JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
Vol.2024:27

Navigating the Complexities of ESG Integration: Challenges, Opportunities and Path to Sustainable Corporate Development

Gao Huiping[1*], Tan Seng Teck[1] Syriac Nellikunnel[2]

[1]Faculty of Business and Communications, INTI International University, Malaysia
[2]Faculty of Business, Perdana University, Malaysia

[*]**Email**: i24028730@student.newinti.edu.my

Abstract

This study focuses on the practical application of the Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) framework and examines its role in promoting corporate sustainability and fulfilling social responsibilities. Through an analysis of theoretical frameworks, literature, and case studies, the paper highlights the major challenges ESG frameworks face in corporate operations, including stakeholder conflicts, short-term financial pressures, policy resistance, and inconsistent quantitative standards. Despite the significant achievements of ESG frameworks in enhancing brand reputation, attracting investors, and guiding sustainable development, the research also identifies issues such as "greenwashing," which undermine their overall credibility and effectiveness. The study suggests that companies must deeply integrate ESG principles with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), leveraging innovation and improving transparency to transform social responsibility into competitive advantages, thereby driving the global economy's green transition and sustainable development.

Keywords

ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance); Sustainable Development；Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR); Greenwashing; Stakeholder Theory; United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Introduction

The integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles has emerged as a critical aspect of corporate strategy in the modern business landscape. As global challenges such as climate change, social inequality, and governance issues continue to intensify, ESG frameworks provide companies with a structured approach to address these pressing concerns while aligning their operations with sustainability goals. This paper explores the complexities of implementing ESG principles, focusing on their potential to enhance corporate accountability, transparency, and long-term competitiveness. It critically evaluates the tensions between short-term financial objectives and long-term sustainability goals, highlighting the

Submission: 25 November 2024; **Acceptance:** 18 December 2024

challenges posed by inconsistent global standards, stakeholder conflicts, and the risk of superficial adoption or "greenwashing." By examining theoretical perspectives, case studies, and practical examples, this study aims to assess the extent to which ESG frameworks can drive meaningful corporate transformation and contribute to sustainable development in an increasingly interconnected and responsibility-driven global economy.

Definition and Origin of ESG

ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) represents a comprehensive framework used to assess how companies address environmental impacts, fulfill social responsibilities, and implement governance practices. The environmental dimension encompasses critical issues such as carbon emissions, energy efficiency, and sustainable resource use. The social dimension evaluates factors such as labor conditions, employee welfare, community engagement, and human rights. Meanwhile, the governance dimension focuses on corporate accountability, transparency, ethical conduct, and board effectiveness, which collectively ensure that a company adheres to sound management practices (Eccles, 2018).

The concept of ESG was first introduced in the 2004 report *Who Cares Wins*, published by the United Nations Global Compact. This seminal report aimed to highlight the competitive advantages that businesses could achieve by integrating sustainability into their core operations and decision-making processes. It emphasized that addressing environmental, social, and governance concerns is not only a moral imperative but also a strategic necessity in an increasingly sustainability-conscious market (Pollman, 2022).

Over time, ESG has evolved into a critical tool for both investors and corporations, leading to the development of various ESG indexes. These indexes are designed to provide measurable insights into a company's sustainability performance. Broad market indexes such as the MSCI ESG Index and the S&P 500 ESG Index offer a high-level evaluation of corporate sustainability across industries. Thematic indexes, like the FTSE4Good Index, focus on specific sustainability themes, while industry-specific indexes, such as the Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI), provide more granular assessments within particular sectors. These tools have become instrumental in guiding investors to make informed decisions by evaluating companies' long-term resilience and commitment to sustainable development (Pagano, 2018).

Core arguments

1. The real game between profit and sustainable development

As the global community pays more attention to environmental and social responsibilities, the business model of enterprises is facing unprecedented challenges. The shareholder theory proposed by Friedman emphasizes that the only responsibility of enterprises is to maximize shareholder profits, and all decisions should be made around improving shareholder returns (Friedman, M., 2007). However, with the rise of the concept of sustainable development, this theory seems increasingly outdated. The shareholder theory is too focused on short-term economic benefits and ignores long-term factors such as environment, society and governance (ESG), which are the key to whether today's companies can gain sustainable advantages in competition. Especially in the context of climate change, resource shortages and increasing social inequality, the model of companies pursuing profits alone will not be able to cope with the complex challenges of the future. Instead, it may lead to a long-term reputation crisis and resource depletion, and ultimately harm the interests of shareholders. Therefore, the corporate strategy of pursuing long-term sustainable development is obviously more in line with the current economic and social environment (Lloret, A., 2016).

