Research Proposal
on
“Investigating the Impact of ESG Scores on Portfolio Performance”

Introduction

In recent years, Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors have become critical elements in investment decision-making processes. As global challenges such as climate change, social inequality, and governance accountability intensify, investors and stakeholders are shifting their focus from traditional financial metrics to more sustainable and ethical investment strategies. This research aims to dissect and analyze the financial performance of portfolios constructed with varying levels of ESG scores to address the academic and practical question: Do ESG factors truly influence portfolio returns, and if so, how? This proposal will outline the project structure, starting with a literature review, followed by the formulation of research questions, methodology, potential limitations, and a project timetable.

Research Background

The integration of ESG factors into investment decision-making has evolved from a niche interest to a mainstream practice, as evidenced by the increasing volume of ESG disclosures (KPMG, 2022). Elkington's (2018) reevaluation of the Triple Bottom Line introduces a broader perspective on corporate success, emphasizing the need for an integrated approach to sustainability in business practices.

Empirical research offers mixed insights into the impact of ESG factors on financial performance. Derwall et al. (2005) suggest that high eco-efficiency scores correlate with superior market performance, proposing a positive link between environmental stewardship and financial returns. Conversely, Auer & Schuhmacher (2016) report minimal differences in risk-adjusted returns between portfolios with high and low ESG ratings, indicating that the financial implications of ESG factors might be more complex and context-dependent than previously thought.

Studies by Khan, Serafeim, and Yoon (2016) further the discussion by highlighting the importance of materiality in ESG assessments, suggesting that the impact of ESG factors is contingent on their relevance to a company's specific operational context. This body of work, while extensive, reveals a gap in comprehensive, empirical analysis that considers the separate

and combined effects of the Environmental, Social, and Governance components on portfolio performance, particularly over extended periods and across different market conditions.

Research Objectives

- **Primary Objective:** To examine whether portfolios constructed based on high and low ESG scores exhibit differences in financial performance.

- **Secondary Objective:** To analyze the impact of individual ESG components (Environmental, Social, Governance) on the financial performance of portfolios.

Hypothesis

H1: Portfolios with higher ESG scores outperform those with lower scores in terms of financial returns.
H2: The individual components of ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) each uniquely contribute to the performance disparities observed in portfolios.

Methodology

The study will employ a quantitative research design, utilizing historical data from investment portfolios and their respective ESG scores. The following steps outline the research methodology:

1. **Data Collection:** Gather data on portfolios' ESG scores from reputable sources such as Bloomberg or Morningstar Sustainalytics. The portfolios will be constructed based on their overall ESG scores as well as their individual Environmental, Social, and Governance scores.

2. **Portfolio Construction:** Create two sets of portfolios — 'Top' portfolios comprising stocks from the highest decile of ESG scores and 'Bottom' portfolios from the lowest decile.

3. **Performance Measurement:** Use the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) and Fama-French three-factor model to measure and compare the performance of these portfolios over a suitable historical period.

4. **Statistical Analysis:** Employ regression analysis to examine the relationship between ESG scores and portfolio performance, adjusting for relevant financial and economic variables.

Potential Limitations and Practical Concerns

Access to comprehensive, standardized ESG data may pose a challenge, as reporting standards vary between companies and regions. To mitigate this, the research will focus on data from databases known for their rigorous data collection methodologies. Additionally, the dynamic nature of ESG criteria and their impact over time could affect the reliability of longitudinal analyses.

Expected Outcomes

This study expects to find a positive correlation between high ESG scores and superior portfolio performance. Additionally, it aims to determine the relative impact of each ESG component on financial outcomes, providing investors with deeper insights into how these factors might influence their investment strategies.

Significance

Understanding the financial implications of ESG factors is vital for investors aiming to align financial returns with ethical and sustainable practices. By providing empirical evidence on the financial performance of ESG-integrated portfolios, this research could influence future investment strategies and policy formulations within the financial sector.

This research proposal provides a comprehensive plan to explore a timely and increasingly relevant area of finance, bridging ethical considerations with financial performance through the lens of ESG factors.

Timetable for Research Report:

April (Week 2-4)

- Week 2-3: Finalize and submit the research proposal and secure access to financial databases to begin data collection.
- Week 4: Start preliminary data analysis.

May (Week 7-8)

- Week 7-8: Complete data collection and develop analytical models.

June (Week 9-12)

- Week 9-10: Conduct detailed statistical analysis.
- Week 11-12: Analyze results and draft the research findings.

July (Week 13-16)

- Week 13-14: Refine and finalize the draft of the research report.
- Week 15-16: Peer review and report revisions.

August (Weeks 17-18)

- Week 17-18: Prepare to submit the completed research report.

This concise timetable ensures the project is completed efficiently within three months, focusing on essential tasks and milestones.

