Journal of Marketing & Social Research

ISSN (Online): 3008-0711

Volume: 02 | Issue 05 | 2025

Journal homepage: https://jmsr-online.com/

Research Article

Profit with Purpose: Integrating ESG Finance, Ethical Commerce, and Strategic Branding in Global Markets

Dr. Nivedha V[1] and Dr. Vijayalakshmi S[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Ramapuram Campus, Chennai-89

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Ramapuram Campus, Chennai-89

Received: 26/05/2025; Revision: 10/06/2025; Accepted: 20/06/2025; Published: 05/07/2025

***Corresponding author: Dr Nivedha V (*0225nive@gmail.com*)**

Abstract: As global markets grapple with mounting environmental crises, social inequalities, and shifting stakeholder expectations, the business landscape is undergoing a profound redefinition—one where financial performance is no longer enough. This paper explores the intersection of ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding to propose an integrated model of purpose-driven profitability. Using primary data collected from 175 multinational firms and 220 ethical consumers across three continents, the study investigates how ESG-aligned financial decisions and ethically anchored branding strategies interact to drive trust, loyalty, and sustainable returns. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is employed to assess the relationships among constructs such as ESG Integration, Brand Purpose Clarity, Ethical Consumption Alignment, and Investor Confidence. The results reveal that firms with clear purpose narratives embedded in their ESG frameworks experience enhanced stakeholder trust, reduced reputational risk, and increased capital inflow—especially when their ethical claims are consistently translated into operational behaviors and brand messaging. Interestingly, the study finds that authenticity and coherence across ESG disclosures and consumer-facing narratives are more influential than ESG scores alone. Moreover, the moderating role of cross-market sensitivity indicates that what constitutes "ethical" varies significantly across cultures and industries, challenging brands to localize their global purpose strategies. This paper argues that profitability and purpose are not mutually exclusive but co-evolving forces, and that the new competitive edge lies not in greenwashing or virtue signaling but in deeply integrated, stakeholder-driven brand ecosystems. The research offers a strategic roadmap for firms aiming to align investor value with societal benefit, proving that in a post-growth economy, the most enduring profits are those made with purpose.

Keywords: ESG Finance, Ethical Commerce, Strategic Branding, Stakeholder Trust, Purpose-Driven Marketing, Investor Confidence, Brand Purpose Clarity, Sustainable Profitability, ESG Integration, Conscious Capitalism.

INTRODUCTION

The 21st-century marketplace is undergoing a tectonic shift. Gone are the days when quarterly profits alone determined a firm's legitimacy and longevity. In an era defined by climate volatility, social unrest, data transparency, and investor activism, the metrics of success are no longer confined to financial statements. Instead, a new paradigm has emerged—one that blends profitability with purpose, positioning environmental stewardship, social equity, and ethical governance not as peripheral responsibilities but as core business imperatives. The convergence of ESG finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding signals a fundamental rethinking of what it means to win in the global economy. This paper begins from that premise: that sustainable profitability now requires aligning bottom-line performance with top-tier ethical standards and stakeholder values.

While ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) frameworks have become ubiquitous in corporate reporting and investment discourse, their real impact on market strategy, brand perception, and consumer behavior remains contested. Many firms adopt ESG compliance models to satisfy regulatory mandates or attract institutional capital, but without embedding these values into their organizational DNA or customer-facing identity. Similarly, strategic branding and purpose-driven marketing often exist in parallel silos, celebrated for emotional storytelling or social impact campaigns but rarely linked to governance metrics or long-term financial sustainability. This decoupling has created a trust gap—where consumers and investors increasingly question the authenticity of ethical claims, particularly in the face of greenwashing scandals, supply chain opacity, and performative diversity pledges. The challenge, then, is not simply to "do ESG" or "market purpose" but to integrate them—operationally, narratively, and strategically.

This paper seeks to explore precisely that intersection: how ESG financial decisions, ethical commerce practices, and strategic brand positioning can be harmonized to create long-term, stakeholder-aligned profitability. At its core lies the concept of "Profit with Purpose"—a reframing of capitalism that does not sacrifice competitive edge for conscience, but rather recognizes that reputation, resilience, and relational capital are today's real growth engines. The inquiry is both timely and necessary. According to a 2024 Edelman Trust Barometer report, 74%

of global consumers believe brands should take a stand on societal issues, and 61% say they will boycott brands that are perceived as unethical—even if those brands deliver convenience or lower prices. Likewise, BlackRock and other major institutional investors have reiterated that ESG alignment is not only a fiduciary duty but a filter for long-term investment viability.

The implications ripple across the ecosystem. For investors, ESG scoring systems signal risk exposure and corporate foresight. For consumers, ethical commerce practices reflect lived values and personal identity. For employees, purpose-driven branding fosters engagement, loyalty, and innovation. And for brands, coherence across ESG narratives and marketing communications builds trust capital—the invisible yet invaluable currency of modern business. But alignment remains elusive. Many firms struggle with operationalizing ESG principles beyond PR campaigns or compliance audits. Others dilute their brand promise by failing to activate purpose consistently across touchpoints—from sourcing and logistics to advertising and CX design. This disjunction invites cynicism and weakens the very trust brands seek to cultivate.

To address this gap, this research employs a primary data methodology involving 175 multinational corporations and 220 ethically inclined consumers across Asia, Europe, and North America. The study investigates how perceived ESG integration, brand purpose clarity, ethical alignment, and investor confidence interact within a structural framework. Constructs such as Stakeholder Trust, Financial Resilience, and Ethical Brand Engagement are analyzed using SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) to understand causal pathways and moderating variables. In doing so, the study moves beyond abstract theorizing to provide actionable insights on how firms can operationalize “profit with purpose” at scale.

What emerges is a model in which ESG is not just an investment screen but a strategic foundation; in which branding is not merely storytelling but value signaling; and in which purpose is not a campaign but a compass. This model suggests that when ESG finance and ethical commerce are coherently embedded in a brand’s architecture—when they speak the same language across investor decks and Instagram posts—brands unlock a unique form of capital: stakeholder belief. And belief, unlike buzz, compounds. It retains customers, attracts talent, resists backlash, and outlasts market volatility.

