JOURNAL OF BUSINESS
MANAGEMENT & INNOVATION
www.jbmij.org

JBMI
Insight

ESG Governance and Stakeholder Trust in Insurance: A Review of Emerging Practices

Sarah Mandy

Publication Date: August 2025

Abstract

This study explores the role of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) governance practices in shaping stakeholder trust and enhancing institutional performance within the insurance sector. Using a desktop review methodology, the study synthesizes scholarly and industry literature published between 2018 and 2024 to assess how ESG integration influences financial resilience, risk management, regulatory compliance, stakeholder engagement, and technological innovation. The findings reveal that insurers that embed ESG principles into their operations consistently outperform their counterparts in return on equity, risk preparedness, and stakeholder loyalty. ESG adoption also improves regulatory adaptability and facilitates access to green capital markets. However, the study identifies persistent challenges, including fragmented disclosure standards, ESG data limitations, and resource gaps, particularly among small and mid-sized insurers. The paper applies Stakeholder Theory, Legitimacy Theory, and the Resource-Based View to contextualize ESG as a strategic asset rather than a compliance burden. The study concludes that institutionalizing ESG governance is essential for long-term viability and recommends harmonized disclosure frameworks, targeted capacity-building, digital infrastructure investment, and strengthened stakeholder communication. These findings offer both theoretical contribution and practical guidance for insurers, policymakers, and sustainability advocates.

Keywords: *ESG governance, stakeholder trust, insurance sector, financial resilience, risk management, sustainability, regulatory compliance, desktop review.*

1.1 Introduction

The integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles has emerged as a central theme in contemporary risk-bearing institutions, especially within the insurance sector where long-term obligations and public accountability converge (Weber, 2023; Deloitte, 2023). Among the three ESG dimensions, governance plays a foundational role in anchoring institutional credibility, regulatory alignment, and stakeholder legitimacy (Al-Shaer, 2020; Dicuonzo, Fusco, & Tartaglia Polcini, 2022). Governance structures define how ESG priorities are translated into corporate policy, risk management, disclosure, and performance incentives, thereby shaping both internal resilience and external trust (Phillips, 2003; Freeman, 1984).

In the insurance sector, trust is not merely a reputational attribute but a functional prerequisite. Clients, regulators, investors, and communities engage with insurers on the assumption that they will operate transparently, ethically, and sustainably (Johnson, 2020; Hafner et al., 2020). ESG-aligned governance, particularly when institutionalized at the board and executive levels, provides the decision-making architecture necessary for delivering on these stakeholder expectations (Ng, 2021; PwC, 2023). The growing global emphasis on disclosure frameworks such as the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) has further elevated the need for insurers to embed ESG governance into risk oversight, investment strategy, and product innovation (OECD, 2021; Arner, Barberis, & Buckley, 2020).

Stakeholder theory, articulated by Freeman (1984), provides a normative and strategic rationale for this governance shift. The theory posits that an organization's survival depends on its capacity to balance and address the needs of all stakeholders, not merely its shareholders. In ESG contexts, this means aligning governance systems with the interests of customers seeking climate-conscious policies, regulators demanding compliance, investors prioritizing ethical risk, and employees requiring inclusive labor practices (Harrison et al., 2019; Suchman, 1995). Recent studies confirm that insurers who prioritize ESG governance experience higher brand loyalty, reduced litigation risk, and stronger investor confidence, particularly under volatile economic conditions (Atz et al., 2023; Park & Kim, 2020).

Legitimacy theory further reinforces the imperative for ESG governance by highlighting how insurance firms must align with prevailing social values to retain their license to operate (Suchman, 1995; Deegan, 2002). In a sector where intangible commitments—such as future claims settlement—are fundamental, perceived legitimacy becomes a critical strategic asset (Cho, Laine, Roberts, & Rodrigue, 2015). ESG governance provides the platform for signaling this legitimacy through transparent reporting, ethical conduct, and values-driven leadership (Al-Shaer, 2020; Phillips, 2003). Regulatory convergence on ESG norms across Europe, Asia, and Africa has also amplified the reputational and compliance stakes for insurers (Ng, 2021; OECD, 2021), reinforcing the idea that trust and governance are intrinsically intertwined.

