Role of Artificial Intelligence in Sustainable Development: The Strategic Place of AI and ESG Integration in Corporate Governance

Hamza Younus[1] and Abdul Rauf Kashif[2]

https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2025.14.4.12

Abstract

This paper investigates how the intersection of artificial intelligence (AI) and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) models in corporate strategy is evolving and how it can support sustainable development and responsible governance. The study, based on a mixed-methods design with a longitudinal quantitative analysis of 600 publicly traded companies over 3 years and in-depth, unstructured qualitative interviews, explores the relationship between AI adoption and ESG performance, accounting for industry- and region-specific inclusive factors. Quantitative findings indicate that AI investments and ESG scores have a positive, statistically significant relationship, and that industry influences on AI investments are significantly stronger in industries with high AI intensity, such as technology. Qualitative responses indicate that AI helps monitor the environment in real time, engage stakeholders, and uphold ethical standards, thereby changing routine organisational processes and decision-making. The paper advances the resource-based view, the stakeholder theory, and the socio-technical systems theory to describe AI's strategic position as a distinctive, valuable asset and to enhance corporate sustainability competence. It outlines key ethical and governance issues associated with AI, emphasizing the need for well-constituted oversight mechanisms. The study's real-world application for managers, policymakers, and investors is that there must be clear AI standardization, enforceable governance, and the incorporation of AI-led ESG indicators. Given the limitations of the existing empirical literature, the study proposes prospective longitudinal and quasi-experimental studies to determine causality and external validity. On the whole, the results demonstrate the strategic prospects of AI as a driver of sustainable business conduct, calling for a responsible, moral, and people-oriented approach to technological innovation in line with social values.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Sustainable Development, Corporate Strategy.

Introduction

Over the last few years, the nature of corporate strategy has been changing at a fundamentally revolutionary pace, not just due to technological novelty, but also to evolving stakeholder expectations and pressing sustainability challenges. Artificial intelligence (AI) has become one of the new innovations that offers a transformational opportunity, reinventing how organizations conduct their operations, make decisions, and create value. At the same time, the concepts of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) have been moved to the center of corporate responsibility and strategic planning in response to society-wide aspirations to have businesses

[1]*Research Scholar, MSBA, University of Southern Punjab, Multan. Email: hamzayounus55@gmail.com*
[2]*Assistant Professor, University of Southern Punjab, Multan. Email: abdulraufkashif@usp.edu.pk*

Compliance with ethical standards: There are no conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial). This study did not receive any funding.

conduct themselves responsibly. The intersection of AI and ESG has therefore become one of the most fascinating and moving phenomena influencing the future of business management, corporate governance, risk management, and sustainable development.

This merging is not accidental; it stems from a radical shift in how companies view risk, opportunity, and their duties. With the dynamism of organizations attempting to address complex, data-rich issues like climate change and resource depletion, as well as social inequality and regulations, organizations are increasingly seeking AI-based solutions to boost transparency, efficiency, and stakeholder involvement. On the other hand, the necessity to make AI responsible, i.e., ethical, transparent, and focused on societal values, has become a part of sustainable corporate governance. These forces in interplay have significant impacts on how companies model their long-term strategies, resource allocation, and report their sustainability performance.

The Strategic Importance of AI and ESG Integration

The connection between AI and ESG is a paradigm shift focusing on conventional, often silo, strategies regarding corporate responsibility and the application of technologies. In the past, sustainability processes were usually marginal or compliance-based, and rarely embedded in normal business operations. Nevertheless, the growing popularity of ESG metrics, along with increased inquiries from shareholders, governments, and civil society, has elevated sustainability as a strategic priority. At the same time, the maturation of AI technologies, such as machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, and robotics, has created new opportunities to use data to make decisions, optimize operations, and engage stakeholders.

When these threads are brought together, they create a new strategic piece: AI is utilized to better achieve, monitor, and report on ESG goals; ESG is taken into account when creating, regulating, and deploying AI systems; and the organization as a whole is more attentive, transparent, and aligned with society's objectives. This has not been technology integration but a strategic one, integrating sustainability into the very fabric of corporate practices in innovation and governance.

AI and Sustainable Business as a Strategic Resource

In strategic management, AI is gradually becoming an essential asset, potentially a source of competitive advantage when used wisely. According to the Resource-Based View (RBV) of the firm, the basis of sustained competitive advantage is anchoring on unique, valuable, and inimitable resources (Barney, 1991). In this respect, AI technologies, particularly proprietary or hard-to-duplicate ones, offer companies an opportunity to develop unique ESG competencies. Examples include using AI to optimize resource utilization by firms, reduce emissions, increase supply chain transparency, enhance stakeholder communication, and enable real-time detection of compliance-related issues.

The strategic value of AI is enhanced by its ability to analyze large, intricate datasets, including both structured and unstructured ones that cannot be effectively analyzed with traditional analytical tools. This will enable companies to generate new insights, detect emerging threats, and formulate proactive approaches aligned with sustainability goals. For example, a more precise evaluation of ecological effects is possible with AI-powered environmental monitoring based on satellite or sensor data, whereas social responsibility efforts can be informed by sentiment analysis from social media or stakeholder contacts.

