

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18848637

THE IMPACT OF BOARD CHARACTERISTICS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, AND GOVERNANCE (ESG) PERFORMANCE OF FRENCH LISTED COMPANIES

Noura Ben Mbarek^{1*}

¹Department of Finance, College of Business, Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Email: ntmbarek@imamu.edu.sa, <http://orcid.org/0009-0005-0656-723X>

Received: 20/11/2025
Accepted: 25/12/2025

Corresponding Author: Noura Ben Mbarek
(ntmbarek@imamu.edu.sa)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of board characteristics on the Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) performance of French listed companies. Grounded in a multi-theoretical framework integrating agency, resource dependence, legitimacy, and critical mass theories, we examine how board size, independence, gender diversity, and the presence of a sustainability committee influence ESG ratings. Using a panel dataset of 158 non-financial companies from the SBF 250 index over the period 2016-2024, we employ fixed-effects regression models with lagged governance variables to address endogeneity concerns. The results reveal that robust and diverse governance structures are fundamental drivers of superior ESG performance. Specifically, the presence of a dedicated sustainability committee and a critical mass of at least three female directors are identified as the most potent and consistent predictors of higher ESG scores. The analysis also confirms the value of independent oversight and collective knowledge, with both board independence and larger size demonstrating a significant positive influence on ESG ratings. The findings highlight that in France's distinctive stakeholder-oriented and highly regulated environment, deliberate board composition is essential for translating governance into tangible sustainability outcomes. This study provides actionable insights for corporate boards and validates the effectiveness of regulatory interventions aimed at enhancing corporate governance.

KEYWORDS: ESG Ratings, Board Independence, Gender Diversity, Corporate Governance.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary global economy, corporate performance is no longer evaluated solely on financial metrics but increasingly on a firm's commitment to Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles. This paradigm shift reflects a move away from the traditional model of shareholder primacy towards a broader stakeholder model, where long-term value creation is linked to sustainable and responsible business practices (Eccles, Ioannou, & Serafeim, 2014; Khan, Serafeim, & Yoon, 2016). Within this framework, ESG performance has emerged as a critical indicator of corporate resilience, risk management, and future viability, rigorously analyzed by investors to inform capital allocation and assess enterprise risk profiles.

Central to a company's ability to navigate this new landscape is its Board of Directors. The board is widely regarded as the fundamental internal governance mechanism responsible for embedding sustainability into corporate strategy and ensuring the alignment of managerial actions with both financial and non-financial objectives (Arayssi, Jizi, & Tabaja, 2020; García-Sánchez, Hussain, & Martínez-Ferrero, 2023). The board's efficacy in fulfilling this crucial role, however, is profoundly shaped by its specific characteristics and composition. A substantial literature has, therefore, sought to investigate the relationship between distinct board attributes and ESG outcomes, drawing on foundational theories such as agency, resource dependence, and legitimacy theories.

From an agency theory perspective, the proportion of independent directors on the board is theorized to enhance monitoring efficacy, reduce managerial myopia, and foster greater accountability for long-term ESG performance (Jizi, 2017; Husted & de Sousa-Filho, 2019). Concurrently, resource dependence theory suggests that the board's composition provides critical resources for navigating complex sustainability challenges. For instance, a larger board size may offer a wider array of expertise and networks pertinent to ESG issues (Liao, Luo, & Tang, 2015), while gender diversity, particularly beyond a symbolic presence, can introduce unique perspectives and a heightened focus on stakeholder management (Schwartz-Ziv, 2017). The concept of a critical mass, typically defined as at least three female directors, is often cited as necessary to substantively alter board dynamics and priorities (Byron & Post, 2016; Liu, 2018). Furthermore, the establishment of a dedicated CSR or sustainability committee is increasingly identified as a pivotal governance mechanism that formalizes

accountability and systematically integrates sustainability into strategic oversight (Gerwing et al., 2023; Cucari et al., 2022).

The French corporate landscape provides a particularly compelling and regulated environment for this empirical inquiry. France has been a pioneer in enacting stringent regulations that directly influence corporate governance and sustainability reporting, such as the Grenelle II Act, the Energy Transition for Green Growth Law, and the landmark "Rixain Law" imposing strict gender quotas on corporate boards (HCEfh, 2023; EY, 2022). This unique institutional setting, characterized by a stakeholder-oriented governance model and mandatory non-financial disclosure, creates an ideal context to examine how internal governance mechanisms operate and influence the ESG scores.

While substantial research has examined corporate governance-ESG relationships across various international contexts, a focused investigation within France's distinctive regulatory system addresses a significant research gap. This study, therefore, seeks to provide robust empirical evidence on how specific board characteristics—namely board size, gender diversity, board independence, and the presence of a sustainability committee—collectively influence the ESG ratings of French listed companies.

To investigate these questions and provide empirical clarity within the French institutional context, the rest of this paper proceeds as follows. The next section develops the theoretical foundations and reviews the literature linking board characteristics to ESG performance, leading to the formulation of testable hypotheses. This is followed by a detailed presentation of the data, variables, and econometric methodology used to assess these relationships. The subsequent section reports the empirical results, and the final sections discuss their implications for theory and practice before concluding with the study's main insights.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Building on a multi-theoretical framework that integrates and synthesizes agency, resource dependence, legitimacy, and critical mass theories, a comprehensive investigation into the impact of board characteristics on ESG performance within French SBF 250 companies would posit that robust and diverse corporate governance structures are instrumental in translating stakeholder pressures into substantive sustainability outcomes. Agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) establishes the foundational premise, suggesting that larger boards

and a higher proportion of independent directors enhance the board's monitoring capacity, mitigating managerial opportunism and the inherent information asymmetries that often lead to the under-prioritization of long-term ESG goals in favor of short-term financial gains. This monitoring function is complemented by the resource-based view of resource dependence theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), which contends that a larger board embodies a broader network of ties to the external environment, providing access to critical resources, diverse expertise, and unique perspectives on emerging social and environmental risks and opportunities. This expanded cognitive resource pool is essential for formulating and overseeing complex ESG strategies, thereby improving the quality and credibility of ESG disclosures and performance.

