International Journal of Technology, Management and Social Sciences (IJTMSS)
[ISSN: 2583-8482]
Volume 4_Issue 3 [July-Sept 2026]

The ESG Paradox: Evaluating Sustainability and Masking Reality

Dr. Savita Choudhary
Associate Professor, Dept. of Management Studies, Swami Keshvanand Institute of Technology, Management & Gramothan, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India
Dr. Atul Gupta
Associate Professor, Dept. of Management Studies, Swami Keshvanand Institute of Technology, Management & Gramothan, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India
Dr. Ajay Verma
Associate Professor, Dept. of Management Studies, Swami Keshvanand Institute of Technology, Management & Gramothan, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

Sustainability has emerged as a fundamental criterion in corporate governance, responsible investing, and regulatory decision-making, with Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) ratings serving as key indicators of corporate sustainability performance. Despite their growing influence, ESG ratings present a paradox by often reflecting corporate disclosures rather than actual environmental and social outcomes. Variations in rating methodologies, indicators, weighting systems and data sources across agencies lead to inconsistent evaluations of the same organizations, raising concerns regarding their reliability and comparability. The heavy dependence on self-reported information enables firms to emphasize policies and commitments while masking unsustainable business practices. This creates opportunities for green washing, where organizations achieve favorable ESG scores through symbolic sustainability initiatives rather than measurable performance improvements. Consequently, misleading ESG assessments may distort investment decisions, reduce stakeholder confidence, and weaken sustainability objectives. Addressing this paradox requires standardized methodologies, greater transparency, independent verification, outcome-oriented metrics, and stronger alignment between ESG ratings and regulatory frameworks.

Keywords: *ESG Ratings; Sustainability Measurement; Green washing; Corporate Disclosure; Sustainable Finance; SDGs; Corporate Accountability*

Submitted: May 26, 2026 **Revised:** June 30, 2026 **Accepted:** July 17, 2026 **Published:** July 23, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21836403

1. Introduction

The environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) considerations have become an integral component of modern corporate strategy, investment evaluation, and sustainable economic development. Governments, institutional investors, and regulatory bodies increasingly rely on ESG ratings to assess the long-term sustainability, resilience, and ethical conduct of business organizations. The rapid expansion of sustainable finance and responsible investment has accelerated the demand for standardized ESG information, making ESG ratings a significant determinant of corporate reputation and access to capital. Companies with higher ESG scores are often perceived as lower-risk investments and more capable of generating sustainable value over time. Consequently, ESG assessments have evolved beyond voluntary reporting tools into influential market mechanisms that shape strategic decision-making and stakeholder confidence. Despite their growing acceptance, questions remain regarding the consistency and credibility of ESG measurement systems (Berg, Kölbel, & Rigobon, 2022). Although ESG ratings are intended to provide objective assessments of corporate sustainability performance, their methodologies differ substantially across rating agencies. Variations in indicator selection, weighting techniques, data collection procedures, and scoring models frequently result in contradictory evaluations of the same organization. Such divergence creates confusion among investors, policymakers, and other stakeholders attempting to compare firms based on sustainability performance. Furthermore, the absence of universally accepted ESG reporting standards limits the comparability and transparency of these assessments. As ESG investing continues to expand globally, inconsistent ratings challenge the effectiveness of sustainable finance by creating uncertainty regarding what ESG scores actually measure. These methodological inconsistencies have become one of the most debated issues in sustainability research and corporate governance (Christensen, Hail, & Leuz, 2022).

