9-24-2025

Effective Strategies for the Implementation of Environmental Social and Governance Initiatives to Improve Brand Value

Charity Ndisengei
Walden University

Walden University

College of Management and Human Potential

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Charity Ndisengei

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Ronald Black, Committee Chairperson, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Douglas Gilbert, Committee Member, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2025

Abstract

Effective Strategies for the Implementation of Environmental Social and Governance

Initiatives to Improve Brand Value

by

Charity Ndisengei

MBA, University of Stellenbosch, 2015

Grad. Dip. Mktg., Institute of Marketing Management, 2009

Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

August 2025

Abstract

Some business leaders lack effective strategies to develop and implement their organization's environmental, social, and governance (ESG) initiatives to improve the value of the organization's brand. Business leaders, in particular, are concerned with balancing the improvement of brand value while addressing stakeholder expectations and navigating regulatory complexities. Grounded in institutional and legitimacy theories, the purpose of this qualitative pragmatic inquiry was to explore effective strategies for the implementation of ESG initiatives to improve brand value. Participants included five senior leaders from the energy, nonprofit, technology, and consulting sectors who had implemented ESG initiatives. Data were collected through semistructured interviews and publicly available documentation. Through thematic analysis, five themes were identified: (a) ESG strategy integration, (b) authenticity and value creation, (c) challenges in ESG implementation, (d) stakeholder influence and engagement, and (e) regulatory and market pressures. A key recommendation is for business leaders to embed ESG initiatives in core business strategy, driven by leadership and transparency. The implications for positive social change include the potential for organizational leaders to enhance transparency and accountability in corporate and community efforts thereby fostering more ethical and sustainable corporate-community relationships.

Effective Strategies for the Implementation of Environmental Social and Governance Initiatives to Improve Brand Value

by

Charity Ndisengei

MBA, University of Stellenbosch, 2015

Grad. Dip. Mktg., Institute of Marketing Management, 2009

Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

August 2025

Dedication

To Michael, my partner in all things—thank you for being the constant when everything else shifted. You carried our family with grace and strength, and this degree is as much yours as it is mine.

To Micaela and Chlöe—your love, patience, and hugs were the best motivation. I hope you've seen what determination looks like and that you always chase your dreams with boldness and joy.

To my mother and siblings—thank you for your unwavering support and belief in me, even from afar.

And to my father and forefathers, whose sacrifices made it possible for me to dream—I walk through doors you never had the chance to enter. I am proud to carry your name forward.

Acknowledgments

I would like to begin by expressing my deepest gratitude to my committee chair, Dr. Black, whose expertise, unwavering support, and steady encouragement were instrumental throughout this doctoral journey. His thoughtful insights, patience, and rigorous guidance consistently elevated the quality of my work and kept me focused during moments of uncertainty.

I am also sincerely grateful to my committee members for their valuable feedback and dedication to scholarly excellence. Their critical perspectives helped shape this research and challenged me to think more deeply and refine my analysis.

To the business leaders and professionals who generously shared their time and insights during the data collection, thank you. Your contributions not only enriched this study but also affirmed the relevance and urgency of ESG implementation in today's corporate environment.

A heartfelt thank you goes to my colleagues, mentors, and friends whose encouragement and shared wisdom sustained me through each phase of the program. Your check-ins, pep talks, and solidarity made the difference.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Section 1: Foundation of the Project

Growing stakeholder, regulatory, and market pressures have elevated environmental, social, and governance (ESG) initiatives from voluntary programs to strategic imperatives. The purpose of this qualitative multiple case study was to explore effective strategies used by business leaders to implement ESG initiatives that enhance brand value. Grounded in a conceptual framework based on institutional theory and legitimacy theory, this study also incorporated supporting theoretical perspectives—including stakeholder theory, the resource-based view (RBV), and signaling theory—to enrich the analysis and provide a multidimensional understanding of ESG strategy implementation. The study included semistructured interviews with 10 senior executives across diverse U.S. industries. Thematic analysis, guided by a pragmatic approach, yielded five key themes: (a) ESG strategy integration, (b) authenticity and value creation, (c) challenges in ESG implementation, (d) stakeholder influence and engagement, and (e) regulatory and market pressures.

Findings indicated that embedding ESG into core operations enhanced brand trust, stakeholder alignment, and long-term differentiation. Authenticity was critical, as stakeholders reacted negatively to greenwashing, highlighting the need for verifiable ESG commitments. Barriers such as regulatory complexity, inconsistent metrics, and internal resistance were identified and mitigated through stakeholder engagement and transparent signaling. The findings support the conceptual proposition that ESG serves both as a legitimacy mechanism and a strategic asset. The study recommends that leaders implement integrated ESG frameworks aligned with brand values and supported by cross-functional governance, third-party verification, and ongoing stakeholder engagement. The implications for positive social change include advancing transparent, ethical, and sustainable business practices that benefit society, the environment, and future generations.

Background of the Problem

Although corporate responsibility significantly impacted consumer trust and brand loyalty, business leaders struggled to effectively integrate and communicate ESG initiatives. This study investigated the strategic development and implementation of ESG initiatives within the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector using a qualitative pragmatic inquiry approach. A pragmatic approach to examining ESG strategies provided a framework for exploring the complex interplay between these initiatives and brand value enhancement, addressing the subjective experiences and perspectives of business leaders in a real-world setting. Today's business environment is increasingly influenced by ESG initiatives as critical components of corporate strategy. These initiatives reflect a company's commitment to operating in an environmentally sustainable and socially responsible manner while maintaining effective governance practices.

The effective integration of ESG factors has become a significant determinant of brand value and market differentiation (Bhaskaran et al., 2020). In most industries, firms are pressured to improve their ESG performance not only by environmental mandates but also by consumer expectations and competitive dynamics. Despite the acknowledged importance, many organizations struggle to develop and implement ESG strategies that resonate authentically and positively with their target markets (Grubor & Milovanov, 2017).

Business Problem Focus and Project Purpose

The specific business problem was that some business leaders lacked effective strategies to develop and implement their organization's ESG initiatives to improve the value of the organization's brand. The purpose of this qualitative pragmatic inquiry was to explore effective strategies that business leaders use to develop and implement ESG initiatives that enhance the value of their brand. The population group for this project was business leaders in mid to large-size organizations actively involved in ESG initiatives in the United States. The sampling method was purposive, which allowed the selection of participants with knowledge and experience relevant to the study. The target sample included five business leaders who implemented ESG initiatives. To collect the data, I conducted semistructured interviews. The conceptual framework for this study was based on institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995) and legitimacy theory (Suchman, 1995), which provided a lens for understanding how organizations implement ESG strategies to conform to societal expectations and maintain legitimacy.

Research Question

What strategies do business leaders use to develop and implement ESG initiatives that enhance their brand's perceived value?

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

Assumptions are statements that are taken to be true without proof. They are fundamental premises on which the research is based but cannot be directly verified (Simon & Goes, 2013). In the current study, the following assumptions were made:

Knowledge of Business Leaders

I assumed that business leaders were knowledgeable about ESG issues pertinent to their industries, enabling them to implement effective strategies that aligned with these initiatives. This assumption was supported by the increasing trend of businesses incorporating ESG criteria into their strategic planning (Eccles et al., 2012).

Consumer Value of ESG Initiatives

I assumed that consumers value ESG initiatives, which influence their brand loyalty and purchasing decisions. This assumption was based on existing literature that suggested a growing consumer preference for brands that demonstrate strong ESG commitments (Nielsen, 2015).

Knowledge of Business Leaders

I assumed that business leaders were knowledgeable about ESG issues pertinent to their industries, enabling them to implement effective strategies that aligned with these initiatives. This assumption was supported by the increasing trend of businesses incorporating ESG criteria into their strategic planning (Eccles et al., 2012).

Limitations

Limitations are potential weaknesses or constraints in the research that are not within the control of the researcher (Creswell, 2014). The following limitations were identified in the current study:

Geographic Limitation

The research was geographically confined to the Houston market, potentially limiting the transferability of the findings to other regions. This limitation meant that the results may not be applicable to businesses operating in different geographic or cultural contexts.

Media Influence

Perceptions of ESG may be shaped by current media narratives, which are dynamic and can change over time. This limitation could affect the long-term relevance and sustainability of the findings because shifts in media coverage and public discourse might influence consumer attitudes toward ESG initiatives.

Transition

In Section 1, I provided the background for the problem; addressed the business problem focus, project purpose, and research question; and discussed assumptions and limitations. In Section 2, I review professional and academic literature. Section 3 includes a discussion of the project ethics, the nature of the project, data collection and analysis activities, and reliability and validity. In Section 4, I discuss the findings and the implications for business practice, social change, and further research.

Section 2: The Literature Review

A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature

A thorough review of professional and academic literature involving critical analysis and synthesis was fundamental to this study. Engaging with existing scholarship was essential for situating the research within the broader field context and establishing a robust conceptual framework. This critical analysis supports the evaluation of the credibility and validity of the findings (see Dodgson, 2021).

This literature review explored the established and emerging elements within the existing literature on ESG initiatives and their impact on brand value. The review highlights the strengths, weaknesses, contradictions, and controversies in current theories and postulates (see Dodgson, 2021). The conceptual framework for this study was anchored in institutional theory and legitimacy theory. Institutional theory, proposed by DiMaggio and Powell (1983), suggests that organizations conform to societal norms and practices to gain legitimacy within their institutional environments. Legitimacy theory, as articulated by Suchman (1995), posits that organizations undertake actions conforming to societal values to maintain legitimacy.

Institutional theory and legitimacy theory provided a lens to understand how business leaders develop and implement ESG strategies that enhance brand value. By aligning with societal norms and values, organizations can achieve perceived legitimacy, which is crucial for building a value-enhancing corporate brand (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Suchman, 1995). This theoretical framework was critical for understanding the strategic maneuvers organizations can undertake to sustain legitimacy and enhance brand value through responsible ESG practices (see Suchman, 1995).

A key aspect of the literature review was to systematically address the conceptual framework, including a critical analysis of supporting theories. This analysis included the theoretical underpinnings of institutional theory and legitimacy theory, addressing how these frameworks had been applied in previous research to understand the role of ESG initiatives in enhancing brand value. The review synthesizes scholarship on themes related to the study's purpose, which was to explore effective strategies that business leaders use to develop and implement ESG initiatives to improve brand value.

Application to the Applied Business Problem

Conceptual Framework

The increasing emphasis on ESG initiatives in corporate strategy has transformed business practices, moving sustainability from a peripheral concern to a core business function (Eccles et al., 2012). As companies manage investor expectations, regulatory mandates, and shifting consumer preferences, the adoption of ESG strategies is no longer optional but a strategic imperative (Eccles et al., 2012). Recent studies reinforced this shift, showing that firms with integrated ESG programs demonstrate superior long-term value creation, improved risk mitigation, and enhanced stakeholder trust (Chai et al., 2023; Whelan et al., 2021).

This study was grounded in a conceptual framework based on institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995) and legitimacy theory (Suchman, 1995), which provided a lens for understanding how organizations adopt ESG initiatives to conform to institutional expectations and gain societal legitimacy. To support and enrich the interpretation of findings, I used several complementary conceptual models to examine mechanisms through which ESG initiatives contribute to brand value, stakeholder engagement, and long-term performance. These conceptual models included stakeholder theory, the RBV, signaling theory, and institutional entrepreneurship theory. Each offered a distinct perspective on how ESG strategies function within organizations and their broader environments. Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) posits ESG as a stakeholder-driven imperative. This perspective emphasizes that companies are accountable not only to shareholders but also to a broad array of stakeholders, including customers, employees, suppliers, and communities. Engaging in ESG practices can strengthen relationships with these groups, leading to enhanced brand loyalty and trust.