In sum, this paper proposes that the next evolution of global business will not be defined by those who simply adopt ESG metrics or champion ethics in advertising—but by those who weave them into a unified, strategic identity that both performs and transforms. Profit with purpose is not a slogan. It is a system. And it may well be the blueprint for capitalism’s next chapter.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The intersection of ESG finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding has become a focal point in contemporary management literature, yet remains fragmented across disciplines such as corporate finance, sustainability studies, marketing ethics, and organizational behavior. Historically, the concept of purpose in business was often framed in opposition to profit, with Friedman’s (1970) shareholder primacy doctrine dominating mainstream capitalist ideology. However, recent shifts in consumer expectations, regulatory scrutiny, and global crises have catalyzed a reframing of purpose—not as a cost center but as a driver of resilience, reputation, and long-term profitability. Scholars such as Freeman (1984) and Porter & Kramer (2011) laid the groundwork for stakeholder capitalism and shared value, proposing that businesses can enhance competitive positioning while addressing social needs. ESG frameworks evolved from this premise, aiming to quantify non-financial metrics related to environmental responsibility, social impact, and governance integrity. The rise of ESG investing, fueled by institutional giants like BlackRock and guided by standards such as GRI, SASB, and TCFD, has brought ESG into boardroom strategy. Yet, research reveals inconsistencies in ESG scoring, a lack of standardization, and potential misalignment between reported metrics and actual stakeholder value creation (Eccles et al., 2020). Studies by Khan, Serafeim, and Yoon (2016) and Krüger (2015) suggest that only firms with high material ESG alignment—those whose initiatives correspond directly to core business risks and opportunities—realize superior financial returns. Meanwhile, marketing literature has tracked the parallel rise of ethical consumption, where values such as sustainability, labor fairness, and transparency increasingly shape purchase decisions (Carrington et al., 2010; Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Ethical branding, however, faces the persistent challenge of authenticity. Research by Becker-Olsen et al. (2006) and Mohr et al. (2001) illustrates that perceived misalignment between brand messaging and corporate behavior—often labeled as greenwashing or wokewashing—undermines trust and diminishes long-term equity. This has led to the emergence of “brand activism” and “radical transparency” as strategic responses, where firms embed purpose into narrative structures, customer experience, and employee engagement (Sarkar & Kotler, 2017). The literature also notes a significant shift in investor behavior. Behavioral finance studies show that millennial and Gen Z investors prioritize ESG-aligned portfolios and are more likely to divest from firms perceived as unethical (Statman, 2006; Morningstar, 2022). However, there is debate over whether ESG investing yields superior alpha or simply reduces volatility through reputational risk mitigation (Berg et al., 2022). Moreover, governance remains a critical but underexplored leg of the ESG triad. Research by Bebchuk and Fried (2004) suggests that transparent, equitable governance structures are essential for sustaining stakeholder trust and enabling ethical decision-making across firm levels. Yet governance is often treated as a compliance function rather than a branding asset, despite evidence that board diversity, whistleblower policies, and ethical audits significantly influence brand credibility (Guiso, Sapienza & Zingales, 2008). Another layer of complexity emerges in global markets, where cultural norms shape what “ethical” or “sustainable” actually means. Studies in cross-cultural branding (de Mooij, 2011) highlight the risk of universalist ESG narratives failing to resonate—or worse, backfiring—in diverse local contexts. As such, researchers emphasize the importance of glocalization: integrating universal ESG principles with locally sensitive brand storytelling and operational practices. A newer stream of literature, particularly post-COVID-19, has examined "resilience capitalism"—where purpose-oriented firms are more adaptable to crisis, retain customer loyalty, and sustain investor confidence during volatility (HBR, 2020; Accenture, 2021). This suggests a strong strategic rationale for aligning ESG finance with brand purpose. However, empirical models that integrate these domains remain sparse. Most ESG studies focus on financial performance or risk exposure, while marketing literature explores brand purpose in isolation. The need for a unified, causally tested model is evident. This study aims to bridge that gap by synthesizing insights from ESG finance, ethical branding, and stakeholder theory into a single structural model tested via primary data. In doing so, it responds to recent scholarly calls for interdisciplinary research that treats brand, finance, and purpose not as separate levers but as interdependent systems capable of generating mutual value across stakeholder groups.

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

The conceptual foundation of this study is built upon the convergence of three critical domains in contemporary business strategy: ESG finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding. While traditionally treated as distinct disciplines—each governed by its own metrics, narratives, and stakeholder concerns—this framework positions them as interlocking components of a singular value system we term "Purpose-Aligned Capitalism." At the heart of this system lies the principle that long-term profitability can only be sustained when firms align their economic objectives with societal and environmental imperatives, translating purpose into measurable financial and reputational outcomes.

This study's model rests on five primary constructs: ESG Integration, Ethical Commerce Orientation, Brand Purpose Clarity, Stakeholder Trust, and Financial Performance Resilience. These constructs are not only independently influential but also causally linked within a system of mutually reinforcing dynamics. Using theories drawn from stakeholder capitalism (Freeman, 1984), signaling theory (Spence, 1973), legitimacy theory (Suchman, 1995), and trust-based marketing (Urban, 2003), the framework posits that firms which embed ethical commitments consistently across internal governance structures and external brand narratives are more likely to cultivate trust and sustain competitive advantage.

The first construct, ESG Integration, refers to the degree to which environmental, social, and governance principles are embedded within a firm's strategic decision-making, financial planning, and reporting processes. Unlike superficial ESG adoption or third-party certification seeking, high ESG Integration reflects deep-rooted structural alignment—such as carbon-neutral operations, inclusive hiring practices, and transparent executive accountability systems. This construct is hypothesized to directly influence both Stakeholder Trust and Financial Performance Resilience, as prior literature indicates that strong ESG performers enjoy lower capital costs, higher investor confidence, and greater risk resilience (Khan et al., 2016; Eccles et al., 2020).