Despite these developments, practical challenges remain. Smaller and mid-sized insurers often lack the structural capacity to establish robust ESG governance systems, resulting in fragmented reporting, poor data governance, and reactive compliance (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015; Dicuonzo et al., 2022). This asymmetry creates a two-speed industry in which only well-capitalized firms can fully align with ESG benchmarks—leaving others exposed to regulatory, reputational, and systemic risks (Weber, 2023; PwC, 2023). According to Deloitte (2023), firms that institutionalize ESG governance through dedicated sustainability officers, board committees, and performance-linked key performance indicators (KPIs) are 3.5 times more likely to meet emerging regulatory requirements and secure stakeholder loyalty.

In sum, ESG governance is not simply a tool for corporate compliance but a **strategic fulcrum** for building stakeholder trust, institutional resilience, and sustainable performance in the insurance sector (Barney, 1991; Hafner et al., 2020). As global ESG expectations continue to evolve, the ability of insurers to embed governance structures that are credible, transparent, and inclusive will determine their competitive positioning and societal relevance (Snyder, 2019; Freeman, 1984). This study therefore focuses on understanding how ESG governance practices influence stakeholder trust in insurance—drawing from both theoretical foundations and emerging practices in global insurance markets.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles has emerged as a strategic imperative for financial institutions aiming to align profitability with sustainability, accountability, and resilience. In the insurance sector, where long-term commitments, fiduciary responsibility, and stakeholder interdependence are central, the governance dimension of ESG is particularly critical. Robust governance structures provide the institutional scaffolding for ESG implementation by embedding sustainability into decision-making, risk oversight, compliance mechanisms, and stakeholder engagement frameworks (Weber, 2023; Dicuonzo, Fusco, & Tartaglia Polcini, 2022). Despite this, there remains a profound gap between the normative expectations of ESG-aligned governance and the practical realities of its adoption across the global insurance industry.

While ESG integration in financial services has gained global momentum, the insurance sector continues to face complex structural, operational, and regulatory constraints that hinder effective governance-based ESG adoption. Deloitte (2023) reports that fewer than 40 percent of insurers worldwide have implemented comprehensive ESG strategies, primarily due to fragmented reporting frameworks, underdeveloped data infrastructure, and shortages in ESG-literate talent. These barriers are especially pronounced among small and mid-sized insurers, which often operate with limited capital and minimal strategic bandwidth to invest in governance reforms or digital ESG tools (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015; Dicuonzo et al., 2022). This creates a dichotomized landscape in which only large, well-resourced firms are able to credibly implement and report ESG governance practices—exacerbating systemic risks and market imbalances.

Compounding these structural limitations is the persistent inconsistency in ESG disclosure standards. Although regulatory initiatives such as the EU's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) and the IFRS's ISSB framework have made progress toward harmonization, most insurance firms still struggle with the absence of universally accepted benchmarks for ESG governance and stakeholder accountability (Al-Shaer, 2020; Park & Kim, 2020). This lack of alignment hampers the comparability, credibility, and enforcement of ESG practices across jurisdictions, leading to stakeholder confusion, compliance inefficiencies, and in some cases, superficial box-ticking exercises that fail to deliver substantive change (OECD, 2021; Cho, Laine, Roberts, & Rodrigue, 2015). As sustainability expectations become more embedded in capital allocation decisions and policy frameworks, insurers that delay or dilute ESG governance risk facing competitive disadvantages, reputational erosion, and financial fragility (Ng, 2021; Atz et al., 2023).

Most crucially, the current discourse on ESG in insurance has insufficiently interrogated the link between governance mechanisms and stakeholder trust—a critical blind spot given the trust-dependent nature of the industry. Insurance is premised on confidence: confidence in a firm's solvency, ethical behavior, social responsibility, and long-term claims integrity. Yet, few studies offer a rigorous examination of how internal governance structures—such as ESG-focused board committees, transparent decision processes, and executive accountability—translate into external stakeholder trust among policyholders, regulators, investors, and employees (Freeman, 1984; Phillips, 2003; Johnson, 2020). In an era marked by climate disruption, social equity demands, and regulatory upheaval, failure to foster and institutionalize stakeholder trust through ESG governance could erode the core legitimacy and operational continuity of insurance firms (Suchman, 1995; Hafner et al., 2020).