References:

1. Alessandrini, F. and Jondeau, E. (2019), ESG Investing: From Sin Stocks To Smart Beta, Swiss Finance Institute, Geneva.
2. Amel-Zadeh, A. and Serafeim, G. (2017) *Why and how investors use ESG information: Evidence from a global survey*, *SSRN*. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2925310 (Accessed: 06 April 2024).
3. Auer, B.R. and Schuhmacher, F. (2016), "Do socially (ir)responsible investment pay? New evidence from international ESG data", *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance.*
4. Bauer, R., Derwall, J. and Otten, R. (2007), "The ethical mutual fund performance debate: new evidence from Canada", *Journal of Business Ethics.*
5. Capelle-Blancard, G. and Monjon, S. (2012), "Trends in the literature on socially responsible investment: looking for the keys under the lamppost", Business Ethics: A European Review.
6. Cheng, B., I. Ioannou, and G. Serafeim, 2014. Corporate Social Responsibility and Access to Finance. Strategic Management Journal 35.
7. Derwall, J., Guenster, N., Bauer, R. and Koedijk, K. (2005), "The eco-efficiency premium puzzle", *Financial Analysts Journal.*
8. Dhaliwal, D. S., O. Z. Li, A. Tsang, and Y. G. Yang. 2011. Voluntary Disclosure and the Cost of Equity Capital: The Initiation of Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting. The Accounting Review 86.
9. Dhaliwal, D. S., S. Radhakrishnan, A. Tsang, and Y. Yang, G. 2012. Nonfinancial Disclosure and Analyst Forecast Accuracy: International Evidence on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure. The Accounting Review 87.
10. Diltz, J.D. (1995), "Does social screening affect the portfolio performance", *Journal of Investing.*
11. Elkington, J. (2018) *25 years ago I coined the phrase 'triple bottom line.' here's why it's time to rethink it.*, *Harvard Business Review*. Available at:

https://hbr.org/2018/06/25-years-ago-i-coined-the-phrase-triple-bottom-line-heres-why-im-giving-up-on-it (Accessed: 05 April 2024).

12. Grewal, J., Riedl, E. and Serafeim, G., 2017. Market Reaction to Mandatory Nonfinancial Disclosure. Harvard Business School Working Paper.

13. Grewal, J., Hauptman, C. and Serafeim, G. 2017. Stock price synchronicity and material sustainability information. Harvard Business School Working Paper.

14. GSIA (2022) *Global Sustainable Investment review2022*. Available at: https://www.gsi-alliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/GSIA-Report-2022.pdf (Accessed: 06 April 2024).

15. Hamilton, S., Jo, H. and Statman, M. (1993), "Doing well while doing good? The investment performance of socially responsible mutual funds", *Financial Analysts Journal.*

16. Jackman, H. (2024) *ESG reporting frameworks – comparing the GRI and the SASB - ESG pro ltd..*, *ESG PRO Ltd. - UK leader for ESG reporting software*. Available at: https://esgpro.co.uk/esg-reporting-frameworks-comparing-the-gri-and-the-sasb/ (Accessed: 05 April 2024).

17. Kempf, A. and Osthoff, P. (2007), "The effect of socially responsible investing on portfolio performance", *European Financial Management.*

18. Khan, M., G. Serafeim., and A. Yoon. 2016. Corporate Sustainability: First Evidence on Materiality. The Accounting Review 91.

19. KPMG (2022) *Survey of sustainability reporting 2022*. Available at: https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/se/pdf/komm/2022/Global-Survey-of-Sustainability-Reporting-2022.pdf (Accessed: 05 April 2024).

20. Lydenberg, S., Michael, M., Burckart, W. and Clark, M. (2018), Why and How Investors Can Respond To Income Inequality, UNPRI.

21. Mollet, J.C. and Ziegler, A. (2014), "Socially responsible investing and stock performance: new empirical", *Review of Financial Economics*

22. PRI (2018) *Why and how investors can respond to ...* Available at: https://www.unpri.org/download?ac=5599 (Accessed: 06 April 2024).

23. PRI (2022) *Principles for Responsible Investment 2022 signatory ... - un pri*. Available at:

https://dwtyzx6upklss.cloudfront.net/Uploads/w/q/a/202210072022prisgmminutes2022final_873485.pdf (Accessed: 05 April 2024).

24. Statman, M. and Glushkov, D. (2009), "The wages of social responsibility", *Financial Analysts Journal.*

25. United Nations (2022) *United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda*, *United Nations*. Available at: https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda-retired/ (Accessed: 05 April 2024).

26. Woetzel, L. *et al.* (2015) *How advancing women's equality can add $12 trillion to global growth*, *McKinsey & Company*. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/employment-and-growth/how-advancing-womens-equality-can-add-12-trillion-to-global-growth (Accessed: 06 April 2024).

27. World Economic Forum (2018) *World Economic Forum annual meeting 2018*, *World Economic Forum*. Available at: https://www.weforum.org/events/world-economic-forum-annual-meeting-2018/ (Accessed: 06 April 2024).

28. World Inequality Lab (2022) *WorldInequalityReport2022_Full...* Available at: https://wir2022.wid.world/www-site/uploads/2021/12/WorldInequalityReport2022_Full_Report.pdf (Accessed: 05 April 2024).

29. Zehir, E. and Aybras, A. (2020) Is there any effect of ESG scores on portfolio performance? evidence from Europe and Turkey, Journal of Capital Markets Studies. Available at: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JCMS-09-2020-0034/full/html?cv=1 (Accessed: 08 April 2024).