ESG Performance and Accounting Transparency: Evidence from Thai Listed Firms in The Stock Exchange of Thailand (SET)

Namporn Sathirakul
Faculty of Business Administration
Thai Nichi Institute of Technology
Bangkok, Thailand
namporn@tni.ac.th

Watson Chansajcha
Faculty of Business Administration
Thai Nichi Institute of Technology
Bangkok, Thailand
Watsontpa14@gmail.com

***Abstract*—This research seeks to analyze the connection between Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) performance and accounting transparency (ATI) of firms listed on the Stock Exchange of Thailand. The sample of 177 companies with ESG ratings in 2024 used in the study was made up of SETSMART database and annual reports. The relationship between ESG ratings and accounting transparency was examined using correlation and multiple regression. The results show that ESG ratings have no statistically significant impact on the level of accounting transparency of Thai listed companies. By contrast, firm-level structural factors – such as price-to-book value (PBV), firm size, industry type and audit quality – have strong effects on firms' levels of transparency. Given the above findings, it can be argued that ESG disclosures in the Thai context tend to focus on the corporate image, rather than the improvement in the quality of financial reporting. This study provides valuable policy implications for regulatory authorities to fine-tune ESG evaluation tools that more accurately reflect the quality of financial information. The results would promote greater transparency and investor confidence in the Thai capital market, aligning it with international standards, while also guiding investors in developing effective strategies for investing in ESG-oriented firms.**

***Keywords*—Accounting Transparency Index (ATI), Corporate Governance, ESG, Emerging Market, Stock Exchange of Thailand,**

I. INTRODUCTION

Sustainable development is an increasingly important issue for businesses all over the world. For a business to achieve sustainability, it is necessary to adhere to ESG principles. Firms with impressive ESG performance tend to enjoy higher investor confidence levels, easier access to financing, and smaller operating risks [9]. In Thailand, the Stock Exchange of Thailand (SET) has actively promoted systematic ESG disclosure by listed companies through its SET ESG Rating, which measures the performance of companies on the sustainability aspect in environmental, social, and governance areas. However, despite the increasing number of ESG-rated firms, a series of corporate incidents — including accounting misstatements, bond default postpones, and profit reports inconsistent with true cash flow — have raised questions of the reliability of financial data. These instances challenge the assumption that high ESG ratings are a signal of improved accounting transparency and reporting quality. Theoretically, accounting transparency is an important dimension of efficient business practice through which stakeholders may judge firms' performance. Reference [4] conceptualize accounting transparency to the degree to which accounts fairly reflect the true financial health of a firm, which is important for limiting information asymmetry from managers to investors. On the other hand, a lack of transparency makes it more prone to manipulation of information and loss of investor confidence. In Thailand, few research has empirically examined the correlation between ESG performance and accounting transparency. Hence this study investigates the extent to which the SET ESG Rating corresponds with the level of Accounting Transparency (ATI) in Thai listed companies. Filling this research gap, the study contributes valuable insights for investors in developing ESG-based investment strategies and provides regulatory implications for improving transparency and investor trust in the Thai capital market.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Concept of ESG

Sustainable business has become a term that increasingly receives global attention, starting from the United Nations' Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, which brought forth the idea of development that considers economic, social and environmental concerns. In Thailand, the Stock Exchange of Thailand (SET) has been promoting sustainability in the capital market since 2014 through both the Thailand Sustainability Investment (THSI) and Sustainability Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ), which assess corporate ESG performance. Their goals are to promote sustainable corporate behavior and to reduce external risks stemming from environmental regulations and social pressures. The ESG assessment framework of SET includes three dimensions (Environmental, Social and Governance). According to [19], companies that adopt ESG initiatives relevant to material business issues also tend to outperform their peers financially. In accordance with SET's ESG Rating system, company performance on these three dimensions is evaluated and rated among four levels — AAA, AA, A and BBB — representing different levels of sustainability compliance.

B. SET ESG Assessment Principles

The SET ESG Rating is derived from the Sustainability Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) formulated according to the

Global Reporting Initiative Standards (GRI), Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), and Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) standards (GRI, 2021; SASB, 2022; TCFD, 2017). This assessment is grounded in three main pillars:
Environmental (E): Assessment of energy consumption, waste management, reduction of greenhouse gases, and resource conservation.
Social (S): Employment policy, workplace security, community engagement, equality, and human rights.
Governance (G): Audit on board structure, risk management, anti-corruption policy, and transparency in information disclosure.