This study thus responds to a critical research gap by exploring the emerging relationship between ESG governance and stakeholder trust in the insurance industry. It interrogates not only the structural barriers to governance adoption but also the mechanisms through which ESG governance practices build—or fail to build—trust with key constituencies. By centering governance and trust as co-dependent pillars of ESG integration, the study contributes to both academic inquiry and practical strategy within an increasingly sustainability-driven insurance environment.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine how ESG-aligned governance practices influence stakeholder trust within the insurance sector, with a focus on emerging institutional frameworks, regulatory expectations, and stakeholder perceptions. Through a desktop review of academic literature, industry reports, and policy documents, the study seeks to identify the mechanisms by which governance structures—such as board oversight, executive accountability, disclosure systems, and compliance architectures—enhance or undermine stakeholder confidence, particularly in trust-sensitive contexts such as climate risk, ethical underwriting, and transparency.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The insurance sector's adoption of ESG principles represents a transformative shift in how financial institutions conceptualize long-term value, institutional resilience, and stakeholder accountability. Among the three ESG dimensions, governance is uniquely positioned as the operational driver that institutionalizes sustainability principles and signals integrity to internal and external stakeholders. This study is significant in that it foregrounds ESG governance as the critical enabler of trust in the insurance value chain—a sector where reputation, solvency, and ethical conduct are central to institutional legitimacy.

For insurance practitioners, this study provides a consolidated understanding of how governance mechanisms—such as ESG committees, internal controls, disclosure protocols, and performance-linked executive incentives—can be strategically leveraged to build stakeholder trust. Such insights are vital in navigating contemporary challenges related to regulatory convergence, greenwashing risks, and climate-related reputational exposure. Firms that embrace these practices stand to benefit from stronger client retention, improved investor relations, and enhanced regulatory standing.

From a policy and regulatory perspective, the study contributes to ongoing efforts to standardize ESG frameworks and promote governance reforms across financial sectors. It underscores the importance of harmonized ESG disclosure standards, supervisory clarity, and targeted capacity-building for smaller insurers. By highlighting structural disparities in ESG adoption and the governance–trust gap, the research advocates for inclusive policy responses that support equitable ESG advancement across the insurance industry.

Academically, the study enriches existing ESG discourse by linking stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, and the resource-based view to practical governance functions and trust outcomes in insurance. This theoretical synthesis not only strengthens the conceptual grounding of ESG governance but also opens avenues for future empirical research—particularly in evaluating how governance practices translate into measurable trust indicators such as customer loyalty, policyholder retention, reputational capital, and regulatory goodwill.

2.1 Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory, initially articulated by Freeman (1984), redefines the purpose of the firm as one that must serve the interests of all stakeholders, not just shareholders. This includes clients, employees, regulators, communities, and investors. The theory argues that organizational survival and long-term value creation are contingent upon the firm's ability to respond to the expectations, needs, and values of these various groups (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). In the context of ESG governance, Stakeholder Theory provides a moral and strategic justification for embedding transparent, accountable, and socially responsive systems into corporate governance.

Within insurance, a sector inherently reliant on trust and long-term obligations, the relevance of Stakeholder Theory is heightened. ESG-aligned governance mechanisms—such as sustainability committees, transparent underwriting processes, and ethical board leadership—act as vehicles through which stakeholder alignment is operationalized (Johnson, 2020). As stakeholder pressure intensifies in light of climate crises, social inequalities, and regulatory demands, insurers that institutionalize stakeholder-responsive ESG governance tend to gain reputational capital, client retention, and regulatory goodwill (Harrison et al., 2019; UNEP FI, 2012). Thus, Stakeholder Theory grounds the premise that stakeholder trust is both a consequence and a requirement of robust ESG governance practices in the insurance industry.