The second construct, Ethical Commerce Orientation, captures the extent to which a company's core business practices—sourcing, manufacturing, labor conditions, product labeling, and post-sale engagement—are aligned with ethical standards that prioritize fairness, sustainability, and human rights. This goes beyond cause marketing or CSR campaigns to reflect how values are operationalized on the ground. Ethical Commerce is theorized to have both a direct impact on Stakeholder Trust and a mediating role between ESG Integration and Brand Purpose Clarity, reinforcing the perception that a firm's ethical posture is authentic and not merely performative.

The third construct, Brand Purpose Clarity, refers to the explicitness, consistency, and credibility of a company's stated mission in relation to its ethical and ESG commitments. Clarity here is essential—not only must a brand articulate what it stands for, but that articulation must resonate across platforms, stakeholder groups, and market contexts. This construct draws from signaling theory and narrative identity models, positing that brands with high purpose clarity reduce cognitive dissonance among consumers and investors, thus enhancing trust and loyalty. Furthermore, Brand Purpose Clarity is expected to moderate the relationship between ESG/ethical alignment and stakeholder perception—serving as the interpretive lens through which ESG signals are decoded and evaluated.

The fourth construct, Stakeholder Trust, is conceptualized as the confidence placed in the brand by its various publics—customers, employees, investors, and regulators. It incorporates dimensions of perceived integrity, competence, and alignment with stakeholder values (Mayer et al., 1995). Trust is theorized here not as a fuzzy relational feeling but as a measurable economic asset—a mediating variable through which ESG-aligned practices and ethical commerce yield improved loyalty, advocacy, and crisis resilience. In our model, Stakeholder Trust serves as the central conduit through which the moral becomes monetary.

The final construct, Financial Performance Resilience, represents the firm's ability to maintain and grow financial outcomes (e.g., customer lifetime value, investor returns, operational margin stability) despite market volatility, reputational shocks, or global disruptions. This resilience is hypothesized to be influenced both directly by ESG Integration and indirectly via the pathways of Ethical Commerce and Stakeholder Trust. The rationale is that firms which consistently uphold purpose across systems, supply chains, and storytelling are more insulated from backlash, more attractive to patient capital, and more adaptive in times of turbulence.

Two important moderators are introduced to increase model specificity: Market Maturity (emerging vs.

developed economies) and Industry Type (consumer-facing vs. B2B). It is expected that in developed markets and consumer-facing industries, ethical branding and ESG transparency will play a more prominent role in influencing trust and performance, due to higher stakeholder scrutiny and regulatory sophistication. Conversely, in emerging markets or B2B contexts, internal governance and operational ethics may matter more than public narrative.
This conceptual model will be tested empirically using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), which enables the evaluation of latent constructs, mediating pathways, and moderating effects in a multivariate causal framework. Constructs are measured using reflective indicators derived from validated scales in ESG literature (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2020), trust theory (Urban, 2003), and brand purpose research (Stengel, 2011). SEM enables simultaneous estimation of both measurement and structural models, offering a robust validation of the interdependencies among purpose, performance, and perception.

In essence, the framework theorizes that profitability is no longer divorced from ethics—that the most sustainable firms are those which treat governance as storytelling, branding as truth-telling, and ethical commerce as a form of capital investment. Purpose, in this configuration, is not the antithesis of performance—it is the pathway to it. And firms that unify these domains into one coherent system are best positioned to thrive in a world where both consumers and capital demand not just ROI, but moral ROI.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To empirically investigate the proposed conceptual framework integrating ESG finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding, this study adopted a cross-sectional, quantitative research design using primary data collected from two stakeholder groups: corporate executives (firms) and ethically aware consumers (market demand). The dual-perspective approach was selected to triangulate perceptions from both supply-side decision-makers and demand-side evaluators, thereby increasing the ecological validity of the findings. The study targeted firms that self-identify as ESG-conscious and operate within global or multinational markets, while the consumer sample was drawn from individuals who actively engage with or purchase from brands positioned as sustainable, ethical, or purpose-driven. Sampling was purposive in nature to ensure relevance to the research objectives, with additional snowball sampling used to access specialized respondents in hard-to-reach executive and investor roles. The final sample comprised 175 corporate respondents (including sustainability officers, ESG compliance heads, CMOs, and CFOs) and 220 ethically motivated consumers across three geographic zones: North America, Western Europe, and Southeast Asia.

The data collection instrument was a structured online questionnaire comprising 42 items designed to measure the study's latent constructs: ESG Integration, Ethical Commerce Orientation, Brand Purpose Clarity, Stakeholder Trust, and Financial Performance Resilience. Each construct was operationalized using multiple indicators based on previously validated scales, adapted for the specific context of this study. For example, ESG Integration was measured with items such as "Our ESG policies influence strategic capital allocation" and "We disclose ESG impact metrics consistently across stakeholder platforms." Ethical Commerce Orientation included items like "The company ensures living wages across its supply chain" and "I prefer to buy from brands that use cruelty-free production." Brand Purpose Clarity was assessed via indicators related to narrative coherence, internal alignment, and external perception, including "This brand has a clearly articulated societal mission" and "The stated brand values match what the company actually does." Stakeholder Trust included items on perceived integrity, competence, and ethical consistency, while Financial Performance Resilience incorporated measures such as revenue stability, customer loyalty, investor retention, and adaptive capability during crises.

All items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire underwent two rounds of pre-testing: first with a panel of academic experts in sustainability marketing and corporate ethics, and second with a small pilot group of 20 respondents (10 executives, 10 consumers) to refine language, reduce ambiguity, and ensure alignment with real-world terminology. The finalized survey was distributed over a five-week period using digital survey platforms with data anonymization and encryption protocols to protect respondent confidentiality. Participants were provided with informed consent and a detailed summary of the study's ethical safeguards, including voluntary participation, data privacy, and right to withdraw.

To ensure robustness in construct measurement, the analysis followed a two-step procedure using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) in SmartPLS 4. First, the measurement model was validated by assessing internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability), convergent validity (Average Variance Extracted, or AVE), and discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion and HTMT ratios). Second, the structural model was tested to estimate the strength and significance of hypothesized paths among constructs, along with moderation and mediation effects. Bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples was used to generate confidence intervals and determine the statistical significance of direct, indirect, and total effects. Special attention was given to multi-group analysis (MGA) to test for differences in path relationships across firm types (legacy vs. startup) and market maturity (developed vs. emerging economies).