However, although the concept of ESG provides a framework for corporate sustainable development, its actual application still faces certain limitations. The conflict between the short-term profit goals of shareholder theory and the long-term goals of sustainable development remains the main challenge for companies to achieve sustainable development. If a company faces the risk of declining short-term profitability due to investment in expensive green technology, it may choose to abandon this investment under the pressure of short-term returns from shareholders. This situation highlights the huge challenges faced by companies in balancing the long-term vision of sustainable development with quarterly earnings reports and shareholder expectations. Especially in the United States, changes in the political and economic environment in some states have caused the application of ESG indexes to stagnate or even regress. For example, Florida and Texas have taken a stance against ESG investment in recent years. Florida Governor Ron DeSantis has explicitly opposed the use of ESG standards in state-level public investment, believing that this is inconsistent with the responsibilities of the state government, and even banned the use of ESG standards in government investment in 2022 (Chime, C., 2024). The Texas government has banned the sale of a large number of ESG funds due to the possible negative impact on the local economy (Rajgopal, 2024).

In summary, although ESG provides a framework for companies to pursue sustainable development, the short-term financial pressure, conflicts of interest and policy resistance faced in its actual application process have limited its widespread implementation and effectiveness. Especially in a specific political and economic environment, the promotion of ESG has not only stagnated, but has even regressed. This shows that the ESG framework alone is difficult to fully respond to the complex challenges faced by companies in achieving long-term sustainable development.

2 ESG dilemma: the quantitative challenge of corporate responsibility

It is undeniable that the ESG index measures a company's performance and fulfillment of their social responsibilities to a certain extent, but in practice, companies face many challenges and contradictions in fulfilling their social responsibilities. There is often a conflict between a company's social responsibility (CSR) and its goal of pursuing profits, especially in the trade-off between short-term economic benefits and long-term sustainable development (Hategan, 2018).

When implementing ESG strategies, companies often face short-term financial pressures, and many companies' ESG initiatives remain on the surface, lacking depth and substantive changes. For example, Deutsche Bank claims to support green finance and launches financial products such as green bonds and sustainable investment funds, which ostensibly reflects its commitment to environmental protection and social responsibility. However, in reality, the proportion of green projects in the bank's investment portfolio is extremely low, and it still invests heavily in highly polluting industries such as oil, coal and natural gas. Although its green finance commitments seem positive, in actual operations, it has not made fundamental adjustments to the traditional investment model, resulting in a lack of depth and substance in its ESG actions (Relano, 2012.). This "formalistic" performance exposes the huge gap between green finance commitments and actual investment behavior, and cannot promote true sustainable development.

In addition, ESG indicators lack global unified standards, and rating agencies around the world use different frameworks and indicators to measure the ESG performance of companies. In 2023, there are more than 600 ESG rating agencies worldwide, using different evaluation standards and methods (Jiang 2024). Well-known agencies such as MSCI, Sustainalytics, Refinitiv and CDP use their own independent scoring systems, evaluation dimensions and weights, and each agency may have significant differences in the evaluation methods, scoring standards and even data sources for the same company. This leads to differences in scores for the same company in different reports, resulting in "selective disclosure" of companies in ESG evaluations (Roszkowska-Menkes, M., 2024). Therefore, the ESG index is far from a perfect corporate responsibility measurement tool, but a framework that needs further improvement and standardization.

3 How to reconcile the multiple needs of stakeholders

From the perspective of stakeholder theory, the goal of a company is not only to serve shareholders, but also to consider the interests of all stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, society and the environment. It emphasizes that companies must make decisions that are in line with the overall interests on the basis of balancing the interests of all parties (Parmar, B.L., 2010). Different stakeholders have different expectations and needs for companies, and ESG indicators cannot fully consider the diverse needs of all stakeholders; this also means that the responsibility and performance of companies in terms of environment, society and governance cannot be simply measured by a single ESG score.