2.2 Signaling Theory

Signaling Theory, introduced by Spence (1973), posits that in environments of information asymmetry, organizations send signals to external audiences to demonstrate credibility, competence, and alignment with accepted norms. In the context of ESG governance, signaling occurs when insurance firms adopt visible, verifiable practices—such as ESG disclosures, sustainability-linked executive compensation, and third-party ESG ratings—to communicate trustworthiness and long-term viability to stakeholders who cannot directly observe internal behaviors (Connelly et al., 2011).

For insurance firms, ESG signals are particularly salient given the sector's reliance on perceived solvency, ethical conduct, and future-oriented commitments. ESG governance structures, when formalized through disclosures, ESG-linked KPIs, or independent audits, act as signals that reduce stakeholder uncertainty and build confidence in the firm's values and capabilities (Al-Shaer, 2020; Atz et al., 2023). Signaling Theory therefore explains why insurers that demonstrate ESG alignment through governance innovations are more likely to retain investor interest, attract socially conscious clients, and enjoy favorable regulatory engagement (Weber, 2023; Deloitte, 2023). The theory strengthens the argument that stakeholder trust is not merely a by-product of governance, but a function of how effectively governance signals are designed and communicated.

2.3 Stewardship Theory

Stewardship Theory, developed by Davis, Schoorman, and Donaldson (1997), presents a contrasting perspective to agency-based models of governance. It assumes that organizational actors, particularly senior executives and board members, are intrinsically motivated to act in the best interests of the firm and its stakeholders, rather than pursuing opportunistic self-interest. In an ESG context, this theory aligns closely with the notion that corporate leaders view sustainability and ethical governance not as constraints but as part of their fiduciary and moral duty (Donaldson & Davis, 1991).

Within the insurance sector, Stewardship Theory underscores the role of leadership commitment in advancing ESG governance and building stakeholder trust. Executives who embrace stewardship values are more likely to champion transparent ESG disclosures, initiate stakeholder engagement programs, and integrate long-term sustainability metrics into strategic planning (Hafner et al., 2020; Ng, 2021). As ESG considerations become central to regulatory compliance, brand value, and customer loyalty, stewardship-oriented governance ensures that insurers proactively pursue trust-building behaviors even in the absence of coercive oversight (Phillips, 2003; Freeman, 1984). This theory thus reinforces the premise that internal leadership orientation is critical to the successful institutionalization of ESG governance and the trust outcomes it produces.

3. Methodology

This study adopted a desktop review methodology to critically investigate how Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) governance structures influence stakeholder trust within the insurance sector. A desktop review, as defined by Snyder (2019), entails a rigorous and structured examination of existing academic literature, industry reports, and policy documents to address specific research questions. The method is particularly suited for synthesizing wide-ranging evidence where primary data collection is not feasible or necessary. Given the conceptual nature of ESG governance and the multidimensional nature of stakeholder trust, a desktop review enabled the consolidation of both empirical insights and normative frameworks from diverse contexts. It also allowed for the examination of regulatory shifts, institutional best practices, and emerging global expectations, all of which are central to ESG transformation in financial services.

The review process followed a structured multi-phase protocol, beginning with the identification and screening of relevant literature. The search was conducted using major academic databases, including JSTOR, ScienceDirect, SAGE Journals, Google Scholar, and SpringerLink. Grey literature was also reviewed, with key documents retrieved from authoritative organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI), PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), Deloitte, and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). Documents were selected if they were published between 2018 and 2024, reflecting the period of accelerated ESG uptake in the insurance sector following the COVID-19 pandemic and the global proliferation of sustainability regulations.

Specific search terms and Boolean logic operators were used to locate relevant studies. These included combinations such as “ESG governance in insurance,” “stakeholder trust and corporate sustainability,” “insurance risk disclosure,” “climate-aligned insurance boards,” and “sustainability reporting frameworks in financial institutions.” Inclusion criteria required that selected sources address ESG implementation within insurance or comparable financial sectors such as reinsurance or asset management. In addition, sources had to provide clear theoretical or empirical relevance to ESG governance or stakeholder engagement, and sufficient methodological transparency to allow for analytical synthesis. Sources not written in English, lacking credibility, or unrelated to governance or trust constructs were excluded.