Such an assessment is performed annually by the SET. Companies must file supporting documentation to be verified by sustainability experts. Companies achieving at least 50% in each dimension are eligible for an ESG classification. The SET also takes in additional criteria such as Corporate Governance Reporting (CGR) scores, profitability, shareholders' equity, and absence of regulatory flags (e.g., CB, CS, CC, CF) before rating companies at the end. The SET also came up with the SET ESG Index, which includes companies that scored high on ESG scores, have adequate market capitalization, free float, and activity by trade for at least nine of the previous twelve months. To improve global comparability the SET has worked with the London Stock Exchange Group subsidiary FTSE Russell to place its ESG assessment on an international level. Starting in 2024–2025, the SET will pilot the FTSE Russell ESG Score in conjunction with its current framework, with a full implementation by 2026, when the legacy SET ESG Rating will be phased out [30].

C. Concept of Accounting Transparency

Accounting transparency is defined as the degree to which firm financial statements represent a firm's real economic output and are verifiable by outsiders [5]. High transparency means that investors and other stakeholders have reliable information to act upon. Accrual quality and managerial discretion constitute a fundamental element to the measurement of transparency. Reference [7] identified that accrual quality is the measurement of the alignment of the account's accruals to the cash flows in past, current, and future periods. High correlation means earnings are better quality and the financial statements are transparent. A weak correlation, on the other hand, indicates that earnings can be manipulated and more opaque information. Reference [8] find that poor accrual quality raises information risk, since investors cannot know for certain whether profits are an outcome of good performance or of accounting adjustments. Similarly, [13] explain that low-transparency companies—quantified by absolute discretionary accruals—face greater risk of stock price crash. Accounting Transparency is calculated as a composite Accounting Transparency Index (ATI) that is combined of three financial factors in this paper: Return on Assets (ROA), Operating Cash Flow to Net Income (CFO/NI), and the inverse of the Debt-to-Equity ratio (1/D/E). The index reflects the consistency among the profitability, cash flow and capital structure of the financial reporting, thus represents that the information is all transparent as a whole and this is how the index measures it.

D. Relationship Between ESG and AccountingTransparency

Extensive studies, both domestic and global, also have already investigated the relationship between ESG practices and quality of financial reporting. Much research indicates a positive correlation: more ESG performance leads to better corporate governance mechanisms and internal controls, less earnings manipulation, and greater transparency [14], [20]. Recent work confirms that ESG performance is associated with improved accounting transparency in countries with governance standards [10], [24]. Moreover, [9] also find that over 90% of the literature (meta-analysis of more than 2,000 studies) reports a positive ESG–financial performance linkage. In the emerging markets it has been mixed, though. Reference [23] studied listed Egyptian companies and found that real earnings management by companies, although more ESG disclosure has risen, may mean that ESG reporting is not meaningful but more symbolic. For example, [21] found audit quality and ownership structure do not have a major effect on ESG disclosure in Chile, suggesting that ESG publication is not a proof of accounting openness.

In Thailand, the SET has also encouraged companies to publish ESG information through One Reports and sustainability reports, to boost transparency and investors' trust. Reference [27] indicated that companies with higher ESG disclosure received more favorable market reactions. Reference [29] found a positive association between ESG disclosure and ROA and Tobin's Q of Thai firms and noted that firms audited by Big4 firms tend to participate in higher levels of disclosure and transparency. The positive influence of SET ESG Ratings on firm value by [25] also indicates a signaling theory perspective and ESG as part of conveying credibility in reporting. Reference [22] identified that governance (G) components play a dominant role in reducing firm specific risk volatility through better disclosure quality. However, others reported weaker or inconsistent results. Reference [16] analyzed the Morningstar Sustainalytics ESG Risk Ratings and did not find a robust association between ESG performance and short-term stock returns. In [17], social disclosure would be negatively related to earnings quality, while in [26] there is no significant correlation between ESG and financial reporting quality in Thai listed firms. Reference [2] found a positive correlation between ESG and accounting conservatism, but only for the governance aspect. Reference [28] have shown that the ESG disclosure is beneficial in performance of firms for certain industries (mostly the governance and the social dimension), but it is not strong in the other factor: environmental disclosure. In general, the influence of ESG reporting in Thailand on market performance is limited.