Stakeholder Engagement and Ethical Governance Role

Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) emphasizes that organizations are in a web of mutually related interests, including shareholders and customers, as well as employees, communities, regulators, and civil society. An appropriate interaction and the readiness of these stakeholders are vital in guaranteeing legitimacy, confidence, and sustainability. AI enhances this ability by tracking stakeholder sentiment in real time, automating stakeholder feedback processes, and personalizing communication strategies.

Nevertheless, AI implementation raises governance and ethics concerns. Responsible AI usage is associated with transparency, accountability, fairness, and privacy, particularly when sensitive data are involved or when consequential decisions are made. Other regulatory agencies, such as the OECD (2023), have outlined a framework and guidelines to encourage trustworthy AI, focusing on the need to integrate ethical principles into the design and management of AI.

The place of AI in ESG is therefore twofold: it may be a trigger to enhance sustainability performance and responsiveness to different stakeholders, yet it also poses risks related to bias, opacity, and unintentional noise. These considerations highlight why robust governance mechanisms and regulations are necessary to ensure that AI aligns with the values and principles of a sustainable society.

The Increasing Significance of ESG in Corporate Strategy

ESG has been viewed very differently since its formation. Initially, as part of socially responsible investing (SRI) in the 1960s and 1970s, ESG metrics evolved into elaborate systems that measure a firm's social responsibilities and environmental impacts, as well as its governance practices (Friede, Busch, and Bassen, 2015). In the modern world, ESG is part of corporate strategy, risk management, and capital allocation.

Empirical evidence indicates that high ESG performance is associated with greater financial strength, reduced volatility, and enhanced reputation (Friede et al., 2015). Investors are increasingly relying on ESG disclosures and ratings as sources of information for their decision-making, noting that sustainability risks may be converted into financial risks. Strategic interest in ESG is further strengthened by regulatory progress, including the European Union's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR), the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), and various national regulatory initiatives.

The ESG measurement is plagued by several issues despite its visibility. Reporting standards differ, data quality may be problematic, and there is no universal measure, making comparability and transparency more difficult. However, those that successfully incorporate ESG issues into their business practices and develop technological solutions to the problem, especially AI, can be better prepared to meet stakeholder expectations, address risks, and exploit new opportunities.

The Empirical Evidence Void and the Necessity of the Knowledge Gap

Although the conceptual and theoretical connections between AI and ESG are strong, the empirical literature is fragmented and immature. The majority of studies target single elements, including the effects of AI on operational efficiency, emissions reductions, and financial metrics, and do not conduct a systematic analysis of how AI affects the multidimensional concept of ESG. Besides, the current literature often relies on cross-sectional data, case studies, or qualitative methods, offering limited opportunities to make causal inferences or to understand the long-term implications.

Rigorous, longitudinal, and multi-method studies are urgently needed to explain the effects of AI use on ESG outcomes at the firm level. The heterogeneity of industries, geographic space, and organizational settings should be taken into account in such research. It must also take into consideration the possible confounding factors- including firm size, industry features, regulatory framework, and corporate culture- that could mediate or moderate the relationship.

Besides, given the ever-accelerating pace of AI technology's evolution, there is a need to determine how AI can drive sustainable development, either by enhancing operations, engaging stakeholders, or changing governance, which will again be instrumental in shaping strategy, policy, and regulation.

Purposes and Value Additions of the Current Research

This paper seeks to address this gap by examining the role of AI implementation in corporate ESG performance using a mixed-methods approach. It is a qualitative study that incorporates quantitative results from ESG scores of firms, patent data, and research and development spending, and provides qualitative data from industry reports, interviews, and practitioner observations. This holistic method will help gain a subtle insight into the processes, circumstances, and limitations that precondition the role of AI in advancing sustainability.

In particular, the study covers the following research questions:

1. What effect does the adoption of AI have on the overall ESG performance?
2. What are the most impacted AI dimensions of the ESG, i.e., environmental, social, or governance?
3. What organizational, industry, or regulatory condition holds the greatest influence?
4. Which are the most important processes by which AI can lead to sustainability results?
5. What does it mean by the risks, challenges, and other ethical concerns linked to AI-based ESG initiatives?

Through these answers, the study provides theoretical and practical implications to managers, policymakers, investors, and academia. It promotes knowledge of AI as a strategic asset in sustainable finance and points the way toward responsible innovation and governance.

Theoretical Underpinnings and Model

In order to explain the complicated interdependence of AI and ESG, the research uses three of the most theoretical models:

Resource-Based View (RBV)

Places AI as a fundamental strategic resource with the ability to create sustainable competitive advantage in a united effort with organizational routines, data abilities, and innovative capacity (Barney, 1991). The RBV also emphasizes that companies with distinctive AI resources (such as proprietary algorithms, data ecosystems, or advanced analytics) can develop distinct ESG practices that are difficult to copy.

Stakeholder Theory

Concentrates on the fact that the management of a wide range of stakeholder interests is what drives organizational performance. AI will improve stakeholder sentiment tracking, proactively respond to issues, and foster open communication (Freeman, 1984). This ability is of essential importance to the development of trust and legitimacy in sustainability programmes.

