INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN INNOVATION, MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL SCIENCES
DOI: https://doi.org/10.57109/238 ISSN:
VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, September -2024

IJARIMSS
ISSN 2739-6797

Research paper

The Investor's Dilemma: Balancing Social Preferences and Financial Returns in Sustainable Investments

EL BIJRI Nada [1,*], MZARA Safae[2], BOUABD Fatima[2]

[1] ENCG Kenitra, *Université Ibn Tofail, Kenitra, Morocco, Morroco*

[2] *Faculté d'Economie et de de Gestion, Université Ibn Tofail, Kenitra, Morocco, Laboratoire des Sciences Économiques et Politiques Publiques, Morroco*

PAPER INFO

Paper History
Received 26 April 2024
Accepted 24 July 2024

Keywords
Sustainable Investments
ESG Criteria
Investor Motivation
Ethical Investing
Financial Returns

ABSTRACT

This article examines the intricate relationship between investors' social preferences and their pursuit of financial returns in the context of sustainable investments. By reviewing the existing literature, this paper aims to shed light on the motivations driving investors toward sustainable investments and the financial performance outcomes of these assets. It explores whether investors are primarily motivated by ethical considerations or by the expectation of superior financial returns. Additionally, the article discusses the challenges associated with integrating environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria into investment decisions and the evolution of the sustainable investment market.

Introduction

The growing interest in sustainable investments has prompted extensive academic research to understand investor motivations and the financial performance associated with these assets. This phenomenon raises fundamental questions: Are investors motivated by social preferences, as suggested by Riedl and Smeets (2017), or are they primarily seeking superior financial returns, as argued by Hartzmark and Sussman (2019)? This article explores these questions by providing a literature review on the motivations of sustainable investors and examining the trade-offs associated with such investments. By delving into the complex dynamics and emerging trends in the field of sustainable investments, this article highlights the key factors influencing investment decisions and the challenges investors face.

**Corresponding author. Email:* nadabijri@gmail.com

1. Investor Motivations

The increasing interest in sustainable investments has led to a thorough exploration of investor motivations. Investors may be drawn to ethical and personal considerations, as well as the financial return prospects associated with sustainable investments. This section examines these various motivations and the reasons why investors choose to align their portfolios with environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria.

- **Ethical and Personal Values**

Investors are often motivated by ethical considerations and seek to align their investments with their personal values. Renneboog, Ter Horst, and Zhang (2008) show that many investors avoid supporting industries or practices they consider harmful, such as tobacco, arms, or gambling. These investors aim to use their portfolios to promote responsible and ethical practices.

Hong and Kacperczyk (2009) also found that investors avoid stocks of "sinful" companies, such as those involved in tobacco, alcohol, and gambling. This aversion to industries perceived as harmful is largely driven by social norms and ethical concerns.

Bollen (2007) analyzed the influence of social preferences on fund flows to socially responsible investments. He found that SRI funds receive positive flows in response to good past performance, suggesting strong social motivation among investors.

Statman (2000) proposed that sustainable investments can be seen as a luxury that investors are willing to pay for. By analyzing the market for ethical funds, he concluded that investors accept slightly lower returns to achieve non-financial benefits.

- **Financial Returns**

Beyond ethical motivations, many investors are also attracted by the financial return prospects of sustainable investments. Friede, Busch, and Bassen (2015) conducted a meta-analysis of over 2,000 empirical studies and concluded that integrating ESG criteria into investment decisions generally does not lead to financial sacrifices. In fact, they found evidence indicating that it can even improve long-term returns. This meta-analysis highlights that companies integrating ESG criteria tend to have better financial performance, partly due to their effective risk and opportunity management.

Hartzmark and Sussman (2019) also showed that investors value sustainability, and that sustainable funds attract more capital due to the perception of better future performance. Their study indicates that investors are willing to allocate more resources to funds that integrate ESG criteria, reinforcing the idea that these investments are perceived as financially advantageous.

Khan, Serafeim, and Yoon (2016) contributed to this perspective by showing that companies with good ESG practices achieve better financial results. Their study underscores that sustainability can go hand in hand with profitability, reinforcing the idea that ESG criteria are key performance indicators.