RBV

RBV posits ESG as a competitive advantage. By integrating ESG initiatives, companies can develop unique resources and capabilities that are valuable, rare, and difficult to imitate, thereby achieving a sustainable competitive advantage.

Signaling Theory

Signaling theory posits ESG as a market signal of corporate responsibility. Adopting ESG practices can serve as a positive signal to the market about a company's commitment to ethical behavior and long-term sustainability, thereby enhancing its reputation and brand image.

Triple Bottom Line

The triple bottom line (TBL) posits ESG's contribution to people, planet, and profit. This framework underscores the importance of balancing social, environmental, and economic responsibilities. Companies that excel in ESG performance often experience improved financial outcomes, as well as positive impacts on society and the environment.

Institutional Entrepreneurship Theory

Institutional entrepreneurship theory posits ESG as a driver of industry transformation. This perspective highlights the role of proactive companies in leading industry-wide changes toward sustainability by adopting and promoting ESG standards, thereby setting new norms and practices within their sectors.

This multitheoretical approach enabled a nuanced examination of how organizations developed and implemented ESG strategies by linking theoretical lenses to distinct but interconnected dimensions of organizational value. Institutional theory and legitimacy theory provided the foundational rationale for understanding how organizations respond to external regulatory, normative, and societal pressures—highlighting how ESG initiatives contribute to legitimacy and risk mitigation. Stakeholder theory and signaling theory illuminated how ESG practices serve as strategic mechanisms to engage investors, employees, and customers, thereby enhancing brand perception and stakeholder trust. The RBV explained how firms that internalize ESG principles develop unique, nonsubstitutable capabilities that translate into sustained financial performance. Finally, institutional entrepreneurship theory captured how pioneering firms shape industry norms through ESG leadership, reinforcing strategic differentiation and long-term market positioning. These theoretical perspectives enabled a holistic interpretation of ESG as a legitimacy-enhancing mechanism and a driver of competitive advantage in brand and business performance.

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory suggests that organizations operate within an environment of external pressures that dictate strategic behavior (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). ESG adoption is frequently not discretionary but rather a function of institutional conformance, whereby firms align with evolving regulatory, investor, and societal expectations (Meyer & Rowan, 1977. Recent work reinforced that institutional environments create opportunities and constraints that shape ESG strategy development and reporting practices (Gauthier, 2013).

Institutional Isomorphism in ESG Adoption

Organizations conform to ESG principles through three forms of isomorphism (Scott, 1995):

Coercive Isomorphism

Government regulations (e.g., the European Union Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities, the Securities and Exchange Commission’s climate disclosure rule) force firms to adopt ESG strategies or face penalties. For instance, the European Union’s nonfinancial reporting directive has significantly influenced sustainability disclosure quality and consistency across member states.

Mimetic Isomorphism

Firms copy industry leaders' ESG initiatives to remain competitive and reduce strategic uncertainty. When faced with ambiguity—such as determining what constitutes meaningful ESG disclosure—organizations often emulate the sustainability approaches of high-performing or well-regarded peers.

Normative Isomorphism

Industry standards (e.g., Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)), Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB)) establish best practices that shape ESG decision-making (Eccles et al., 2012). Normative pressures are often driven by professional associations, consultants, and educational institutions that define what is "acceptable" or "leading" ESG performance.

Empirical Evidence: Institutional ESG Pressures

Research shows that firms in highly regulated industries (e.g., finance, energy, manufacturing) are more likely to adopt ESG practices due to regulatory pressures, whereas firms in consumer-facing sectors (e.g., retail, hospitality) integrate ESG due to mimetic and normative forces (Eccles et al., 2012). For example, Yakovleva and Vaz de Carvalho (2023) found that ESG adoption in SMEs was highly influenced by perceived legitimacy within industry networks, reflecting a blend of normative and mimetic dynamics.

Case Study: Volkswagen's Emissions Scandal

Volkswagen's 2015 emissions fraud scandal, where it manipulated environmental compliance data, resulted in $30 billion in fines, a 40% decline in brand trust, and heightened regulatory scrutiny (Ewing, 2017). This case exemplifies the severe reputational and financial consequences that can occur when organizations breach regulatory expectations tied to environmental standards. From an Institutional Theory perspective, Volkswagen's actions represent a failure to conform to coercive pressures - namely, regulatory compliance mandates, resulting in institutional backlash. Simultaneously, the scandal reflects a profound erosion of legitimacy, as described in Legitimacy Theory (Suchman, 1995), in which stakeholders withdrew moral and cognitive support due to perceived deception. The case reinforces the broader argument that ESG compliance is not merely symbolic - it is critical for sustaining both legitimacy and long-term brand equity in the eyes of regulators, consumers, and investors.

Legitimacy Theory

Legitimacy Theory asserts that businesses must conform to societal norms to maintain credibility and trust (Suchman, 1995). ESG initiatives serve as a mechanism to gain and sustain legitimacy, particularly as investors and consumers prioritize sustainability (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975; Michelon et al., 2015). In the context of ESG, legitimacy is not static but contingent upon a firm's ability to meet evolving stakeholder expectations, adapt to external regulatory environments, and authentically embed sustainability into strategic operations (Duque-Grisales & Aguilera-Caracuel, 2021)

Types of ESG Legitimacy

Pragmatic Legitimacy

Pragmatic legitimacy refers to the tangible ESG benefits that firms must demonstrate, such as reduced operational risk and enhanced financial performance, to satisfy stakeholder expectations. For example, Fujikura and Oe (2023) found that pragmatic legitimacy significantly shapes investor perceptions of environmental initiatives, particularly in environmentally sensitive industries.

Moral Legitimacy

Moral legitimacy stems from companies engaging in ESG activities perceived as ethically “the right thing to do,” such as pursuing carbon neutrality or upholding labor rights. Moral legitimacy is evaluated through consequential, procedural, and structural lenses (Bowen, 2017), where stakeholders judge whether actions align with broader societal values beyond short-term self-interest.

Cognitive Legitimacy

As ESG becomes the norm, firms must integrate sustainability into their core identity or risk reputational decline (Michelon et al., 2015). Cognitive legitimacy is achieved when ESG is no longer questioned but assumed to be an inherent part of corporate identity. As Tost (2011) and Suchman (1995) argue, once ESG becomes cognitively embedded, firms must integrate sustainability into their operations or risk reputational erosion. This is especially relevant for hybrid and emerging organizational forms, such as social enterprises, where stakeholders expect a taken-for-granted alignment with ESG norms (Bitektine & Haack, 2015; Q. Li, Tang, & Z. Li, 2024)

Regulatory Drivers of ESG Legitimacy

Institutional environments also shape ESG legitimacy. Policies such as the EU’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the U.S. SEC’s Climate Risk Disclosure rules impose mandatory ESG reporting, shifting legitimacy from voluntary to regulated conformance (Flammer, 2021). These frameworks require companies to substantiate the authenticity of their ESG commitments with measurable evidence, or risk facing regulatory scrutiny and reputational consequences.

Case Study: BlackRock's ESG Influence

BlackRock, the world's largest asset manager, has publicly committed to using ESG metrics in its investment decisions and requires portfolio companies to demonstrate ESG compliance. By leveraging its financial influence, BlackRock pressures firms to strengthen sustainability disclosures or risk divestment. This expectation illustrates how investor pressure functions as a powerful driver of legitimacy in the ESG landscape (Khan et al., 2016).

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory posits that businesses must serve a broad range of stakeholders, not just shareholders (Freeman, 1984). As ESG considerations become more central to corporate strategy, the role of stakeholders in influencing business decisions has expanded significantly (Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2022). ESG initiatives directly affect:

Consumers

72% of millennials prefer sustainable brands (Gómez-Trujillo et al., 2020), indicating that consumer purchasing behavior is increasingly aligned with corporate sustainability values.

Investors

ESG-focused funds outperform traditional portfolios, driving capital reallocation (Eccles et al., 2012). Institutional investors such as BlackRock and Vanguard exert pressure on companies to provide ESG disclosures and pursue responsible business practices (Khan et al., 2016).

Employees

Companies with strong ESG frameworks report higher retention and productivity, attributed to a stronger alignment between employee values and corporate purpose (C.C. Lee et al., 2023).

Recent research extends these insights. Mahajan et al. (2023) emphasize that stakeholder theory is a holistic framework that integrates the economic, social, and moral dimensions of business, offering a robust foundation for ESG implementation. Kivits and Sawang (2021) also highlight that stakeholder engagement enhances strategic alignment and organizational adaptability in sustainability initiatives.

Case Study: Patagonia's Stakeholder-Centric ESG Strategy

Patagonia's Fair Trade-certified supply chain, environmental advocacy, and commitment to circular fashion exemplify stakeholder-centric ESG practices. The company's transparency and activism have solidified its reputation as a sustainability leader, strengthening customer loyalty and employee engagement (Chatterji et al., 2018).

Resource-Based View (RBV)

RBV argues that sustainability can be a competitive advantage if ESG investments create valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources (Barney, 1991).

Environmental Sustainability

Eco-efficient operations reduce costs and improve brand reputation. For instance, Unilever saved €1.2 billion through sustainability-driven cost efficiencies (Whelan et al., 2021).

Social Responsibility

Progressive social policies attract and retain top talent. For example, Salesforce integrates ESG principles into its employer brand by emphasizing equity, sustainability, and purpose-driven culture. This aligns with findings by Glavas (2016), who demonstrated that corporate social responsibility enhances employee engagement by enabling individuals to bring more of their authentic selves to work, fostering deeper organizational commitment and increasing retention. Governance transparency—Enhanced governance mitigates risk and boosts investor confidence. Tesla's board reforms in response to governance scrutiny reflect how transparency strengthens stakeholder trust.

Empirical Support

Meta-analyses show that firms with high ESG scores outperform competitors across financial metrics, risk exposure, and brand perception (Friede, Busch, & Bassen, 2015). Moreover, stakeholder-focused ESG strategies are positively associated with innovation, organizational resilience, and reputational capital (Bridoux & Vishwanathan, 2020).

Signaling Theory

Signaling Theory suggests that firms use ESG disclosures to signal commitment to corporate integrity (Connelly et al., 2011; Spence, 1973. These disclosures serve to bridge information asymmetries between firms and their stakeholders, acting as credible indicators of corporate intent and responsibility (Kharouf et al., 2020).

Investor Signaling

Strong ESG disclosures attract institutional investors by signaling lower risk and long-term viability. For example, Flammer (2013) demonstrated that firms with proactive ESG signaling were more likely to experience increased investor support and favorable market valuations.

Consumer Signaling

Eco-certifications such as B Corp or Fair Trade function as market-recognized signals of sustainable practices, which consumers use to infer corporate ethics and sustainability performance. This, in turn, allows firms to capture loyalty premiums and justify higher pricing (Hawn et al., 2018; Kharouf et al., 2020).

Mitigating Greenwashing

Signaling theory also highlights the risk of sending misleading or unverifiable ESG signals (Moser & Martin, 2012). Greenwashing undermines the credibility of ESG disclosures and can severely damage stakeholder trust. To mitigate this, firms must provide verifiable, consistent, and externally audited ESG information (Cojoianu et al., 2020; D. Zhang, 2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly being used to detect inconsistencies and assess disclosure quality, particularly in ESG ratings, thereby reducing greenwashing behaviors (D. Zhang, 2024).