Socio-Technical Systems Theory

Reiterates the need to make technological systems sample organisational structures, systems of governance, and human control to obtain the sought results (Baxter & Somerville, 2011). Good integration means that AI tools might assist with responsible decision-making, ethical principles, and accountability in ESG.

Collectively, these frameworks will enable a multifaceted perspective on the possible ways of deploying AI strategically to increase corporate sustainability performance within the context of technological capabilities and organizational settings.

Significance, Policy Relevance, and Scope

It would be interesting to examine publicly traded companies across various industries and regions that researchers acknowledge as having industry-specific issues, such as energy-intensive manufacturing or data-sensitive financial services, to inform the study of the connection between AI and ESG. The analysis covers the years 2018 to 2024 and reflects the rapid changes in AI technologies and reporting practices driven by increasing regulatory and stakeholder pressure.

The results will be used to educate various parties:

Corporate Managers

Offering perspectives on how AI can be well incorporated in sustainability efforts with the consideration of governance, data management, and ethical issues.

Policy Makers and Regulators

Providing empirical data in the creation of norms, policies, and frameworks that support the responsible implementation of AI in line with sustainability objectives.

Investors and Financial institutions

Existing knowledge regarding the role of AI-driven ESG metrics in informing risk assessment, investment decisions, and engagement strategies should be strengthened.

Academic Community

Adding to the existing research on AI and ESG, providing a tight empirical basis to the subsequent research.

The intersection of AI and ESG is a critical new horizon for corporate approaches, with deep implications for sustainable development, technological advancements, and social welfare. Although the potential benefits are high, they can only be achieved with a subtle understanding of the mechanisms, conditions, and risks involved. This research paper aims to offer this knowledge by undertaking a multi-methodological study that would enhance theory and practice in the pursuit of responsible, innovative, and sustainable business.

Literature Review

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become an increasingly popular topic among scholars and practitioners over the last ten years due to its quick development and application in corporate strategy. Simultaneously, the significance of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) in investment, corporate management, and social expectations has altered the picture of responsible business behavior. Although AI and ESG have been thoroughly examined as separate fields, their intersection is a relatively new field of research with a promising future in establishing theories and conducting empirical research.

The purpose of the given literature review is to summarize the available studies involving AI and ESG, determine gaps, and place the importance of the convergence between AI and ESG in the context of sustainable finance and corporate strategy. It is divided into three main parts: (1) AI in business and society, (2) ESG systems and their changing role in business and investment, and (3) the new nexus of AI and ESG, with theoretical insights, empirical data, and challenges.

Artificial Intelligence in Business and Society

The History of AI and the Abilities of AI

Artificial intelligence, generally defined as the simulation of human intelligence by machines, encompasses technologies such as machine learning (ML), natural language processing (NLP), computer vision, robotics, and autonomous systems (Russell and Norvig, 2020). The path of AI development has shifted from rule-based expert systems to more advanced algorithms that can learn and adapt.

The scale of big data, improvements in computing power, and the development of algorithms have fueled the rapid adoption of AI across industries (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2017). The companies use AI in predictive analytics, process automation, customer engagement, supply chain optimization, and decision support (Davenport et al., 2020). Empirical research shows that AI can increase operational efficiency, reduce costs, and enhance innovation (Manyika et al., 2017).

A strategic resource and a disruptive technology, AI is analyzed as a part of an innovation strategy. Strategically, AI is a dynamic capability that has the potential to change routine and positioning of organizations (Teece, 2007). The Resource-Based View (RBV) argues that proprietary AI resources, such as unique algorithms, data warehouses, and organizational knowledge, can provide a sustainable competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). To illustrate, when discussing the case of the Amazon-driven personalized recommendation system, the example of how AI-based data analytics contributes to customer retention and market dominance can be given (Huang and Rust, 2021).

Furthermore, the disruptive nature of AI can range from the level of a single company to that of industry-scale transformations. Knowledge work automation, self-driving cars, and smart manufacturing are re-establishing industry lines and value chains (Bessen, 2019). The implications of these developments rest on both economic productivity, the labor market, and societal well-being (Manyika et al., 2017).

Ethical, Governance, and Societal Problems

Irrespective of the promise, AI raises important ethical and governance issues. There is strong controversy over bias, transparency, accountability, privacy, and safety among scholars, practitioners, and regulators (Crawford and Paglen, 2019). The use of algorithmic bias may further strengthen existing social imbalances, and opaque black-box models can undermine accountability (O'Neil, 2016). The European Commission's Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI (2019) focus on principles such as transparency, fairness, and human oversight.

International bodies and governments have retaliated by offering regulatory propositions and orientations. The principles for responsible AI - The principles for responsible AI, as outlined in the World Economic Forum's "The G20," were established to advance the creation of systems that are inclusive, humane, and responsible. The difficult part is to strike a balance between innovation and responsible deployment, which is especially important when AI directly affects society, e.g., environmental sustainability, social justice, etc.

The issue of AI and Sustainability: Opportunities and Risks

AI presents transformational opportunities in the framework of sustainability. It could improve environmental surveillance, resource utilization, renewable energy integration, and disaster management (Rolnick et al., 2019). For example, predictive models powered by AI contribute to climate modeling, environmental impact assessment, and sustainable agriculture (Klerkx et al., 2019).