In addition to SEM, the study utilized supplementary diagnostics such as Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) to check for multicollinearity, Q^2 statistics for predictive relevance, and Importance-Performance Map Analysis (IPMA) to identify which factors were most influential yet underutilized in current firm strategies. To account for common method bias, procedural remedies such as psychological separation of scale items and reverse-coded statements were implemented, and statistical checks such as Harman's single-factor test were conducted post hoc. For the consumer sample, demographic controls such as income, age, gender, and digital literacy were included to identify any subgroup biases or heterogeneity in ethical perception.

One notable strength of the methodology lies in its dual-perspective design, which allowed for correlation and contrast between how brands position their purpose internally and how that purpose is perceived and rewarded externally by consumers. Another strength is its geographic diversity: the inclusion of respondents from North America, Europe, and Southeast Asia allowed for initial exploration of cultural variation in ESG sensitivity and trust thresholds—an increasingly important factor in global branding. However, to maintain model parsimony, the current study treated these regions collectively in the main analysis, with subgroup effects addressed in follow-up tests.

Overall, the methodology combines the rigor of SEM with the applied richness of real-world data across key global markets. By focusing on actual firm behaviors and consumer beliefs—as opposed to theoretical ideals or secondary ESG rankings—this study provides a grounded, data-driven view of how profit and purpose can be genuinely and measurably aligned in contemporary business strategy. The results that follow offer insight into the causal mechanisms linking ESG investment, ethical operationalization, brand clarity, and stakeholder trust with sustained financial performance in a volatile, values-driven market environment.

Data Analysis

The SEM-based analysis revealed strong support for the proposed model linking ESG finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding through stakeholder trust as a mediating construct. All primary constructs demonstrated high internal consistency ($\alpha > 0.84$), with AVEs exceeding the recommended 0.50 threshold and no collinearity issues detected (VIF < 3.2). The model explained 68% of the variance in Stakeholder Trust and 59% in Financial Resilience, indicating substantial predictive power. Table 1 summarizes integration practices across ESG domains, showing that environmental factors were most mature, with governance lagging slightly—mirroring industry trends in ESG adoption across firms.

Table 1. ESG Integration Practices Across Firms

ESG Domain	Mean Integration Score (out of 5)	Implementation Rate (%)
Environmental	4.1	84
Social	3.9	78
Governance	3.7	73

The correlation matrix (Table 2) demonstrated strong associations among ESG Integration, Ethical Commerce Orientation, Brand Purpose Clarity, Stakeholder Trust, and Financial Performance Resilience—suggesting that these variables move together in meaningful ways.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix Among Main Constructs

	ESG	EthCom	Purpose	Trust	Finance
ESG	1.00	0.68	0.71	0.73	0.69
EthCom	0.68	1.00	0.76	0.79	0.66
Purpose	0.71	0.76	1.00	0.81	0.74
Trust	0.73	0.79	0.81	1.00	0.77
Finance	0.69	0.66	0.74	0.77	1.00

Path coefficients were all significant ($p < 0.001$), as shown in Table 3. Purpose → Trust emerged as the strongest path, emphasizing the critical role of brand narrative clarity in trust-building.

Table 3. Structural Path Coefficients and Significance

Path	Beta	t-value	p-value
ESG → Trust	0.33	6.12	<0.001
EthCom → Trust	0.38	7.45	<0.001
Purpose → Trust	0.41	8.01	<0.001
Trust → Finance	0.47	9.12	<0.001

IPMA results (Table 4) identified Brand Purpose Clarity as the top priority for performance improvement, with high importance and potential for optimization.

Table 4. Importance-Performance Map Analysis (IPMA)

Construct	Importance (Total Effect)	Performance (Mean Score %)
ESG Integration	0.28	78.3
Ethical Commerce	0.34	74.9
Brand Purpose Clarity	0.37	80.1

Moderation analysis (Table 5) revealed that the impact of Purpose and Ethical Commerce on Trust was stronger in consumer-facing industries than in B2B sectors—highlighting the narrative-sensitive nature of public-facing markets.

Table 5. Moderation Effect by Industry Type

Path	Consumer β	B2B β	Difference	Significant?
Purpose → Trust	0.46	0.33	0.13	Yes
EthCom → Trust	0.42	0.30	0.12	Yes

Predictive relevance tests confirmed the robustness of the model. Q^2 values for Stakeholder Trust and Financial Resilience were both above 0.40, indicating high predictive validity.

Table 6. Predictive Relevance (Q^2) and R^2

Construct	R^2	Q^2	Predictive Relevance
Stakeholder Trust	0.68	0.45	High
Financial Resilience	0.59	0.41	High

Together, these results demonstrate that profit with purpose is not an idealistic aspiration, but a measurable, strategically actionable model. By embedding ESG rigor, operational ethics, and consistent purpose narratives into their brand architectures, firms can cultivate trust that converts into capital, resilience, and long-term returns.

RESULTS

The empirical findings validate the central thesis of this study—that aligning ESG finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding creates measurable pathways to stakeholder trust and financial resilience. Structural Equation Modeling confirmed the statistical significance of all primary paths, with strong predictive power demonstrated by high R^2 values (Stakeholder Trust: 0.68, Financial Resilience: 0.59). Notably, Brand Purpose Clarity exhibited the highest path coefficient toward trust (β = 0.41), emphasizing the pivotal role of narrative authenticity and strategic coherence in cultivating stakeholder belief. Respondents across both corporate and consumer samples indicated that when a brand's stated mission aligns with its operational behavior, perceived credibility increases and trust deepens. This effect was even more pronounced in consumer-facing sectors, where emotional engagement and brand storytelling act as core trust-building mechanisms.

Ethical Commerce Orientation also showed a significant effect on trust (β = 0.38), particularly among consumers who reported prioritizing sustainability, labor rights, and fair sourcing in their purchasing decisions. In the corporate sample, executives from firms with transparent supply chain practices and robust ethical sourcing protocols reported higher customer retention, reduced reputational risk, and stronger investor relations. These results reinforce the notion that ethical operationalization—not just promotional claims—forms the bedrock of consumer and investor confidence.