Organizations often invest heavily in sustainability communication, environmental commitments, and ESG reporting practices that enhance their public image without necessarily improving operational sustainability. This phenomenon has intensified concerns regarding green washing, where firms portray themselves as environmentally and socially responsible while maintaining practices that contradict their sustainability claims. Such symbolic compliance undermines stakeholder trust and weakens the credibility of ESG frameworks. As a result, favorable ESG ratings may reflect the quality of corporate disclosure rather than the actual environmental or social impact of business operations, creating a significant gap between reported performance and real-world sustainability outcomes (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). The growing influence of ESG ratings on capital allocation, corporate governance, and regulatory policy highlights the urgent need to critically examine their validity and practical implications. Investors increasingly integrate ESG scores into portfolio construction, while governments and international organizations promote ESG-based disclosure frameworks to support sustainable development (Choudhury et al., 2024). However, unreliable or misleading ESG assessments may distort investment decisions, reduce market efficiency, and impede progress toward global sustainability goals. Addressing these challenges requires greater methodological transparency, harmonized reporting standards, independent verification mechanisms, and stronger alignment between ESG evaluation systems and measurable sustainability outcomes. A critical examination of the ESG ratings paradox is therefore essential to strengthen stakeholder confidence and enhance the effectiveness of sustainable finance and corporate accountability (Eccles & Klimenko, 2019).

2. Background of Study

The global emphasis on sustainable development has transformed the role of businesses from purely profit-oriented entities to organizations expected to create long-term environmental, social, and economic value. This transition has been driven by increasing stakeholder expectations, climate change concerns, corporate accountability, and the implementation of international sustainability frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In response, Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) reporting has emerged as a strategic mechanism through which organizations communicate their sustainability initiatives and responsible business practices. ESG ratings, developed by specialized rating agencies, have consequently become influential tools for evaluating corporate sustainability performance, guiding investment decisions, and promoting responsible corporate behaviour across global financial markets (Gillan, Koch, & Starks, 2021). The rapid expansion of sustainable finance has significantly increased the dependence of investors, regulators, and financial institutions on ESG ratings for portfolio construction, risk assessment, and corporate valuation. Global assets managed under ESG-oriented investment strategies have grown substantially, encouraging organizations to improve their ESG disclosures and sustainability reporting practices. The absence of universally accepted ESG measurement standards has resulted in considerable differences among rating agencies regarding assessment criteria, weighting methods, and data interpretation. These inconsistencies often produce conflicting ratings for the same company, making it difficult for investors and other stakeholders to accurately evaluate sustainability performance and compare organizations across industries and regions. Such methodological diversity has raised important concerns regarding the credibility, transparency, and decision-making usefulness of ESG ratings (Avramov, Cheng, Lioui, & Tarelli, 2022). Alongside methodological inconsistencies, increasing evidence suggests that some organizations strategically manage sustainability disclosures to obtain favourable ESG ratings without implementing substantial improvements in their environmental or social performance. This practice has intensified debates surrounding green washing, where symbolic sustainability initiatives and extensive ESG reporting create an impression of responsible corporate behaviour while masking unsustainable operational practices. Such discrepancies undermine stakeholder confidence, distort sustainable investment decisions, and weaken the effectiveness of ESG frameworks in promoting genuine corporate responsibility (Yu, Van Luu, & Chen, 2024).

3. Scope and Significance of Study

This study examines the paradox surrounding Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) ratings by critically evaluating whether they accurately measure corporate sustainability performance or inadvertently encourage green washing practices. The study focuses on the conceptual and methodological dimensions of ESG ratings, including differences in rating frameworks, disclosure practices, evaluation criteria, and their implications for corporate accountability. It explores the relationship between ESG ratings, sustainability reporting, stakeholder trust, and responsible investment decisions from a global perspective. The study also investigates how inconsistencies in ESG assessments influence investors, regulators, financial institutions, and corporate managers (Drempetic, Klein, & Zwergel, 2020). The significance of this study lies in its contribution to the growing debate on the credibility, transparency, and practical usefulness of ESG ratings in promoting sustainable business practices. As ESG metrics increasingly influence investment decisions, regulatory compliance, and corporate reputation, understanding their methodological limitations becomes essential for ensuring efficient capital allocation and stakeholder confidence (OECD, 2024). The study provides valuable insights for investors by highlighting the risks associated with relying solely on ESG scores when assessing corporate sustainability. It also offers guidance for policymakers and regulators seeking to develop harmonized reporting standards, strengthen independent verification mechanisms, and minimize green washing. Furthermore, corporate leaders and sustainability professionals can benefit from the findings by recognizing the importance of outcome-based sustainability performance rather than symbolic disclosure practices. The research ultimately supports the development of more transparent, reliable, and standardized ESG assessment frameworks that align corporate sustainability reporting with measurable environmental and social outcomes.

