESG scores despite their potential alignment with sustainability goals.

Sector of Activity

A company's sector of activity significantly impacts its ESG ratings, as industries vary in their environmental and social implications.

High-Impact Sectors: Industries with greater environmental or social impacts, such as energy, mining, or manufacturing, face stricter scrutiny from stakeholders and rating agencies. These companies must actively adapt their practices to meet ESG criteria (Hahn & Kühnen, 2013).

Low-Impact Sectors: Firms in less impactful sectors, such as technology or services, may experience less pressure but are not exempt from demonstrating responsible governance and social equity.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

These sectoral differences underscore the importance of tailoring ESG strategies to the unique challenges and expectations of each industry.

Size of Activity

The size of a company plays a pivotal role in influencing ESG ratings, with larger firms often demonstrating superior performance compared to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Larger organizations benefit from greater access to resources, established reporting mechanisms, and robust governance structures, which facilitate comprehensive ESG disclosures and alignment with sustainability benchmarks.

These advantages enable large firms to invest in advanced reporting systems and dedicate teams to manage ESG compliance effectively, enhancing their ratings and visibility. In contrast, SMEs face significant challenges in meeting the extensive reporting and compliance requirements due to limited resources and infrastructure. (Tamimi & Sebastianelli, 2017)

Despite their potential alignment with sustainable practices, these constraints often result in lower ESG scores, underscoring the importance of tailored strategies to address disparities in ESG evaluation across organizations of varying sizes (Campbell, 2007, Drempetic et al., 2019).

Impact of Legal Frameworks on Corporate ESG Practices

Legal frameworks serve as both a regulatory and motivational tool for companies, promoting transparency and encouraging better alignment with stakeholder expectations. By mandating disclosures and establishing performance benchmarks, these frameworks create a structured environment in which companies are held accountable for their ESG initiatives. Moreover, compliance with legal and regulatory standards often leads to enhanced corporate reputation, increased investor trust, and better access to capital. (Yaghi, 2024).

While legal frameworks play a pivotal role, disparities in regional regulations and the voluntary nature of some global standards can lead to inconsistencies in ESG practices. Companies operating in regions with underdeveloped ESG regulations may lack the motivation to adopt best practices, highlighting the need for more harmonized international policies. Nonetheless, in regions like Saudi Arabia, the proactive introduction of ESG disclosure requirements demonstrates how targeted legal interventions can drive significant progress toward sustainability goals.

Challenges in ESG Implementation

The implementation of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) principles faces several significant challenges that impede its widespread adoption and effectiveness.

Challenge 1. Ambiguities in ESG Definitions and Evaluation Criteria

A lack of universally accepted definitions and evaluation criteria is one of the most significant obstacles to ESG implementation. ESG covers a diverse range of issues—from environmental impact and social responsibility to governance practices—leading to varying interpretations of what constitutes effective ESG performance. This diversity results in inconsistent methodologies among rating agencies, as some prioritize environmental factors while others emphasize governance or social aspects. These discrepancies undermine the comparability and reliability of ESG scores, making it difficult for companies to align with international benchmarks and for stakeholders to trust the evaluations.

Challenge 2. Resistance to ESG Adoption Due to Costs and Ratings

Corporate resistance to ESG adoption is often driven by the perceived financial and operational burden. Implementing ESG practices requires substantial investments in data collection systems, reporting mechanisms, and policy reforms, which can be particularly challenging for smaller firms or those in resource-intensive industries. Additionally, the fear of unfavorable ratings further dissuades companies

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

from embracing ESG practices. Poor scores can damage a company's reputation, deter investors, and limit access to capital, leading some organizations to engage in superficial efforts—commonly referred to as "greenwashing"—to appear compliant without genuinely addressing sustainability issues. (Ur Rehman Irshad et al, 2023).

Challenge 3. Legal Barriers to ESG Implementation

The legal environment presents additional challenges for ESG adoption. Regulations governing ESG practices are often fragmented and vary significantly across regions, creating uncertainty for companies operating in multiple jurisdictions. While some countries have established clear ESG disclosure requirements, others lack comprehensive frameworks, leaving companies to navigate a patchwork of voluntary guidelines and mandatory rules.

For example, in Saudi Arabia, the Capital Market Authority (CMA) introduced ESG Disclosure Guidelines in 2019, but these are relatively new and still evolving. Globally, frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) offer guidance, but compliance remains voluntary in many regions. This legal uncertainty can lead to uneven enforcement, with some companies facing stricter scrutiny than others. Moreover, the absence of standardized regulations increases the risk of legal liabilities, as companies may inadvertently fail to meet disclosure or reporting requirements.