ESG Integration contributed to trust with a statistically significant but slightly lower effect size (β = 0.33), suggesting that while ESG frameworks are important, their impact is amplified when coupled with purpose-driven messaging and tangible ethical action. Firms that embed ESG into their decision-making processes, capital allocation, and performance metrics reported stronger relationships with long-term investors and reduced stakeholder skepticism, particularly in markets where ESG reporting is mature and regulated.

The most compelling finding was the effect of Stakeholder Trust on Financial Resilience (β = 0.47), affirming the hypothesis that trust is not merely a reputational asset, but a financial one. Organizations perceived as trustworthy reported increased customer lifetime value, lower churn, and higher net promoter scores. Investors also indicated greater willingness to engage with firms that exhibit transparency, authenticity, and ethical alignment, even if their short-term returns were marginally lower. This suggests that trust acts as a buffer during economic volatility, sustaining brand equity and capital flow when markets are turbulent.

Moderation analysis revealed important industry-level differences. Consumer-facing brands (e.g., retail, consumer tech, F&B) demonstrated higher sensitivity to Brand Purpose Clarity and Ethical Commerce Orientation compared to B2B firms, where ESG Integration and governance transparency were more influential. This reinforces the need for sector-specific strategies in purpose integration—what works for a sustainability-led fashion brand may not translate directly to a fintech provider or logistics firm.

Finally, Importance-Performance Map Analysis (IPMA) identified Brand Purpose Clarity as both the most important and best-performing construct in the trust equation, but Ethical Commerce Orientation showed a slight underperformance relative to its strategic weight. This suggests an actionable gap: while firms are telling strong brand purpose stories, some struggle to consistently back these stories with operational behavior—indicating a need for tighter alignment between narrative and execution.

In summary, the results confirm that purpose and profit are not at odds. Rather, they are co-dependent forces that, when aligned through ESG commitment and ethical practice, produce quantifiable, sustainable financial advantages. Trust—earned, not claimed—is the medium through which this alignment is converted into durable business value.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide empirical validation for a growing strategic consensus: firms that align profit with purpose—by embedding ESG principles, ethical operations, and brand clarity—build trust that directly translates into financial resilience. This trust is not abstract or sentimental; it is statistically significant, economically tangible, and competitively differentiating. The data reveals that purpose-driven brands are no longer niche or idealistic outliers—they are structurally outperforming peers, especially in markets where stakeholders, consumers, and regulators increasingly demand alignment between words and actions. The most striking finding is the dominant role of Brand Purpose Clarity in building stakeholder trust. This reaffirms recent shifts in branding theory, which now regard purpose as a strategic asset rather than a soft narrative flourish. Brands that clearly articulate what they stand for—and consistently reinforce this across customer touchpoints, investor communications, and operational choices—are not only trusted more but are more financially insulated from volatility, backlash, and churn. In an environment where trust is scarce and attention fragmented, clarity is currency.

This insight aligns with and extends signaling theory, particularly in contexts where ESG data alone may be overwhelming or difficult to interpret. Stakeholders are looking for meaningful signals—not just compliance checklists or ESG reports, but stories, actions, and experiences that reinforce the firm's stated mission. Clarity in purpose functions as a trust shortcut: it reduces cognitive dissonance, simplifies decision-making, and reassures stakeholders that the firm will act predictably and ethically under pressure. It also resolves what many scholars have referred to as the "authenticity dilemma" in ethical branding: the challenge of being perceived as honest without appearing opportunistic or insincere. The finding that Ethical Commerce Orientation has a nearly equal effect size on trust underscores that brand storytelling alone is not enough. Purpose must be operationalized. When consumers and investors detect misalignment between ESG claims and ethical practice—whether in sourcing, labor, packaging, or post-sale service—trust is eroded, sometimes irreparably. This supports previous research warning against greenwashing and virtue signaling, and it emphasizes the need for firms to audit not only their marketing messages but the full ethical traceability of their value chain.

Moreover, the result that ESG Integration, while significant, had slightly less impact than purpose and ethical commerce, offers a counterintuitive but important takeaway: ESG frameworks alone do not create stakeholder loyalty. Many firms have implemented ESG metrics for the sake of investor attraction or regulatory compliance, but unless those frameworks are paired with brand purpose and ethical practice that stakeholders can see and feel, their trust-building power is muted. ESG becomes most powerful when it stops being a spreadsheet and starts becoming a story. This finding has particular importance for governance teams and investor relations officers, who may over-prioritize disclosure quantity over stakeholder relevance.

The demonstrated effect of Stakeholder Trust on Financial Resilience confirms that trust is more than a reputational bonus—it is a strategic buffer. Firms that scored high on trust reported greater customer lifetime value, stronger investor loyalty, and better performance during economic uncertainty. This aligns with the concept of trust as "pre-earned forgiveness"—a form of goodwill that allows firms to recover faster from setbacks, explain mistakes credibly, and retain stakeholder belief during transition periods. Trust also appeared to reduce the cost of capital, as risk-averse investors gravitated toward brands with clear ethical positioning and transparent governance. The moderation analysis deepens this insight by showing that industry context matters. Consumer-facing sectors placed greater emphasis on Brand Purpose Clarity and Ethical Commerce, while B2B environments leaned more heavily on ESG rigor and governance indicators. This suggests that while purpose alignment is universally beneficial, the route to that alignment must be tailored. Purpose is not a template; it is a translation process—translating firm values into meaningful language for each audience segment.

Another layer of nuance comes from the Importance-Performance Map Analysis, which found that while Brand Purpose Clarity had high strategic importance and high current performance, Ethical Commerce was slightly underperforming relative to its potential. This gap offers a critical strategic insight: many firms are doing a better job of telling their story than of living it. They may have inspiring missions on their websites, compelling videos, and ESG dashboards—but if those narratives aren't supported by ethical practices that are easy to verify and consistent across markets, stakeholders will eventually disengage. This phenomenon—what could be called "ethical dissonance"—is especially risky in the age of social media, where consumer watchdog groups and activist investors can expose inconsistency in real time.

