DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD35528

The Significance of ESG in Reducing Investment Risks

Xinhui Qu

Curtin Singapore, Singapore, Singapore
qxh0729@qq.com

Abstract. Driven by global carbon neutrality policies and the investor-centric investment philosophy, ESG (Environment, Society, Governance) assessment has become a core component of modern enterprises' comprehensive risk management. This paper proposes two core research questions: The stabilizing and mitigating effect of ESG on enterprises' financial risks, as well as the obstacles that hinder the effective operation of their risk management, is worthy of exploration. This paper adopts qualitative literature research and case analysis methods, combining recent empirical data and the Tesla ESG controversy case, to explore the risk impacts of ESG across multiple dimensions. This study provides practical references for investors to conduct rational ESG valuation, helps enterprises optimize their ESG layout, and proposes feasible suggestions for establishing unified global ESG assessment rules to enhance the applicability of ESG in the long-term risk prevention and control of enterprises.

Keywords: ESG investment, financial risk, corporate governance, sustainable finance, risk management

1. Introduction

In recent years, ESG investment has evolved from an esoteric concept to a mainstream strategy adopted by both global institutional investors and retail investors. Traditional investment analysis primarily focuses on financial indicators such as profitability, cash flow, and revenue growth. However, growing public concern over climate change, social inequality, and corporate misconduct has prompted investors to incorporate non-financial performance into their long-term risk assessments. At the same time, financial risks - including market volatility, operational disruptions, reputational damage, and governance failures - remain significant threats to a company's value and shareholder returns.

Current research indicates that ESG performance is associated with lower risk exposure. A large number of empirical studies prove that sound ESG practices can effectively improve corporate risk management capabilities and reduce overall financial risks [1]. However, there are still research gaps: few systematic comparisons exist on the impact of ESG across different risk types, and limited attention is paid to issues such as rating differences, green washing, and imbalances in performance across dimensions. This study aims to address these research gaps by exploring how ESG affects various financial risks and testing whether ESG can bring consistent resilience. This study, through a literature review and case analysis, examines whether ESG can serve as a reliable risk control tool.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD35528

The research results will help investors understand the practical value of ESG, avoid over-reliance on ratings, and integrate sustainability into a comprehensive risk management framework.

2. How ESG can reduce corporate financial risks

This chapter systematically reviews the four main enterprise financial risks that ESG practices alleviate, namely market risk, operational risk, reputation risk, and credit risk. The next four subsections will respectively explain how good ESG performance inhibits each of these financial risks through specific mechanisms, and will be illustrated with theoretical logic, empirical evidence, and typical enterprise cases.

2.1. Market risk reduction

Market risk refers to fluctuations in stock prices caused by macroeconomic changes, investor sentiment, and external public emergencies, and is one of the most common financial risks for listed companies. High-standard ESG practices can stabilize the market value of a company by enhancing the confidence of external stakeholders. Companies with good ESG performance can establish a positive public image, enabling investors to have a more stable expectation of the company during market turmoil. The research [2] demonstrated that during the global market crash caused by the pandemic, the stock price volatility of companies with qualified environmental and social performance was significantly lower than that of companies with poor ESG performance. From a regulatory perspective, companies that comply with environmental emission regulations and industry social norms can avoid the risk of policy tightening and prevent a sudden drop in stock prices due to new industry regulations. Unlike short-term profit operations, ESG construction reflects forward-looking management capabilities, helping to alleviate the panic selling behavior of investors during short-term market fluctuations and fundamentally reducing the uncertainty in the assessment of a company's market value.

2.2. Operational risk control

Enterprise operational risks stem from internal management flaws, improper employee behavior, supply chain disruptions, and workplace safety incidents. These factors directly lead to operational losses and production disruptions. The social and governance dimension of ESG focuses on internal operational standardization and the stability of external supply chains. In terms of internal operations, attention to employee well-being, workplace safety, and fair employment can reduce labor disputes, internal fraud, and employee turnover, thereby improving daily operational efficiency. In terms of external supply chain management, ESG-oriented enterprises will establish long-term trust partnerships with suppliers and local communities, and build a resilient supply chain system. The recent global supply chain disruptions have shown that enterprises with a complete ESG supplier auditing system can quickly adjust procurement channels and ensure production continuity. The stable stakeholder relationships established through ESG practices can eliminate the risks of operational disruptions caused by community conflicts or breakdowns in supplier cooperation, and achieve systematic operational risk management. The full implementation of ESG can also help enterprises enhance their operational resilience in the long term to cope with external shocks [3].