Nonetheless, AI also poses threats, including increased energy consumption from massive data centers, the potential for abuse, and unintended social harms. AI, by its essence, has an environmental impact that should be considered (Strubell, Ganesh, and McCallum, 2019). Sustainable AI creation and implementation, in turn, require incorporating sustainability principles into technological innovation.

The Theories of ESG and Their Development

The ESG paradigm began as socially responsible investing (SRI) in the 1960s and 1970s, which incorporated ethics into the consideration of financial returns (Sparkes and Cowton, 2004). Formalization of ESG as a holistic approach began in the early 2000s, emphasizing the importance of non-financial variables as short-term value-generating forces (Sullivan and Mackenzie, 2017).

ESG indicators are extremely diverse and include carbon emissions, water usage, labor standards, diversity policies, board independence, anti-corruption measures, and others (Kotsantonis, Pinney, and Serafeim, 2016). These measures are intended to reflect a firm's sustainability profile, risk exposure, and stakeholder interactions.

Investment and Corporate Governance: The Emergence of ESG

Empirical evidence shows that high ESG performance is associated with reduced risk, improved financial performance, and stronger reputation (Friede, Busch, and Bassen, 2015). Regulatory requirements, societal expectations, and value relevance are driving the growing importance of ESG criteria in portfolio management (Clark et al., 2015).

Mandatory disclosure requirements, regulatory initiatives (the EU Sustainable Finance Action Plan, the TCFD recommendations, and the EU Sustainable Finance Action Plan), and regulatory initiatives have increased the pace of ESG integration (European Commission, 2020). The developments have led companies to improve ESG reporting, use standardized models (e.g., GRI, SASB), and ensure higher data quality.

The ESG field is not without its challenges, despite its prominence. Assessments are complicated by variability in metrics, non-comparability, and data quality problems (Kotsantonis et al., 2016). The rise of ESG ratings and rankings, created by various agencies, further contributes to inconsistency, confusion, and distrustful stakeholders.

The recent controversies are at risk of greenwashing, in which companies can exaggerate or falsify ESG performance to satisfy stakeholders (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). As a result, efforts are underway to develop standardized, transparent, and auditable ESG metrics.

ESG and Financial Performance

The relationship between ESG and financial performance is complex and context-dependent. The meta-analyses indicate that the relationship is mostly positive but show heterogeneity across industry, geographic region, and measurement methods (Friede et al., 2015). According to some scholars, ESG can serve as a risk-mitigation tool, while others assert that ESG projects can entail expenses and short-term declines in financial indicators.

The discussion highlights the need to know how companies use ESG to their strategic advantage, especially when it comes to technological features such as AI.

The Collusion of AI and ESG: New Horizons

Artificial Intelligence and ESG: Conceptual Underpinnings

The emerging body of AI and ESG research addresses the potential of AI technologies to improve sustainability initiatives, enhance the quality of ESG disclosures, and facilitate responsible governance. According to scholars, AI can be used as a facilitator of so-called sustainable intelligence; that is, applying data-driven insights to promote environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and ethical decision-making (Kraus et al., 2021).

As a case in point, AI systems help track environmental changes in real time using satellite images and sensor networks (Rolnick et al., 2019). NLP algorithms will examine corporate disclosures, social media, and news to measure the stakeholder sentiment and reputation risks (Liu et al., 2020). Machine learning models forecast future ESG risks, which can inform proactive strategies (Zhang et al., 2021).

Empirically, the process of innovating has been identified as comprising three stages: creating, adopting, and commercializing. <|human|>Empirical Evidence and Case Studies. There is empirical evidence and case studies that the innovation process is divided into three stages: creating, adopting, and commercializing.

Although it has a theoretical potential, empirical studies of the role of AI in ESG are still quite scarce, but are increasing. According to case studies, companies such as Microsoft, Google, and Unilever currently use AI to monitor carbon emissions, enhance supply chains, and labor practices (Ghosh and Gupta, 2021). The correlation between AI investments and better ESG scores is quantitatively proven, but the causal link has not yet been fully examined.

For example, Bouri et al. (2020) report that companies that invest more in AI-related R&D have superior ESG ratings, suggesting a strategy fit. In the same vein, Klerkx et al. (2019) contend that precision agriculture using AI can also promote environmental sustainability by enabling the use of fewer resources.

Difficulties and Risks in the AI-ESG Integration

There are no issues with introducing AI into ESG programs. The problems of data privacy, algorithmic bias, and transparency pose a risk to stakeholders' trust (Crawford and Paglen, 2019). Additionally, sustainability objectives might be undermined by the environmental costs of AI, particularly energy use (Strubell et al., 2019).

The absence of standardized measures and regulatory uncertainty is limiting adoption. Ethical issues, such as decisions regarding a vulnerable population, should be well governed (OECD, 2023). The mentioned challenges imply the need for a responsible approach to AI deployment that considers ESG principles.

Theoretical Views of AI-ESG Synergies

Theoretically, AI and ESG can meet at crossroads in many ways. The RBV prioritizes the use of AI as a source of capacity, enabling firms to create unique sustainability capabilities (Barney, 1991). In the stakeholder theory, it is emphasized that AI may enhance stakeholder engagement and transparency (Freeman, 1984). The socio-technical systems theory proposes harmonizing technological and organizational factors to ensure that ESG results are responsible (Baxter & Somerville, 2011).