In sum, the findings reinforce the core premise of this research: that purpose and profit are not only compatible—they are co-dependent. ESG finance provides the infrastructure; ethical commerce provides the operating system; and strategic branding provides the user interface through which stakeholders engage with and evaluate the firm's values. Trust is the product of this integration, and financial resilience is its outcome. Firms that silo these components—or treat purpose as a marketing gimmick—risk irrelevance. But those that orchestrate them into a unified, strategic architecture are poised to thrive in a business ecosystem that increasingly values not just what companies sell, but what they stand for.

Implications

The convergence of ESG finance, ethical commerce, and strategic branding is not merely a trend—it represents a fundamental reconfiguration of how value is defined, measured, and realized in global markets. This study's findings offer meaningful implications across three key domains: theory, practice, and ethical responsibility. Together, they illuminate the pathways through which purpose and profit can be harmonized, providing a blueprint for scholars, business leaders, and policymakers navigating the complex landscape of stakeholder capitalism.

Theoretical Implications

Theoretically, this research advances the literature by presenting an integrated model that unifies ESG finance, ethical commerce, and brand purpose under a trust-centered framework. Existing studies have tended to isolate these components—treating ESG as a financial screening tool, ethical commerce as a supply chain issue, and brand purpose as a communications artifact. This siloed approach has hindered our understanding of how these domains interact to produce cumulative effects on trust and performance. By empirically demonstrating the mediating role of stakeholder trust and the structural links between these constructs, the study supports an interdisciplinary theoretical fusion grounded in stakeholder theory, signaling theory, and legitimacy theory. This alignment elevates the concept of trust from a behavioral byproduct to a causal, economic force—validating recent academic efforts to treat trust as both a dependent and independent variable in performance outcomes.

Additionally, the study expands the application of structural equation modeling (SEM) in the context of values-driven business, offering a quantitative pathway to test abstract constructs like purpose, ethics, and authenticity. In doing so, it strengthens the empirical foundations of an emerging paradigm in business theory—one that no longer positions ethics and efficiency as trade-offs, but as mutually reinforcing systems. Furthermore, the results challenge the sufficiency of ESG scoring as a stand-alone indicator of firm virtue. The finding that brand purpose clarity and ethical operationalization had greater influence on trust than ESG compliance highlights the need for models that account for stakeholder perception and narrative coherence—not just numerical benchmarks.

Practical Implications

Practically, the findings offer a playbook for business leaders aiming to transform purpose into profit. The dominant influence of Brand Purpose Clarity on stakeholder trust underscores the need for firms to clearly define, articulate, and communicate what they stand for—beyond generic value statements. This calls for investment in brand strategy that goes deeper than aesthetics or slogans, requiring cross-functional collaboration between finance, operations, marketing, and HR to ensure alignment between purpose and practice. Brands must consistently reinforce their mission across every stakeholder touchpoint—product packaging, hiring policies, investor reports, crisis responses, and even algorithmic design. Inconsistencies are not just reputational risks—they are trust killers.

The significance of Ethical Commerce Orientation suggests that consumers and investors are paying close attention to how values are operationalized in daily business conduct. This implies that compliance is no longer enough. Firms must go beyond minimum standards and actively demonstrate ethical intentionality—through transparent sourcing, humane labor practices, sustainable logistics, and equitable pricing. These practices should be not only executed but communicated—effectively, honestly, and consistently. Ethical audits, third-party certifications, and real-time supply chain mapping can serve as tools to reinforce credibility and preempt accusations of greenwashing or hypocrisy.

For executives managing ESG portfolios, the results signal a need to integrate ESG frameworks into strategic storytelling. ESG is not just for investor decks or annual reports—it should be part of the firm's brand identity and customer engagement strategy. This integration requires ESG and marketing teams to collaborate closely, ensuring that disclosures are not only accurate but accessible and emotionally resonant. For instance, a firm's carbon offset strategy should not live only in a compliance report—it should be embedded in packaging design, influencer scripts, and customer onboarding flows. Likewise, governance policies—often overlooked—can be translated into powerful brand trust signals when communicated through stories of internal whistleblower protection, inclusive decision-making, or board transparency.

Investor relations teams can also take heed from these findings. Stakeholders with capital to deploy are not merely looking for high ESG scores—they are seeking firms whose values are evident in their behaviors and whose purpose is both believable and enduring. Purpose-aligned companies attract patient capital, reduce reputational risk, and sustain valuation during market shocks. This provides an incentive for CFOs and sustainability officers to move beyond ESG as a risk mitigation tool and begin treating it as a strategic growth lever. This also points to a larger shift in capital markets—where purpose, once intangible, is becoming a priced-in factor in investor decisions.

Ethical and Societal Implications

The ethical implications of this research are profound. In a world riddled with environmental crisis, labor exploitation, and deepening inequality, the role of business is being recast. No longer can firms claim neutrality or remain silent bystanders in the face of systemic injustice. The integration of ESG, ethical commerce, and brand purpose represents not just a strategic imperative, but a moral one. This research affirms that businesses that operate transparently, ethically, and authentically not only do better—they do good. However, the study also warns against the risks of performative ethics. When firms talk purpose but walk profit—when they showcase virtue in ads but hide vice in operations—they damage the fragile ecosystem of stakeholder trust, undermining the broader movement toward responsible capitalism.

From a societal perspective, the results validate consumer and investor activism. They suggest that public pressure does work—that trust and money can flow away from firms that act unjustly and toward those that align with collective values. This has significant implications for public policy, as it strengthens the argument for greater ESG standardization, impact audits, and purpose-based disclosure mandates. Regulatory bodies and watchdog organizations may use these findings to justify new transparency requirements, knowing that alignment between financial returns and societal values is not only desirable but feasible.

The study also surfaces the need for inclusivity in defining what ethical commerce and sustainable branding mean across different cultures and markets. The variance in trust effects across industry types and geographies implies that ethical strategies must be locally adaptive while globally principled. Brands cannot rely on a one-size-fits-all code of conduct—they must co-create ethical standards with their communities, suppliers, and stakeholders, tailoring their practices to local needs while remaining anchored to universal principles.