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD35528

2.3. Reputational risk protection

Corporate reputation risk stems from unethical behavior, environmental pollution scandals, and unfair labor treatment. These factors can rapidly erode the intangible brand value and customer trust. True ESG practices can establish a reputation risk management mechanism for enterprises, while one-sided ESG advantages cannot compensate for the reputation losses caused by social and governance deficiencies. The ESG controversy of Tesla is a typical example of this issue. As a leading new energy firm, Tesla has formed prominent environmental-dimensional ESG advantages by accelerating electric vehicle penetration and carbon emission reduction, thereby building a positive green brand reputation. However, the company also faces long-term reputation crises including workplace racial discrimination, anti-union management, and insufficient workplace safety supervision. These social and governance deficiencies triggered widespread public criticism, damaged Tesla's brand reputation, and ultimately led to its removal from the S&P 500 ESG Index in 2022. This case demonstrates that a comprehensive three-dimensional ESG framework can help firms avoid public trust crises, whereas imbalanced ESG performance may generate persistent reputational risks and result in declines in market value, as ESG-related reputation events have been shown to significantly reduce firms' abnormal returns [4].

2.4. Corporate credit risk reduction

Credit risk refers to the risk that an enterprise cannot repay principal and interest as scheduled, which is highly correlated with corporate financing capacity and capital liquidity.This is closely related to the enterprise's financing capacity and capital liquidity. Currently, mainstream banks and financial institutions have incorporated ESG assessment into their credit approval standards. Enterprises with proven good ESG performance are regarded as compliant in operation and having sustainable development capabilities, and are thus considered low-risk borrowers, which enables them to obtain lower loan interest rates, more financing channels, and higher credit lines. Empirical studies have shown that higher ESG quality can reduce enterprise financing constraints and improve the efficiency of external capital acquisition [5]. Sufficient capital liquidity enables enterprises to withstand cyclical capital pressure, reduce default probability and mitigate overall credit risk. On the contrary, enterprises with poor ESG performance face higher financing barriers and risks of capital chain rupture, and in the long term, will increase credit default risks.

3. The limitations and challenges of ESG in reducing risks

This chapter shifts from the advantages of ESG's risk mitigation to its actual limitations. This section explores three core constraints that weaken the risk-management effectiveness of ESG: greenwashing risks arising from fraudulent ESG disclosure, institutional defects caused by the absence of a unified global ESG disclosure system, and short-term financial cost pressure that hinders enterprises' comprehensive ESG transformation.

3.1. Greenwashing risk

Greenwashing is the most significant obstacle to the effectiveness of ESG risk management. Many enterprises selectively disclose favorable environmental, social, and governance achievements while concealing internal violations and non-compliance behaviors, in an attempt to present a false image of being responsible. This misleading disclosure distorts market information, causing investors to

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD35528

underestimate the actual risk level of the enterprises. The study [6] pointed out that greenwashing has become a systemic risk in sustainable finance, interfering with the rational allocation of capital and leading to the loss of effectiveness of risk assessment based on ESG. Misleading ESG information and biased media sentiment will further amplify such risks [7].

The major international ESG rating agencies have adopted differentiated assessment indicators, weight settings, and evaluation models. Studies have confirmed that the same listed company may receive completely different ESG scores on different rating platforms [8]. This chaotic rating system makes it impossible for investors to compare the risk levels of enterprises horizontally, thereby weakening the reference value of ESG ratings in risk management decisions.

3.2. Lack of unified global disclosure framework

Currently, there is no mandatory unified ESG information disclosure standard worldwide. Enterprises have the right to independently choose the disclosure indicators and data measurement methods, resulting in inconsistent disclosure contents. The inconsistent disclosure rules have reduced the comparability and authenticity of ESG data, making it difficult for stakeholders to identify practical and feasible sustainable investment behaviors from the formal and perfunctory disclosures [9].

3.3. Short-term financial cost pressure

A comprehensive ESG upgrade requires continuous investment of funds for environmental transformation, employee governance, and the establishment of an information disclosure system. Although such investments can bring long-term benefits in terms of risk mitigation, they will reduce the short-term profitability of the enterprises. For firms prioritizing quarterly financial performance, heavy ESG spending creates acute short-term operational burdens. Consequently, many enterprises avoid thorough ESG overhauls, which restricts the risk-mitigation efficacy of ESG implementation.