Triple Bottom Line (TBL) & Institutional Entrepreneurship

TBL, introduced by Elkington (1997), extends the purpose of ESG beyond economic performance to also include social and environmental considerations—People, Planet, and Profit. This holistic perspective emphasizes that sustainability must be embedded into every facet of organizational decision-making. Recent research supports the need to evaluate ESG outcomes using TBL-aligned metrics to measure social impact and environmental resilience, not just financial returns (Satar, 2022).

Institutional Entrepreneurship Theory (Battilana et al., 2009) explains how firms act as change agents that reshape institutional norms through ESG innovation. Companies like Tesla exemplify this through their redefinition of industry standards around emissions, vehicle design, and renewable energy adoption. By breaking from traditional industry models, such firms create new institutional logics that others emulate.

ESG Implementation and Industry-Specific Comparisons

Recent studies emphasize that ESG effectiveness varies significantly across industries due to differing stakeholder expectations and regulatory pressures—key constructs within Institutional and Legitimacy Theory. Ioannou and Serafeim (2019) found that financial and technology companies lead in ESG reporting transparency, in part due to investor-driven normative and mimetic pressures. In contrast, energy and manufacturing firms face stronger coercive pressures linked to environmental regulations.

Bhaskaran et al. (2020) highlighted that firms in the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector often adopt ESG practices to strengthen brand trust and consumer loyalty, aligning with stakeholder legitimacy motives. In contrast, industrial firms tend to pursue ESG primarily for compliance purposes, reflecting more institutional isomorphism than value-driven integration. These sectoral distinctions are critical to understanding the variability in ESG's impact on brand value, and they reinforce the importance of contextualizing ESG strategies within specific institutional environments.

For example, Flammer (2021) analyzed ESG adoption trends across financial services, retail, healthcare, and energy, revealing that investor pressure disproportionately influences financial firms, while consumer expectations drive ESG in retail and FMCG sectors. Bae et al. (2023) further argue that the technology sector's focus on supply chain ethics and responsible AI governance is an emerging ESG priority.

Global Perspectives: ESG in the United States, Europe, and Emerging Markets

The adoption and regulation of ESG initiatives vary widely across global markets. Hsu, Liang, and Matos (2021) compared ESG reporting mandates in the U.S. and the EU, concluding that European firms face stricter regulatory requirements, leading to more structured ESG frameworks. In contrast, U.S. firms often adopt ESG voluntarily, with investor activism serving as the primary driver of ESG commitment (Flammer, 2021).

In emerging markets, Nguyen et al. (2021) found that government incentives and social impact investments play a greater role in driving ESG adoption compared to regulatory compliance. Wu, Pownall, Shih, and C. Zhang (2025) further highlight that

Chinese companies integrate ESG differently, prioritizing social governance and state-driven sustainability programs rather than purely market-driven ESG frameworks.

Criticism and Contrasting Views on ESG Effectiveness

While ESG initiatives are widely promoted, some scholars argue that their effectiveness remains inconsistent across industries and regions. Cornell and Damodaran (2020) criticize ESG for being poorly standardized, making it difficult to compare corporate sustainability efforts. Similarly, Eccles and Stroehle (2018) argue that ESG rating discrepancies among different agencies create confusion, undermining ESG credibility.

Other critiques include the potential for "greenwashing", where companies exaggerate ESG efforts without substantial impact (Grubor & Milovanov, 2017). Harjoto and Salas (2017) found that some firms treat ESG initiatives purely as a branding exercise, failing to integrate sustainability into their core business operations.

Despite these challenges, recent studies emphasize that well-executed ESG strategies still correlate with long-term brand resilience and market success (Eccles et al., 2012). Ailawadi et al. (2013) demonstrate that consumer trust significantly improves when companies provide third-party ESG verification, mitigating greenwashing risks.

Empirical Support From Recent Studies

Several recent studies support the relevance and applicability of this integrated framework in understanding and enhancing brand value through ESG initiatives. Ailawadi et al. (2013) investigated the impact of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on consumer loyalty. They found that CSR influences consumer behavior, proposing that

CSR initiatives aligned with consumer expectations can enhance brand value. This study emphasizes the importance of integrating consumer expectations into ESG strategies to foster loyalty and brand value.

Bhaskaran et al. (2020) analyzed the impact of ESG initiatives on the performance of global organizations. They found that high ESG engagement correlates with better performance, highlighting the positive effect of internal stakeholder welfare and corporate governance practices on firm valuation. This study provides empirical evidence supporting the market-based benefits of comprehensive ESG strategies.

Ceciliano et al., (2021) utilized a structural equation modeling framework to assess how CSR influences brand equity. Their findings reveal a positive relationship between CSR activities and brand equity, mediated by consumer trust and moderated by brand familiarity. This study highlights the indirect effects of CSR on brand value, emphasizing the role of trust and familiarity in enhancing brand equity.

Harjoto and Salas (2017) investigated the influence of CSR on brand value and reputation. They found that proactive stakeholder engagement through CSR strengths builds goodwill, enhancing brand value. Conversely, CSR concerns indicate a reactive stance that potentially diminishes goodwill. This study underscores the importance of proactive CSR strategies in enhancing brand value.

Nguyen et al. (2021) explored the influence of ESG initiatives on the financial performance of S&P 500 non-financial firms. They found that robust ESG practices are linked to enhanced financial performance, validating the stakeholder-focus theory. This study provides additional empirical evidence for ESG’s impact on financial performance, pertinent to understanding how ESG initiatives can enhance brand value and stakeholder engagement.

By integrating Institutional Theory and Legitimacy Theory, this study provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how organizations develop and implement ESG initiatives to enhance brand value. The empirical evidence from the studies reviewed in this section support the strategic implications of adopting ESG strategies that align with societal expectations and enhance legitimacy.

Business leaders can improve their brand's perceived value, market differentiation, customer loyalty, and long-term revenue growth by effectively implementing and communicating ESG initiatives. This integrated approach underscores the importance of not only adopting ESG practices but also ensuring their alignment with institutional norms and stakeholder expectations to build legitimacy and enhance brand value.

This expanded literature review provides a comprehensive, industry-specific, and global analysis of ESG strategies. The research incorporates recent 2022–2025 studies, evaluates contrasting views on ESG effectiveness, and highlights regional variations in ESG implementation. Additionally, the review engages with theoretical debates surrounding Institutional and Legitimacy Theory, offering a robust foundation for understanding the role of ESG in brand value enhancement.

The next sections will apply this literature to the study's qualitative findings, drawing connections between theoretical frameworks and real-world ESG implementation strategies.

Transition

In this section, I examined relevant professional and academic literature and explored its relevance to the applied business problem including the interplay of regulatory, competitive, stakeholder, and strategic factors positions ESG as both a necessity and a competitive differentiator in the modern business landscape. Section 3 will cover topics such as project ethics, the nature of the project, data collection and analysis activities, and considerations of reliability and validity. In Section 4, I will present the findings and discuss their implications for business practice, social change, and future research directions.

Section 3: Research Project Methodology

In this section, I outline the research project methodology, detailing the ethical considerations, research design, data collection process, sampling strategy, data analysis techniques, and validity and reliability measures. These components provided a robust framework for understanding the effective strategies business leaders used to implement ESG initiatives to enhance brand value.

Project Ethics

As the primary researcher for this qualitative pragmatic inquiry, I remained committed to upholding the highest ethical standards to ensure the integrity and credibility of my study while protecting the rights and well-being of all participants. In my role as the primary data collection instrument, I maintained a position of neutrality and objectivity throughout the study to minimize bias and ensure the authenticity of the findings (see Creswell & Poth, 2018). This involved being transparent about potential conflicts of interest and maintaining a professional distance from participants to prevent any undue influence on responses.

I ensured that informed consent was obtained from all participants. Each participant received a detailed consent form outlining the purpose of the study, procedures involved, potential risks and benefits, and the voluntary nature of participation (see Patton, 2015). Participants had the opportunity to ask questions and could withdraw at any point without negative consequences. To maintain confidentiality, personal identifiers were removed from the data, and pseudonyms were assigned (see Creswell & Poth, 2018). I securely stored digital data using encrypted cloud storage and physical data in a locked cabinet, accessible only to me. This study adhered to the ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report, which emphasized respect for persons (ensuring informed consent and autonomy), beneficence (minimizing risk and maximizing benefit), and justice (ensuring fair and unbiased treatment; National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 1979). I complied with institutional review board requirements as I conducted this study. My institutional review board approval number was 11-12-24-1165087.

To enhance transparency, I provided participants with periodic updates, shared preliminary findings, and obtained feedback to ensure accuracy and relevance. To further ensure participant confidentiality, I will retain all research data securely for 5 years, after which they will be permanently destroyed following research guidelines (see Yin, 2018). By adhering to these ethical principles, I aimed to contribute valuable insights while protecting the rights, dignity, and privacy of all participants throughout this research.

Nature of the Project

I employed a qualitative method because an in-depth, interpretive approach was necessary to capture rich, contextualized narratives from senior executives who had implemented ESG initiatives. Qualitative inquiry is appropriate when the goal is to understand complex organizational phenomena from participants' perspectives rather than to quantify predefined variables (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Within qualitative inquiry, a pragmatic inquiry design was selected. Pragmatism prioritizes actionable knowledge and methodological flexibility—characteristics that aligned with the current study's aim of generating findings leaders can apply to ESG strategy implementation (see Kaushik &

Walsh, 2019). The design allowed the integration of semistructured interviews, document review, and iterative analysis, ensuring that results remained anchored in real-world practice.

Population, Sampling, and Participants

The target population for this study included business professionals with relevant experience in the research topic. I used purposive sampling to select five participants who could provide rich, relevant, and diverse perspectives. This sampling method is appropriate for qualitative research because it ensures that participants have specific characteristics crucial for addressing the research questions (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The sample size of five individuals was sufficient because it was determined based on the principle of data saturation, which occurs when no new information or themes are observed in the data (Guest et al., 2006).

The participants were selected from a list of former clients and business acquaintances with whom I had worked in my current role. To gain access to participants, I leveraged my professional networks. Establishing a working relationship with participants involved clearly communicating about the study’s purpose, ensuring confidentiality, and obtaining informed consent.

Data Collection Activities

Data collection for this study included semistructured interviews selected for their balance between flexibility and structure. Semistructured interviews are advantageous in qualitative research because they allow participants to express their thoughts freely while ensuring that key topics are comprehensively covered (Kallio et al., 2016). This method facilitated a deeper understanding of the participants' experiences and insights, which was crucial for the objectives of the current study.

The first step in the data collection process was the preparation of the interview protocol (see Appendix B). This involved developing a detailed interview guide to ensure consistency and comprehensiveness across all interviews. The protocol included a list of open-ended questions designed to elicit detailed responses from participants, as well as prompts to explore specific areas of interest further. The preparation of a robust interview protocol is essential for maintaining the reliability and validity of the data collected (Kallio et al., 2016).

Interviews were conducted remotely (via phone or video conferencing) or in person, depending on the participants' preferences and availability. The flexibility in the mode of conducting interviews was important to accommodate participants' schedules and locations, thereby enhancing participation rates and the quality of data collected (see Lo Iacono et al., 2016). Remote interviews offered the advantage of reaching participants who may have been geographically dispersed, while in-person interviews facilitated a more personal interaction.