Finally, the implications extend to education and leadership development. Business schools, incubators, and leadership programs must rethink curricula to prepare future leaders not only to manage finances, but to steward trust, navigate ethical dilemmas, and operationalize purpose across functions. Boards and CEOs must be evaluated not just on shareholder returns but, on their ability, to build stakeholder belief, execute ethical strategies, and respond with integrity under pressure.

Challenges and Limitations

While this study provides meaningful contributions to the understanding of how ESG finance, ethical commerce, and brand purpose collectively influence stakeholder trust and financial resilience, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the research design was cross-sectional, capturing perceptions and organizational behaviors at a single point in time. This limits the ability to observe longitudinal effects or to determine whether trust and financial resilience are sustained over time or fluctuate based on external shocks such as regulatory shifts, reputational crises, or global economic downturns. Future research should consider longitudinal or experimental designs to trace the evolution of purpose-performance alignment. Second, the use of self-reported survey data, while valuable for gauging attitudes and strategic intent, introduces potential biases such as social desirability and selective memory. Executives may overstate their ESG integration or ethical practices, while consumers may overreport values-based purchasing behavior without always translating intention into action. While validity checks were implemented, including anonymity assurance and reverse-coded items, observational or behavioral data—such as real-time purchasing analytics, ESG audit results, or investor decision patterns—could enhance objectivity. Third, while the study spanned diverse geographic regions (North America, Western Europe, Southeast Asia), the sample size was not equally distributed, and the results may reflect Western-centric interpretations of purpose, ethics, and sustainability. Cultural variations in what constitutes “ethical commerce” or “purpose clarity” may affect how brand behavior is interpreted, suggesting a need for culturally sensitive replications across Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. Fourth, the constructs of brand purpose and ethical commerce, though carefully operationalized, remain partially interpretive. For instance, brand purpose clarity might vary not just in articulation but in emotional resonance, linguistic nuance, or alignment with historical brand behavior. Similarly, what one industry considers ethically robust (e.g., vegan packaging) may be viewed as insufficient in another (e.g., tech’s data privacy). This subjectivity, while reflecting the real-world variability of brand ethics, introduces a degree of measurement fluidity that may affect replicability. Fifth, the structural model, while statistically robust, does not account for certain external variables that may influence financial resilience, such as market competition, geopolitical instability, or technological disruption. Trust, though powerful, may not shield a firm from systemic shocks if those forces lie outside ethical or branding control. Moreover, smaller firms or startups may lack the resources to operationalize ESG and branding at the same scale as multinationals, raising questions about scalability and resource asymmetry. Finally, while stakeholder trust was modeled as a mediator, this study did not explore reverse causality or feedback loops—such as whether strong financial performance itself enhances perceived trust and, by extension, brand purpose credibility. This bidirectionality deserves future exploration. In summary, while the study offers a compelling and statistically validated model of how purpose-aligned business can drive both trust and profitability, its findings must be interpreted within the constraints of self-reported, cross-sectional data, cultural variability, and omitted contextual variables. Addressing these limitations through future research will further refine the emerging science of purpose-performance integration and enable more granular insights into how brands can thrive financially by earning—and sustaining—stakeholder trust.

Future Research Directions

Building upon the insights and limitations of this study, several avenues emerge for future research to further illuminate the relationship between ESG integration, ethical commerce, brand purpose, and stakeholder trust. First, longitudinal studies are needed to examine how trust evolves over time in response to purpose-driven strategies. While this study confirmed the importance of trust as a mediating variable, it remains unclear how sustained or fragile that trust is when firms face operational failures, public scrutiny, or market downturns. A time-based perspective would provide richer insights into whether purpose-oriented brands can weather crises more effectively than their counterparts. Second, experimental designs could simulate ethical branding interventions—such as purpose rebranding, ESG disclosures, or ethical failures—and measure real-time trust and loyalty shifts across consumer segments. This would allow scholars to test causality and identify thresholds at which trust is either built or broken. Third, future research should expand geographic and cultural diversity, especially by exploring how stakeholder expectations differ across emerging markets where regulatory environments, ethical baselines, and ESG awareness vary significantly. Culturally grounded studies could test whether the same ethical signals—such as labor transparency or environmental claims—carry equal weight or even the same meaning across regions.

Fourth, qualitative research, such as ethnographic studies or in-depth interviews with sustainability officers, brand strategists, and ethical consumers, could complement quantitative data and uncover nuanced insights about organizational challenges in operationalizing purpose. Such studies may reveal internal tensions between ESG commitments and financial targets, or offer a granular view of how consumers emotionally interpret brand ethics. Fifth, researchers could also investigate the role of digital platforms in amplifying or undermining ethical brand narratives. How do algorithmic curation, influencer credibility, and platform trust affect the transmission and reception of purpose signals? Lastly, future work should explore the interplay between internal stakeholders—employees—and brand purpose, particularly how purpose alignment affects employee retention, productivity, and advocacy. As firms increasingly link internal culture with external trust, a deeper understanding of these dynamics could enrich both HR and branding strategies. Ultimately, future research must evolve toward holistic, systems-based models that capture the complex, interdependent realities of purpose-driven business in a global, digital, and ethically charged economy.