Generally, previous research in Thailand has focused mainly on the association between ESG disclosure and financial performance (e.g., returns, risk, or cost of capital). Very few researchers have extensively investigated the association between ESG ratings and accounting transparency. This paper thus aims to address this gap, using the Accounting Transparency Index (ATI) – the latter is defined as:

$$ATI = (ROA + CFO/NI + 1/D/E) / 3$$

that determines Relationship between ESG Rating and ATI while controlling for Firm age, Audit quality (Big4 namely PwC, KPMG, Deloitte and EY), Firm size, industry and Price-to-book value (PBV).

III. Research Objectives and Hypotheses

1. To analyze the relationship between ESG performance, defined as a measure of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) score (SET ESG Rating) and accounting transparency index (ATI) performance among companies that are listed on the Stock Exchange of Thailand (SET).

2. To examine the impact of controlling variables—firm age, audit quality (Big4), firm size, industry type and price-to-book value (PBV)—on accounting transparency differences among Thai listed firms.

From the theoretical and empirical literature, the following hypotheses are formed:

H1: ESG performance (ESG Rating) has a positive influence on accounting transparency (ATI) of Thai companies on the Stock Exchange.

H2: Firms audited by Big Four accounting firms exhibit higher levels of accounting transparency than those audited by non-Big Four firms.

H3: Firm age, asset size, industry type, and PBV have differing effects on accounting transparency level.

IV. Research Methodology

A. Data Collection and Variables

This research is based on a quantitative research methodology with secondary data, taking both the SETSMART (Stock Exchange of Thailand) database and annual reports of enterprises. The study investigates the relationship between ESG Rating and Accounting Transparency (ATI) for the firms on the SET in 2024. The sample consists of 177 publicly listed firms, excluding financial institutions and banks due to their unique financial structures and regulatory environments, which differ substantially from those of non-financial industries.

Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) model is used for data analysis. The main statistical software used for the analysis was SPSS Statistics to perform the calculations and Excel for preliminary data handling, including the computation of variables utilized to construct the Accounting Transparency Index (ATI). The objective of this analysis was to explore the relationship between the independent variable (ESG Rating) and the dependent variable (ATI), while controlling other variables that may influence accounting transparency.

B. Data Analysis Procedures

The following analysis methods were taken for the data analysis:
1. Descriptive Statistics: For summarization of specific sample variables.
2. Pearson's Correlation Analysis: to examine bivariate relationships among variables and potential multicollinearity.
3. Multiple Regression Analysis: To assess the proposed hypotheses and determine which ESG ratings and control variables influence accounting transparency. The model of regression is defined accordingly:

$$ATI=\beta 0+\beta 1ESGRate+\beta 2Firmage+\beta 3Big4+\beta 4Asset+\beta 5industry+\beta 6PBV+\varepsilon.$$

<u>Dependent variable:</u>

The Accounting Transparency Index (ATI) is represented by a composite index that reflects the comparability of profitability, cash flow, and capital structure. We can get the formula as:

$$ATI = [Z(ROA)+Z(CFO/NI)+Z(1/D/E)] / 3.$$

Where:
ROA = Return on Assets.
CFO/NI = Ratio of operating cash flow to net income.
D/E = Debt-to-equity ratio.
Higher ATI values signal better alignment between profitability, cash flows, and leverage and therefore mean that the accounting process is more transparent.

<u>Independent Variables:</u>

ESG Rating (ESGrate) Indicates the SET ESG Rating of each firm (BBB–AAA) (numerically coded for analysis).

<u>Control Variables:</u>

Firm Age (Firmage): years since start-up date.
Audit Quality (Big4): Dummy variable (1 = audited by Big Four; 0 = not).
Firm Size (Asset): Natural log of its total assets.
Industry Type (Industry): The dummy variable for each industry (i.e. Agriculture, Consumer, Industrial, Real Estate, Resources, and Technology)
PBV - Price-to-Book Value: Market price-to-book ratio showing the expectations for the market and accounting value of the firm.
ε, which is the error term.