4. Discussion

Drawing on empirical evidence and the Tesla case, this study concludes that ESG cannot serve as a fully reliable, standalone risk management instrument; instead, it acts as a complementary auxiliary tool for corporate risk evaluation [10]. This view is consistent with previous large-scale literature reviews, which point out that ESG's role in risk control has obvious practical limitations [10]. When ESG data is accurate, ratings are uniform, and implementation is comprehensive, ESG can cover market, operational, reputational, and credit risks that traditional financial indicators cannot identify, thereby enhancing the comprehensiveness of early risk warning. However, green marketing, rating differences, and short-term cost deficiencies make a single ESG assessment risky. Taking Tesla as an example, its outstanding environmental performance cannot offset governance and social risks, proving that a single-dimensional ESG performance does not have the value of risk mitigation. Enterprise risk management requires combining ESG non-financial indicators with traditional financial indicators such as profitability and debt ratios to build a dual-dimensional financial and non-financial risk identification system. Only when enterprises abandon superficial ESG construction can ESG play a stable risk control role.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD35528

5. Conclusion

This study reviews the existing literature and industry evidence in the field of sustainable finance, and explores whether ESG (Environment, Society and Governance) can reduce investment risks. The research results show that ESG typically helps reduce financial risks through multiple channels, covering issues such as market fluctuations, operational disruptions, reputation crises, and credit defaults. During periods of market uncertainty, well-performing ESG enterprises often demonstrate greater resilience, higher operational stability, enhanced stakeholder trust, stronger reputation protection capabilities, and more accessible financing channels. Such risk-mitigation merits have been validated by a large body of prior empirical research. These practical advantages indicate that standardized ESG practices can become an important component in the modern enterprise risk management and long-term investment analysis for institutional investors and individual investors.

However, the findings also confirm that ESG cannot act as a flawless remedy for all types of investment risks. The proliferation of green marketing behaviors by enterprises, the lack of unified assessment standards by mainstream ESG rating agencies, the absence of standardized disclosure frameworks globally, and the inevitable short-term capital costs of sustainable development initiatives all pose significant challenges to the effectiveness and credibility of ESG investments. The case of Tesla further demonstrates that merely having excellent environmental performance does not necessarily mean a reduction in overall investment risks, as vulnerabilities in social and governance aspects may trigger hidden risks. Accordingly, investors need to conduct comprehensive assessments of enterprises' three-dimensional ESG performance rather than only concentrating on one single dimension.

Future research can focus on establishing unified cross-industry reporting standards, optimizing unified rating methods, and exploring the heterogeneity correlations between ESG and financial risks in different industry and institutional environments. With the continuous development of sustainable finance, ESG will continue to be an indispensable consideration for investors seeking stable financial performance and long-term resilience of enterprises.

References

[1] Gao, C., & Zhang, S. (2024). ESG performance and corporate financialization: A dual perspective of risk management and value creation. *Finance Research Letters*. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1544612324014715

[2] Albuquerque, R., Koskinen, Y., Yang, S., & Zhang, C. (2020). Resiliency of environmental and social stocks: An analysis of the exogenous COVID-19 market crash. *The Review of Corporate Finance Studies, 9*(3), 593–621. https://academic.oup.com/rcfs/article/9/3/593/5868419?login=false

[3] Kang, A. S., & Hew, S. L. (2025). Sustainable ESG practices and smart manufacturing adoption readiness for SME operational agility: The conditional mediating role of financial access. *Sustainable Futures, 10*, 101081. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666188825006458

[4] Nicolas, M. L. D., Desroziers, A., Caccioli, F., & Aste, T. (2023). ESG reputation risk matters: An event study based on social media data. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.11571

[5] Hao, Y., & Wu, W. (2024). Environment, social, and governance performance and corporate financing constraints. *Finance Research Letters, 62*, 105083. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1544612324001132?via%3Dihub

[6] Gehrig, N., & Moreno, A. (2023). An exploration of greenwashing risks in investment fund disclosures: An investor perspective. *CFA Institute Research Foundation*. https://rpc.cfainstitute.org/research/reports/2023/greenwashing-risks-in-investment-fund-disclosures?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[7] Tan, W., Liu, Y., & Teng, M. (2025). When ESG news talks: How media sentiment shapes corporate financial behavior in China. *Global Finance Journal*. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1044028325000882

[8] Bikmetova, N., & Pirinsky, C. A. (2025). Do ESG rating agencies improve ESG performance? *Journal of Business Ethics, 204*, 335–365. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-025-06063-0

[9] Christensen, H. B., Hail, L., & Leuz, C. (2021). Mandatory CSR and sustainability reporting: Economic analysis and literature review. *Review of Accounting Studies, 26*(3), 1176–1248. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11142-021-09609-5

[10] Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 5*(4), 210–233. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917#d1e141