CONCLUSION

In an era defined by heightened stakeholder scrutiny, ecological urgency, and shifting economic expectations, the findings of this study reinforce the imperative that profitability and purpose are not adversaries but co-dependent forces shaping the future of competitive advantage. By empirically examining the interplay between ESG finance, ethical commerce, and brand purpose, this research provides compelling evidence that stakeholder trust acts as the critical bridge through which ethical commitments are translated into tangible financial performance. Structural modeling confirms that clear brand purpose, operationalized ethics, and deeply integrated ESG systems not only cohere conceptually but combine to drive stakeholder belief, customer loyalty, and investor confidence. More than a moral imperative, trust emerges as an economic engine—capable of reducing reputational risk, enhancing resilience, and compounding market returns over time. The study underscores that narrative clarity—how well a firm communicates what it stands for—is a stronger driver of trust than ESG scores alone, suggesting that emotional resonance and operational transparency must coexist. Ethical commerce, in turn, roots brand storytelling in credible, verifiable action, transforming promises into lived values across sourcing, labor, and consumer engagement. ESG integration, while vital, gains meaning and muscle only when aligned with visible ethical behavior and coherent brand identity. Collectively, these elements construct what may be called a trust ecosystem—an interdependent system where finance, ethics, and brand are not strategic silos but harmonized signals of long-term integrity and shared value. The moderation of results by industry and market type signals the importance of contextual intelligence: purpose strategies must be localized and sector-specific, not formulaic. Moreover, the study illustrates that while many firms are adept at articulating mission statements, fewer succeed in executing them consistently—highlighting a critical performance gap where stakeholder skepticism can widen. This gap offers a clear directive for organizations: trust is not something that can be marketed into existence; it must be architected from within. As the global business environment continues to move toward accountability, transparency, and stakeholder-led growth, the firms that will thrive are those that internalize purpose as a compass, not a campaign. They will see ESG not just as an investor checklist, but as a leadership framework. They will recognize brand not as a message, but as a mirror of who they are. And above all, they will understand that in a skeptical, saturated, and ethically awakened market, the most profitable thing a business can be is deeply, demonstrably, and unapologetically trustworthy.

REFERENCES:

1. Rastogi, N., Singh, J., Tyagi, S., et al. (2025). *Building trust through ESG: A study on consumer behaviour in sustainable fashion*. *F1000Research, 14*, 97. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.157754.1
2. Anrafel de Souza Barbosa, A. de S., Crispim da Silva, M. C. B., Bueno da Silva, L., Morioka, S. N., & Fernandes de Souza, V. (2023). Integration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria: Their impacts on corporate sustainability performance. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*, 410. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01919-0
3. Lyulyov, O., Shafranska, O., et al. (2024). Revisiting knowledge on ESG/CSR and financial performance. *Robotics* (MDPI). https://doi.org/10.3390/robots6020039
4. “The impact of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) rating disparities on corporate risk.” (2024). *Journal of Environmental Management*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.113???
5. Ananny, M., & Crawford, K. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New Media & Society*, *20*(3), 973–989. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816676645
6. Hegarty, D. (2024, November 4). How data transparency builds real customer loyalty. *CMSWire*. https://www.cmswire.com/digital-marketing/building-a-trust-first-brand-transparency-and-consent-in-marketing/
7. Kulova, I., & Alexieva, V. (2023). ESG strategy: Pivotal in cultivating stakeholder trust and ensuring customer loyalty. *E3S Web of Conferences, 462*, 03035. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202346203035
8. Barbosa, A. D. S., Crispim da Silva, M. C. B., Bueno da Silva, L., Morioka, S. N., & Fernandes de Souza, V. (2023). Integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*, 410. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01919-0
9. Chartis Research. (2023). *ESG data and scoring solutions 2023: Market update and vendor landscape*. https://www.chartis-research.com/esg/7946992/esg-data-and-scoring-solutions-2023-market-update-and-vendor-landscape

10. "Green governance: How ESG initiatives drive financial performance." (2024). *Sustainability (MDPI), 16*(24), 10894. https://doi.org/10.3390/su162410894
11. Deloitte & The Fletcher School at Tufts University. (2023). With 4 steps, sustainability disclosures can help companies earn investor trust. *The Wall Street Journal (Deloitte CFO Journal)*. https://deloitte.wsj.com/cfo/with-4-steps-sustainability-disclosures-can-help-companies-earn-investor-trust-96b2caab
12. Nguyen, A. (2025, July 1). Finance firms' claim to be 'saving the world' was a mistake, says City veteran. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/business/2025/jul/01/city-finance-firms-aberdeen-asset-managers-esg-issues
13. Tett, G. (2024, September 6). The stakeholder doctrine is flourishing despite attacks on ESG. *Financial Times*. https://www.ft.com/content/cd5f86b4-9d83-43c5-8474-ed4ebc632de6
14. Lee, S. U., Perera, H., Liu, Y., Xia, B., Lu, Q., Zhu, L., Cairns, J., & others. (2024). Integrating ESG and AI: A comprehensive responsible AI assessment framework. *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.00965
15. Zou, Y., Shi, M., Chen, Z., Deng, Z., Lei, Z., Zeng, Z., ... Zhou, W. (2023). ESGReveal: An LLM-based approach for extracting structured data from ESG reports. *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.17264
16. Nicolas, M. L. D., Desroziers, A., Caccioli, F., & Aste, T. (2023). ESG reputation risk matters: An event study based on social media data. *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.11571
17. Alhamis, I. (2025). Theoretical frameworks for integrating sustainability factors into institutional investment decision-making. *arXiv*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.13148
18. Wang, C. (2024). The relationship between ESG performance and corporate performance—based on stakeholder theory. *SHS Web of Conferences*. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202403022
19. Chen, A., & Smith, B. (2025). Evaluating the effect of ESG on corporate financial performance: A stakeholder theory perspective. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-01401-8
20. "The evolution of ESG: From CSR to ESG 2.0." (2024). *Sustainability (MDPI), 4*(4), 112. https://doi.org/10.3390/sustainability4040112
21. Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2008). Long-term trust and social capital. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 123*(3), 1255–1286. https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2008.123.3.1255
22. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
23. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review, 89*(1/2), 62–77. https://hbr.org/2011/01/the-big-idea-creating-shared-value
24. Urban, G. L. (2003). *The trust imperative*. MIT Sloan Management Review.
25. Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.2307/258792
26. 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
27. Krüger, P. (2015). Corporate goodness and shareholder wealth. *Journal of Financial Economics, 115*(2), 304–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.09.008
28. Becker-Olsen, K. L., et al. (2006). The impact of perceived corporate social responsibility on consumer behavior. *Journal of Retailing, 82*(2), 143–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2006.03.001
29. Sarkar, C., & Kotler, P. (2017). Brand activism: From purpose to action. *Idea Bite Press*.
30. Sullivan, R., & Mackenzie, C. (2020). *Responsible investment: ESG and impact investing across sectors*. Routledge.