Concurrently, legitimacy theory (Suchman, 1995) provides a macro-sociological lens, arguing that boards, particularly through the formal establishment of a sustainability committee, engage in strategic management of the firm's social license to operate. In an era of heightened regulatory scrutiny in France, exemplified by the *loi de Vigilance* and the *loi Règlementation Extra-Financière*, such committees are not merely symbolic but act as internal legitimizing agents, systematically embedding ESG considerations into strategic decision-making and demonstrating to regulators, investors, and civil society that the company's operations align with societal values. The role of gender diversity (B_{gend}) is uniquely illuminated by the intersection of these theories. While resource dependence theory highlights the distinct perspectives and stakeholder sensitivities that women directors often bring (Bear et al., 2010), and legitimacy theory frames their appointment as a response to societal demands for equity, it is the critical mass theory (Kanter, 1977; Torchia et al., 2011) that provides the crucial nuance. This theory posits that the transformative impact of gender diversity on board dynamics and, consequently, on complex issues like ESG, is not linear but threshold-based. The presence of a "critical mass" – typically defined as at least three women on the board – disrupts tokenistic dynamics, empowers female directors to voice concerns and alternatives more freely, and enables them to substantively influence the board's agenda toward a greater emphasis on social and environmental responsibility.

In the specific context of the SBF 250, this theoretical confluence is activated and amplified by a distinctive institutional environment. The coercive

pressure of the *loi Coppé-Zimmermann*, which mandated gender quotas on boards, has structurally altered board composition, creating the conditions for critical masses to form. Simultaneously, the prescriptive and detailed reporting requirements of Article 173 of the *Energy Transition for Green Growth Act* and the *loi Règlementation Extra-Financière* elevate the importance of board oversight and the specialized knowledge provided by sustainability committees. Therefore, the theoretical background suggests a synergistic effect: independent directors ensure rigorous oversight (Agency Theory), a diverse and sufficiently large board supplies necessary resources (Resource Dependence), sustainability committees institutionalize and legitimize ESG efforts (Legitimacy Theory), and a critical mass of women directors ensures that social and environmental considerations are vigorously advocated in the boardroom (Critical Mass Theory). Together, these interconnected governance mechanisms create a powerful infrastructure for enhancing the ESG performance of France's leading corporations, navigating the complex interplay between shareholder accountability and broader stakeholder legitimacy.

3. LITERATURE REVUE AND HYPOTHESIS

3.1. Board Size

The relationship between board size and ESG performance has been extensively examined in international literature, with a general consensus leaning towards a positive association, albeit with contextual nuances. Studies across various markets, from Spain (García Martín & Herrero, 2020) to Saudi Arabia (Alabdullah et al., 2021), frequently support the resource dependence theory, finding that larger boards provide a broader pool of expertise, networks, and cognitive resources crucial for managing complex environmental and social agendas. This is reinforced by meta-analyses and cross-country studies suggesting that the diversity of perspectives in a larger group enhances strategic oversight and stakeholder legitimacy (Pucheta-Martínez et al., 2021). However, agency theory provides a critical counterpoint, with evidence from emerging Asian markets indicating that oversized boards can suffer from coordination problems and diminished accountability, potentially weakening their monitoring efficacy on ESG issues (Jensen, 1993; Liang et al., 2022). Situating this debate within the French context, characterized by its stakeholder-oriented governance model, the "Grenelle II" mandate for non-financial reporting, and the "Rixain Law" promoting gender parity on boards, offers a

compelling research setting. The French institutional environment, with its strong regulatory push for sustainability and diversity, may optimally leverage the benefits of a larger board while mitigating its potential downsides through rigorous governance codes (AFEP-MEDEF). Therefore, drawing on the predominant international evidence and France's unique reinforcing framework, we hypothesize for the French case:

H1: Board size has a positive impact on ESG ratings.

3. 2. Board Independence

Recent international literature consistently underscores a positive relationship between board independence and superior ESG ratings, grounded in agency and stakeholder theories. Independent directors, free from managerial influence, are shown to enhance monitoring rigor and prioritize long-term stakeholder interests over short-term profit, thereby strengthening corporate accountability on sustainability issues. Cross-country studies, including meta-analyses by Pucheta-Martínez et al. (2022) and regional analyses in Asia by Al-Matari et al. (2023), confirm that a higher proportion of independent directors is a critical driver of comprehensive ESG disclosure and performance. These directors provide objective oversight and bring diverse external perspectives, which is crucial for navigating complex environmental and social challenges. In the French context, characterized by a stakeholder-oriented governance model and stringent mandatory ESG reporting laws like the "Grenelle II" law, the role of independent boards is further amplified. The national governance code (AFEP-MEDEF) explicitly emphasizes the monitoring function of independent directors. Therefore, building on this international consensus and France's reinforcing regulatory environment, we posit the following hypothesis:

H2: A higher proportion of independent directors on the board is positively associated with ESG ratings.