The above challenges collectively hinder progress toward effective ESG implementation. Addressing these challenges is essential for fostering sustainable corporate practices and aligning with stakeholder expectations.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis of the challenges, methodologies, and factors influencing ESG adoption, the following recommendations aim to enhance corporate ESG implementation and performance:

Standardization of ESG Definitions and Criteria

Policymakers, rating agencies, and industry leaders should collaborate to develop standardized ESG definitions and evaluation criteria. Harmonizing global standards will reduce ambiguities, improve comparability, and build trust among stakeholders.

Capacity Building for Smaller Enterprises

Governments and financial institutions should provide targeted support to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), such as grants, subsidies, or access to green financing. This will help SMEs overcome resource constraints and align with ESG benchmarks.

Incentives for ESG Adoption

Governments can encourage ESG adoption by offering tax benefits, preferential loans, or funding for companies that demonstrate a commitment to sustainability. Such incentives will reduce resistance to ESG practices and motivate companies to go beyond compliance.

Transparency in ESG Rating Methodologies

Rating agencies should disclose their methodologies to enhance the credibility and fairness of ESG ratings. Companies should be provided with clear pathways to improve their scores, fostering continuous improvement.

Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791

Sector-Specific ESG Strategies

ESG frameworks should account for sector-specific challenges and opportunities. Tailored guidelines for industries with high environmental or social impacts, such as energy or manufacturing, will ensure more meaningful assessments and actionable strategies.

Strengthening Legal and Regulatory Frameworks

Governments must establish clear, enforceable ESG regulations, ensuring consistency across regions. Legal frameworks should mandate comprehensive ESG disclosures, with penalties for non-compliance and rewards for exceeding benchmarks.

Conclusion

This study highlights the complexities of ESG adoption, influenced by valuation methodologies, resource availability, sector-specific characteristics, company size, and legal frameworks. While ESG presents opportunities for long-term financial and non-financial benefits, challenges such as ambiguous definitions, resource disparities, resistance to adoption, and fragmented legal systems hinder its widespread implementation.

Addressing these challenges requires a multi-stakeholder approach. Standardizing ESG definitions and criteria, providing incentives for adoption, enhancing transparency in ratings, and strengthening legal frameworks will create an environment conducive to effective ESG practices. Companies must align their internal strategies with sector-specific guidelines and global standards to improve their performance and foster stakeholder trust.

Future research should address the underexplored social and governance dimensions of ESG to better understand their impact on corporate performance and stakeholder relations. Additionally, cross-sector and cross-regional analyses are necessary to uncover the unique challenges and best practices across industries and regions. These studies would provide valuable insights for creating harmonized international standards and informing policy and strategy development.

By implementing these recommendations and advancing research in these areas, businesses can navigate ESG complexities more effectively, contributing to global sustainability objectives and securing long-term value for stakeholders in a rapidly evolving regulatory and market landscape.

Acknowledgment

Author of this Article would like to thank the Governance and Policy Design Research Lab (GPDRL) of Prince Sultan University (PSU) for their financial and academic support to conduct this research and publish it in a reputable Journal.

References

Adam, A. M., & Shavit, T. (2008). How Can a Ratings-based Method for Assessing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Provide an Incentive to Firms Excluded from Socially Responsible Investment Indices to Invest in CSR? Journal of Business Ethics, 82(4), 899–905.

Ait Saadi, F. (2022), ESG Performance and Extra-financial Reporting, Recherches en Sciences de Gestion, 4(151), 169-192.

Alwiya A., Pinto L., (2022), Non-Financial Benefits of Corporate Social Responsibility to Saudi Companies in MDPI , Mar-2022 , doi: 10.3390/su14063446.

Arayssi M., Jizi M.-I. (2018) Does Corporate Governance Spillover Firm Performance? A Study of Valuation of MENA Companies. Soc Responsib J 15(5):597–620.

Arjalies, D. L., & Mundy, J. (2013), The Use of Management Control Systems to Manage CSR Strategy: a Levers of Control Perspective, Management Accounting Research, 24(4), 284-300.