During the interviews, I ensured that all conversations were recorded with the participants' consent. Recording the interviews was crucial for capturing the exact words and nuances expressed by the participants, which was important for accurate data analysis. Following the interviews, I transcribed the recordings verbatim. Verbatim transcription is essential for preserving the integrity of the data and ensuring that the analysis reflects the participants' true perspectives (Halcomb & Davidson, 2006). The use of semistructured interviews provided a rich and detailed data set that was essential for the qualitative analysis in this study.

Interview Questions

The interview questions were designed to elicit detailed and meaningful responses from participants, focusing on their experiences, perceptions, and insights related to the research topic. The questions were open-ended to allow for in-depth exploration of the subject matter:

1. In your experience, what are some common approaches that organizations take in implementing ESG initiatives?
2. What are the typical motivations or drivers behind the development of ESG strategies in the organizations you’ve worked with or observed?
3. How have you seen ESG initiatives impact the expectations or inquiries of customers, investors, or other stakeholders across different organizations?
4. Based on your knowledge, how do organizations typically measure the value of their brand, and what role do ESG initiatives play in that assessment?
5. In your experience, what changes have you observed in how organizations assess their brand value after implementing ESG projects?
6. From your perspective, what challenges do business leaders commonly face when integrating ESG initiatives into their organizational strategies?
7. How do you believe future trends in ESG might shape the way organizations approach brand management and stakeholder engagement?

8. In your opinion, how do ESG initiatives generally influence customer perceptions of an organization's brand?
9. How do internal stakeholders, such as employees and leadership teams, typically perceive the value or impact of ESG initiatives?
10. Is there any advice you would give to leaders about embarking on an ESG implementation journey?

Data Organization and Analysis Techniques

To ensure the integrity and accuracy of the data collected, I employed a systematic approach to data organization. All interview recordings were transcribed verbatim to capture the participants' exact words and nuances. These transcriptions were stored in a secure, password-protected digital format to maintain confidentiality and prevent unauthorized access. Additionally, I used a coding system to label and categorize the data, which facilitated easier retrieval and analysis (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Each interview transcript was assigned a unique identifier to maintain anonymity while allowing for easy reference. I maintained a reflective journal throughout the data collection process to document my thoughts, observations, and any potential biases that arose. This reflective practice ensured that I remained aware of my influence on the data and maintained a high level of reflexivity.

The data analysis process followed a thematic analysis approach, which was well-suited for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within qualitative data. Thematic analysis allowed for a flexible yet rigorous examination of the data, making it appropriate for this study's objectives (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

The first step in the analysis involved immersing myself in the data by reading and rereading the interview transcripts and listening to the recordings multiple times. This process helped me become deeply familiar with the content and I began identifying potential patterns and themes (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

I systematically coded the data by highlighting significant phrases and assigning labels to relevant segments of text. This coding process was guided by the research questions and the theoretical framework of the study. I used qualitative data analysis software, such as NVivo, to assist with the organization and management of codes (Castleberry & Nolen, 2018).

After coding the entire dataset, I collated the codes into potential themes. Themes with broader patterns of meaning derived from the codes provided a coherent narrative that addressed the research questions. This step involved sorting and organizing the codes into meaningful groups (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

I reviewed and refined the themes to ensure they accurately represented the data. This process involved checking the themes against the coded data extracts and the entire dataset to confirm that they captured the significant aspects of the data. I made the necessary modifications to ensure that the themes were coherent and distinct (Nowell et al., 2017).

Once the themes had been reviewed and refined, I defined and named them. This step involved writing detailed descriptions of each theme, explaining what they represented and how they related to the research questions. Clear and concise theme definitions enhanced the clarity and interpretability of the findings (Braun & Clarke, 2019).

The final step in the analysis involved writing a detailed report that presented the themes and illustrated them with data extracts. This research study provided a comprehensive account of the findings, linking them back to the research questions and the relevant literature. The research study is structured to highlight the most significant themes and provide insights into the research topic (Castleberry & Nolen, 2018).

By following these systematic data organization and analysis techniques, a rigorous and credible analysis that offers valuable insights into the research topic was produced.

Reliability and Validity

Ensuring the reliability and validity of qualitative research was crucial for establishing the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings. Reliability referred to the consistency and dependability of the research outcomes, while validity pertained to the accuracy and truthfulness of the data interpretation. In qualitative research, these concepts were addressed through various strategies aimed at enhancing the study's rigor. Techniques such as member checking, maintaining an audit trail, triangulation, prolonged engagement, rich descriptions, and reflexivity were employed to address potential biases and ensure that the findings were well substantiated (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). By implementing these strategies, I produced reliable and valid results that provided a robust understanding of the research topic (Coleman, 2021; Singh et al., 2024).

Reliability

In qualitative research, reliability referred to the consistency and dependability of the research findings (Creswell & Poth, 2018). To ensure the reliability of this study, I implemented several strategies. I used member checking to validate the findings with the participants. After analyzing the data, I shared the preliminary results with the participants to confirm that the interpretations accurately reflected their experiences and perspectives. This process ensured that the findings were credible and reliable (Birt et al., 2016).

I maintained a detailed audit trail throughout the research process. This trail included documentation of all research activities, decisions, and changes made during the study. By keeping a thorough record, I provided transparency and allowed others to understand and replicate the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I employed data triangulation by using multiple data sources and methods to corroborate the findings. Triangulation enhanced the reliability of the study by providing a more comprehensive understanding of the research topic (Carter et al., 2014).

Validity

Validity in qualitative research referred to the accuracy and truthfulness of the findings (Creswell & Poth, 2018). To ensure the validity of this study, I used several strategies. To enhance credibility, I relied on prolonged engagement and persistent observation. Prolonged engagement involved spending sufficient time with the participants to build trust and gain a deep understanding of their experiences, while persistent observation involved focusing on the relevant aspects of the study to identify significant patterns and themes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These measures ensured the reliability and validity of the study, thereby enhancing the credibility and trustworthiness of the research findings.

To address transferability, rich, thick descriptions of the research context, participants, and findings were provided. Detailed descriptions allowed readers to determine the extent to which the findings could be transferred to other contexts (Morse, 2015). Dependability was ensured by conducting an external audit. I asked a peer researcher to review the research process and findings to ensure that they were logical, traceable, and well documented (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Confirmability was achieved through reflexivity and maintaining an audit trail. Reflexivity involved being aware of and addressing any potential biases and preconceptions that could have influenced the research process. By keeping an audit trail, I provided evidence that the findings were shaped by the participants' experiences and not by researcher bias (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Transition and Summary

This study laid the groundwork for exploring how environmental, social, and governance (ESG) initiatives were developed and implemented within the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector. Using a qualitative pragmatic inquiry approach, the research uncovered the strategies business leaders employed to enhance brand value while aligning with societal norms and expectations. The integration of Institutional Theory and Legitimacy Theory served as a robust framework for understanding both the external pressures and the internal motivations that shaped ESG practices. Section 4 presents the findings of the thematic analysis, interprets those findings through the lenses of Institutional and Legitimacy Theory, and discusses their implications for business practice, social change, and future research before concluding the study.

Section 4: Findings and Conclusions

The central research question guiding this study was the following: What strategies do business leaders use to develop and implement ESG initiatives that enhance their brand's perceived value? This question addressed the practical and strategic approaches that business leaders take to align their organizations with ESG principles, not only as a means of compliance but as a mechanism of fostering long-term brand growth, stakeholder engagement, and market differentiation. Given the increasing global emphasis on sustainability, responsible business practices, and corporate transparency, this study sought to uncover the intricate processes through which organizations successfully embed ESG into their operational and strategic frameworks.

Emerging Themes and Analysis

Thematic analysis of participant interviews and supporting documentation revealed five key themes regarding the implementation of ESG initiatives. These themes emerged as the most significant factors influencing how business leaders navigate the complexities of ESG integration while balancing stakeholder expectations, regulatory requirements, and market competitiveness:

- ESG strategy integration
- authenticity and value creation
- challenges in ESG implementation
- stakeholder influence and engagement
- regulatory and market pressures

These themes reflected the strategic, operational, and financial complexities of ESG adoption, offering insights into how organizations navigate ESG pressures to build brand equity, investor confidence, and competitive advantage. Table 1 provides the key ESG themes and representative quotes.

Table 1

Key ESG Themes and Representative Quotes

Theme	Representative quote	Literature support
ESG strategy integration	"Companies that integrate ESG at the core perform better in the long run."	DiMaggio and Powell (1983); Bhaskaran et al. (2020)
Authenticity and value creation	"ESG must be embedded, not just a PR exercise."	Suchman (1995); Eccles et al. (2012)
Challenges in ESG implementation	"Regulatory complexity is one of the biggest challenges in ESG execution."	Harjoto and Salas (2017)
Stakeholder influence and engagement	"Investor pressure has made ESG a business priority."	Freeman (1984); Nguyen et al. (2021)
Regulatory and market pressures	"Companies operating internationally must meet different ESG expectations, creating compliance burdens."	Scott (1995); Flammer (2021)

These themes are described in-depth, with comprehensive discussion supported by qualitative data, peer-reviewed literature, and theoretical underpinnings.

Theme 1: ESG Strategy Integration

ESG initiatives yielded the highest impact when they were not treated as standalone CSR projects but were instead woven into the fundamental strategic and operational fabric of the organization. Participants described how companies that successfully integrated ESG considerations into supply chain management, product development, corporate governance, and employee engagement also emphasized the use of formal frameworks and ESG indicators to monitor value creation. Although participants did not cite specific statistical outputs, they discussed internal value-creation models and reporting mechanisms—such as ESG performance frameworks and alignment with the European Union taxonomy and the United Nations sustainable development goals—as tools for evaluating environmental and social outcomes. P1 (energy sector executive) noted "we measure ESG value across financial, environmental, and social development impact. If a program doesn't create measurable value, we don't implement it." P2 (sustainability executive, nonprofit sector) reported "you don't want sustainability sitting in a silo. It needs to be part of who you are as a business. A lot of companies are already doing ESG-related work but aren't labeling it as such."

Alignment to the Conceptual Framework

This theme supported institutional theory, particularly DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) notion of coercive and normative isomorphism, where firms internalize ESG due to regulatory mandates and evolving stakeholder expectations. Participants cited pressure from regulatory bodies and market norms to adopt ESG practices holistically, reflecting the institutionalization of sustainability as a strategic imperative (see Scott, 1995). At the same time, the theme aligned with the RBV (Barney, 1991), suggesting that firms viewed ESG capabilities—such as sustainable supply chains, ethical governance, and employee-aligned cultures—as valuable, rare, inimitable, and nonsubstitutable resources. These

ESG-based competencies fostered long-term differentiation and risk mitigation, enabling firms to build and sustain competitive advantage.

Alignment to the Existing Literature on Effective ESG Business Practice

Current study findings confirm and extend findings from recent studies. Shaikh and Zubair (2024) found that ESG integration enhances firm performance when aligned across strategy, operations, and human capital. Shaikh and Zubair advocated for a systems-level approach to ESG that mirrored current participants' emphasis on embedding sustainability into core processes. Similarly, Nawaz and Koç (2023) argued that strategic ESG integration mitigates risk exposure and fostered operational resilience, reinforcing current participants' view that ESG is most effective when institutionalized.

Unilever's sustainability efforts resulted in €1.2 billion in energy cost savings and increased investor confidence (Aguinis & Glavas, 2019). This case illustrated how embedded ESG strategies not only drove efficiency but also enhanced corporate reputation—validating both institutional theory and RBV perspectives on ESG as a source of strategic and legitimacy-based value. By adopting what Shaikh and Zubair (2024) called a "systems-based ESG model," firms such as Unilever not only aligned their ESG strategy with long-term value creation but also ensured internal coherence across departments and leadership functions. This model supported organizational resilience and adaptability, particularly in volatile market and regulatory environments.

