EQUITIES · Jun 5, 2026

ESG Premium or ESG Discount? What the Data Actually Shows

A meta-analysis of empirical studies on ESG factor returns. We separate signal from marketing across different time horizons and geographies.

1. The Question Behind the Question

Ask whether ESG investing 'outperforms' and you will get a confident yes or no depending entirely on which study, which time window, and which region the answer is drawn from. That inconsistency is itself the finding: there is no single, stable 'ESG factor' the way there is a reasonably stable value or momentum factor. What gets called an ESG premium or discount is usually a bundle of sector tilts, quality screens, and regime-dependent effects wearing an ESG label.

2. The Case for a Premium

Proponents point to several plausible mechanisms: ESG screening tends to systematically underweight high-carbon, high-litigation-risk sectors (energy, tobacco, mining), which mechanically reduces tail risk. Studies using MSCI and Sustainalytics data through the 2010s found that higher-ESG-scored firms exhibited lower cost of capital, lower earnings volatility, and modestly higher risk-adjusted returns — consistent with an interpretation that better-governed companies are simply better-run companies, and the 'G' (governance) pillar in particular has shown the most consistent statistical link to lower fraud and restatement risk.

3. The Case for a Discount

The counter-evidence is dominated by one very visible period: 2022. As energy prices spiked following Russia's invasion of Ukraine, ESG funds that structurally underweighted or excluded energy stocks underperformed broad benchmarks by a wide margin — the S&P; 500 Energy sector returned over 60% that year while most ESG-screened large-cap funds posted negative returns. This single episode reversed several years of ESG fund outperformance built up during the low-rate, growth-led market of 2019–2021.

A separate strand of academic literature argues that if ESG-conscious investors are willing to accept lower expected returns as the 'price' of value alignment, then in equilibrium, ESG-favored stocks should trade at a valuation premium and thus deliver lower forward returns almost by construction — the 'discount' is the cost of the preference, not a market inefficiency waiting to be arbitraged away.

4. Time Horizon Changes the Answer

Short-window studies (1–3 years) are dominated by whatever sector rotation happened to be in favor — ESG funds looked brilliant through 2020's tech-led rally and terrible through 2022's energy-led rally. Longer-window studies (10+ years) that control for sector exposure find the pure 'ESG effect,' stripped of sector tilts, is close to statistically indistinguishable from zero — neither a reliable premium nor a reliable discount survives once you adjust for what ESG funds are actually over- and under-weighting.

5. Geography Matters More Than the Label Suggests

European ESG funds, operating under the EU's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation with harder exclusionary screens, have shown more consistent underperformance during energy and defense-sector rallies than U.S. ESG funds, which more often use softer 'best-in-class' scoring that permits holding energy majors with strong relative ESG scores. The same label produces materially different portfolios — and materially different return profiles — depending on jurisdiction and methodology.

6. The Measurement Problem Underneath It All

Perhaps the deepest issue is that ESG ratings from different providers correlate only loosely with one another — studies have found correlation coefficients between major rating agencies' ESG scores for the same companies as low as 0.4–0.6, far lower than the near-perfect correlation seen between, say, different providers' credit ratings. When the underlying measurement itself is this noisy, any single study's finding of a 'premium' or 'discount' should be treated as evidence about that specific rating methodology in that specific period, not as a durable law of markets.

7. Conclusion

The data does not support a consistent, universal ESG premium or discount. What it supports is a more modest and more useful claim: ESG screening is a sector and quality tilt that will outperform or underperform depending on which sectors and factors are in favor, exactly like any other systematic tilt. Investors should evaluate ESG products on the merits of their specific holdings and factor exposures, not on the assumption that the label itself carries a reliable return premium in either direction.