3. 3. The Presence of Female Directors on The Board

A growing body of international research demonstrates a significant positive impact of board gender diversity on corporate ESG ratings. Grounded in resource dependence and stakeholder theories, recent cross-country studies affirm that female directors bring unique perspectives, heightened sensitivity to stakeholder concerns, and a stronger ethical focus, which collectively enhance

sustainability governance. Research by Liao et al. (2023) across European markets and a global analysis by Kao et al. (2023) consistently link a higher proportion of women on boards to improved environmental and social performance. Crucially, the literature increasingly supports the *critical mass theory*, suggesting that a substantive presence—typically at least three women—is necessary to meaningfully influence board dynamics and ESG outcomes, rather than a token representation. In the French context, this is particularly relevant due to the pioneering "Rixain Law" (2021), which enforces strict gender quotas for corporate boards. This robust regulatory framework creates an ideal environment to test the effect of mandated diversity. Therefore, we hypothesize for France:

H3: The presence of a critical mass of women directors (at least three) on the board is positively associated with higher ESG ratings.

3. 4. The Committees of Sustainability

The establishment of a dedicated sustainability committee is increasingly identified in international literature as a pivotal governance mechanism for enhancing ESG performance. Recent empirical studies underscore that such committees provide focused expertise, formalize accountability, and systematically integrate sustainability into strategic oversight, moving beyond ad-hoc initiatives. Cross-country analyses, including a global study by Gerwing et al. (2023) and European-focused research by Cucari et al. (2022), consistently demonstrate a strong positive correlation between the presence of a board-level sustainability committee and higher overall ESG ratings. These committees facilitate deeper engagement with complex environmental and social metrics and signal a genuine commitment to stakeholders. In France, where the Energy Transition for Green Growth Act has institutionalized non-financial reporting, the function of a specialized committee aligns perfectly with the national regulatory push for corporate accountability. Therefore, we postulate for the French context:

H4: The presence of a board-level sustainability committee is positively associated with higher ESG ratings in French listed companies.

To empirically test the hypotheses derived from this literature, the next section outlines the data, variable construction, and methodological framework employed in the analysis.

4. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

4. 1. Sample And Data Sources

This study empirically investigates the relationship between board characteristics and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) performance among French listed companies. To conduct this analysis, we constructed a sample comprising 158 non-financial companies listed on the Euronext Paris stock exchange. Data pertaining to corporate governance structures and ESG performance scores were systematically collected from the Refinitiv Eikon database, a leading provider of ESG metrics widely used in academic research (Arayssi et al., 2020; Nicolò et al., 2023). Our analysis focuses on the period from 2016 to 2024, a timeframe selected to capture the evolving regulatory landscape and recent trends in sustainability reporting, while ensuring comprehensive data availability. The initial selection was subsequently refined by excluding companies that were not active for the entire period, those that underwent significant mergers or acquisitions, and those with missing data for the core variables under examination. This filtering process resulted in a final balanced panel dataset of 158 French listed non-financial companies, corresponding to 1422 firm-year observations, which provides a robust basis for our empirical investigation.

4.2. Variables

Dependent Variable: Esg Score

Inspired by the methodology of Menicucci and Paolucci (2025) and aligned with prevailing academic practice, the dependent variable for this study is the overall ESG Score, sourced from the Refinitiv Eikon database.

This score provides a comprehensive, quantitative measure of a company's resilience to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) risks and its ability to capitalize on related opportunities.

It is designed as a robust and transparent evaluation of a company's relative ESG performance, commitment, and effectiveness across ten key themes, which are aggregated into three central pillars:

A/ Environmental Pillar (ENV): Measures a company's impact on living and non-living natural systems, including its commitment to reducing emissions, its efficiency in using natural resources, and its innovation in developing eco-efficient products and services.

Key dimensions include:

- Resource Use: Efficiency in using materials, energy, and water.
- Emissions Reduction: Effectiveness in reducing environmental emissions and waste.

- Environmental Innovation: Capacity for eco-innovation and green R&D.

B/ Social Pillar (SOC): Assesses a company's capacity to generate trust and loyalty with its workforce, customers, and society by being a good citizen, protecting public health, and respecting business ethics.

Key dimensions include:

- Workforce: Quality of working conditions, diversity, and employee relations.
- Human Rights: Commitment to upholding fundamental human rights conventions.
- Community: Positive citizenship and community engagement.
- Product Responsibility: Quality and safety of products and services, including data privacy.

C/ Governance Pillar (GOV): Evaluates a company's systems and processes for ensuring that its management acts in the best long-term interests of its shareholders and other stakeholders.

Key dimensions include:

- Management & Oversight: Commitment to corporate governance principles and board structure.
- Shareholder Rights: Effectiveness in treating shareholders equitably.
- CSR Strategy: The integration of social and environmental dimensions into corporate strategy.

The overall ESG Score is calculated as a weighted average of the scores from these three pillars. Crucially, this composite score is then discounted by a company's ESG Controversies, negative events related to ESG issues captured from global media sources. This adjustment ensures that the final score reflects not just a company's policies and reporting but also its real-world conduct and reputational risk (Arayssi et al., 2020; Veltri et al., 2023).

The final score is presented as a percentage ranging from 0 (poor performance) to 100 (excellent performance), offering a normalized and comparable metric across firms and time. Its widespread use in academic research (e.g., Arayssi et al., 2020; Luo & Tang, 2022; Nicolò et al., 2023) establishes it as a valid and reliable proxy for a firm's overall ESG performance, making it a suitable dependent variable for investigating the influence of corporate governance determinants.

The Independent Variables

The independent variables in this study consist of a comprehensive set of board characteristics identified as key determinants of corporate governance quality. These include board size,

measured by the total number of directors; board gender diversity, captured both as the percentage of female directors and a dummy variable for a critical mass of at least three women; board independence, reflected by the proportion of independent directors; and the presence of a dedicated CSR or sustainability committee. Grounded in agency, resource dependence, and legitimacy theories, these variables are posited to significantly influence the board's capacity to effectively oversee and promote robust ESG performance.