2. Performance of Sustainable Investments

The performance of sustainable investments has been extensively studied in the academic literature, often revealing significant financial advantages. This section explores the findings of various studies that have analyzed long-term returns and the specific impacts of integrating ESG criteria on corporate performance.

- **Long-Term Returns**

Eccles, Ioannou, and Serafeim (2014) conducted a comprehensive study showing that companies with strong sustainability practices outperform their less responsible counterparts in terms of long-term stock and accounting performance. Their study, based on data from 1993 to 2010, demonstrates that sustainability-focused companies are more resilient and better prepared to face economic crises. They exhibit higher risk-adjusted returns and superior profit margins, indicating efficient resource management and continuous innovation.

- **Studies and Analyses**

Clark, Feiner, and Viehs (2015) compiled research showing that integrating ESG criteria is associated with lower capital costs, better operational performance, and superior stock returns. Their report highlights that companies adopting sustainable practices can attract investments more easily by reducing perceived risks. For example, proactive environmental risk management can prevent future costs related to regulations or environmental damage, while attention to social and governance issues can enhance reputation and customer loyalty.

Friede, Busch, and Bassen (2015) conducted a meta-analysis of over 2,000 empirical studies and concluded that integrating ESG criteria into investment decisions generally does not lead to financial sacrifices. In fact, they found evidence indicating that it can even improve long-term returns. This meta-analysis highlights that companies integrating ESG criteria tend to have better financial performance, partly due to their effective risk and opportunity management.

Hartzmark and Sussman (2019) showed that investors value sustainability, and that sustainable funds attract more capital due to the perception of better future performance. Their study indicates that investors are willing to allocate more resources to funds that integrate ESG criteria, reinforcing the idea that these investments are perceived as financially advantageous.

Khan, Serafeim, and Yoon (2016) also contributed to this perspective by showing that companies with strong ESG practices achieve better financial results. Their study emphasizes that sustainability can go hand in hand with profitability, reinforcing the idea that ESG criteria are key performance indicators.

3. Integration of ESG Criteria

Integrating ESG criteria into investment decisions has become a common practice for evaluating not only financial performance but also non-financial risks of companies. This approach allows investors to better understand and manage potential risks while promoting sustainable and ethical practices. Concurrently, shareholder engagement on ESG issues enables investors to directly influence corporate practices, contributing to significant improvements in governance and sustainable performance. This

section delves into the impact of integrating ESG criteria and shareholder engagement on corporate performance and investment portfolios.

- **Risk Analysis**

Integrating ESG criteria allows investors to better evaluate non-financial risks. Giese, Lee, Melas, Nagy, and Nishikawa (2019) reveal that ESG scores improve portfolio quality by identifying companies with reduced idiosyncratic risks. Their study shows that companies with high ESG scores tend to have better risk management, which can translate into more stable financial performance.

Companies that effectively manage their environmental impacts can avoid costly regulatory sanctions and minimize risks related to environmental degradation. For example, a company proactive in managing its carbon emissions can not only avoid fines but also benefit from carbon credits and a better reputation among environmentally conscious consumers. Similarly, a company that excels in governance can avoid financial scandals and conflicts of interest, ensuring greater transparency and better decision-making. This effective risk management often results in reduced stock volatility and more stable financial performance.

- **Shareholder Engagement**

Dimson, Karakaş, and Li (2015) demonstrate that shareholder engagement on ESG issues can improve the performance of both companies and investors. Their study shows that investors can positively influence corporate practices by using their voting power and engaging in dialogues with management on sustainability issues. They found that companies responding to shareholder engagements often improve their ESG performance and financial results.

Shareholder engagement can take several forms. Direct dialogues with corporate management allow investors to discuss ESG concerns and encourage improvements. Shareholder proposals at annual meetings can also be used to promote sustainable and responsible practices. Voting on ESG resolutions is another powerful tool, enabling shareholders to signal their support or opposition to certain corporate practices.