Moreover, new paradigms, such as the concept of sustainable AI, promote integrating environmental, social, and governance considerations into AI development and implementation (Kraus et al., 2021).

Gaps and Future Directions

Although the literature acknowledges AI's potential to contribute to ESG, significant gaps remain. The majority of the research is investigative, narrow, or evidence-based to a specific case. Strict, longitudinal, and cross-sector empirical studies are necessary to determine causality between and establish the best practices.

Also, the literature lacks agreement on the standards for measurement, governance, and ethical principles for responsible AI in the context of sustainability. It is essential to develop standardized metrics, clear algorithms, and mechanisms of accountability.

Lastly, the dynamic evolution of AI technologies, combined with changing regulatory environments and social demands, requires continuous research into how organizations can adapt, innovate, and act responsibly in this domain.

The academic evidence regarding AI and ESG is a developing yet quickly growing subject area due to technological progress and societal demands of sustainability. Although AI has revolutionary potential to improve environmental performance, social responsibility, and ethical governance, it is associated with critical challenges of transparency, bias, and environmental footprint.

This review highlights the essence of taking up integrated and multidisciplinary approaches- a combination of management theory, technological knowledge, and ethics- to learn and utilize AI to ensure sustainable development. Future studies should be aimed at finding causal relationships, building universal structures, and ensuring that the use of AI is based on societal values and sustainability objectives.

Such synthesis provides the background for the current research, which seeks to empirically explore the effect of AI adoption on corporate ESG performance, addressing the critical gaps in the literature identified below.

Methodology

Research Design

This study follows a mixed-methods research approach to examine the effect of adopting artificial intelligence (AI) on corporate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance, using both quantitative and qualitative methods to comprehensively understand corporate ESGs. The rationale for using a mixed-methods approach is to take advantage of both the quantitative and qualitative methods-quantitative analysis to get the empirical evidence of the relationship and pattern, and the qualitative to assess the context and mechanism, perception, and organizational practices.

Specifically, the study is conducted using sequential explanatory design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017), whereby the quantitative phase is conducted first, while the qualitative phase is conducted after, and used to illustrate and explain the result from the quantitative phase. This approach supports an overall understanding of AI's role on ESG outcomes on the firm level - both in terms of measurable impact as well as in terms of nuanced processes within accounting organizations.

The general research framework is shown in Figure 1 (not included here), which presents the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods.

Rationale for Choice of Methodology

The choice of a mixed-methods design is driven by the complexity and multidimensionality of AI implementation and ESG performance. Quantitative data enables the analysis of correlations and possible cause-and-effect relations across a large population of firms over an extended period of time (years). On the other hand, the use of qualitative data, i.e., interviews and document analysis, can provide rich insights about organizational mechanisms and challenges as well as the context of AI's impact on ESG.

Quantitative Phase

Population and Sample

The quantitative component addresses publicly listed companies across different industries and geographic regions, favoring those listed on major stock exchanges such as the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), the NASDAQ, and the European Stock Exchanges (e.g., Euronext, Frankfurt Stock Exchange). The inclusion criteria are:

Firms must have seen some data on investments or initiatives related to artificial intelligence through research and development (R&D) expenses, patent filings, or expenditures.

Firms should keep at least 3 years of records to run longitudinal analysis.

A stratified random sampling approach is employed by industry (i.e., manufacturing/technology/financial services/energy) and region (North America, Europe, Asia) to reflect participation. The first sampling frame comprises approximately 1000 firms, from which the final sample of approximately 600 firms is selected according to inclusion/exclusion criteria.

Data Collection and Sources

There are different sources of data collection along the lines of:

ESG Data: Collected from ESG rating agencies such as MSCI ESG Ratings, Sustainalytics, Refinitiv, and Addenbrothers, etc., that have already established their existence. These agencies provide standardized ESG scores at the firm level that cover environmental, social & governance aspects.

AI Adoption Indicators: Selected proxies for AI adoption are:

Research and Development (R&D), expenditure specifically on AI or machine learning development projects based on the annual report and financial statements of the firms.

Patent filings that are related to AI technologies that were retrieved from patent databases such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

Disclosures in sustainability reports or annual reports that describe AI efforts that are related to ESG objectives.

Financial Data: Financial variables of firms (e.g., total assets of firms, revenue, profitability) from information databases, such as Bloomberg, Thomson Reuters Eikon, and Orbis.

Control Variables: Firm size, Industry Classification, Leverage, Board composition, and Regional Indicators.

Variables and Measurement

Independent Variable: Use of Artificial Intelligence

Operationalized using a composite index which represents a combination of:

Log of the AI-related R&D expenditure (scaled on the total expenditure R&D)

Number of patent filings related to AI (normalized per firm).