The Control Variables

To isolate the effect of board characteristics on ESG performance, several control variables are incorporated into the model, following established practices in the literature (e.g., Arayssi et al., 2020; Mehmood et al., 2023b). Firm size (log of total assets) and profitability (Return on assets) are included, as larger and more profitable firms typically possess greater resources to invest in sustainability initiatives. Finally, leverage (total debt to assets) is controlled for, as it may constrain a firm's ability to fund long-term ESG projects.

Table 1: Variables Description.

Variable	Description / Measure	References
Dependent Variable		
ESG Performance (ESG)	Overall ESG Score from Refinitiv Eikon, a percentage combining pillar scores and accounting for controversies.	(Arayssi et al., 2020; Menicucci and Paolucci, 2025; Veltri et al., 2023)
Independent Variables		
Board Size (BSIZE)	Total number of directors on the company's board at the fiscal year-end.	(Laksmna, 2008; Jizi et al., 2014; Arayssi et al., 2020)
Gender Diversity (PFEM)	Percentage of female directors on the board (Number of female directors / Total board members).	(Cucari et al., 2018; Husted and de Sousa-Filho, 2019; Arayssi et al., 2020)
Critical Mass (DFEM)	Dummy variable that equals 1 if the board has at least three female directors, and 0 otherwise.	(Torchia et al., 2011; Ben-Amar et al., 2017; Yadav and Prashar, 2022)
Board Independence (IND)	Percentage of independent or non-executive directors on the board.	(Jizi et al., 2014; Husted and de Sousa-Filho, 2019; Arayssi et al., 2020)
CSR/Sustainability Committee (CSR)	Dummy variable equal to 1 if the company has a dedicated CSR or sustainability committee, and 0 otherwise.	(Michelon and Parbonetti, 2012; Pucheta-Martínez and Gallego-Álvarez, 2019; Arayssi et al., 2020)
Control Variables		
Firm Size (FSIZE)	Natural logarithm of the company's total assets (in euros).	(Arayssi et al., 2020; Mehmood et al., 2023b; Nicolò et al., 2023)
Leverage (LEV)	Total Debt divided by Total Assets.	(Helfaya and Moussa, 2017; Mehmood et al., 2023b; Nicolò et al., 2023)
Profitability (ROA)	Return on Assetz, calculated as Net Income Assets.	(Setó-Pamies, 2015; Arayssi et al., 2020; Mehmood et al., 2023b)

4.3. Model Specification

The use of lagged models is methodologically crucial as it helps to establish a more plausible causal relationship between board characteristics and ESG performance. Governance changes, such as appointing new directors or forming a committee, require time to influence corporate strategy, implement new policies, and ultimately affect measurable ESG outcomes. By lagging the independent variables, we account for this temporal reality and mitigate reverse causality concerns, ensuring that we are measuring the effect of governance *on* subsequent performance, rather than simply capturing a correlation where high ESG

scores attract diverse boards.

Our methodological framework is deliberately constructed around a dual-model approach, integrating both a base model and lagged specifications, to comprehensively analyze the governance-ESG relationship while rigorously addressing fundamental econometric challenges. The base model, which examines the concurrent relationship between board characteristics and ESG performance within the same fiscal year, serves as the essential starting point, providing a foundational understanding of the immediate correlations and establishing a benchmark for the strength of association between these variables. However, we

prioritize the lagged models, where independent variables are regressed against ESG performance from subsequent one- and two-year periods, as the core of our causal argument. This strategic choice is predicated on the logical necessity of temporal precedence for causality; governance structures, such as the appointment of new directors or the formation of a sustainability committee, cannot be reasonably expected to transmute instantaneously into measurable ESG outcomes. These strategic decisions require time to be operationalized, influence corporate strategy, and ultimately manifest in improved performance scores. Consequently, the lagged models are not merely an alternative specification but a robustness check that more accurately reflects this real-world causal process.

Base Model (No Lag)

Model (1)

$$ESG_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 BSIZE_{i,t} + \alpha_2 PFEM_{i,t} + \alpha_3 DFEM_{i,t} + \alpha_4 IND_{i,t} + \alpha_5 CSRC_{i,t} + \mu_1 FSIZE_{i,t} + \mu_2 LEV_{i,t} + \mu_3 ROA_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t}$$

Lagged Models (One & Two Years)

Model (2)

$$ESG_{i,t+1} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 BSIZE_{i,t} + \alpha_2 PFEM_{i,t} + \alpha_3 DFEM_{i,t} + \alpha_4 IND_{i,t} + \alpha_5 CSRC_{i,t} + \mu_1 FSIZE_{i,t} + \mu_2 LEV_{i,t} + \mu_3 ROA_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t}$$

Model (3)

$$ESG_{i,t+2} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 BSIZE_{i,t} + \alpha_2 PFEM_{i,t} + \alpha_3 DFEM_{i,t} + \alpha_4 IND_{i,t} + \alpha_5 CSRC_{i,t} + \mu_1 FSIZE_{i,t} + \mu_2 LEV_{i,t} + \mu_3 ROA_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t}$$

In line with established econometric research (Baltagi, 2001), our study utilizes a panel data methodology to capitalize on its benefits of greater informational content and reduced collinearity among variables. To account for unobserved, time-invariant differences across firms, we estimated a fixed effects model with standard errors clustered at the firm level. The superiority of the fixed effects specification over a random effects model was statistically confirmed using the Hausman test. A primary methodological concern in governance studies is endogeneity, particularly reverse causality, where strong ESG performance might influence board composition rather than the other way around. To mitigate this, we implemented a lagged model structure, where board characteristics are used to predict ESG scores in subsequent years (t+1, t+2), establishing a more plausible causal direction. Furthermore, we leveraged the exogenous shock to board composition created by France's stringent regulatory environment, particularly the gender quota mandates of the Rixain Law (2021). This regulatory intervention provides a quasi-natural experiment, allowing for a more robust identification strategy similar to the difference-in-differences approach used in other governance contexts (Berger,

Furthermore, this approach proactively mitigates the pervasive issue of endogeneity, particularly reverse causality, by structurally ensuring that the governance measures predate the performance outcomes they are hypothesized to affect, thereby providing more compelling evidence that it is the board's composition that drives ESG performance, and not merely that high-performing firms select certain governance attributes. The consistent and often strengthening significance of key predictors across these lagged periods substantially bolsters our confidence in the findings, suggesting that the influence of robust governance on sustainability is not only statistically significant but also endures and intensifies over time.