To ensure analytical rigor, the quality of literature was appraised using a modified Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist. Only high-quality peer-reviewed studies or institutional publications with clear ESG relevance were retained. The selected data were then imported into NVivo 14 software, which enabled efficient coding, thematic categorization, and memoing. Both inductive and deductive coding strategies were applied. Inductive coding allowed themes to emerge organically from the data, while deductive coding ensured alignment with the study's theoretical foundation. Data excerpts were systematically grouped into thematic categories that reflected recurring concepts across the literature.

Thematic synthesis was employed as the core analytical strategy, following the framework proposed by Thomas and Harden (2008). The process generated five dominant themes: ESG governance structures and board accountability, stakeholder engagement and trust dynamics, regulatory alignment and disclosure practices, risk oversight and transparency, and the role of digital infrastructure in ESG reporting. These themes were used to explore patterns, contradictions, and innovations within the global insurance context, while also mapping variations between developed and emerging markets, multinational and regional insurers, and public versus private institutions.

Triangulation across academic sources, policy reports, and industry benchmarks helped strengthen the validity and credibility of the findings. Moreover, the entire synthesis was grounded in the conceptual lens of Stakeholder Theory, Signaling Theory, and Stewardship Theory. This theoretical alignment enabled a more coherent interpretation of how internal governance mechanisms translate into stakeholder perceptions of trustworthiness, legitimacy, and ethical conduct. By drawing upon these frameworks, the study ensured that the analysis was not only empirically sound but also conceptually grounded, providing a holistic understanding of ESG governance and its role in shaping stakeholder trust in the insurance sector.

4.0 Findings

The integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into the insurance sector has generated wide-ranging organizational benefits, particularly when anchored in strong governance structures. ESG-aligned governance has emerged as a key driver of financial resilience, improved risk oversight, regulatory responsiveness, stakeholder trust, and technological modernization. Drawing from a comprehensive desktop review of academic, institutional, and industry sources, five major themes were identified that illustrate how ESG governance shapes trust dynamics and competitive positioning within insurance firms.

4.1 Financial Resilience

Across the literature, there is compelling evidence that insurers integrating ESG principles into governance mechanisms exhibit superior financial resilience. ESG-aligned governance enhances financial discipline, promotes long-term investment strategies, and mitigates exposure to systemic shocks. Weber (2023) observes that insurers with advanced ESG structures consistently demonstrate more stable Return on Equity (ROE), stronger solvency margins, and better performance under market stress, largely due to risk-sensitive capital allocation and sustainable asset diversification.

Atz et al. (2023), through a meta-analysis of over 1,100 studies, found that companies with comprehensive ESG governance frameworks realized financial performance improvements of between 5 and 7 percent, a result driven by enhanced risk management and increased investor confidence. Ng (2021) similarly reports that ESG-integrated asset management strategies reduce exposure to volatile sectors, thereby safeguarding insurers against severe valuation losses during economic uncertainty.

Moreover, ESG governance directly influences access to capital. Morgan Stanley (2022) found that nearly 70 percent of institutional investors incorporate ESG performance in capital deployment decisions. This aligns with Signaling Theory, which posits that well-structured governance and transparent ESG disclosures serve as reliable indicators of credibility and fiduciary integrity. Therefore, ESG-aligned governance does not merely contribute to internal financial health—it positions insurers more favorably in global financial markets, attracting capital on terms that reinforce resilience and competitiveness.

4.2 Risk Management

Risk management lies at the core of insurance operations, and ESG governance has proven instrumental in enhancing firms' capacity to identify, assess, and mitigate both traditional and emergent risks. The literature underscores that governance structures which explicitly embed ESG risk oversight—such as board-level ESG committees, sustainability audits, and climate risk scenario planning—yield stronger institutional preparedness. Alsaifi, Elnahass, and Salama (2020) found that insurers with formal ESG protocols were significantly less exposed to catastrophic underwriting losses, especially in sectors sensitive to environmental and reputational risk.

Dicuonzo et al. (2022) further affirm that ESG governance promotes more comprehensive enterprise risk management systems by linking executive accountability to ESG risk thresholds and integrating social impact considerations into product development. Governance-enabled ESG strategies have also been shown to reduce litigation risk, align underwriting portfolios with long-term trends, and support proactive market repositioning.