Qualitative disclosures coded for AI initiatives according to ESG (presence, absence - binary indicator).
Dependent Variable: The ESG Performance
Measured through ESG scores, which are offered by rating agencies, on a scale of 0 to 100.
The scores are further split into three parts:

- Environmental score
- Social score
- Governance score

Control Variables

- Firm size (log of total assets)
- Leverage ratio (Total debt/ total assets)
- Industry dummy variables
- Region dummy variables
- Board independence (per cent independence for directors)

Data Analysis Procedures

The quantitative analysis is carried out in a few steps:
Descriptive Statistics: To describe the sample and the analysis of the distribution of the variables in the sample.
Correlation Analysis: To test the initial relationship between the variables.
Panel Data Regression: A fixed-effects or random-effects model is used to study the impact of AI adoption on ESG scores over time, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity.
The Hausman test evaluates whether the model can or should be treated as fixed effects or random effects.

The model specification

\[ESGit = b0 + b1 AILimit adoptionit + b2 Controlsit + mu i + lambad + ei t\] in which the effects of firms are picked up by the value of mui, the effect of time by the value of lambdat, and in which the error term is the value of epsilonit, where \(\mui \) picks up firm-specific effects, \(\lambdat \) picks up time effect, and \(\epsilon_{it} \) is the error term.
Robustness Checks: Alternative specifications for AI adoption (e.g., alternative operationalization of adoption, such as patent filings) and subsamples (e.g., industry-specific and/or region-specific)
Longitudinal Analysis: Use of lagged variables to determine causality, such as whether adoption of artificial intelligence predicts alteration in ESG scores in subsequent years.

Validity and Reliability

Construct validity is assessed using several indicators of AI adoption, including financial, patent, and disclosure data.
Internal consistency of composite indices was checked using Cronbach's alpha.
Data triangulation across different sources enhances validity.
Potential biases are addressed through control variables, fixed-effects models, and robustness checks.

Qualitative Phase

Purpose and Rationale

The purpose of the qualitative stage is to place the numerical results in perspective and promote understanding. Specifically, it tests the nature of organizational mechanisms, managerial perceptions, and market context that affect AI's impact on ESG.

Participant Selection

Purposive sampling is used to identify important informants from a sample of 20 firms, or a few more, based on high, medium, and low ratings for AI adoption and ESG scores. Participants include:

1. Chief Sustainability Officers (CSOs)
2. Chief Technology Officers
3. Artificial Intelligence project managers, Data scientists
4. Board members who manage ESG initiatives

Selection criteria include relevance to AI and ESG initiatives, willingness to participate, and the need to represent industries and regions.

Data Collection Methods

Data collection methods are semi-structured interviews, information from documents, and observation:

Interviews: These will be through video conference, last around 45*60 min, and be focused on:

- Processes Around Organizational for A.I Implementation

Perceived effects on ESG outcomes

- Difficulties and ethical issues.
- Government and monitoring mechanisms; and

Document Analysis: Corporate Reports and AI Policies - Sustainability Revelation - Internal Memos - AI and ESG Document Analysis.

Observation: Whenever possible, site visits or virtual tours of Artificial Intelligence labs or sustainability teams, in order to gain an understanding of organizational routines

Interview Protocol

The major themes in the interview protocol are as follows:

- Drivers behind adopting AI when it comes to ESG goals
- Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Sustainability Processes
- Organizational culture and leadership support
- Ethical/governing structures
- Attached is a list of its challenges and unintended consequences
- Questions are open-ended to allow participants to elaborate and provide nuanced insights.

Data Analysis Procedures

Qualitative data is analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The following steps are followed in analyzing the data:

Transcription: The interviews are transcribed verbatim.

Coding: First, open coding helps to identify important concepts and patterns.

Categorization: Codes clustered into themes covering mechanisms, facilitators, barriers, and ethics.

Theme Development: Themes reviewed and developed to ensure coherence and relevance.
Interpretation: Themes are put into the context of the existing literature and relate these to quantitative findings
NVivo or ATLAS.ti is used to ease coding and analysis.

Ensuring Trustworthiness
Triangulation: Use of different elements of data and/or methods.
Member Checking: Sharing the preliminary findings obtained with the study participants for checking the validity.
Reflexivity: Keeping a journal of research as a means of keeping track of bias and assumptions
Peer Debriefing: Getting involved with colleagues for critical feedback

Ethical Considerations
Important ethical protocols include:
Informed Consent: It is giving people detailed information about the study's purpose, how it will work, the risks, and benefits before they join a study.
Confidentiality: Data are rendered anonymous, and identifying information is stored securely.
Voluntary Participation: Participants may drop out at any time with no penalty.
Data Security: Digital data is stored on encrypted devices and accessed only by the research team.
Ethical Approval: The study protocol is reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University to which we are affiliated.

Findings
This part examines the welfare and the effect of AI adoption on corporate ESG performance, involving a detailed analysis of the empirical findings from the mixed-methods study. The analysis centers on integrating extensive statistical descriptions, interpretive understanding, and theoretical understanding of context to provide a nuanced account of the mechanisms underlying the findings, along with their implications and broader significance.

Descriptive Statistics Data
Empiricism is founded on the nature and distribution of the data. The basis of any good empirical model is the nature and distribution of the data. In this study, the dataset consisted of 600 publicly listed companies, and we observed them over three years (i.e., 1800 firm-year observations). This is longitudinal panel data, which allows for dynamics over time and firm-specific heterogeneity.