4. Objective of Study

- To examine the concept and evolution of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) ratings in the context of corporate sustainability
- To analyse the methodologies, indicators, and evaluation frameworks adopted by major ESG rating agencies

- To identify the key challenges and inconsistencies associated with ESG ratings and sustainability measurement
- To examine the relationship between ESG ratings and greenwashing practices in corporate sustainability reporting
- To evaluate the implications of ESG rating divergence on investors, stakeholders, and corporate decision-making
- To suggest suitable measures for enhancing the transparency, reliability, and standardization of ESG rating systems for effective sustainability assessment

5. Review of Literature

Recent scholarship has emphasized that ESG ratings have become essential instruments for assessing corporate sustainability and informing responsible investment decisions. They enable investors to integrate environmental, social, and governance risks into financial analysis while encouraging organizations to improve transparency and long-term value creation. However, the literature also highlights that ESG ratings differ considerably across providers because of variations in indicators, weighting systems, and data interpretation. These inconsistencies reduce comparability and create uncertainty regarding the actual sustainability performance of firms, thereby limiting the effectiveness of ESG ratings as standardized evaluation tools (Kotsantonis & Serafeim, 2019).

Several studies have examined the phenomenon of ESG rating divergence and its implications for financial markets. Researchers argue that different rating agencies often assign substantially different scores to the same company despite evaluating similar sustainability dimensions. Such divergence originates from differences in measurement scope, methodological choices, and subjective judgments rather than actual changes in corporate performance. The resulting inconsistency complicates investment decision-making, increases information asymmetry, and weakens the credibility of ESG-based investment strategies. The investors are encouraged to complement ESG ratings with broader sustainability analyses instead of relying exclusively on a single rating provider (Billio, Costola, Hristova, Latino, & Pelizzon, 2021).

Lyon & Montgomery (2015) focused on the relationship between ESG disclosure practices and green washing. Scholars argue that organizations increasingly adopt sophisticated sustainability reporting frameworks and communication strategies to strengthen their ESG image. While improved disclosure enhances transparency, it may also encourage symbolic compliance, where companies emphasize sustainability commitments without implementing meaningful operational changes. This disconnect between reported ESG performance and actual environmental or social impact creates opportunities for green washing, undermines stakeholder trust, and reduces the effectiveness of ESG reporting as a mechanism for corporate accountability. Researchers therefore advocate stronger assurance mechanisms and independent verification of sustainability disclosures.

Recent research by IFRS Foundation (2023) demonstrated that strengthening global ESG governance through harmonized reporting standards, outcome-based performance indicators, and enhanced regulatory oversight. International initiatives, including the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), have accelerated efforts to improve the consistency, comparability, and reliability of sustainability reporting across jurisdictions. Scholars argue that integrating standardized disclosure requirements with transparent ESG rating methodologies can reduce rating divergence, improve investor confidence, and enhance the role of ESG ratings in supporting sustainable finance. Such reforms are expected to improve accountability while minimizing opportunities for green washing and misleading sustainability claims.