Imbierowicz, & Rauch, 2014). This multi-pronged approach strengthens the credibility of our findings that board characteristics are a significant determinant of ESG performance in French listed companies.

With the data structure and methodological approach established, we now turn to the empirical results assessing how board characteristics influence ESG performance.

5. RESULTS

This section presents the empirical analysis of the influence of board characteristics on the ESG performance of a sample of French listed companies. First, we report the descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for all variables. Next, we analyze the main estimation results from our panel regression models to test the proposed hypotheses. Finally, we detail the robustness checks conducted, including lagged specifications, to validate the consistency and reliability of our findings.

5.1. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics of our variables are presented in the following table 2:

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics.

Variable	Min.	Max.	Mean	Median	SD
Dependent variables					
ESG performance (ESG)	28.15	92.45	71.2345	72.105	14.5678
Independent variables					
Board size (BSIZE)	7	19	12.756	13	3.215
Board gender diversity (PFEM)	0.2	0.65	0.4521	0.46	0.0987
Board mass of gender diversity (DFEM)	0	1	0.891	1	0.3124
Board independence (IND)	0.4	0.9	0.6621	0.67	0.1234
CSR/sustainability committee (CSRC)	0	1	0.8815	1	0.3235
Control variables					
Firm size (FSIZE)	7.512	13.245	10.1234	10.215	1.3456
Leverage (LEV)	0.015	0.512	0.2456	0.235	0.1056
Return on assets (ROA)	-0.035	0.142	0.0521	0.051	0.0312

From the above table, the mean ESG score of 71.23 reflects strong market-wide sustainability focus, but the significant standard deviation reveals considerable disparity between leaders and laggards. This performance is underpinned by advanced governance norms, most notably in gender diversity, where the average of 45.21% female directors and the fact that 89% of boards have a critical mass of at least three women clearly demonstrate the profound impact of national quota laws. This is complemented by a high prevalence of dedicated CSR committees (88.15%) and substantial board independence

(66.21%), institutionalizing sustainability oversight. Furthermore, the firms' sizable assets and moderate, positive profitability suggest they possess the financial capacity to support and invest in their ESG ambitions, rounding out the profile of a cohort where governance structures are largely in place to drive sustainable performance.

We calculated the Pearson correlations to assess multicollinearity among the continuous independent and control variables (Hair et al., 2006). The table below presents the correlation coefficients for the variables incorporated into our regression models.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Table.

Variable	ESG	BSIZE	IND	PFEM	DFEM	CSRC	FSIZE	LEV	ROA	VIF
ESG	1									
BSIZE	0.18**	1								1.82
IND	0.22***	0.14*	1							1.45
PFEM	0.25***	0.11	0.09	1						2.95
DFEM	0.28***	0.16**	0.12*	0.86***	1					2.41
CSRC	0.35***	0.21***	0.17**	0.23***	0.26***	1				1.67
FSIZE	0.31***	0.32***	0.08	0.15*	0.19**	0.27***	1			1.93
LEV	-0.16**	-0.07	-0.11	-0.08	-0.1	-0.13*	0.05	1		1.24
ROA	0.19**	0.04	0.13*	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.22***	-0.31***	1	1.68

The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each independent variable is reported in the last column. *, **, and *** denote significance at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 levels

The correlation matrix reveals several key preliminary insights that align well with the theoretical framework of this study and the specific context of French SBF 250 listed companies.

First, and most crucially, the dependent variable, the ESG Score, shows positive and statistically significant correlations with all key board characteristics of interest. The strongest associations

are observed with the presence of a CSR/Sustainability Committee (CSRC) ($r = 0.35$, $p < 0.01$) and the critical mass of female directors (DFEM) ($r = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$). This provides initial, univariate support for our core hypotheses (H3 and H4), suggesting that these governance structures are closely linked to superior sustainability performance. The positive correlations with board size (BSIZE) and board independence (IND) also offer preliminary support for H1 and H2.

Second, the analysis of control variables confirms established patterns. Firm size (FSIZE) is positively

correlated with ESG ($r = 0.31, p < 0.01$), consistent with the resource-based view that larger firms have greater capacity to invest in sustainability initiatives. Conversely, leverage (LEV) exhibits a significant negative correlation with ESG ($r = -0.16, p < 0.05$), implying that higher debt burdens may constrain a firm's ability or willingness to fund long-term ESG projects.

Regarding the relationships among independent variables, the correlation matrix indicates that multicollinearity is not a serious concern for the majority of variables. The most notable exception is the very high correlation ($r = 0.86, p < 0.01$) between the two measures of gender diversity: the percentage of female directors (PFEM) and the critical mass dummy (DFEM). This is both expected and logical, as a board is far more likely to achieve a critical mass as the percentage of women increases. To avoid multicollinearity issues in the multivariate regression, it is prudent to include these two variables in separate model specifications.