Dimson et al. (2015) show that successful shareholder engagements often lead to positive changes in the ESG practices of targeted companies. These changes can include improvements in waste management, diversity and inclusion policies, or more transparent governance practices. Consequently, companies that positively respond to shareholder engagements often see improvements in their financial performance, reflecting more effective risk management and a better market reputation.

4. Challenges of Integrating ESG Criteria in Sustainable Investments

Integrating ESG criteria into investment decisions presents many advantages, but it is not without challenges. Two major obstacles often stand before investors: the lack of standardized data and greenwashing. These issues can complicate the evaluation of corporate ESG performance and undermine the credibility of sustainable investments.

- **Lack of Standardized Data**

One of the main obstacles to integrating ESG criteria is the lack of standardized data. Berg, Koelbel, and Rigobon (2019) highlight inconsistencies in ESG ratings, complicating the task of investors in comparing companies. The diversity of standards and ESG reporting methods can make it difficult to evaluate and compare corporate performance.

ESG rating agencies use different methodologies, criteria, and weights to evaluate corporate ESG performance, leading to very different scores for the same company. For example, a company could receive a high rating from one agency for its environmental practices while receiving a low rating from another agency due to different emphasis on social or governance aspects. This variability complicates the task of investors seeking to integrate ESG criteria coherently and reliably into their investment decisions. The disparity in ratings can also lead to confusion and distrust among investors, reducing the effectiveness of ESG integration.

The inconsistencies in ESG ratings can also be exacerbated by the lack of transparency in the methodology of rating agencies. Some agencies may place more weight on environmental criteria, while others prioritize social or governance aspects. This lack of standardization creates an environment where companies may be tempted to "game" the rating systems to achieve better scores without actually improving their ESG practices. Investors, on the other hand, are left with potentially misleading or contradictory information, making it difficult to compare companies on fair and reliable bases.

- **Greenwashing**

Delmas and Burbano (2011) explain that some companies engage in greenwashing, misleadingly communicating about their environmental performance to improve their public image without adopting real sustainable practices. This practice can mislead investors and undermine the credibility of sustainable investments.

Greenwashing often manifests through slogans and marketing campaigns presenting a company as environmentally friendly while its actual practices do not reflect these claims. For example, a company may highlight symbolic green initiatives, such as tree planting, while continuing to engage in polluting industrial processes. These practices can dilute sustainability efforts and erode investor trust in genuine ESG initiatives. When investors discover that a company's environmental claims are misleading, it can lead to a loss of confidence not only in that company but also in the broader concept of sustainable investing.

Greenwashing poses a major challenge as it creates a false perception of a company's ESG performance. Companies investing in genuine sustainable practices may be put at a disadvantage against those merely pretending to be sustainable, distorting the market. This can discourage companies from making real investments in sustainability, knowing that their efforts may be overshadowed by deceptive marketing campaigns. For investors, greenwashing represents a significant

risk, as it becomes difficult to discern which companies truly have robust ESG practices and which are merely projecting a green image.

5. Market Evolution

The evolution of the sustainable investment market has been marked by growing demand and significant financial innovations. These changes are driven by increasing awareness of ESG issues and increasingly stringent regulations. This section examines in detail these market dynamics.

- **Growing Demand**

The Global Sustainable Investment Alliance (GSIA, 2020) review indicates that responsible investments represent a growing share of assets under management, driven by increased demand from institutional and retail investors. This trend is supported by increasing awareness of ESG issues and increasingly stringent regulations.

Institutional investors, such as pension funds and insurance companies, are increasingly integrating ESG criteria into their investment strategies to meet the expectations of beneficiaries and regulators. For example, many institutions have begun adopting exclusion policies to avoid investing in companies involved in controversial activities such as fossil fuels, tobacco, and weapons. This growing demand is also fueled by millennials, who show a strong preference for responsible investments. As a demographic group, millennials are more inclined to invest in companies and funds that promote sustainable and responsible practices, seeking to align their investments with their personal values.

- **Financial Innovation**

The emergence of new financial products, such as green bonds and ESG funds, responds to the growing demand for sustainable investment options. These innovations allow investors to diversify their portfolios while integrating sustainability criteria.

