

THE EMPLOYEE PERSPECTIVE ON ESG INTEGRATION: ENABLING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES TO DRIVE SUSTAINABILITY IN TRANSFORMATION

Bukka Kavya Reddy*; Nisha Francis**

*Research Scholar,
School of Management Studies,
REVA University, Bangalore, INDIA

**Assistant Professor,
School of Management Studies,
REVA University, Bangalore, INDIA

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2025.00036.4

ABSTRACT

Understanding the complicated relationship between ESG variables and the long-term success of firms is crucial in this dynamic environment. Using the viewpoints of employees from a range of professional services in Bengaluru, this study examines how Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) practices are evolving in professional services organizations. Nuanced insights that support corporate goals and academic discourse are what we hope to offer. Assessing employee understanding of ESG practices in professional service organizations, evaluating the perceived impact of ESG practices on organizational longevity, and examining challenges to ESG adoption are the three primary goals of the study. The study used a mixed-method approach, analysing the questionnaire responses from 302 employees of various professional services in Bangalore. The results indicate that technical ESG targets like carbon neutrality and ESG data reporting are not well understood by employees, but they are aware of general sustainability practices and values such as ethics, diversity, and inclusion. Poor cross-departmental coordination, inconsistent deployment across regions, and a lack of transparency are the main causes of implementation issues for many businesses. To improve use and efficacy of the ESG practices, study recommends more focused training, improved leadership communication, and implementation of user-friendly ESG tools.

KEYWORDS: *Esg Transformation, Professional Services, Sustainability, Employee Engagement, Organizational Performance.*

REFERENCES

1. Alsayegh, M. F., Rahman, R. A., and Homayoun, S. (2020). Transformation of Firm's Corporate ESG Disclosure on Economic, Environmental, and Social (EES) Performance. *Sustainability*, 12(9), 3910. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093910>
 2. Arvidsson, S., Dumay, J., 2022. Corporate ESG reporting quantity, quality, and performance: where to now for environmental policy and practice? *Bus. Strat. Environ.* 31 (3), 1091–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2937>.
-

3. Boukattaya, S., Ftiti, Z., Ben Arfa, N., & Omri, A. (2022). Financial performance under board gender diversity: The mediating effect of corporate social practices. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(5), 1871–1883.
 4. Boulhaga, M., Bouri, A., Elamer, A. A., & Ibrahim, B. A. (2023). Environmental, social and governance ratings and firm performance: The moderating role of internal control quality. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 30(1), 134–145.
 5. Busch, T., & Schnippering, M. (2022). Corporate social and financial performance: Revisiting the role of innovation. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 30(1), 134–145.
 6. Chopra, S. S., Senadheera, S. S., Dissanayake, P. D., Withana, P. A., Chib, R., Rhee, J. H., & Ok, Y. S. (2024). Navigating the Challenges of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Reporting: The Path to Broader Sustainable Development. In Sustainability (Switzerland) (Vol. 16, Issue 2). *Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI)*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020606>
 7. Collevocchio, F., Temperini, V., Barba-Sanchez, V., & Meseguer-Martinez, A. (2025). Sustainable Governance: Board Sustainability Experience and the Interplay with Board Age for Firm Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 197(2), 371–389. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05739-3>
 8. Crowley, D.F.C., Eccles, R.G., 2023. *Rescuing ESG from the culture wars*. Harv. Bus. Rev. <https://hbr.org/2023/02/rescuing-esg-from-the-culture-wars>.
 9. Damodaran, A., 2023. ESG Is beyond Redemption: May it RIP. Financial Times. Das, A., 2023. Predictive value of supply chain sustainability initiatives for ESGperformance: a study of large multinationals. *Multinatl. Bus. Rev.* <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBR-09-2022-0149>.
 10. De Souza Barbosa, A. ; Da Silva, M. C. B. C. ; Da Silva, L. B. ; Morioka, S. N. ; De Souza, V. F. (2023). Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria integration: how they affect companies' sustainability performance. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01919-0>
 11. Disli, M., Yilmaz, M., Mohamed, F., 2022. Board characteristics and sustainability performance: empirical evidence from emerging markets. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal* 13 (4), 929–952. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-09-2020-0313>.
 12. Dufailly, F., & Nordstrand, A.H. (2024). Consultants as Change Agents for Sustainability: A qualitative examination of ESG services [Master thesis]. *Lund University*. Retrieved from <https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=download>
 13. Durand, R., Paugam, L., & Stolowy, H. (2019). Do investors actually value sustainability indices? Replication, development, and new evidence on CSR visibility. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(9), 1471–1490.
 14. Elamer, A. A., & Boulhaga, M. (2024). ESG controversies and corporate performance: The moderating effect of governance mechanisms and ESG practices. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 31(4), 3312–3327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2749>
-