Multicollinearity diagnostics were carried out prior to interpreting the regression findings. Tolerance values hovered between 0.639 and 0.950, and Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) ranging between 1.052 and 1.564—very well within the recommended norms (Tolerance > 0.10; VIF < 10), as recommended by [12]. It also noted that the Condition Index was less than 30 (22.433) and hence it was reported nothing as multicollinearity problem [1]. And hence the model itself was deemed statistically appropriate for interpretation.

V. Research Result

A. Descriptive Statistics (Table 1)

The sample consists of 177 listed firms on the Stock Exchange of Thailand (SET) in 2024. Table 1 presents the distribution of firms by industry and ESG rating. The results indicate that most firms (36%) received an AA rating, followed by 30% with an A rating. Indicating the overall level of ESG performance is moderate to high. The services industry had the largest number of firms, while the resources sector had the highest proportion of firms rated AAA (14 firms). In contrast, the consumer products sector had the fewest firms with ESG ratings. These descriptive results suggest that sustainability engagement is more prevalent in capital-intensive and service-related industries, reflecting differences in ESG adoption and disclosure incentives across sectors.

B. *Correlation Analysis (Table 2)*

Pearson's correlation analysis shows that ESG Rating (ESGrate) is negatively correlated with Accounting Transparency (ATI) at the 0.05 significance level ($r = -0.180$, $p = 0.017$). Firm Size (Asset) similarly has a significant negative correlation with ATI ($r = -0.249$, $p = 0.001$), and Price-to-Book Value (PBV) positively correlates with ATI ($r = 0.394$, $p < 0.001$). Industry Type appears to have a weak negative association ($r = -0.135$, $p = 0.072$), while Audit Quality (Big4) and Firm Age display insignificant associations. Overall, the findings indicate that ESG performance and accounting transparency are weakly and inconsistently related among Thai listed firms.

C. *Multiple Regression Analysis (Table3&4)*

A multiple regression model was used to test these hypotheses and to examine the joint impact of ESG performance and control variables on accounting transparency. The model overall was found to be statistically significant ($F = 10.175$, Sig. = 0.000) and accounted for an estimated 26.4% of the variance in accounting transparency ($R^2 = 0.264$).

D. *Interpretation of Results (Table 5)*

As the regression indicates: This means that ESG performance does not have any notable effect on accounting transparency of Thai listed companies. The negative direction of the coefficient is consistent with the correlation results indicating the ESG disclosure may still be image-orientated rather than quality-oriented reporting. Therefore, H1 is rejected.

Audit Quality (Big4) exhibits a somewhat positive contribution ($p = 0.070$), indicating that Big Four–audited firms exhibit greater accounting disclosure—in line with expectations that large audit firms impose stricter accounting standards and improve investor confidence. Hence, H2 is supported.

PBV (Price-to-Book Value) has a significant and positive effect ($p < 0.001$), suggesting that firms with higher market valuation than book value adopt more transparent financial reporting. Firm Size and Industry Type are both significant negative coefficients suggesting that firms which are larger, also particular industries (energy, real estate, etcetera) are indicative of lower disclosure transparency, probably because of its operational complexity and selective disclosure policies. A firm's age does not significantly affect this effect, suggesting that long duration of the company's existence does not itself determine to what extent levels of transparency are achieved. Hence, H3 is supported here.

Altogether, these findings suggest that ESG ratings alone do not explain level of accounting transparency, it is rather the firm specific structural factors that have a stronger effect.

TABLE 1: THE DISTRIBUTION OF FIRMS BY INDUSTRY AND ESG RATING.

ESG rate	Agriculture	Consumer	Industrial	Real Estate	Resources	Services	Technology	Tot
BBB	2	3	1	1	1	3	3	14
A	11	3	14	6	2	10	7	53
AA	7	1	5	16	10	20	5	64
AAA	7	2	7	8	14	6	2	46
Total	27	9	27	31	27	39	17	177