Theme 2: Authenticity and Value Creation

Participants underscored that the effectiveness of ESG initiatives was significantly undermined when companies engaged in superficial sustainability claims—a phenomenon widely known as greenwashing. This practice not only damaged a company's credibility but also led to significant reputational and financial repercussions.

Participant Perspectives

P3 (sustainability VP, environmental services company) noted

> there's a growing number of empty sustainability claims from organizations that are either industry-driven or simply trying to profit off demand. Unfortunately, for publicly traded companies, it often becomes about what they need to say to investors rather than having a real ESG strategy.

This concern was echoed by several other participants. For example, P4 emphasized that genuine ESG strategies must be fully embedded into business models to be credible: "When ESG becomes embedded in the business model—like in procurement, in governance, in how we treat people—then it becomes a differentiator. But if it's surface-level, it's obvious to stakeholders." P2 similarly remarked that ESG integration must go beyond messaging: "It's not about just putting it in a sustainability report. It's how you run your business, how you make decisions, how seriously leadership takes it."

Together, these perspectives reinforce that value creation through ESG is contingent on authenticity—where ESG is operationalized across functions rather than used as a performative signal. Superficial claims risk backlash, whereas embedded, transparent practices enhance competitive positioning and stakeholder trust.

Alignment to the Conceptual Framework

This theme is well supported by Legitimacy Theory (Suchman, 1995), particularly in its moral and cognitive dimensions. Greenwashing eroded moral legitimacy, which is derived from stakeholder perceptions of ethical sincerity, and threatened cognitive legitimacy, where stakeholders expected sustainability to be embedded as a taken-for-granted part of corporate identity. Companies that failed to demonstrate authenticity risked being perceived as opportunistic or disingenuous, triggering stakeholder distrust and backlash.

Simultaneously, the findings aligned with Signaling Theory (Connelly et al., 2011; Spence, 1973). ESG disclosures served as strategic signals to reduce information asymmetry between companies and external stakeholders. When firms issued ESG claims that were unsupported by credible evidence—such as third-party certifications or performance data—these signals lost credibility, leading to skepticism and investor withdrawal. Therefore, transparency and verifiability are essential to maintaining the strength of ESG signals.

Legitimacy Theory (Suchman, 1995) posits that organizations must align their actions with societal expectations to maintain legitimacy. However, greenwashing undermines trust and damages credibility (Eccles et al., 2012).

A comprehensive analysis by Whelan, Atz, Van Holt, and Clark (2021) reviewed over 1,000 studies published between 2015 and 2020, exploring the linkage between ESG and financial performance, pointing to a growing consensus that good ESG performance is positively correlated with financial outcomes.

Lin (2023) systematically explored the role of ESG strategies in long-term value creation, finding that authentic ESG implementation optimizes financial performance and brand image while driving technological innovation and business model transformation.

Alignment to the Existing Literature on Effective Business Practice

Recent studies affirmed these concerns. Lin (2023) showed that ESG authenticity—particularly the alignment between claims and operational behavior—was a critical predictor of stakeholder trust and brand loyalty. Firms that overstated their ESG commitments without measurable action suffered reputational penalties. Likewise, D. Zhang (2024) emphasized that greenwashing undermined capital allocation by misleading investors, while AI-based ESG verification tools were increasingly used to detect disclosure discrepancies.

Volkswagen falsely claimed compliance with emissions standards, which led to $30 billion in fines and a 40% decline in brand trust (Ewing, 2017). This case exemplified the long-term reputational damage that arose when ESG claims lacked substance and verification. As Whelan et al. (2021) noted, integrating ESG authentically into corporate strategy was linked to positive financial performance, underscoring the risks of superficial ESG commitments. These findings supported participant concerns about ESG posturing and reinforced the necessity of embedding sustainability in operational strategy rather than marketing narratives alone.

Theme 3: Challenges in ESG Implementation

Despite the growing importance of ESG, implementation faced significant barriers, including regulatory inconsistencies, resource constraints and data standardization issues. These findings affirmed Institutional Theory in highlighting how fragmented regulations and inconsistent metrics—especially across jurisdictions—created uncertainty, a central tenet of institutional complexity (Scott, 1995).

Participant Perspectives

Two participants specifically cited regulatory inconsistency as a major challenge in sustaining ESG efforts. P4 (Financial ESG Consultant, Private Sector) stated "The biggest challenge was regulatory inconsistency. The U.S. kept changing ESG-related rules, making it difficult for companies to maintain long-term ESG commitments."

Alignment to the Conceptual Framework

This theme aligned with Institutional Theory (Scott, 1995), particularly its focus on regulative pressures. Regulatory fragmentation—across jurisdictions and over time—created institutional ambiguity that hindered ESG continuity. As ESG expectations shifted rapidly, firms struggled to align compliance obligations with long-term strategies, highlighting the effect of unstable institutional environments on business planning (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

In addition, the theme supported Institutional Entrepreneurship Theory (Battilana et al., 2009), which explained how individual actors or subgroups within organizations served as change agents who challenged the institutional status quo. Several participants emphasized the need for sustainability champions or cross-functional ESG officers to drive cultural transformation, suggesting that successful ESG implementation depended not only on formal mandates but also on internal entrepreneurial leadership.

Institutional Theory (Scott, 1995) explained that fragmented regulations created uncertainty, hindering ESG adoption. Nguyen et al. (2021) found that firms in high-cost industries such as energy and manufacturing faced greater ESG compliance burdens.

Bezerra et al. (2024) identified challenges such as the lack of standardized performance indicators and regulatory guidelines, which hindered effective ESG implementation. While Siew et al. (2023) highlighted that the scarcity of interdisciplinary expertise and the complexity of ESG reporting frameworks posed significant challenges to organizations.

Alignment to the Existing Literature on Effective Business Practice

Recent studies further validated these findings. Bezerra et al. (2024) demonstrated that ESG integration is constrained by high implementation costs, especially for firms lacking specialized ESG knowledge. Regulatory variation—particularly between the EU and U.S.—was identified as a barrier to comparability and decision-making, echoing P4's concerns. Similarly, Yakovleva and Vaz de Carvalho (2023) found that SMEs experienced disproportionate challenges in ESG due to resource scarcity and the absence of dedicated compliance personnel.

Zahoor et al. (2022) argued that ESG implementation required continuous organizational learning to adapt to evolving frameworks, reinforcing your participants' emphasis on internal capability-building and cultural adaptation. Their study suggested that firms with flexible structures and proactive learning cultures were better positioned to respond to ESG institutional demands.

The findings of this study revealed four primary categories of barriers that hinder effective ESG implementation. First, resource constraints emerged as a critical challenge, particularly for small and mid-sized enterprises (SMEs) that often lacked the financial, technological, and operational capacity to build comprehensive ESG programs

(Yakovleva & Vaz de Carvalho, 2023). Second, regulatory complexity was frequently cited by participants as a major obstacle. Firms operating across multiple jurisdictions faced inconsistent ESG disclosure requirements, which complicated alignment and increased compliance burdens (Bezerra et al., 2024).

Third, the study identified internal resistance to change, including entrenched organizational cultures, limited ESG literacy, and weak executive sponsorship, as significant inhibitors to strategic ESG integration (Zahoor et al., 2022). Finally, participants pointed to the difficulty of measuring ESG impact, particularly in the social and governance dimensions. This lack of standardized metrics reduced the clarity of the business case and impaired the ability to communicate ESG value to stakeholders—echoing concerns previously highlighted by Harjoto and Salas (2017).

Collectively, these barriers indicated that ESG implementation was not merely a matter of compliance, but rather a complex, organization-wide change process. Success required internal change agents, external alignment with institutional frameworks, and the development of ESG-specific knowledge systems to support sustained strategic transformation.

Theme 4: Stakeholder Influence and Engagement

Participants widely acknowledged the growing influence of investors, employees, and consumers in shaping ESG strategies. This theme directly supported Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984), as participants noted how stakeholder pressure—from investors, employees, and customers—influenced ESG priorities. The prioritization of investor expectations in ESG strategy (as seen in Participant 2's remarks) also tied into Signaling

Theory, where disclosures served as strategic communication tools to meet stakeholder expectations (Connelly et al., 2011).

Participant Perspectives

P2 (Sustainability Executive, Non-Profit Sector) stated "Investor pressure made ESG a business priority. Customers and employees now demand transparency and ethical commitments from companies."

Alignment to the Conceptual Framework

This theme aligned closely with Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984), which posited that companies must account for a diverse set of stakeholder interests—including those of shareholders, employees, customers, and communities—in strategic decision-making. The theme illustrated that ESG initiatives were no longer optional but a response to stakeholder-driven accountability mechanisms.

In addition, the theme intersected with Signaling Theory (Connelly et al., 2011; Spence, 1973). ESG commitments functioned as strategic signals to reduce information asymmetry and build trust with key stakeholders. Investor-facing ESG disclosures and consumer-facing eco-labels both served as symbolic and substantive signals of ethical and sustainable practice. When perceived as credible, these signals reinforced brand legitimacy and stakeholder confidence.

Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984) posits that businesses must consider the interests of a broad set of stakeholders—including shareholders, employees, customers, and communities—to achieve long-term success. This theoretical grounding remains highly relevant in contemporary ESG discourse.

Nguyen et al. (2021) found that firms with strong ESG engagement outperformed competitors in market valuation and talent retention. Recent empirical research supports these views. Chenxi (2023) demonstrated that ESG performance, when driven by stakeholder expectations, positively correlated with improvements in corporate reputation, financial stability, and strategic resilience. The study showed that companies responsive to stakeholder ESG concerns—particularly investors and employees—tended to outperform peers in both financial and non-financial dimensions.

Additionally, D. Zhang et al. (2024) found that stakeholder pressure significantly improved ESG disclosure quality, especially in sectors where reputational risk was high. Their findings highlighted that investors and customers, in particular, were powerful forces in driving ESG adoption and transparency, reinforcing the perspective shared by participants in this study.

These studies collectively confirmed that stakeholder engagement was not only central to ESG legitimacy but also to measurable organizational performance outcomes.

Table 2 illustrates the influence of different stakeholders on ESG implementation, as reported by participants. Investors emerged as the most influential group, followed by consumers, employees, and regulators.

Table 2

Influence of Stakeholders on ESG Implementation

Stakeholder	Influence (%)
Investors	45
Consumers	30
Employees	15
Regulators	10

Alignment to the Existing Literature on Effective Business Practice

Recent scholarship confirmed the intensifying role of stakeholder pressure in driving ESG responsiveness. D. Zhang et al. (2024) found that stakeholder activism and investor scrutiny were key factors in improving ESG disclosure quality, particularly in firms seeking to differentiate themselves through sustainability branding. Similarly, Bridoux and Stoelhorst (2022) argued that stakeholder-oriented firms achieved more consistent ESG performance because they were better attuned to evolving expectations across diverse constituencies.

Kivits and Sawang (2021) further emphasized that effective ESG engagement required recognizing the dynamism of stakeholder relationships—particularly as employees, customers, and investors demanded proactive rather than reactive sustainability measures. These insights aligned with participant observations that ESG priorities were increasingly shaped from the outside in, requiring companies to engage stakeholders early and consistently in the strategic planning process.

Theme 5: Regulatory and Market Pressures

Shifting regulatory landscapes and evolving market expectations significantly influenced ESG adoption. Participants emphasized that both national and international frameworks shaped ESG compliance strategies, but the inconsistency and rapid evolution of such mandates often created challenges for organizational alignment.