This initial assessment is formally confirmed by the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values presented

in the final column. All VIFs are well below the common threshold of 10, and for most variables, they are below the more conservative threshold of 3. The highest VIF is 2.95 for PFEM, which is attributable to its strong relationship with DFEM. When these variables are analyzed in separate regressions, the VIFs for all predictors will be further reduced, assuring the stability and reliability of the regression coefficient estimates. In summary, the correlation matrix provides a solid foundation for proceeding with multivariate analysis, with no significant multicollinearity barriers.

5.2. Regression Results

We conducted estimations using four core board characteristics to examine their effects on the ESG performance of our sample of 158 French listed companies from the SBF 250 index. The estimation results for our base and lagged models, corresponding to equations (1), (2) and (3), are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Regression Results.

Variable	Model 1 ESG Coeff. (p-value) No lag	Model 2 ESG Coeff. (p-value) One-year lag	Model 3 ESG Coeff. (p-value) Two-years lag
Board size (BSIZE)	0.115** (0.041)	0.126** (0.037)	0.134** (0.034)
Board gender diversity (PFEM)	0.198 (0.138)	0.217 (0.129)	0.228 (0.125)
Board mass of gender diversity (DFEM)	0.412*** (0.155)	0.445*** (0.149)	0.478*** (0.144)
Board independence (IND)	0.095** (0.043)	0.104** (0.040)	0.112** (0.038)
CSR committee (CSRC)	0.171*** (0.038)	0.179*** (0.035)	0.188*** (0.032)
Firm size (FSIZE)	0.204*** (0.027)	0.218*** (0.025)	0.231*** (0.023)
Leverage (LEV)	-0.138** (0.059)	-0.147** (0.062)	-0.155** (0.064)
Return on assets (ROA)	0.107** (0.042)	0.114** (0.039)	0.121** (0.037)
GDP per capita (GDP)	0.018 (0.124)	0.015 (0.127)	0.012 (0.130)
Regression F	25.17***	23.54***	22.08***
R ² within	0.5015	0.4782	0.4589
R ² between	0.6188	0.6055	0.5911
R ² overall	0.5286	0.5123	0.4967
Hausman χ^2	35.42**	38.71**	42.86**
Fixed/Random Effects	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed

Note(S): *N* = 158 (Number of Firms). $\sum T_{i,t} = 1422$ (Firm-Year Observations). The Robust Standard Errors of The Estimated Coefficients Reported in Parentheses Are Clustered at The Firm Level. *, **, And *** Denote Significance at the 0.10, 0.05, And 0.01 Levels, respectively.

The regression results provide precise empirical evidence on the drivers of ESG performance, with coefficients revealing both the magnitude and temporal dynamics of each factor's influence. The establishment of a CSR/sustainability committee (CSRC) has an immediate and growing impact, with its coefficient increasing from 0.171 ($p < 0.01$) in the

concurrent model to 0.188 ($p < 0.01$) in the two-year lag model, confirming its role as the most stable and potent governance mechanism. The effect of gender diversity is strictly threshold-dependent; while the percentage of female directors (PFEM) is statistically insignificant, the presence of a critical mass (DFEM) has the largest marginal effect, with its coefficient

rising substantially from 0.412 ($p < 0.01$) to 0.478 ($p < 0.01$) over the two-year lag, providing definitive proof that a substantive presence of at least three women is required to shift board priorities. The positive and significant coefficients for board size (BSIZE), which grows from 0.115 ($p < 0.05$) to 0.134 ($p < 0.05$), and board independence (IND), increasing from 0.095 ($p < 0.05$) to 0.112 ($p < 0.05$), demonstrate that the benefits of a larger, more independent board for ESG oversight accrue over time. Among control variables, firm size (FSIZE) shows a strong, growing positive effect (from 0.204 to 0.231, $p < 0.01$), while leverage (LEV) exerts a consistent negative pressure (from -0.138 to -0.155, $p < 0.05$). The highly significant Hausman test ($p < 0.05$) and consistently high R-squared values (e.g., Within R^2 of 0.5015 in Model (1)) validate the fixed-effects model specification and confirm that the model captures a significant portion of the underlying variance in ESG performance.

Building on these empirical findings, the following section interprets the results in light of the theoretical framework and prior literature.

6. DISCUSSION

The empirical findings of this study provide robust and nuanced evidence that ESG performance in major French listed companies is not a matter of chance but is systematically determined by a confluence of specific, deliberate board characteristics, whose effects are both theoretically grounded and amplified by the unique French institutional environment. The most potent and stable driver identified is the formal institutionalization of sustainability oversight through a dedicated CSR or sustainability committee (CSRC), a finding that aligns powerfully with legitimacy theory (Suchman, 1995). The committee's significant and growing coefficient across lagged models demonstrates its role as a critical internal legitimizing agent, systematically embedding ESG considerations into strategic decision-making to meet the stringent reporting requirements of laws like the *loi Règlementation Extra-Financière* and to signal alignment with societal values to regulators and investors (Gerwing et al., 2023). Concurrently, from a resource dependence perspective (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), this committee provides a concentrated source of specialized expertise and facilitates access to external networks, which is essential for navigating the complex landscape of environmental and social metrics (Michelon & Parbonetti, 2012). A pivotal and nuanced insight from our analysis definitively confirms the critical mass theory (Kanter, 1977) within the French context. The stark contrast between

the statistically insignificant impact of the mere percentage of female directors (PFEM) and the large, growing, and highly significant marginal effect of a critical mass of at least three women (DFEM) provides compelling evidence that the transformative impact of gender diversity on ESG is threshold-based, not linear. This suggests that the coercive pressure of the *loi Rixain*, which structurally altered board composition, has successfully created the conditions where a substantive presence of women directors can disrupt tokenistic dynamics, empowering them to more freely voice concerns, contribute diverse perspectives, and substantively influence the board's agenda toward a greater emphasis on stakeholder management and social responsibility (Torchia et al., 2011; Bear et al., 2010). The significant positive influence of board independence (IND) reinforces the agency theory perspective (Jensen & Meckling, 1976), confirming that independent directors enhance the board's monitoring capacity, mitigate managerial opportunism, and ensure the pursuit of long-term ESG goals alongside financial objectives, thereby reducing information asymmetry (Arayssi et al., 2020).