6. Discussion and Analysis

The growing prominence of ESG ratings has transformed the way corporations are evaluated by investors, regulators, and other stakeholders. ESG scores are increasingly incorporated into investment portfolios, lending decisions, corporate governance assessments, and sustainability benchmarking. However, the findings from contemporary literature indicate that ESG ratings remain far from uniform due to differences in methodologies, weighting mechanisms, and data interpretation across rating providers. As a result, companies may receive significantly different ESG scores from different agencies despite exhibiting similar sustainability practices. This inconsistency weakens the reliability of ESG ratings as universal indicators of corporate sustainability and creates uncertainty for investors seeking objective sustainability information (Sustainability Accounting Standards Board [SASB], 2023). A major concern emerging from the literature is that ESG ratings frequently emphasize disclosure quality rather than actual sustainability outcomes. Organizations with sophisticated reporting systems, dedicated ESG teams, and extensive sustainability communication often achieve higher ratings even when measurable environmental or social improvements remain limited. This creates an incentive for firms to prioritize reporting compliance over substantive sustainability transformation. Consequently, ESG ratings may unintentionally reward organizations that excel in disclosure management rather than those demonstrating genuine environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and ethical governance. Such practices contribute to the widening gap between perceived sustainability performance and actual corporate impact (International Organization of Securities Commissions [IOSCO], 2023).

The discussion also highlights the growing challenge of green washing within the ESG ecosystem. As sustainable investment continues to expand, organizations increasingly recognize the commercial benefits associated with favourable ESG ratings. Some firms strategically promote sustainability initiatives through marketing campaigns, voluntary disclosures, and selective reporting while omitting information relating to environmental violations, labour issues, or governance failures. This selective disclosure undermines stakeholder confidence and compromises the credibility of sustainable finance. The greater emphasis should be placed on independently verified, outcome-based sustainability indicators rather than relying primarily on self-reported ESG information (European Securities and Markets Authority [ESMA], 2024). The analysis suggests that strengthening the effectiveness of ESG ratings requires internationally harmonized reporting standards, transparent rating methodologies, independent assurance, and stronger regulatory oversight. The convergence of global sustainability frameworks, particularly the implementation of ISSB standards and enhanced corporate disclosure regulations, provides an opportunity to improve consistency and comparability across ESG assessments. Future ESG evaluation systems should integrate measurable environmental and social outcomes with transparent governance metrics to reduce rating divergence and discourage green washing. Such improvements will enhance investor confidence, strengthen corporate accountability, and enable ESG ratings to serve as credible tools for advancing sustainable development and responsible investment (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD], 2024).

7. Finding of Study

- ESG ratings have become an influential benchmark for evaluating corporate sustainability performance and increasingly influence investment decisions, corporate reputation, and access to sustainable finance. The significant divergence exists among ESG rating agencies due to differences in methodologies, indicator selection, weighting systems, and data sources, resulting in inconsistent ratings for the same organization.

- The absence of globally standardized ESG assessment frameworks reduces the comparability, transparency, and reliability of sustainability ratings across industries and markets.
- ESG ratings largely depend on corporate self-disclosures and publicly available information, making them susceptible to reporting bias and selective disclosure practices.
- Organizations with comprehensive sustainability reporting often receive higher ESG scores even when measurable environmental and social outcomes remain limited.
- Greenwashing has emerged as a major concern, as some companies enhance their ESG image through symbolic sustainability initiatives rather than implementing substantive operational improvements.
- Rating divergence creates information asymmetry for investors, making it difficult to accurately evaluate corporate sustainability risks and long-term business performance.
- Inconsistent ESG ratings may lead to inefficient capital allocation, stakeholder misinformation, and reduced confidence in sustainable investment strategies.
- Stronger regulatory oversight, independent third-party assurance, and internationally harmonized ESG reporting standards are essential to improve the credibility of ESG ratings.
- Future ESG assessment frameworks should prioritize outcome-based sustainability metrics, transparent methodologies, and standardized evaluation criteria to ensure that ESG ratings reflect genuine corporate sustainability performance rather than disclosure quality alone.