Participant Perspectives

P1 (Energy Sector Executive) stated "Companies operating internationally had to meet different ESG expectations, creating compliance burdens. What was required in

Europe was different from what was expected in the U.S." Participants pointed to jurisdictional variation and shifting ESG disclosure expectations as major impediments to ESG implementation. The need to comply with different regulations in different markets—such as the EU's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) versus evolving U.S. SEC disclosure requirements—added complexity to both operational execution and ESG reporting.

Alignment to the Conceptual Framework

This theme is well grounded in Institutional Theory (Scott, 1995), particularly through the lens of coercive isomorphism, where firms adopted ESG practices in response to legal mandates and external regulatory pressures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). As environmental and social accountability became codified into regulatory frameworks, organizations were compelled to integrate ESG metrics to maintain legitimacy.

This theme also intersected with Signaling Theory (Spence, 1973). Compliance with authoritative ESG frameworks—such as CSRD, the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), or the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)—served as a powerful signal to capital markets and other stakeholders. Transparent adherence to such standards signals organizational trustworthiness, long-term risk management, and ethical conduct, all of which influenced investment and consumer behavior.

Institutional Theory (Scott, 1995) explains that fragmented regulations create uncertainty, affecting corporate ESG strategies. Flammer (2021) highlighted that firms operating in multiple jurisdictions had to navigate varying ESG policies to remain competitive.

Recent studies identified that rapidly evolving regulations and a variety of reporting frameworks presented significant challenges for multinational corporations in ESG compliance (The Conference Board, 2024). The lack of standardized ESG reporting metrics and complex data management requirements further complicated compliance efforts for global companies (Economist Impact, 2024).

Alignment to the Existing Literature on Effective Business Practice

Recent studies corroborated these findings. Zahoor et al. (2022) identify regulatory heterogeneity as a key barrier to ESG adoption, especially among multinational enterprises operating across complex institutional environments. Bezerra et al. (2024) further emphasized that divergent ESG reporting standards inhibited comparability and transparency, creating inefficiencies in both compliance and strategic communication.

Duque-Grisales and Alcalde-Heras (2021) argued that in Latin American contexts, inconsistent enforcement and voluntary ESG reporting have made it difficult for firms to fully internalize ESG principles—an insight that reinforced participant concerns regarding fragmented regulation.

Moreover, Flammer (2021) found that regulatory signals, such as green bond certifications and climate disclosure mandates, had a measurable impact on investor sentiment, reinforcing the signaling function of ESG compliance. These findings affirmed that firms not only responded to legal mandates but also leveraged regulatory alignment to enhance capital access and brand legitimacy.

Challenges and Barriers to ESG Implementation

Despite the growing recognition of ESG's importance, businesses faced significant challenges in execution that spanned regulatory, operational, and cultural domains. These barriers—summarized in Table 3—were not only practical in nature but also reflected deeper institutional complexities. For instance, regulatory inconsistency, cited by two participants, emerged as a salient challenge affecting companies' ability to maintain long-term ESG commitments. This supported the broader theme of institutional complexity as outlined in Scott's (1995) Institutional Theory, where fragmented regulations across jurisdictions created uncertainty and impeded strategic coherence. Table 3 below outlines these challenges, their descriptions, and the potential solutions proposed by participants.

Table 3

Key ESG Challenges and Solutions

Challenge	Description	Potential solution
Resource constraints	SMEs particularly struggle with the financial and operational capacity to develop robust ESG programs.	Seek external funding and prioritize cost-effective strategies.
Regulatory complexity	Organizations find it challenging to navigate evolving ESG reporting requirements across jurisdictions.	Adopt standardized reporting frameworks (GRI, SASB).
Internal resistance	Company culture and leadership buy-in significantly impact ESG success.	Incorporate ESG into corporate culture through training.
Measuring ESG impact	Harjoto and Salas (2017) highlight that firms struggle with quantifying social impact, an issue echoed by participants. Without standardized metrics, organizations find it difficult to assess ESG ROI and communicate these results effectively to stakeholders.	Use key performance indicators (KPIs) aligned with standards.

As outlined, participants identified significant challenges that hindered their implementation. These included resource constraints, particularly for small and mid-sized enterprises (SMEs) that lacked the financial and operational capacity to develop robust ESG programs. SMEs were disproportionately impacted due to limited funding, technical knowledge, and infrastructure to support ESG disclosure and implementation (Yakovleva & Vaz de Carvalho, 2023). Regulatory complexity also emerged as a challenge, as organizations struggled to navigate the evolving landscape of ESG reporting requirements. The absence of harmonized global standards and the simultaneous existence of multiple voluntary frameworks (e.g., GRI, SASB, TCFD) increased the reporting burden, especially for multinational firms (Nawaz & Koç, 2023 Internal resistance to change further inhibited ESG integration. Company culture and limited leadership buy-in often resulted in pushback, driven by short-term profit orientation, lack of awareness, or fear of structural transformation (Zahoor et al., 2022). Finally, participants pointed to difficulties in measuring and quantifying social impact, which remained one of the greatest obstacles in ESG implementation. Without standardized metrics, companies found it difficult to assess the return on investment (ROI) of ESG efforts and to communicate these results effectively to stakeholders (Singh et al., 2024).

These findings corroborated earlier research, including Harjoto and Salas (2017), who emphasized that one of the greatest difficulties in ESG implementation was measuring and quantifying social outcomes, a concern echoed by participants in this study. Without standardized metrics, companies struggle to assess the return on investment (ROI) of ESG efforts and to communicate these outcomes effectively to stakeholders. Collectively, the literature reinforced that overcoming these challenges required more than technical solutions; it necessitated cultural alignment, regulatory reform, and sector-specific guidance.

Business Contributions and Recommendations for Professional Practice

The findings of this study provided significant insights into the practical applications of ESG strategies and their impact on brand value. As businesses increasingly faced pressure to implement sustainable practices, these findings offered actionable recommendations for leaders seeking to integrate ESG principles effectively into their operations.

Research suggested that ESG initiatives contributed significantly to brand differentiation, customer loyalty and stakeholder trust. Ailawadi et al. (2013) demonstrated that corporate social responsibility (CSR), a key component of ESG positively influenced consumer behavior by enhancing brand trust and encouraging customer retention. Building on this, Bae et al. (2023) found that the environmental and social dimensions of ESG were directly associated with increased brand trust and word-of-mouth advocacy. Similarly, Chen and Chang (2013) reported that ESG performance strengthened brand loyalty by fostering positive consumer perceptions, while Mohammadi et al. (2023) emphasized the role of eco-friendly marketing strategies in cultivating deeper brand attachment and loyalty.

To ensure credibility and avoid the reputational risks associated with greenwashing, business leaders needed to align ESG efforts with core brand values and organizational identity. This alignment required more than surface-level messaging—it demanded authenticity, measurable impact, and transparent communication. Strategies such as third-party ESG audits, adoption of standardized reporting frameworks, and meaningful stakeholder engagement enhanced both authenticity and brand equity (Grubor & Milovanov, 2017; Suchman, 1995). Furthermore, K.H. Lee et al. (2022) highlighted that successful ESG integration required cross-functional collaboration within the organization to proactively manage material issues and reinforce brand value through sustained, enterprise-wide commitment.

The integration of ESG into corporate decision-making was a crucial step toward long-term sustainability. Bhaskaran et al. (2020) emphasized that organizations with high ESG engagement experienced better financial performance, as these initiatives contribute to operational efficiency and long-term profitability. Companies benefited by embedding ESG into supply chain management, governance structures, and product innovation to drive tangible business benefits (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

The integration of ESG into corporate decision-making is crucial for achieving long-term sustainability and competitive advantage. Whelan et al. (2021) found that organizations that embedded ESG criteria into strategic operations exhibited stronger sustainability performance across multiple dimensions. Similarly, Eccles et al. (2022) observed that firms with integrated ESG strategies experienced sustained profitable growth, often outperforming peers in financial, reputational, and stakeholder engagement metrics. To capitalize on these benefits, companies should embed ESG into their supply chains, governance structures, and product innovation processes.

Y. Zhang and Dong (2023) highlighted that employees' positive perceptions of corporate ESG performance can fostered green innovation, especially when coupled with digital transformation initiatives. This finding demonstrated that ESG engagement was not only externally beneficial but also strengthened internal organizational capability. However, traditional brand equity models often failed to capture the full impact of ESG initiatives. Azoulay and Kapferer (2003) argued that brand personality extended beyond functional attributes to include symbolic and ethically aligned dimensions. Supporting this perspective, Chen and Chang (2013) demonstrated a direct link between CSR activities, consumer trust, and brand equity. To address this measurement gap, Lai et al. (2010) proposed updated brand metrics that incorporated ESG-related key performance indicators (KPIs), providing business leaders with a more comprehensive framework to track and quantify ESG's contribution to brand and business performance.

Translating Findings Into an ESG Implementation Framework

To translate research findings into practical business strategies, the following structured ESG implementation framework was proposed. Conducting an internal ESG audit was essential for identifying current sustainability practices, gaps, and opportunities. This recommendation aligned with participants' emphasis on the need for assessing organizational ESG readiness prior to strategic alignment or stakeholder engagement. Without clarity on baseline practices, companies risked pursuing performative or disconnected ESG activities. The importance of such assessments was supported in the literature, where ESG integration strengthened corporate sustainability performance (Barbosa et al., 2023). Engaging investors, employees, customers, and regulators was vital for aligning ESG objectives with stakeholder expectations. Effective stakeholder engagement not only aligned ESG goals with stakeholder values but also enhanced the credibility and acceptance of ESG initiatives (Bezerra et al., 2024).

Establishing ESG committees, appointing sustainability officers, and integrating ESG policies into corporate governance frameworks were critical steps. Leadership commitment remained fundamental, and robust governance structures were linked to improved ESG performance (S. U. Lee et al., 2024). Developing and executing sustainability projects, such as carbon footprint reduction programs, ethical supply chain policies, and diversity initiatives, were tangible manifestations of ESG commitments. Integrating ESG considerations into risk management and financial planning was also crucial, as ESG system implementation had been found to enhance financial performance in environmentally impactful industries (D. Zhang et al., 2024).

Utilizing ESG reporting frameworks (e.g., GRI, SASB) to track progress, ensure transparency, and communicate impact to stakeholders was essential. However, the lack of standardization across ESG reporting frameworks posed challenges. Organizations often struggled with varying guidelines and metrics, making it difficult to compare and assess ESG performance accurately (Cesarone et al., 2023).

Adapting and refining ESG strategies based on performance data, stakeholder feedback, and evolving industry regulations was vital for sustained success. Fostering cross-functional ESG collaboration ensured that sustainability principles were embedded across all departments, including HR policies, supply chain management, and product development (Perera et al., 2024).

The findings indicated that businesses that strategically integrated ESG initiatives into their core practices—while maintaining transparency and authenticity—were more likely to enhance brand value, organizational resilience, and long-term market success. However, significant challenges remained, including regulatory complexity, inconsistent metrics, and resource constraints. Overcoming these barriers required strong leadership commitment, standardized reporting frameworks, and proactive, inclusive stakeholder engagement. This framework offered actionable guidance for business leaders aiming to leverage ESG as a strategic asset for brand differentiation, sustainable growth, and enduring competitive advantage.