The convergence of ESG and risk governance is thus not coincidental but intentional. It reflects a paradigm where sustainability considerations are operationalized through internal controls, disclosure frameworks, and stakeholder-aligned policies. These integrated governance mechanisms not only protect insurers from loss exposure but also signal risk maturity and trustworthiness to external stakeholders.

4.3 Regulatory Compliance

ESG governance has become a strategic response to evolving regulatory demands. Across jurisdictions, regulators are progressively embedding ESG requirements into supervisory frameworks, turning what was once voluntary into a matter of legal and reputational necessity. Al-Shaer (2020) highlights that insurers with formalized ESG governance structures were early adopters of disclosure standards under frameworks such as the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) and the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), enabling them to avoid costly compliance adjustments.

Yet, a persistent challenge remains: the fragmentation of ESG standards across geographies and institutions. Park and Kim (2020) report that insurers operating internationally must navigate a patchwork of inconsistent reporting thresholds, data definitions, and supervisory expectations.

This regulatory complexity disproportionately affects smaller insurers with limited compliance infrastructure.

Nonetheless, insurers that invest in ESG governance demonstrate higher regulatory agility and foresight. Deloitte (2023) notes that firms with ESG-specific departments and compliance tracking systems were 3.5 times more likely to meet new reporting requirements and maintain positive regulatory relationships. These findings reinforce the idea that regulatory compliance, when institutionalized within governance, is not simply a legal function—it is a core trust-building mechanism that signals transparency, accountability, and alignment with global sustainability norms.

4.4 Stakeholder Engagement

Trust-based relationships with stakeholders are foundational to the insurance business model, and ESG governance plays a pivotal role in shaping how these relationships are initiated, nurtured, and sustained. The literature reveals that insurers that institutionalize stakeholder engagement within ESG governance frameworks achieve stronger reputational capital, policyholder loyalty, and employee alignment. Johnson (2020) found that firms with formal stakeholder policies and ESG-aligned communications reported lower policy lapse rates and higher customer satisfaction levels, especially among values-conscious market segments.

From an investor perspective, PwC (2023) reports that governance transparency and environmental risk disclosure are among the most influential variables in ESG investment screening. This underscores the relevance of Stakeholder and Stewardship Theories, which link responsible governance to stakeholder trust and institutional legitimacy.

Beyond external stakeholders, ESG governance also affects internal cohesion. Firms with inclusive governance cultures report stronger employee engagement and lower turnover, contributing to workforce stability and service consistency. These relational dynamics—both external and internal—highlight that ESG governance is not a symbolic or reputational exercise; rather, it is an embedded organizational strategy that builds relational capital and stakeholder confidence across all levels of engagement.

4.5 Technological Innovation

A final but increasingly important finding is the central role of technology in operationalizing ESG governance. As stakeholder and regulatory expectations around ESG become more complex and data-intensive, insurance firms are turning to digital infrastructure to monitor, report, and validate their ESG performance. Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2020) demonstrate how blockchain technologies are being used to create secure, traceable ESG reporting systems, enhancing data credibility and auditability. These innovations reduce information asymmetry and reinforce trust among investors and regulators.

In parallel, insurers are deploying artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning to assess climate exposure, optimize underwriting decisions, and tailor risk pricing models to ESG indicators (Tallon, 2020). These tools are often integrated within governance structures, such as sustainability reporting units or risk oversight committees, suggesting that digital innovation is an embedded—not auxiliary—component of ESG strategy.

Hafner et al. (2020) found that firms investing in ESG digital systems reported faster reporting cycles, improved metric accuracy, and stronger stakeholder engagement via real-time dashboards. These systems enable even mid-sized insurers to meet ESG demands effectively, leveling the field in what was once a resource-intensive compliance arena. Ultimately, technological innovation amplifies the capacity of governance structures to deliver on ESG commitments, reinforcing trust and transparency in an increasingly digitized sustainability landscape.