15. Ferrero-Ferrero, I., Fernández-Izquierdo, M., & Muñoz-Torres, M. (2016). Return on Investment: The impact of Environmental, Social and Governance quality on financial capital. *Sustainability*, 8(10), 1005. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su8101005>
16. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Stakeholders and Corporate Boards: Lessons from Theory and Practice*. Pitman.
17. Freeman, R., McVea, J., 2000. *A stakeholder approach to strategic management*. In: Hitt, M., Freeman, M.E., Harrison, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of Strategic Management*. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
18. Gee, A. (2024, February 11). EY's Ripples program has set out to improve the lives of 1 billion people by 2030. EY. Retrieved from https://www.ey.com/en_gl/newsroom/2019/12/ey-ripples-program
19. Hristov, I., & Searcy, C. (2025). Integrating sustainability with corporate governance: a framework to implement the corporate sustainability reporting directive through a balanced scorecard. *Management Decision*, 63(2), 443–467. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-10-2023-1995>
20. Hunjra, A. I., Bouri, E., Azam, M., Azam, R. I., & Dai, J. (2024). The study focuses on the relationship between economic growth and environmental sustainability in developing economies. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 70, 102341., <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2024.102341>
21. Kates, R. W., Clark, W. C., Corell, R., Hall, J. M., Jaeger, C. C., Lowe, I., & Svedin, U. (2001). Sustainability science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(21), 12401–12404. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.211548898>
22. Li, T. T., Wang, K., Sueyoshi, T., & Wang, D. D. (2021). Esg: Research progress and future prospects. In *Sustainability (Switzerland)* (Vol. 13, Issue 21). MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111663>
23. López-Concepción, A., Gil-Lacruz, A. I., & Saz-Gil, I. (2021). Stakeholder engagement, CSR evolution and SDGs alignment: A systematic review between 2015 and 2021. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2170>
24. M. Renuka, M. Neeti, N Francis, & Jain R. (2025). Role of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) Investment in Financial Performance of Organizations: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*, 5(2), 5644–5654. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.52783/jier.v5i2.3078>
25. Marketing. (2024, August 31). 50 Sustainability statistics You need to know in 2025. *Key ESG*. Retrieved from <https://www.keyesg.com/article/50-esg-statistics-you-need-to-know-in-2024>
26. Martiny, A., Tagliatalata, J., Testa, F., & Iraldo, F. (2024). Determinants of Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) performance: A systematic Literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 456, 142213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.142213>

27. Umar, Z., Kenourgios, D., Papathanasiou, S., 2020. The static and dynamic connectedness of environmental, social, and governance investments: international evidence. *Econ. Modell.* 93, 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j>.
28. de Paula, N., Arditi, D., & Melhado, S. (2017). Managing sustainability efforts in building design, construction, consulting, and facility management firms. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 24(6), 1040-1050.
29. Barney, J., 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *J. Manag.* 17, 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>.
30. Short, J.C., McKenny, A.F., Ketchen, D.J., Snow, C.C., Hult, G.T., 2015. An empirical examination of firm, industry, and temporal effects on corporate social performance. *Bus. Soc.* 55 (8) <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315574848>.
31. Galbreath, J., 2013. ESG in focus: the Australian evidence. *J. Bus. Ethics* 118 (3), 529–541. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1607-9>.
32. Cassely, L., Larbi, S., Revelli, C., Lacroux, A., 2021. Corporate social performance (CSP) in time of economic crisis. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal* 12 (5), 913–942. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-07-2020-0262>.