Green bonds, for example, are issued to finance specific environmental projects, such as renewable energy or sustainable transport infrastructure. These bonds offer investors an opportunity to support ecological projects while obtaining financial returns. Large financial institutions and governments have begun issuing green bonds to attract capital for sustainable initiatives. In 2020, the green bond market reached record levels, indicating strong investor demand for this type of financial product.

ESG funds, on the other hand, invest in companies that meet strict sustainability criteria. These funds select companies that excel in managing their environmental, social, and governance impacts. The rise of ESG funds reflects a broader trend toward integrating ESG criteria into investment decisions, allowing investors to contribute to sustainability goals while diversifying their portfolios. ESG funds use various strategies, such as ESG integration, exclusion, and impact investing, to align financial and sustainability objectives.

Conclusion

Integrating ESG criteria into investment decisions has become a common practice, supported by both ethical and financial motivations of investors. Research shows that sustainable investments can offer significant financial benefits while enabling better risk management and increased corporate resilience. However, challenges remain, including the lack of standardized data and greenwashing, which can complicate the evaluation and comparison of corporate ESG performance. The evolution of the market, with growing demand and the emergence of new financial products such as green bonds and ESG funds, indicates that sustainable investments are set to become a central pillar of global investment strategy. To maximize the positive impact of sustainable investments, it is crucial to continue harmonizing ESG reporting standards and promoting corporate transparency.

References

- Berg, F., Koelbel, J. F., & Rigobon, R. (2019). "Aggregate Confusion: The Divergence of ESG Ratings". *MIT Sloan School of Management Working Paper*.
- Bollen, N. P. (2007). "Mutual Fund Attributes and Investor Behavior". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 42(3), 683-708.
- Chatterji, A. K., & Levine, D. I. (2006). "Breaking Down the Wall of Codes: Evaluating Non-Financial Performance Measurement". *California Management Review*, 48(2), 29-51.
- Clark, G. L., Feiner, A., & Viehs, M. (2015). "From the Stockholder to the Stakeholder: How Sustainability Can Drive Financial Outperformance". *University of Oxford and Arabesque Partners*.
- Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). "The Drivers of Greenwashing". *California Management Review*, 54(1), 64-87.
- Dimson, E., Karakaş, O., & Li, X. (2015). "Active Ownership". *The Review of Financial Studies*, 28(12), 3225-3268.
- Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). "The Impact of Corporate Sustainability on Organizational Processes and Performance". *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835-2857.
- Fatemi, A., Fooladi, I., & Tehranian, H. (2015). "Valuation effects of corporate social responsibility". *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 59, 182-192.
- Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). "ESG and financial performance: aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies". *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210-233.
- Global Sustainable Investment Alliance (2020). "Global Sustainable Investment Review 2020". *GSIA*.
- Hartzmark, S. M., & Sussman, A. B. (2019). "Do Investors Value Sustainability? A Natural Experiment Examining Ranking and Fund Flows". *The Journal of Finance*, 74(6), 2789-2837.
- Henisz, W., Koller, T., & Nuttall, R. (2019). "Five ways that ESG creates value". *McKinsey Quarterly*.
- Khan, M., Serafeim, G., & Yoon, A. (2016). "Corporate Sustainability: First Evidence on Materiality". *The Accounting Review*, 91(6), 1697-1724.
- Kölbel, J. F., Heeb, F., Paetzold, F., & Busch, T. (2020). "Can Sustainable Investing Save the World? Reviewing the Mechanisms of Investor Impact". *Organization & Environment*, 33(4), 554-574.
- Lyon, T. P., & Maxwell, J. W. (2011). "Greenwash: Corporate Environmental Disclosure under Threat of Audit". *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 20(1), 3-41.
- Renneboog, L., Ter Horst, J., & Zhang, C. (2008). "Socially responsible investments: Institutional aspects, performance, and investor behavior". *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 32(9), 1723-1742.
- Statman, M. (2000). "Socially responsible mutual funds". *Financial Analysts Journal*, 56(3), 30-39.