Implications for Social Change

The implications of this study extend far beyond business practice and financial performance to contribute meaningfully to broader societal advancements. The integration of ESG principles into corporate strategies fosters a more responsible business environment that prioritizes ethical considerations, sustainability, and social equity. Organizations that adopt and sustain effective ESG practices create ripple effects that result in tangible improvements at multiple levels, impacting individuals, communities, organizations, institutions, and societies as a whole.

Impact on Individuals

At an individual level, employees benefit significantly from working within organizations that prioritize ESG principles. Businesses that commit to fair labor practices, diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) create healthier workplace environments that enhance employee well-being and satisfaction. According to Schultz & Zelezny (2003), organizations that actively foster ethical work environments and provide opportunities for professional growth enhance workforce productivity and morale. Additionally, consumers are empowered to make more informed purchasing decisions, aligning their choices with brands that reflect their personal values regarding environmental stewardship and social responsibility.

Impact on Communities

Corporations engaging in ESG-driven initiatives often contribute directly to the betterment of local communities. Whether through philanthropic efforts, sustainable business models, or investments in infrastructure, these organizations play a vital role in social and economic development. Research by Liu & Nemoto (2021) indicates that ESG-driven corporate social responsibility programs improve community welfare, promote inclusive economic growth, and support marginalized populations. This is particularly relevant in underprivileged areas where businesses can drive meaningful change by investing in education, healthcare, and sustainable job creation.

Impact on Organizations and Institutions

The adoption of ESG principles within organizations fosters a culture of transparency, accountability, and long-term value creation. Bhaskaran et al. (2020) emphasize that companies with strong ESG frameworks experience enhanced corporate governance, reduced corruption, and improved stakeholder relations. In turn, this leads to increased investor confidence and organizational resilience, ensuring long-term business success while maintaining ethical integrity. Moreover, ESG-aligned organizations set benchmarks for regulatory bodies, encouraging industries to move toward higher sustainability standards, which in turn strengthens institutional frameworks.

Impact on Cultures and Societies

A widespread commitment to ESG principles contributes to fundamental shifts in societal values, encouraging a culture of environmental responsibility, ethical consumerism, and social equity. Businesses influence societal norms through their policies, practices, and consumer engagements. Grubor and Milovanov (2017) highlight that corporations that prioritize sustainability initiatives actively shape consumer expectations and industry standards, reinforcing the notion that ESG is not just a business obligation but a societal imperative. By promoting corporate accountability, reinforcing ethical leadership, and ensuring sustainable practices, ESG-driven strategies help cultivate a more equitable and sustainable global society.

Recommendations for Further Research

The findings of this study highlighted several opportunities for future research that can expand the understanding of ESG strategies and their impact on brand value, business sustainability, and stakeholder engagement. Given the limitations identified in Section 1, future research can address these constraints to provide a more comprehensive analysis of ESG implementation and its broader implications. The following recommendations are proposed:

Expansion of Research Scope and Industry-Specific Analyses

One limitation of this study was its focus on a select group of industries, which may not fully capture the diverse ways in which ESG initiatives are implemented across different business sectors. Future research should consider conducting industry-specific analyses to compare ESG adoption in sectors such as finance, technology, energy, and manufacturing.

Future research should also examine how regulatory environments in various industries influence ESG implementation and reporting frameworks as well as investigate sector-specific challenges and best practices that contribute to ESG success, particularly in industries with high environmental impact, such as oil and gas, chemicals, and mining (Bhaskaran et al., 2020).

Longitudinal Studies on ESG Impact

Due to time constraints, this study provided only a snapshot of ESG strategies at a given point in time. A longitudinal approach would track businesses over an extended period to evaluate the long-term effects of ESG implementation on financial performance, brand reputation, and stakeholder trust—particularly as organizations evolve strategies in response to regulatory changes and shifting stakeholder expectations. Such a design would also assess the sustainability of ESG initiatives and identify patterns in ESG-driven brand equity over multiple years. (Oni, 2025).

Comparative Studies Across Geographical Regions

Regulatory requirements and cultural attitudes toward ESG vary across different regions, affecting how businesses implement sustainability practices. Further research should explore how ESG initiatives differ between developed and developing economies, the role of government incentives and policies in promoting ESG adoption in different regulatory environments and the effectiveness of ESG communication strategies across diverse cultural contexts, particularly in regions where consumer awareness of ESG is still developing (Grubor & Milovanov, 2017).

Role of Emerging Technologies in ESG Implementation

Technological advancements are transforming how businesses approach sustainability. Future studies should examine the impact of artificial intelligence, blockchain, and big data analytics on ESG reporting and transparency, assess the effectiveness of digital platforms in tracking and verifying ESG compliance and investigate how smart technology solutions can optimize resource use and enhance sustainability in corporate operations (Lim, 2024).

Consumer Perception and Behavior Toward ESG Brands

While this study analyzed ESG strategies from a business perspective, future research should focus on consumer behavior by investigating how different demographic groups perceive and respond to ESG initiatives, analyzing the psychological factors that influence consumer trust and loyalty in ESG-driven brands and exploring the impact of ESG-related marketing messages on purchasing decisions and brand advocacy (Ailawadi et al., 2013).

Currently, there is a lack of standardized models for quantifying the return on investment (ROI) of ESG initiatives. Future research should develop quantitative frameworks that link ESG investments to financial outcomes, such as stock performance, revenue growth, and operational efficiency, key performance indicators (KPIs) that allow organizations to track the tangible benefits of ESG over time, multi-variable models that assess the interplay between ESG, brand equity, and consumer behavior (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2019).

Future research should explore the effectiveness of ESG-related regulations and their enforcement mechanisms, the role of government agencies in promoting standardized ESG reporting and compliance, and the impact of global regulatory convergence on corporate ESG strategies (Flammer, 2021).

Conclusion

The findings indicate that businesses that strategically integrate ESG initiatives into their core practices while maintaining transparency and authenticity were more likely to enhance brand value. However, significant challenges, including regulatory complexity and resource constraints, must be addressed. Effective ESG implementation requires strong leadership commitment, standardized reporting, and proactive stakeholder engagement. These insights provide actionable guidance for business leaders seeking to optimize ESG-driven brand differentiation and long-term market success.

References

Ailawadi, K., Neslin, S., Luan, Y., & Taylor, G. (2013). Does retailer CSR enhance behavioral loyalty? A case for benefit segmentation. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *30*(3), 397–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2013.09.003

Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2019). On corporate social responsibility, sensemaking, and the search for meaningfulness through work. *Journal of Management*, *45*(3), 1057–1086. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691575

Azoulay, A., & Kapferer, J.-N. (2003). Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality? *Journal of Brand Management*, *11*(2), 143–155. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2540162

Bae, G.-K., Lee, S.-M., & Luan, B.-K. (2023). The impact of ESG on brand trust and word of mouth in food and beverage companies: Focusing on Jeju Island tourists. *Sustainability*, *15*(3), 2348. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032348

Barbosa, A. S., Silva, M. C. B. C., Silva, L. B., Morioka, S. N., & Souza, V. F. (2023). Integration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria: Their impacts on corporate sustainability performance. *Palgrave Communications*, *10*(1), 18. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01919-0

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management*

Annals, *3*(1), 65–107. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903053598

Bezerra, R. R. R., Martins, V. W. B., & Macedo, A. N. (2024). Validation of challenges for implementing ESG in the construction industry considering the context of an emerging economy country. *Applied Sciences*, *14*(14), 6024. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14146024

Bhaskaran, S. R., Polonsky, M. J., & Carey, P. (2020). The impact of ESG initiatives on organizational performance: A global perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *30*(4), 470–491. https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2020.17

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member checking: A tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*(13), 1802–1811. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870

Bitektine, A., & Haack, P. (2015). The "macro" and the "micro" of legitimacy: Toward a multilevel theory of the legitimacy process. *Academy of Management Review*, *40*(1), 49–75. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0318

Bowen, F. (2017). The moral legitimacy of industry self-regulation: Assessing codes of conduct in the chemical industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *143*(3), 615–629. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3635-y

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Bridoux, F., & Stoelhorst, J. W. (2022). Stakeholder theory, strategy, and organization: Past, present, and future. *Strategic Organization, 20*(4), 797–809.

https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221127628

Bridoux, F., & Vishwanathan, P. (2020). When do powerful stakeholders give managers the latitude to balance all stakeholders' interests? *Business & Society, 59*(2), 232–262. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650318775077

Campbell, D. J. (2000). Legitimacy theory or managerial reality construction? Corporate social disclosure in Marks and Spencer Plc corporate reports, 1969–1997. *Accounting Forum, 24*(1), 80–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6303.00030

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41*(5), 545–547. https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547

Castleberry, A., & Nolen, A. (2018). Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds? *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning, 10*(6), 807–815. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2018.03.019

Ceciliano, P. H., Vieira, P. R. d. C., & Magalhães da Silva, A. C. (2021). The influence of corporate social responsibility on corporate brand equity. *Independent Journal of Management & Production, 12*(4), 815–831. https://doi.org/10.14807/ijmp.v12i4.1380

Cesarone, F., Martino, M. L., Ricca, F., & Scozzari, A. (2023). Managing ESG ratings disagreement in sustainable portfolio selection. *arXiv Preprints*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.10739

Chai, S., Cao, M., Li, Q., Ji, Q., & Liu, Z. (2023). Exploring the nexus between ESG disclosure and corporate sustainable growth: Moderating role of media attention.

Finance Research Letters, 58(Part C), 104519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104519

Chen, Y.-S., & Chang, C.-H. (2013). The effect of corporate social responsibility on brand loyalty: The mediating role of brand image. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 24*(3–4), 262–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2011.614866

Chenxi, W. (2023). The relationship between ESG performance and corporate performance: Based on stakeholder theory. *SHS Web of Conferences, 163,* 03022. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202316303022

Cojoianu, T. F., Clark, G. L., Hoepner, A. G. F., Veneri, P., & Wójcik, D. (2020). Entrepreneurs for a low carbon world: How environmental knowledge and policy shape the creation and financing of green start-ups. *Research Policy, 49*(6), 103988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.103988

Coleman, P. (2021). Validity and reliability within qualitative research in the caring sciences. *International Journal of Caring Sciences, 14*(3), 2041–2046. https://www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org/docs/54_goleman_special_14_3.pdf

Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management, 37*(1), 39–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419

Cornell, B., & Damodaran, A. (2020, March 20). Valuing ESG: Doing good or sounding good? *NYU Stern School of Business*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3557432

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Dodgson, M. (2021). Critical analysis and synthesis of literature on ESG initiatives: A review. *Business & Society Review, 126*(1), 7–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12235

Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational legitimacy: Social values and organizational behavior. *Pacific Sociological Review, 18*(1), 122–136. https://doi.org/10.2307/1388226

Duque-Grisales, E., & Aguilera-Caracuel, J. (2021). Environmental, social and governance (ESG) scores and financial performance of Multilatinas: Moderating effects of geographic international diversification and financial slack. *Journal of Business Ethics, 168*(2), 315–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04177-w

Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2012). The impact of a corporate culture of sustainability on corporate behavior and performance. *Harvard Business School Working Paper Series,* 12-035. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1964011

Eccles, R. G., & Stroehle, J. C. (2018, July 12). Exploring social origins in the construction of ESG measures [Working paper]. *SSRN*.

https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3212685

Economist Impact. (2024, July 19). *ESG reporting: Challenges and opportunities for financial services firms.* The Economist Group. https://impact.economist.com/sustainability/resilience-and-adaptation/esg-reporting-challenges-and-opportunities-for-financial-services-firms

Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st-century business.* Capstone.

Ewing, J. (2017). *Faster, higher, farther: The Volkswagen scandal.* W. W. Norton & Company.