TABLE 2: CORRELATIONS

Correlations

		ATI	ESGrate	Firmage	Big4	Asset	Industry	PBV
ATI	Pearson Correlation	1	-.180*	-.030	.074	-.249**	-.135	.394**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.017	.690	.325	.001	.072	.000
	N	297	177	177	177	177	177	177
ESGrate	Pearson Correlation	-.180*	1	-.100	.199**	.522**	.032	-.076
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017		.186	.008	.000	.669	.314
	N	177	177	177	177	177	177	177
Firmage	Pearson Correlation	-.030	-.100	1	.041	.079	-.079	-.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.690	.186		.589	.297	.298	.590
	N	177	177	177	177	177	177	177
Big4	Pearson Correlation	.074	.199**	.041	1	.269**	.079	.077
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.325	.008	.589		.000	.297	.309
	N	177	177	177	177	177	177	177
Asset	Pearson Correlation	-.249**	.522**	.079	.269**	1	.230**	.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.297	.000		.002	.992
	N	177	177	177	177	177	177	177
Industry	Pearson Correlation	-.135	.032	-.079	.079	.230**	1	.220**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.072	.669	.298	.297	.002		.003
	N	177	177	177	177	177	177	177
PBV	Pearson Correlation	.394**	-.076	-.041	.077	.001	.220**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.314	.590	.309	.992	.003	
	N	177	177	177	177	177	177	177

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 3: MODEL SUMMARY

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.514[a]	.264	.238	.56262

a. Predictors: (Constant), PBV, Asset, Firmage, Big4, Industry, ESGrate

TABLE 4: ANOVA

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19.324	6	3.221	10.175	.000[b]
	Residual	53.812	170	.317		
	Total	73.136	176			

a. Dependent Variable: ATI

b. Predictors: (Constant), PBV, Asset, Firmage, Big4, Industry, ESGrate

TABLE 5: COEFFICIENTS

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.759	.273		2.782	.006		
	ESGrate	-.043	.056	-.061	-.773	.441	.688	1.454
	Firmage	-.001	.002	-.023	-.342	.733	.950	1.052
	Big4	.244	.134	.125	1.824	.070	.915	1.093
	Asset	-.079	.032	-.206	-2.502	.013	.639	1.564
	Industry	-.065	.024	-.190	-2.716	.007	.881	1.135
	PBV	.137	.022	.421	6.197	.000	.937	1.067

a. Dependent Variable: ATI

VI. DISCUSSION AND POLICYIMPLICATIONS

A. *Discussion*

The regression of the ESG Rating shows a weak negative but statistically insignificant association with Accounting Transparency (ATI). This means that for the Thai context, ESG performance has not been a valid indicator of quality and reliability of financial reporting. The finding reflects the current phase of ESG implementation in emerging markets, which is more symbolic than substantive, with ESG disclosure still at a relatively early stage. The finding follows Agency Theory [15] and posits that managers use ESG disclosure as a signaling mechanism to reduce conflicts of interest with the shareholders rather than an improvement in information quality. In these contexts, ESG is just another reputation-management tool rather than proof for transparent accounting practice. The findings can be seen as supporting [23], [18]; they observe that in emerging markets ESG disclosure is often strategically utilized as a means of addressing external pressures, rather than enhancing accounting transparency. Reference [11] add that the effect of ESG on accounting transparency varies according to the pressure exerted by different interests and the degree of regulatory enforcement. In Thailand enforcement remains limited, and consequently, ESG efforts have not yet yielded tangible financial transparency results.

In reference to the control variables, the results identify several salient patterns:

Price-to-Book Value (PBV) has a strong positive effect on ATI. This finding is in line with [3], who observed a positive relationship between high-quality financial reporting and higher firm price. The evidence suggests Thai investors reward transparent firms with a higher market value.

Audit Quality (Big4) demonstrates a strong positive correlation with ATI, albeit at a marginal level of significance. Reference [31] posited that the highest ranked audit firms foster financial transparency owing to rigorous audit standards and credibility. This implies that external assurance remains an important factor of transparency in the Thai business context and must become a more important factor than voluntary ESG activities.

ATI is negatively affected by Firm Size and Industry Type. Bigger firms might have less transparency because they're more complex and have multi-part reporting systems. Likewise, variations in industry characteristics influence disclosure behavior—for example, energy and real estate companies, which face greater ESG scrutiny, may emphasize selective or symbolic ESG reporting to manage public perception. Moreover, industry-based examination suggests different patterns: energy and real estate are negatively correlated to the ESG–ATI relationship and agriculture and services have weakly positive yet statistically insignificant associations. This heterogeneity highlights the specificity of ESG disclosure and transparency practices by industry, in line with [4]; who claim that complexity in industries determines firm disclosure incentives and transparency levels.

Firm Age is unrelated to ATI, indicating maturity of a company does not necessarily bring transparency in all of company's financial reporting.