5.0 Conclusion

This desktop review has demonstrated that the integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles—when anchored in sound governance structures—is central to building stakeholder trust and long-term competitiveness in the insurance sector. Far from being a symbolic or regulatory checkbox, ESG governance represents a strategic orientation that strengthens institutional credibility, financial resilience, and risk maturity. Insurers that embed ESG values into board-level oversight, internal controls, and executive accountability systems consistently outperform their counterparts on a range of operational and reputational indicators.

A key insight emerging from the literature is that ESG governance enhances the capacity of insurers to anticipate and manage multidimensional risks. These include climate exposure, reputational vulnerabilities, regulatory non-alignment, and stakeholder disengagement. Firms that adopt forward-looking governance practices—such as ESG-linked remuneration structures, independent sustainability audits, and risk disclosure protocols—demonstrate greater institutional preparedness and market adaptability. These practices reduce information asymmetries, improve stakeholder perceptions, and foster more reliable decision-making across value chains.

Equally important is the role of ESG governance in strengthening stakeholder engagement. Transparency, inclusivity, and ethical conduct—hallmarks of well-governed ESG programs—are directly linked to customer loyalty, investor confidence, and employee retention. As stakeholder expectations evolve in favor of sustainability and corporate responsibility, insurers that proactively govern these relationships through ESG mechanisms stand to enhance their reputational capital and unlock new sources of competitive advantage.

Nevertheless, the study also recognizes persistent challenges that hinder sector-wide ESG transformation. Chief among these are the fragmentation of ESG disclosure standards, disparities in implementation capacity between large and mid-sized insurers, and gaps in digital infrastructure required for high-quality reporting. Without intentional investment and coordinated regulatory guidance, these constraints risk widening the divide between ESG leaders and laggards—undermining both industry cohesion and public trust.

In conclusion, ESG integration—particularly through robust governance—is not merely advisable but imperative for insurers operating in a complex, stakeholder-sensitive, and sustainability-driven global economy. Institutionalizing ESG governance across strategy, operations, and disclosure functions offers a pathway toward resilience, transparency, and stakeholder alignment. Insurers that delay this transition may find themselves increasingly misaligned with market realities and stakeholder expectations. Those that lead will not only manage risks more effectively but also build enduring trust with those they serve.

6.0 Recommendations

To advance the governance-driven integration of ESG principles in the insurance sector, this study offers the following six strategic recommendations:

Policymakers and standard-setting bodies should work toward harmonizing ESG disclosure frameworks to address inconsistencies that hinder comparability and stakeholder trust. Regulatory instruments such as the EU's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and the IFRS's International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) provide foundational models for global alignment. National regulators should adapt and adopt such frameworks to ensure uniform reporting baselines across jurisdictions.

Smaller and mid-sized insurers often lack the governance infrastructure, human capital, and technical resources to operationalize ESG mandates effectively. Governments, industry associations, and donor institutions should support these firms through ESG training programs, subsidized access to reporting tools, and policy incentives. Academic partnerships and mentorship programs with ESG-mature insurers can also accelerate sector-wide diffusion.

Insurers must invest in digital systems capable of supporting ESG compliance, performance tracking, and stakeholder reporting. Technologies such as blockchain for auditability, AI for climate risk modeling, and ESG dashboards for real-time monitoring should be integrated within governance workflows. FinTech partnerships can facilitate scalable deployment, particularly for firms with limited internal development capacity.

Public-private coalitions should be established to co-develop ESG tools, standards, and risk assessment frameworks tailored to the insurance sector. These coalitions should include regulators, insurers, civil society, technology providers, and academic researchers. Areas of focus may include biodiversity underwriting models, just transition risk mapping, and sustainable claims management practices.

Clear, consistent communication of ESG goals, activities, and progress is critical for sustaining stakeholder trust. Insurers should embed ESG updates into investor briefings, client communication, and employee engagement strategies. ESG reporting should go beyond compliance metrics to include narrative transparency, materiality assessments, and third-party validation where possible.

Finally, ESG governance should be structurally embedded into the corporate hierarchy. This includes the formation of ESG-specific board committees, assignment of executive ESG responsibility, integration of ESG KPIs into performance appraisals, and the extension of internal audit to include ESG verification. Executive compensation should be partly tied to ESG outcomes to promote long-term behavioral alignment and cultural integration.