Distributions and Central Tendencies
The dependent variable (the ESG scores) had a standard deviation of 12.30 and a mean of 62.45. The scores ranged from 30.50 to 89.20, indicating that ESG performance varied extensively across firms. The Princeton-Mart distribution was slightly left-skewed (skew = -0.42), indicating that although the majority of firms had higher performance, a smaller group had lower ESG ratings. This skew aligns with other results (Friede, Busch, and Bassen, 2015), suggesting that high-performing firms are more likely to receive better ESG ratings, potentially creating a ceiling effect. Similar trends were exhibited in the Environmental, Social, and Governance sub-scores. The social score, with a mean of 64.10, was slightly higher than the environmental score (mean = 58.20), suggesting that, overall, firms were better in the social and governance dimensions than in the

environmental dimension. This pattern aligns with previous research, which suggests that the implementation of social and governance-related initiatives is more often straightforward or more visibly prioritized by firms (Kotsantonis et al., 2016).
The index of artificial intelligence investment, a composite proxy based on R&D spending, patent registrations, and qualitative disclosures, had an average of 0.45 and a standard deviation of 0.30. Its distribution is skewed (mean = 1.10), indicating that most firms invested modestly in AI, while a few big innovators invested heavily, reflecting strategic differentiation or resource availability.

Control Variables

Firm Size: As measured by the natural logarithm of total assets (with an average of 8.25 (with a sample size roughly spread between 5.20 and 11.30), and are typical of a sample containing predominantly medium to large-sized firms.
Leverage Ratio: Averaged 0.35, range was 0.10 to 0.80, indicating a moderate level of debt. This variable captures firms' financial structure and can potentially affect their ability to invest in ESG and AI initiatives.
Board Independence: This was an average of 55% of board directors who are independent, though there was some variance in this percentage, in line with best governance practices.

Data Quality and Outliers Spectator

The level of data completeness was good (less than 2% Missing data). Missing values were handled using multiple imputation, thereby preserving statistical power and reducing bias. The influential observations were absent, as outlier detection using Cook's distance and leverage diagnostics did not identify any such observations that would have influenced the findings. Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) were estimated for all predictors, and they were found to be less than 2.5, indicating low multicollinearity. The data cleaning exercise provided sufficient ground for further inferential studies.

Preliminary Bivariate Relationships (Correlation Analysis)

Before proceeding to the multivariate modelling, Pearson correlation coefficients indicated a few initial relations between variables:
AI Investment and ESG Score: The correlation coefficient was $p < .001$ (.42). This moderate positive correlation implies that firms that invest more in AI are more likely to have better ESG scores, consistent with the theoretical expectation that AI technologies will benefit from better data-driven sustainability practices.
Firm Size and ESG: With a coefficient of 0.35 ($p < 0.001$), a positive association between firm size and ESG metrics is detected (consistent with the resource-based view of Barney 1991 and earlier empirical evidence in the prior literature by Sullivan & Mackenzie 2017).
AI Investment and Firm Size: The correlation of 0.30 ($p < 0.001$) indicates that larger companies are more likely to invest significant resources in AI, possibly because they have greater capacity for research and innovation.
Leverage and ESG: The negative correlation of -0.25 ($p < 0.01$) indicates that more leveraged firms tend to have lower ESG scores, perhaps due to financial constraints or risk-averse governance, leading to lower ESG investment (Goss & Roberts, 2011).
These correlations supported expected relationships or indicated potential multicollinearity issues, which were low given the low VIFs in the multivariate models.

Multivariate Regression Analysis: A Measure of the Impact of AI

The underlying analysis used fixed-effects panel regressions, justified by the Hausman test (kh2 = 8.45, p = 0.014), which indicated that unobserved firm-specific heterogeneity was correlated with the regressors. Fixed-effects models are good for controlling for time-invariant characteristics, in the sense that within-firm variation over time is isolated.

Model Specification

The regression model contained important control variables - firm size, leverage, governance structures - and industry and region dummy variables as well as year fixed effects to control for the effects of macroeconomics on ESG ratings.

The relation of the variables in the separate primary regression equation was:

\[ESG it = bet0 + bet1 AI{it} + bet2 FirmSize{it} + bet3 Leverage{it} + bet4 BoardIndep{it} + Industry Dummies + Region Dummies + néanmoins mu i + lambda d + epsilon it\], where \(\mui\) is unobservable, time invariant firm characteristics and \(\lambdat\) is common temporal shocks.

Key Results

AI Investment Index (beta = 12.45, p < 0.001): The coefficient indicates that a 1-unit increase in AI investment is associated with a 12.45-unit increase in ESG scores, holding other factors constant. This precision impact makes AI an important strategic enabler for enhancing sustainability and governance.

Firm Size (\beta = 1.20, p = 0.001\): Larger companies are more likely to perform better in terms of ESGs. This relationship, in line with previous studies (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2017), reflects the fact that larger organizations have greater resources, institutional capacity, and stakeholder pressure to engage in ESG practices, which AI may further enable through data analytics.

Leverage (\(\beta = -4.10, p = 0.007\)): The negative association means that the highly leveraged companies are likely to have a lower ESG score, which could be due to low financial resources for sustainability investments or risk-averse behavior in the governance of the companies.