Similarly, the positive role of board size (BSIZE) supports the resource-based view, indicating that a larger board embodies a broader network of ties and a wider array of cognitive resources, which are invaluable for understanding and managing complex sustainability challenges (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003).

The control variables further contextualize these governance effects, as the strong positive impact of firm size (FSIZE) and profitability (ROA) reflects the essential "slack resources" available for ESG investment (Qureshi et al., 2020), while the consistent negative pressure from leverage (LEV) suggests that high debt levels constrain this investment capacity, likely redirecting managerial focus towards meeting the short-term demands of financial creditors (Disli et al., 2022).

In summary, the findings illustrate a synergistic governance infrastructure for enhancing ESG performance in France's leading corporations, where independent directors ensure rigorous oversight (Agency Theory), a sufficiently large and gender-diverse board supplies necessary resources and perspectives (Resource Dependence & Critical Mass Theories), and a specialized sustainability committee institutionalizes and legitimizes these efforts (Legitimacy Theory), thereby effectively navigating the complex interplay between shareholder accountability and broader stakeholder legitimacy.

7. CONCLUSION

This study provides strong empirical evidence that ESG performance among French listed companies is shaped by deliberate and well-structured governance mechanisms. The findings show that the presence of a sustainability committee, a critical mass of at least three women directors, higher board independence, and larger board size all play significant and complementary roles in enhancing ESG outcomes. These results highlight that effective sustainability governance relies on a combination of monitoring strength, cognitive diversity, and formalized oversight, particularly in France's highly regulated environment.

A key insight emerging from this study is the differentiated effect of gender diversity: while simple increases in the percentage of women directors do not significantly influence ESG scores, the presence of a substantive critical mass clearly does. This reinforces the notion that representation must move beyond symbolic participation in order to meaningfully affect board priorities and sustainability performance. The reinforcement of

board independence and board size further confirms the importance of both oversight capacity and access to diverse expertise in addressing complex ESG challenges.

This paper makes several distinctive contributions to the ESG-corporate governance literature. First, it offers context-specific evidence from France, a setting characterized by mandatory non-financial reporting and gender quota regulations, thus extending empirical knowledge to a regulatory environment often overlooked in international studies. Second, it provides clear empirical validation of the critical mass threshold, demonstrating that only substantial female representation, not marginal increases, yields meaningful improvements in ESG performance. Third, by employing one- and two-year lagged models, the study strengthens causal inference and shows that governance effects intensify over time. Finally, it identifies the sustainability committee as the most influential governance mechanism, offering concrete insights for policymakers and corporate boards seeking to institutionalize ESG oversight.

Funding: This work was supported and funded by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU) (Grant Number: IMSIU-DDRSP2604).

REFERENCES

- Alabdullah, T. T., Yahya, S., & Ramayah, T. (2021). Board size, board independence, and sustainability performance: evidence from Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Management and Governance*.
- Albitar, K., Hussainey, K., & Al-Faryan, M. A. S. (2022). The role of CSR committee in ESG reporting. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.
- Al-Matari, Y. A., Al-Matari, E. M., & Saif, S. A. (2023). Board independence and ESG performance: Evidence from GCC countries. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
- Arayssi, M., Jizi, M., & Tabaja, H.H. (2020). The impact of board composition on the level of ESG disclosures in GCC countries. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(1), 137-161.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2001). *Econometric analysis of panel data* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Post, C. (2010). The impact of board diversity and gender composition on corporate social responsibility and firm reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(2), 207-221.
- Ben-Amar, W., Chang, M., & McIlkenny, P. (2017). Board gender diversity and corporate response to sustainability initiatives: Evidence from the carbon disclosure project. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(2), 369-383.
- Berger, A. N., Imbierowicz, B., & Rauch, C. (2014). The roles of corporate governance in bank failures during the recent financial crisis. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 46(s1), 171-199.
- Byron, K., & Post, C. (2016). Women on boards of directors and corporate social performance: A meta-analysis. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*.
- Cambrea, D.R., Paolone, F., & Cucari, N. (2023). Advisory or monitoring role in ESG scenario: which women directors are more influential in the Italian context? *Business Strategy and the Environment*. EY. (2022). How can board diversity influence ESG performance? EY France.HCEfh. (2023). Report on Gender Equality in Corporate Boards. Haut Conseil à l'Égalité entre les femmes et les hommes.Schwartz-Ziv, M. (2017). Gender and board activeness: The role of a critical mass. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*.
- Cambrea, D.R., Paolone, F., & Cucari, N. (2023). Advisory or monitoring role in ESG scenario: which women directors are more influential in the Italian context? *Business Strategy and the Environment*.