References

Alsaifi, K., Elnahass, M., & Salama, A. (2020). Market responses to firms' voluntary environmental disclosure: Empirical evidence from the United Kingdom. *Journal of Financial Stability*, *44*, 100694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2019.100694

Al-Shaer, H. (2020). Do audit committees and board characteristics enhance ESG disclosure? Evidence from FTSE 350 index. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *29*(2), 661–675. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2390

Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2020). FinTech, RegTech and the reconceptualization of financial regulation. *Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business, 37*(3), 371–413.

Atz, U., Liu, J., Bruno, M., & Van Holt, T. (2023). Does sustainability generate better financial performance? Review, meta-analysis, and propositions. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 13*(2), 321–348. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2021.1940849

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Boell, S. K., & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2015). On being 'systematic' in literature reviews in IS. *Journal of Information Technology*, *30*(2), 161–173. https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2014.26

Brown, S., Ghosh, S., & Vogt, R. (2020). ESG and the pandemic: Resilience and impact. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *13*(11), 276. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13110276

Cho, C. H., Laine, M., Roberts, R. W., & Rodrigue, M. (2015). Organized hypocrisy, organizational façades, and sustainability reporting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *40*, 78–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2014.12.003

Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, *37*(1), 39–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review*, *22*(1), 20–47. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180258

Deegan, C. (2002). Introduction: The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures – a theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *15*(3), 282–311. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435852

Deloitte. (2023). *2023 Insurance Industry Outlook: ESG, Technology and Risk Transformation*. Deloitte Insights. https://www2.deloitte.com/

Dicuonzo, G., Fusco, F., & Tartaglia Polcini, P. (2022). ESG and insurance industry: A corporate governance approach. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 19*(3), 57–67. https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv19i3art5

Donaldson, L., & Davis, J. H. (1991). Stewardship theory or agency theory: CEO governance and shareholder returns. *Australian Journal of Management, 16*(1), 49–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/031289629101600103

Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(1), 65–91. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9503271992

Eccles, R. G., & Klimenko, S. (2019). The investor revolution. *Harvard Business Review, 97*(3), 106–116.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman Publishing.

Hafner, S., Jones, A., Anger-Kraavi, A., & Pohl, J. (2020). Closing the green finance gap: A systems perspective. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions, 34*, 26–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2019.11.007

Harrison, J. S., Barney, J. B., Freeman, R. E., & Phillips, R. A. (2019). Stakeholder theory at a crossroads. *Business & Society, 58*(1), 25–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650318796792

Johnson, M. (2020). ESG and the insurance customer: Trust, transparency and the new competitive edge. *Insurance Journal of Ethics, 8*(3), 204–218.

Morgan Stanley. (2022). *Sustainable Signals: Asset Owners Embrace Sustainability*. Morgan Stanley Institute for Sustainable Investing. https://www.morganstanley.com/

Ng, A. W. (2021). From sustainability accounting to ESG investing: The rise of a new regulatory orthodoxy. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 30*(1), 186–197. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2610

OECD. (2021). *Insurance Sector Responses to COVID-19: A Global Overview of Regulatory and Supervisory Actions*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies, 24*(3), 403–441. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603024003910

Park, J., & Kim, S. (2020). ESG practices and financial performance in European insurers: A regulatory perspective. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance, 45*, 451–477. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41288-020-00161-2

Phillips, R. A. (2003). *Stakeholder Theory and Organizational Ethics*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

PwC. (2023). *2023 Global Insurance Survey: Leading with Purpose in ESG*. PricewaterhouseCoopers. https://www.pwc.com/

Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87*(3), 355–374. https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

Tallon, J. (2020). AI and climate modeling in insurance: Enhancing predictive underwriting. *Journal of InsurTech, 5*(2), 89–104.

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8*, 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management, 14*(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375

UNEP FI. (2012). *Principles for Sustainable Insurance: A Global Sustainability Framework and Initiative for the Insurance Industry*. United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative. https://www.unepfi.org/

Weber, O. (2023). ESG and the insurance business model: Financial resilience through sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 13*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2022.2064257