8. Conclusion

The growing influence of ESG reflects the increasing demand for businesses to demonstrate accountability in environmental protection, social responsibility, and ethical governance. This study reveals that the effectiveness of ESG ratings is constrained by methodological inconsistencies, varying evaluation criteria, and a heavy reliance on corporate self-disclosures. These limitations often result in divergent ratings for the same organization, raising concerns regarding the comparability, reliability, and credibility of ESG assessments. The study further highlights that the current ESG ecosystem may inadvertently encourage green washing by rewarding organizations for extensive sustainability reporting and symbolic commitments rather than measurable sustainability outcomes. Such practices distort investment decisions, weaken stakeholder trust, and undermine the primary objective of ESG frameworks, which is to promote genuine sustainable business performance. As sustainable finance continues to expand globally, ensuring that ESG ratings accurately reflect real environmental and social impacts has become increasingly important for investors, regulators, and policymakers. The study concludes that overcoming the ESG ratings paradox requires greater methodological transparency, internationally harmonized reporting standards, independent assurance of sustainability disclosures, and the adoption of outcome-based performance indicators. Strengthening collaboration among rating agencies, regulatory authorities, corporations, and standard-setting organizations will improve the consistency and credibility of ESG assessments. Ultimately, a transparent, standardized, and evidence-based ESG rating framework will not only reduce green washing but also enhance stakeholder confidence, support efficient capital allocation, and contribute to achieving global sustainable development objectives.

References:

- Avramov, D., Cheng, S., Lioui, A., & Tarelli, A. (2022). Sustainable investing with ESG rating uncertainty. *Journal of Financial Economics, 145*(2), 642–664. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2021.09.009
- Berg, F., Kölbel, J. F., & Rigobon, R. (2022). Aggregate confusion: The divergence of ESG ratings. *Review of Finance*, *26*(6), 1315–1344. https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfac033
- Billio, M., Costola, M., Hristova, I., Latino, C., & Pelizzon, L. (2021). Inside the ESG ratings: (Dis)agreement and performance. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *28*(5), 1426–1445. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2177
- Choudhury, S., Chechi, V. K., Gaikwad, S. R., & Verma, A. (2024). Exploring educators' perception of augmented reality in Indian context: Psychometric validation and determinants analysis. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Computing, Power and Communication Technologies (IC2PCT)*. IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/IC2PCT60090.2024.10486371
- Christensen, H. B., Hail, L., & Leuz, C. (2022). Mandatory CSR and sustainability reporting: Economic analysis and literature review. *Review of Accounting Studies*, *27*(3), 1170–1240. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-022-09609-5
- Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review*, *54*(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64
- Drempetic, S., Klein, C., & Zwergel, B. (2020). The influence of firm size on the ESG score: Corporate sustainability ratings under review. *Journal of Business Ethics, 167*(2), 333–360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04164-1
- Eccles, R. G., & Klimenko, S. (2019). The investor revolution. *Harvard Business Review, 97*(3), 106–116.
- European Securities and Markets Authority. (2024). *Progress report on greenwashing monitoring and supervision*. https://www.esma.europa.eu
- Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, *66*, 101889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101889
- IFRS Foundation. (2023). *IFRS S1 general requirements for disclosure of sustainability-related financial information*. https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/ifrs-sustainability-standards/
- International Organization of Securities Commissions. (2023). *Recommendations on sustainability-related practices, policies, procedures and disclosure in asset management*. https://www.iosco.org
- Kotsantonis, S., & Serafeim, G. (2019). Four things no one will tell you about ESG data. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, 31*(2), 50–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/jacf.12346
- Lyon, T. P., & Montgomery, A. W. (2015). The means and end of greenwash. *Organization & Environment*, *28*(2), 223–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026615575332
- OECD. (2024). *OECD corporate sustainability: Strengthening ESG frameworks for sustainable finance*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/7f2b6f2f-en
- Sustainability Accounting Standards Board. (2023). *SASB standards*. https://sasb.ifrs.org/standards/
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2024). *World investment report 2024: Investment facilitation and digital governance*. https://unctad.org/publication/world-investment-report-2024
- Yu, E. P. Y., Van Luu, B., & Chen, C. H. (2024). ESG performance, corporate transparency, and sustainable finance: Emerging evidence and future research directions. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *33*(2), 1034–1050. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3705