A company reduces its impact on the environment by cutting production costs, but may inadvertently harm employees by reducing wages or benefits. For example, Amazon has spent money to take some positive measures in environmental protection, promising to achieve carbon neutrality by 2040 and invest in renewable energy projects to improve its ESG score in the environmental field (Hei, W.H., 2023). But at the same time, Amazon has also been widely criticized for its treatment of employees and working environment, especially the working conditions of warehouse workers. Employees face problems such as high-intensity work, low wages and limited benefits (O'Connor, 2013.). Similarly, Apple also faces challenges in supply chain management. Although Apple has performed well in environmental protection and product innovation, its supplier Foxconn's factories have been exposed to poor working conditions and employee suicides, which has aroused public doubts about Apple's supply chain social responsibility ((O'Connor, 2013). Although these problems cannot be reflected through conventional ESG scores, they are the focus of stakeholders such as employees and communities.

In addition, Nestlé has also faced criticism for social responsibility in its supply chain. In 2019, Nestlé was accused of child labor and forced labor in its cocoa supply chain, which damaged its brand image. Although Nestlé has performed well in environmental protection and product innovation, its mistakes in supply chain social responsibility show the challenges that companies may encounter when balancing the needs of different stakeholders (Whoriskey & Siegel, 2019).

These cases show that when companies balance the needs of different stakeholders, they may lose sight of one thing while focusing on the other. A single ESG score is difficult to fully reflect the company's fulfillment of its responsibilities in all aspects. Companies need to consider the diverse needs of stakeholders in depth when formulating and implementing strategies to achieve true sustainable development.

These cases show that when companies balance the needs of different stakeholders, they may lose sight of one thing while focusing on the other. A single ESG score is difficult to fully reflect the company's fulfillment of its responsibilities in all aspects.

4 Decoding the Creation of a Sustainable Generation of Companies

In 1994, John Elkington proposed the Triple Bottom Line (Triple Bottom Line, The concept of TBL aims to promote enterprises to incorporate social responsibility and environmental protection into their core strategies while pursuing financial performance. The key to TBL is to deeply integrate sustainable development into corporate operations, rather than relying solely on formal reports and indicators.

However, the current practice of the ESG framework focuses more on short-term quantifiable performance, ignoring the substantial efforts of enterprises in long-term social impact and environmental protection. The current application of ESG shows that although some companies superficially follow green and social responsibility standards, they may fall into the phenomenon of "greenwashing". For example, in the Volkswagen emissions scandal, although the company promoted its environmental protection technology, it actually manipulated emission tests through cheating software (Jung, 2019.); H&M's "environmental protection series" was criticized as superficial, and the fast fashion model still seriously affected the environment (Chen, X.J. and Fang, G., 2019); Coca-Cola claims to be a leader in plastic recycling, but the amount of disposable plastic bottles it uses is huge, and the recycling rate is far lower than the advertised standard (Noori, R. and Athota, V.S., 2024). Greenwashing incidents reveal the false propaganda and superficial efforts that companies may have when promoting ESG (environmental, social, and governance) practices. This behavior has a profound negative impact on consumers and investors' confidence in green products, which challenges the credibility and effectiveness of ESG (Delmas, 2011). According to a 2022 study, about 59% of consumers are skeptical of companies' green propaganda.

Therefore, it is difficult to effectively resolve the fundamental contradiction between companies' fulfillment of social responsibilities and pursuit of profits, and it is difficult to truly create a "sustainable generation enterprise" based solely on the ESG framework. Companies need to go beyond formal ESG reporting and implement sustainable development strategies in depth to achieve a comprehensive balance in the three aspects of economy, society and environment.