In brief, these results offer empirical support for the observation that the implementation of ESG regulations in Thailand represents the process of adaptation, despite their growing spread in the country, that focuses on compliance and reputation, not on the actual integration of ESG governance elements into the financial information system. These findings suggest a need for more standardized ESG frameworks, firmer assurance mechanisms, and improved regulatory oversight to ensure that reporting of ESG improves substantive accounting transparency.

B. *Policy Implicaitons*

1. For Regulators (SET and SEC Thailand)

Regulatory agencies should strengthen the connection between ESG Ratings and the quality of financial reporting by aligning ESG disclosure standards with international frameworks. In addition, it would increase credibility and consistency by mandating third-party assurance over ESG-related data. Integrated Reporting (IR), which integrates ESG as well as financial reporting in one disclosure, could strengthen investor confidence and enhance transparency in the Thai capital market.

2. For Listed Companies

Companies should go from a mere ESG disclosure model of symbolic reporting to an embedded ESG integration model that embeds sustainability into risk and strategic decision-making. Instead of putting the reporting process for ESG behind closed doors with compliance, companies should be reporting how those ESG initiatives relate to their financial outcomes, including environmental costs, energy efficiency, and governance-related performance. This would bring ESG principles into line with long-term value creation and enhance accountability to stakeholders.

3. For Auditors and Investors

There is a need for auditors to actively verify whether ESG and financial information are consistent by assuring that both financial and non-financial dimensions are covered. Investors, meanwhile, need to consider ESG data as complementary information to evaluate firms' accounting quality and risk exposure rather than as a standalone indicator. This twofold perspective lowers decision-making bias based on superficial sustainability ratings and encourages better-informed investment decisions.

VII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is limited due to its cross-sectional design utilizing ESG data from a single year (2024). Panel data over several years might further be used in future studies to examine dynamic relationships—and possible lagged effects—of ESG improvements on transparency. In addition, qualitative research—like interviews with corporate sustainability officers or auditors—might reveal more about the motivations behind ESG disclosure and its alignment with accounting practices.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the association between Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) performance and Accounting Transparency (ATI) of companies listed on the Stock Exchange of Thailand (SET). According to the data of the 177 non-financial companies in 2024, there is a negative but insignificant relationship between ESG Ratings and accounting transparency. Therefore, in Thailand, ESG practices remain stagnant as they do not represent material improvements in the quality of financial reports. The results indicate that ESG disclosure in the Thai context is largely symbolic and has image-building purposes rather than providing meaningful financial information. In contrast, the impact of structural firm attributes—such as market valuation (PBV), audit quality (Big4), firm size, and industry type—on corporate transparency may be comparatively more significant.

REFERENCES

[1] Belsley, D. A., Kuh, E., & Welsch, R. E. (1980). *Regression diagnostics: Identifying influential data and sources of collinearity.* John Wiley & Sons

[2] Benyasrisawat, P., Vatanavilai, N., Supornrungcharoen, J., Juntasutho, A., & Chitmonkongsuk, A. (2025). The influence of ESG on accounting conservatism: Evidence from Thailand. *Asian Administration and Management Review*. Retrieved from https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/AAMR/article/view/279367

[3] Biddle, G. C., Hilary, G., & Verdi, R. S. (2009). How does financial reporting quality relate to investment efficiency? *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 48(2–3), 112–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2009.09.001

[4] Bushman, R. M., Chen, Q., Engel, E., & Smith, A. (2004). Financial accounting information, organizational complexity and corporate governance systems. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 37(2), 167–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2003.09.005

[5] Bushman, R. M., Piotroski, J. D., & Smith, A. J. (2004). What determines corporate transparency? *Journal of Accounting Research*, 42(2), 207–252. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2004.00136.x

[6] Bushman, R., & Piotroski, J. D. (2006). Financial reporting incentives for conservative accounting: The influence of legal and political institutions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 42(1–2), 107–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2005.10.005

[7] Dechow, P. M., & Dichev, I. D. (2002). The quality of accruals and earnings: The role of accrual estimation errors. *The Accounting Review*, 77(s-1), 35–59. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr.2002.77.s-1.35

[8] Francis, J., LaFond, R., Olsson, P., & Schipper, K. (2005). The market pricing of accruals quality. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 39(2), 295–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2004.06.003