Bardinet- Exraert, F., Comparison of Three ESG Methods: do Extra-financial Databases Provide the Same Information?, Revue Recherche en Sciences de Gestion-Management, 2018/2, n°125, 73-93.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2024
Volume: 3, No: 8, pp. 11925 – 11936
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i8.5791
Chatterji, A. K., & Tofel, M. W. (2010). How Firms Respond to Being Rated. Strategic Management Journal, 31(9), 917–945.
Chelli, M., & Gendron, Y. (2013). Sustainability Ratings and the Disciplinary Power of the Ideology of Numbers. Journal of Business Ethics, 112(2), 187–203.
Déjean, F., Gond, J.-P., & Leca, B. (2004). Measuring the Unmeasured: An Institutional Entrepreneur Strategy in an Emerging Industry. Human Relations, 57(6), 741–763.
Elbasha, T., & Avetisyan, E. (2018). A Framework to Study Strategizing Activities at the Field Level: The Example of CSR Rating Agencies. European Management Journal, 36(1), 38–46.
Espeland, W. N., & Sauder, M. (2007). Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds. American Journal of Sociology, 113(1), 1–40.
Gauthier, J., & Wooldridge, B. (2018). Sustainability Ratings and Organizational Legitimacy: The Role of Compensating Tactics, Sustainability and Social Responsibility: Regulation and Reporting, (pp.141-157)
Grant Thornton, Sustainable Finance and ESG Reporting: Opportunities for Saudi Arabian Companies, 22 Jun 2023, https://www.grantthornton.sa/en/insights/articles-and-publications/sustainable_finance/
Hahn, R., & Kühnen, M. (2013). Determinants of Sustainability Reporting: A Review of Results, Trends, Theory, and Opportunities in an Expanding Feld of Research. Journal of Cleaner Production, 59(15), 5–21.
Hamed, R., Smolarski J., Al-shattarat W., Al-shattarat B.," CSR Reporting and Corporate Performance: the Role of Strategic Emphasis ," in Emarald Group Publishing Ltd , Dec-2024 , doi: 10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2024-0348
Khan, Umair & Liu, Weili. (2023). The Link between Green Innovations, Corporate Performance, ESG Activities, and Sharing Economy. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 30. 1-13. 10.1007/s11356-023-27722-7.
Latridis, G. E., (2013), Environmental Disclosure Quality: Evidence on Environmental Performance, Corporate Governance and Value Relevance, Emerging Markets Review, Volume 14, Pages 55-75, ISSN 1566-014.
Lin WL, Ho, J.-A, Sambasivan, M., Yip N, Mohamed A.-B. (2021) Influence of Green Innovation Strategy on Brand Value: the Role of Marketing Capability and R&D Intensity. Technol Forecast Soc Chang 171:120946.
Michelon, G., & Parbonettia, A. (2012), " The Effect of Corporate Governance on Sustainability Disclosure, Journal of Management and Governance, 16 (3), 1-33.
Onyeka K. Osuji N., Ngwu F., Lynch-Wood G (2023), Stimulating Private Regulation of Corporate Social Responsibility, Cambridge University Press.
Pinto L.," A Qualitative Analysis of Corporate Social Responsibility in Saudi Arabia's Service Sector-Practices and Company Performance ," in MDPI AG , Jun-2023 , doi: 10.3390/su15129284.
Sauder, M., & Espeland, W. N. (2009). The Discipline of Rankings: Tight Coupling and Organizational Change. American Sociological Review, 74(1), 63–82.
Scalet, S., & Kelly, T. F. (2009). CSR Rating Agencies: What is their Global Impact? Journal of Business Ethics, 94(1), 69–88.
Searcy, C., & Elkhawas, D. (2012). Corporate Sustainability Ratings: an Investigation into How Corporations use the Dow Jones Sustainability Index. Journal of Cleaner Production, 35, 79–92.
SGS, ESG – Environmental, Social and Governance , https://www.sgs.com/en-sa/service-groups/esg-environmental-social-and-governance
Sharkey A. J., Bromley P. (2014). Can Ratings have Indirect Effects? Evidence from the Organizational Response to peers' Environmental Ratings. American Sociological Review, 80(1), 63–91.
Shvarts E., Pakhalov A., Knizhnikov A., Ametistova L. (2018). Environmental Rating of Oil and Gas Companies in Russia: How Assessment Affects Environmental Transparency and Performance. Business Strategy and the Environment, 27(7), 1023–1038.
Tamimi N., Sebastianelli R. (2017). Transparency Among S&P 500 Companies: An Analysis of ESG Disclosure Scores. Management Decision, 55(8), 1160–1680.
Ur Rehman Irshad A., Safdar N., Irshad Younas Z., Manzoor W. ," Impact of Corporate Governance on Firms' Environmental Performance: Case Study of Environmental Sustainability-Based Business Scenarios ," in MDPI , May-2023 , doi: 10.3390/su15107775.
Wolfe J, Sauaia ACA (2003) The Tobin q as a Company Performance Indicator. In: Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning: Proceedings of the Annual ABSEL conference, vol 30.
Yaghi R., Corporate Governance Codes: A Controversial Efficiency? , in EnPress Publisher, LLC , Jul-2024 , doi: 10.24294/jipd.v8i7.4359.
Clementino, E., Perkins, R. (2020), How do companies respond to environmental, social and governance (ESG) ratings? Evidence from Italy. Journal of Business Ethics. ISSN 0167-4544