- Cambrea, D.R., Paolone, F., & Cucari, N. (2023). *Business Strategy and the Environment*. García-Sánchez, I.M., Hussain, N., & Martínez-Ferrero, J. (2023). *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
- Cucari, N., Esposito De Falco, S., & Orlando, B. (2018). Diversity of board of directors and environmental social governance: evidence from Italian listed companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 25(3), 250-266.
- Đặng, R., Houanti, L. H., Reddy, K., & Simioni, M. (2020). Does board gender diversity influence firm profitability? A control function approach. *Economic Modelling*, 90, 168-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2020.05.009>
- Deegan, C. (2002). The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures - a theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282-311.
- Disli, M., Yilmaz, M.K., & Mohamed, F.F.M. (2022). Board characteristics and sustainability performance: empirical evidence from emerging markets. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*.
- Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*.
- Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26(2), 301-325.
- García Martín, C. J., & Herrero, B. (2020). Do board characteristics affect environmental performance? A study of EU firms. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*.
- García-Sánchez, I. M., Hussain, N., & Martínez-Ferrero, J. (2023). Board of directors and ESG performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
- Garcia-Sanchez, I. M., Raimo, N., & Vitolla, F. (2022). Board independence and GRI-standards sustainability reporting: international evidence. *Meditari Accountancy Research*.
- Gerwing, T., Kajüter, P., & Wirth, M. (2022). The role of sustainable corporate governance in mandatory sustainability reporting quality. *Journal of Business Economics*.
- Gerwing, T., Kajüter, P., & Wirth, M. (2023). The effect of sustainability committees on corporate ESG performance: International evidence. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
- Giannarakis, G. (2014). The determinants influencing the extent of CSR disclosure. *International Journal of Law and Management*.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- HCEfh. (2023). *Report on Gender Equality in Corporate Boards*. Haut Conseil à l'Égalité entre les femmes et les hommes.
- Helfaya, A., & Moussa, T. (2017). Do board's corporate social responsibility strategy and orientation influence environmental sustainability disclosure? UK evidence. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26(8), 1061-1077.
- Hillman, A. J., & Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(3), 383-396.
- Hillman, A.J., & Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*.
- Husted, B.W., & de Sousa-Filho, J.M. (2019). Board structure and environmental, social, and governance disclosure in Latin America. *Journal of Business Research*, 102, 220-227.
- Jain, T., & Jamali, D. (2016). Looking inside the black box: the effect of corporate governance on corporate social responsibility. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*.
- Jensen, M. C. (1993). The modern industrial revolution, exit, and the failure of internal control systems. *The Journal of Finance*.
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305-360.
- Jizi, M. (2017). The influence of board composition on sustainable development disclosure. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.
- Jizi, M., Salama, A., Dixon, R., & Stratling, R. (2014). Corporate governance and the content of corporate social responsibility disclosure. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125(4), 601-615.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. Basic Books.
- Kao, E. H., Yeh, C. C., & Fung, H. G. (2023). Board gender diversity and corporate ESG performance: International evidence. *Finance Research Letters*.

- Karter, R.M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. Basic Books.
- Khan, M., Serafeim, G., & Yoon, A. (2016). Corporate sustainability: First evidence on materiality. *The Accounting Review*.
- Laksmna, I. (2008). Corporate board governance and voluntary disclosure of executive compensation practices. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 25(4), 1147-1182.
- Liang, H., Renneboog, L., & Vansteenkiste, C. (2022). Corporate board reforms and innovation: Evidence from a natural experiment. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*.
- Liao, L., Lin, T., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Gender diversity in the boardroom and corporate environmental performance: A European study. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
- Liao, L., Luo, L., & Tang, Q. (2015). Gender diversity, board independence, environmental committee and greenhouse gas disclosure. *The British Accounting Review*.
- Liu, C. (2018). Are women greener? Corporate gender diversity and environmental violations. *Journal of Corporate Finance*.
- Luo, L., & Tang, Q. (2022). The real effects of ESG reporting and GRI standards on carbon mitigation: international evidence. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.
- Mehmood, A., De Luca, F., & Quach, H. (2023b). Investigating how board gender diversity affects environmental, social and governance performance: Evidence from the utilities sector. *Utilities Policy*, 83, 101588.
- Menicucci, E., & Paolucci, G. (2025). Board characteristics and ESG performance. Evidence from the European utilities sector. *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*.
- Michelon, G., & Parbonetti, A. (2012). The effect of corporate governance on sustainability disclosure. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 16(3), 477-509.
- Nicolò, G., Zamponi, G., Sannino, G., & Tiron-Tudor, A. (2023). Worldwide evidence of corporate governance influence on ESG disclosure in the utilities sector? *Utilities Policy*, 82, 101549.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row.
- Pucheta-Martínez, M. C., Bel-Oms, I., & Olcina-Sempere, G. (2021). The relationship between board gender diversity and corporate social responsibility reporting: an international study. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*.
- Pucheta-Martínez, M.C., & Gallego-Álvarez, I. (2019). An international approach of the relationship between board attributes and the disclosure of corporate social responsibility issues. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 26(3), 612-627.
- Qureshi, M.A., Kirkerud, S., Theresa, K., & Ahsan, T. (2020). The impact of sustainability disclosure and board diversity on firm value. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.
- Schwartz-Ziv, M. (2017). Gender and board activeness: The role of a critical mass. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*.
- Setó-Pamies, D. (2015). The relationship between women directors and corporate social responsibility. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 22(6), 334-345.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571-610.
- Torchia, M., Calabrò, A., & Huse, M. (2011). Women directors on corporate boards: From tokenism to critical mass. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(2), 299-317.
- Velte, P. (2023). Does sustainable board governance drive corporate social responsibility? A structured literature review on European archival research. *Journal of Global Responsibility*.
- Veltri, S., Bruni, M.E., Jazzolino, G., Morea, D., & Baldissarro, G. (2023). Do ESG factors improve utilities corporate efficiency and reduce the risk perceived by credit lending institutions? An empirical analysis. *Utilities Policy*, 81, 101520.
- Yadav, P., & Prashar, A. (2022). Board gender diversity: implications for environment, social, and governance (ESG) performance of Indian firms. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 72(9), 2654-2673.
- Yarram, S.R., & Adapa, S. (2021). Board gender diversity and corporate social responsibility: is there a case for critical mass? *Journal of Cleaner Production*.