Embrace the Future: How ESG Breaks the Game

Measuring a company's performance in fulfilling its social responsibilities and ethical values, especially in the field of sustainable development and corporate social responsibility (CSR), is a complex challenge. To provide a transparent, authentic and clear social responsibility demonstration for enterprises, enterprises need to incorporate ESG into their long-term strategies and continuously improve their social responsibility level through quantitative and qualitative assessment methods, third-party independent audits, stakeholder feedback, innovation-driven methods, etc. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide enterprises with a global framework to guide how they can make positive contributions in the environment, society and governance. It includes 17 core goals, 169 specific sub-goals and 231 indicators. It covers major issues around the world, including poverty eradication, climate change, gender equality, economic growth and employment (Carlsen, 2022). If enterprises no longer fulfill their ESG responsibilities simply to comply with regulations or gain social recognition, but use SDGs as the core driving force to promote corporate innovation and sustainable development, this model may become the future of creating a sustainable generation of enterprises. For example, Unilever is committed to promoting sustainable consumption and production through its Sustainable Living Plan (Lawrence, 2018). Patagonia actively implements SDG 13 (climate action) and SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth), and promotes sustainable development by reducing carbon emissions, using recycled materials and promoting environmental protection. These initiatives have not only helped the company gain recognition from consumers, but also promoted the green transformation of the global supply chain, becoming a model of corporate innovation and sustainable development (Pascual, M.A., Mataloni, G. and Quintana, R.D., 2022).

Conclusion

In today's rapidly changing business environment, although the ESG index is widely used, it is not a perfect tool to measure corporate sustainability and long-term competitiveness. Although ESG has made rapid progress in attracting environmentally conscious consumers, enhancing brand reputation and attracting investors in the past decade, it also faces a series of challenges. Critics believe that the environmental dimension (E) of ESG is often plagued by the problem of "greenwashing", the social dimension (S) has gradually become the focus of political struggles, and the governance dimension (G) is often ignored. In addition, the lack of a global unified ESG assessment standard has also exacerbated the differentiation of various ratings, further complicating the practice of ESG assessment.

Despite this, many companies still view ESG as a core element to drive long-term success and continue to implement this principle in their strategies. As the global economic and social environment continues to change, companies have become an important way to enhance corporate resilience and sustainability by aligning ESG with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This integration not only helps to enhance the social value of companies, but also provides a strong impetus for them to compete in the future.

Reference

Carlsen, L., & Bruggemann, R. (2022). The 17 United Nations' sustainable development goals: A status by 2020. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology, 29*(3), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2021.1996046

Chen, X. J., & Fang, G. (2019, May). Analysis on green marketing strategy of clothing firm: Take H&M for example. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management Science and Industrial Engineering* (pp. 146–150).

Chime, C. (2024). Navigating the complexities of ESG integration by companies in the United States. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4830133

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review*, *54*(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64

Eccles, R. G., & Stroehle, J. C. (2018). Exploring social origins in the construction of ESG measures. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3212685

Hategan, C. D., Sirghi, N., Curea-Pitorac, R. I., & Hategan, V. P. (2018). Doing well or doing good: The relationship between corporate social responsibility and profit in Romanian companies. *Sustainability*, *10*(4), 1041. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10041041

Jiang, P. C., Feng, G. F., Wang, H. J., & Chang, C. P. (2024). CSR from different perspectives: The global ESG indexes updated. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2384

Jung, J. C., & Sharon, E. (2019). The Volkswagen emissions scandal and its aftermath. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence, 38*(4), 6–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21942

Lloret, A. (2016). Modeling corporate sustainability strategy. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(2), 418–425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.06.047

Lawrence, J., Rasche, A., & Kenny, K. (2018). Sustainability as opportunity: Unilever's sustainable living plan. In *Managing Sustainable Business: An Executive Education Case and Textbook* (pp. 435–455). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1144-7_24

O'Connor, S. (2013). Inside Foxconn: How Apple gets its products made. *Financial Times.* https://www.ft.com/content/your-article-link

Pagano, M. S., Sinclair, G., & Yang, T. (2018). Understanding ESG ratings and ESG indexes. In *Research Handbook of Finance and Sustainability* (pp. 339–371). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pascual, M. A., Mataloni, G., & Quintana, R. D. (2022). Reaching out for the UNDP sustainable development goals in Patagonia. In *Freshwaters and Wetlands of Patagonia: Ecosystems and Socioecological Aspects* (pp. 527–541). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74767-5_24

Pollman, E. (2022). The making and meaning of ESG. *University of Pennsylvania Institute for Law & Economics Research Paper*, (22-23).

Rajgopal, S., Srivastava, A., & Zhao, R. (2024). Economic substance behind Texas political anti-ESG sanctions. *SSRN Electronic Journal.* https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4386268

Whoriskey, P., & Siegel, R. (2019). Cocoa's child laborers. *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2019/business/hershey-nestle-mars-chocolate-child-labor-west-africa/