[9] Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917

[10] García-Sánchez, I. M., & Noguera-Gámez, L. (2017). Integrated reporting and stakeholder engagement: The effect on corporate transparency. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 24(5), 485–499. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1428

[11] García-Sánchez, I. M., Hussain, N., & Khan, S. A. (2022). Does board gender diversity improve the quality of ESG disclosure? *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(1), 34–52. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2171

[12] Gujarati, D. N. (2004). Basic econometrics (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

[13] Hutton, A. P., Marcus, A. J., & Tehranian, H. (2009). Opaque financial reports, R², and crash risk. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 94(1), 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2008.10.003

[14] Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2015). The impact of corporate social responsibility on investment recommendations: Analysts' perceptions and shifting institutional logics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(7), 1053–1081. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2268

[15] 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

[16] Juengchalermsak, O. (2023). The relationship between ESG risk rating and stock returns of Thai companies listed in SET ESG rating. Independent Study, M.Sc. (Accounting and Financial Management), Thammasat University.

[17] Kanchana, K., & Boonkird, S. (2024). Is earnings quality influenced by environmental, social and governance disclosures? Evidence from MAI-listed firms in Thailand. Journal of International Business, Innovation and Management, 5(1), 53–65. Retrieved from https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jibim/article/download/275277/183221/1143331

[18] Khan, M., Muttakin, M. B., & Siddiqui, J. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and accounting transparency in emerging economies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 179(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04900-3

[19] Khan, M., Serafeim, G., & Yoon, A. (2016). Corporate sustainability: First evidence on materiality. *The Accounting Review*, 91(6), 1697–1724. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-51383

[20] Kim, Y., Park, M. S., & Wier, B. (2012). Is earnings quality associated with corporate social responsibility? *The Accounting Review*, 87(3), 761–796. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-10209

[21] Lavin, J. F., & Montecinos-Pearce, A. A. (2021). ESG disclosure in an emerging market: An empirical analysis of the influence of board characteristics and ownership structure. Sustainability, 13(19), 10498. https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910498

[22] Lerdchakorn, P., & Phadoongsitthi, M. (2025). The relationship between sustainability indices and firm-idiosyncratic risk of listed companies on the Stock Exchange of Thailand. *Journal of Management Science*, Ubon Ratchathani University, 14(1), 73–93.

[23] Liu, T., Abdelbaky, A., Elamer, A. A., & Elmahgoub, M. (2023). Real earnings management and ESG disclosure in emerging markets: The moderating effect of managerial ownership from a social norm perspective. *Heliyon*, 9(12), e22832. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22832

[24] Martínez-Ferrero, J., & García-Sánchez, I. M. (2017). Sustainability assurance and cost of capital: Does assurance impact on credibility of corporate social responsibility information*? Business Ethics: A European Review*, 26(3), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12150

[25] Moolkham, M. (2025). SET ESG ratings and firm value: The new sustainability performance assessment tool in Thailand. *PLoS ONE*, 20(2), e0315935. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315935

[26] Saikhwan, P., & Nitirojntanad, K. (2024). Financial reporting quality and ESG prominence on the relationship of board attributes and ownership structure to investment efficiency of listed companies in the Stock Exchange of Thailand. *Arts of Management Journal*, 8(2), 112–141. Retrieved from https://so02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jam/article/view/269280

[27] Suttipun, M., & Yordudom, T. (2021). Impact of environmental, social and governance disclosures on market reaction: An evidence of Top 50 companies listed from Thailand. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 20(3–4), 753–767. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRA-12-2020-0377

[28] Tanmeesuk, S., & Sukcharoensin, P. (2025). Linking public ESG disclosure to financial performance and stock returns: A hybrid analysis of Thailand's SET100 firms (SET Working Paper No. 9/2025). The Stock Exchange of Thailand. https://www.set.or.th/setresearch

[29] Teraparb, T. (2022). The relationship between ESG disclosure and firm performance: Evidence from companies listed on the Stock Exchange of Thailand. Master's Thesis, Thammasat Business School, Thammasat University.

[30] The Stock Exchange of Thailand. (2023). SET ESG Ratings Methodology 2023. https://www.setsustainability.com

[31] Wang, M., & Hussainey, K. (2013). Voluntary forward-looking statements driven by corporate governance and their value relevance. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 32(3), 26–49.