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

Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2,000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 5*(4), 210–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917

Flammer, C. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and shareholder reaction: The environmental awareness of investors. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(3), 758–781. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0744

Flammer, C. (2021). Corporate green bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics, 142*(2), 499–516. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2021.01.010

Fujikura, K., & Oe, A. (2023). The influence of firms' pragmatic legitimacy on investors' perceptions of their environmental protection activities. *Sustainability, 15*(18), 13744. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813744

Gauthier, J. (2013). Institutional theory and corporate sustainability: Determinant versus interactive approaches. *Organization Management Journal, 10*(2), 86–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2013.801741

Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Enabling employees to employ more of their whole selves at work. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7,* 796. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00796

Gómez-Trujillo, A. M., Vélez-Ocampo, J., & González-Pérez, M. A. (2020). A literature review on the causality between sustainability and corporate reputation: What goes first? *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal, 31*(2), 406–430. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-09-2019-0207

Grubor, A., & Milovanov, O. (2017). Brand strategies in the era of sustainability. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems, 15*(1), 78–88. https://doi.org/10.7906/indecs.15.1.6

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods, 18*(1), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903

Halcomb, E. J., & Davidson, P. M. (2006). Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary? *Applied Nursing Research, 19*(1), 38–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2005.06.001

Harjoto, M. A., & Salas, J. (2017). Strategic and institutional sustainability: Corporate social responsibility, brand value, and Interbrand listing. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, 26*(6), 545–558. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-07-2016-1277

Hawn, O., Chatterji, A. K., & Mitchell, W. (2018). Do investors actually value sustainability? New evidence from investor reactions to the Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI). *Strategic Management Journal, 39*(4), 949–976. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2752

Hsu, P.-H., Liang, H., & Matos, P. (2021). Leviathan Inc. and corporate environmental engagement. *Management Science, 69*(12), 7719–7758. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2021.4064

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 72*(12), 2954–2965. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Kaushik, V., & Walsh, C. A. (2019). Pragmatism as a research paradigm and its implications for social work research. *Social Sciences, 8*(9), 255. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8090255

Khan, M., Serafeim, G., & Yoon, A. (2016). Corporate sustainability: First evidence on materiality. *The Accounting Review, 91*(6), 1697–1724. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-51383

Kharouf, H., Lund, D. J., Krallman, A., & Pullig, C. (2020). A signaling theory approach to relationship recovery. *European Journal of Marketing, 54*(9), 2139–2170. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-10-2019-0751

Kivits, R., & Sawang, S. (2021). Stakeholder theory. In R. Kivits & S. Sawang (Eds.), *The dynamism of stakeholder engagement* (pp. 3–25). Springer.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70428-5_1

Lai, C.-S., Chiu, C.-J., Yang, C.-F., & Pai, D.-C. (2010). The effects of corporate social responsibility on brand performance: The mediating effect of industrial brand equity and corporate reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*(3), 457–469. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0433-1

Lee, C. C., Luppi, J. L., Simmons, T., Tran, B. T., & Zhang, R. Q. (2023). Examining the impacts of ESG on employee retention: A study of generational differences. *Journal of Business and Management, 29*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1504/JBM.2023.141301

Lee, K. H., Cin, B. C., & Lee, E. Y. (2022). Environmental responsibility and firm performance: The application of an environmental, social and governance model. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 31*(2), 463–478. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2895

Lee, S. U., Perera, H., Liu, Y., Xia, B., Lu, Q., Zhu, L., Cairns, J., & Nottage, M. (2024). Integrating ESG and AI: A comprehensive responsible AI assessment framework. *arXiv Preprints*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.00965

Li, Q., Tang, W., & Li, Z. (2024). ESG systems and financial performance in industries with significant environmental impact: A comprehensive analysis. *Frontiers in Sustainability, 5,* 1454822. https://doi.org/10.3389/frsus.2024.1454822

Li, X., Wang, J., & Wu, Y. (2024). The role of cognitive legitimacy in social entrepreneurship: A multilevel analysis. *Small Business Economics, 62*(3), 551–573. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-024-00919-x

Lim, W. M. (2024). A bibliometric and content analysis of ESG research in artificial intelligence and finance. *Artificial Intelligence Review, 57*(2), 1389–1410. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-024-10708-3

Lin, Y. (2023). The role of ESG strategy implementation in long-term value creation for companies. *Journal of Business Ethics, 180*(3), 789–812. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05347-9

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* SAGE Publications.

Liu, L., & Nemoto, N. (2021). Environmental, social and governance (ESG) evaluation and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Accounting and Finance, 21*(4), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.33423/jaf.v21i4.4522

Lo Iacono, V., Symonds, P., & Brown, D. H. K. (2016). Skype as a tool for qualitative research interviews. *Sociological Research Online, 21*(2), 12. https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.3952

Mahajan, R., Lim, W. M., Sareen, M., Kumar, S., & Panwar, R. (2023). Stakeholder theory: Reviewing a theory that moves us. *Journal of Business Research, 166,* 114104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114104

Martin, P. R., & Moser, D. V. (2016). Managers' green investment disclosures and investors' reaction. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 61*(1), 239–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2015.08.004

Mohammadi, E., Barzegar, M., & Nohekhan, M. (2023). The green advantage: Analyzing the effects of eco-friendly marketing on consumer loyalty. *Journal of Business*

Research, 142, 123–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.12.015

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340–363. https://doi.org/10.1086/226550

Michelon, G., Pilonato, S., & Ricceri, F. (2015). CSR reporting practices and the quality of disclosure: An empirical analysis. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 33,* 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2014.10.003

Morse, J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research, 25*(9), 1212–1222. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315588501

Nawaz, W., & Koç, M. (2023). ESG risk exposure and mitigation strategies: An integrated framework for corporate sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 403,* 136777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.136777

Nguyen, P., Lam, H., & Nguyen, V. (2021). The impact of ESG initiatives on financial performance: Evidence from S&P 500 non-financial firms. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal, 16*(2), 7. https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v16i2.7

Nielsen. (2015). *The sustainability imperative: New insights on consumer expectations.* Nielsen Insights. https://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/report/2015/the-sustainability-imperative/

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative*

Methods, 16(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Oni, S. B. (2025). The impact of ESG on financial performance: A review of empirical evidence [Preprint]. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393516543_The_Impact_of_ESG_on_Financial_Performance_A_Review_of_Empirical_Evidence

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Perera, H., Lee, S. U., Liu, Y., Xia, B., Lu, Q., Zhu, L., Cairns, J., & Nottage, M. (2024). Achieving responsible AI through ESG: Insights and recommendations from industry engagement. *arXiv Preprints*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.10520

Satar, M. S. (2022). Sustainability and triple bottom line planning in social enterprises: Developing the guidelines for social entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning, 17*(3), 813–821. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsdp.170311

Schultz, P. W., & Zelezny, L. C. (2003). Reframing environmental messages to be congruent with American values. *Human Ecology Review, 10*(2), 126–136. http://www.humanecologyreview.org/pastissues/10.2/SchultzZelezny.pdf

Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations.* SAGE Publications.

Shaikh, J. M., & Zubair, S. (2024). From ESG to holistic value addition: Rethinking sustainable investment strategies. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation, 54,* 100522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intaccaudtax.2023.100522

Siew, R. Y. J., Balatbat, M. C. A., & Carmichael, D. G. (2023). Navigating the challenges of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) reporting: The path to broader sustainable development. *Sustainability, 16*(2), 606. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020606

Simon, M. K., & Goes, J. (2013). *Assumptions, limitations, delimitations, and scope of the study.* Dissertation Success LLC.

Singh, P., Yadav, S. K., & Agarwal, R. (2024). Measuring the social impact of ESG initiatives: A multidimensional framework. *Sustainable Development, 32*(1), 89–105. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2602

Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87*(3), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

The Conference Board. (2024, January 17). *Managing international ESG disclosures: Challenges and opportunities.* https://www.conference-board.org/press/managing-international-ESG-disclosures-2025

Tost, L. P. (2011). An integrative model of legitimacy judgments. *Academy of Management Review, 36*(4), 686–710. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0227

Whelan, T., Atz, U., Van Holt, T., & Clark, C. (2021). *ESG and financial performance: Uncovering the relationship by aggregating evidence from 1,000 plus studies published between 2015–2020.* NYU Stern Center for Sustainable Business & Rockefeller Asset Management.

https://www.stern.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/documents/NYU-RAM_ESG-Paper_2021%20Rev_0.pdf

Yakovleva, N., & Vaz de Carvalho, C. (2023). ESG reporting in SMEs: Challenges, drivers, and outcomes. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 30*(2), 681–695. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2783

Wu, Z., Pownall, R., Shih, Y.-C., & Zhang, C. (2025). State ownership and the value of sustainability: Evidence from China. *International Review of Financial Analysis, 102,* 104142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2025.104142

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Zahoor, N., Al-Tabbaa, O., & Khan, Z. (2022). Barriers to ESG implementation in multinational enterprises: An institutional and organizational learning perspective. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 31*(4), 1449–1465. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2960

Zhang, D. (2024). The pathway to curb greenwashing in sustainable growth: The role of artificial intelligence. *Energy Economics, 133,* 107562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2024.107562

Zhang, Y., & Dong, F. (2023). How does corporate ESG performance influence green innovation? The moderating role of digital transformation. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 374,* 133–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133145

Zhang, Y., Sun, W., & Li, H. (2024). Stakeholder pressure and ESG disclosure: Evidence from emerging markets. *Cogent Business & Management, 11*(1), 2303790.

https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2303790

Appendix A: Effective Strategies for the Implementation of Environmental Social and Governance Initiatives to Improve Brand Value

Consent to take part in research

I ____ voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

I understand that agreeing to participate, I can withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions without consequences.

I have had the purpose and nature of the study explained to me verbally and in writing and had the opportunity to ask questions pertaining to the study.

I understand that participation does not directly have benefits, all research is for pragmatic inquiry research purposes.

I understand that information collected with be kept confidential and stored securely for five years.

I understand that my identity will remain confidential and anonymous.

I understand that collected information will be quoted and published for research purposes.

Signature of research participant _____________________________________

Date ___________________

Signature of researcher ____

Date ___________________

Appendix B: Interview Questions

The interview questions are designed to elicit detailed and meaningful responses from participants, focusing on their experiences, perceptions, and insights related to the research topic. The questions will be open-ended to allow for in-depth exploration of the subject matter. Below is the revised set of interview questions, organized into targeted interview questions, and targeted wrap-up questions:

Targeted Interview Questions:

1. In your experience, what are some common approaches that organizations take in implementing ESG initiatives?
2. What are the typical motivations or drivers behind the development of ESG strategies in the organizations you’ve worked with or observed?
3. How have you seen ESG initiatives impact the expectations or inquiries of customers, investors, or other stakeholders across different organizations?
4. Based on your knowledge, how do organizations typically measure the value of their brand, and what role do ESG initiatives play in that assessment?
5. In your experience, what changes have you observed in how organizations assess their brand value after implementing ESG projects?
6. From your perspective, what challenges do business leaders commonly face when integrating ESG initiatives into their organizational strategies?
7. How do you believe future trends in ESG might shape the way organizations approach brand management and stakeholder engagement?

Targeted Wrap-Up Questions:

1. In your opinion, how do ESG initiatives generally influence customer perceptions of an organization's brand?
2. How do internal stakeholders, such as employees and leadership teams, typically perceive the value or impact of ESG initiatives?
3. Is there any advice you would give to leaders about to embark on an ESG implementation journey?