Board Independence(bee = 0.05, p = 0.012). A higher percentage of independent directors is associated with slightly higher ESG scores, consistent with corporate governance theories that stress independent oversight of management as a motivating force for ethical and sustainable behavior (Dalton et al., 1998).

Diagnostic Tests and Validation of Model

The model explained about 35 percent of the variation in ESG scores (adjusted R-squared = 0.35), indicating that it accounts for a significant portion of the variation. The analysis of residuals indicated no violations of normality or heteroscedasticity; the normality tests and the Breusch-Pagan test did not indicate heteroscedasticity. The VIF values were below 2.5, indicating low multicollinearity and stable coefficients.

Regulate and Confirmation of Robustness and Causation Questions

In order to test the strength of the findings:

Alternative proxies and interpretations. Substituting patent filings for investment in AI yields similar positive results (v = 10.85, p < 0.001), reinforcing the stability of the results.

Temporal lag analysis: Resulting in an enhanced effect size (bet here = 14.20, p < 0.001) when a 1-year lag of AI investment was introduced after introducing the AI investments to demonstrate the improvement in ESG performance, as expected to be causal.

Sectoral analysis: Similar results across industries, with larger coefficients in technology firms, which are inherently more AI-intensive, verifying the sector-specific technology relevance of AI for ESG.

While these findings do support a causal relationship, there are certain limitations - including the possibility of unobserved confounders and reverse causality - and there is caution in interpreting the findings.

Qualitative Insights Mechanisms and Organizational Dynamics

Complementing the quantitative results, qualitative research, expressed through interviews with sustainability officers, AI project managers, and senior executives, provides rich insights into the mechanics of AI's impact on ESG outcomes.

Thematic Analysis on Organizational Stories

Improved Data Accuracy and Real-Time Reporting: Several companies stated that AI-powered analytics has changed the ESG reporting process. For example, one of the world's leading manufacturing companies had a sustainability manager share how his company is using AI-enabled sensors to monitor emissions, waste, and resource use in real time, enabling them to intervene and better comply with reporting standards.

Operational Efficiency and Environmental Impact: Firms said they were using AI for predictive maintenance, supply chain optimization, and energy management. Some of these applications resulted in real savings in energy use and waste, which directly enhanced the environmental scores. An executive from an energy company said that AI-driven asset management led to reduced emissions and improved compliance.

Stakeholder Engagement and Social Responsibility: Social media sentiment and stakeholder feedback analysis using AI tools helped firms respond more effectively to social issues faster. For example, a social responsibility officer from a retail corporation reported that using AI-based sentiment analysis helped detect emerging social concerns, leading to greater trust and more positive social ratings.

Governance and Ethical Oversight: Firms that have developed AI ethics committees and governance frameworks have reported more responsible AI deployment, thereby reducing the risks of bias, privacy violations, and misuse. This is the needed oversight mechanism that could have maintained governance standards and strengthened trust among stakeholders.

Implications of the Qualitative Results

These stories are supported by the quantitative relationship between AI investments and ESG improvements. They show that AI is used as an operational and strategic enabler - from the quality of data and efficiency of operations, relationships with stakeholders, and governance - they convert into real results in terms of sustainability, of the technological investments.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The findings, taken together, contribute to the academic discussion on digital transformation and sustainability by linking to and extending the Resource-Based View (RBV). AIs' resources (data analytics, automation, and predictive modelling) are significant competencies that enable firms to achieve sustainable competitive advantages (Barney, 1991).

Furthermore, the results support the idea of the stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), because AI promotes higher levels of transparency, stakeholder interaction, and accountability - all essential requirements to achieve success in terms of ESG. The evidence also aligns with socio-technical systems perspectives (Baxter & Somerville, 2011), encouraging the integration of technological innovation into organizational routines to achieve sustainability goals.

Practical Recommendations

For Managers: AI capability development should be taken as a strategic goal for sustainability. Firms should assign responsibilities for AI governance models, adopt AI into ESG processes, and support organizational cultures that use AI for the benefit of society.

For Policymakers: Clear standards and disclosure requirements for AI initiatives can support responsible deployment aligned with ESG objectives. Incentives for responsible AI use: These incentives may accelerate corporate efforts to become more sustainable.

For Investors: AI-enabled ESG metrics and disclosures: they provide more granular insights into the sustainability practices of the firm in question. Investors need to incorporate AI-related disclosures in their decision-making.

Limitations and Research Direction

Despite the strengths of these findings, several limitations need to be noted. The use of publicly available ESG scores and the self-reporting of AI introduce measurement biases. The observational nature of the data limits the ability to infer causality - while studies of lagged relationships strengthen the case for causality, there may be unmeasured confounders.

Sectoral heterogeneity indicates that the strength of the AI-ESG relationship varies across industries, with the effects strongest for technology firms. Future studies could employ experimental or quasi-experimental research designs to strengthen causal claims, leverage internal firm data on AI investments, and examine stakeholder perceptions.

Longitudinal studies lasting more than 3 years can reflect long-term effects and emerging trends, especially as AI technologies evolve rapidly.

This comprehensive investigation further demonstrates that AI is a strategic asset with significant potential to improve ESG performance. The positive association across sectors and geographies is encouraging that AI can be a catalyst for sustainable transformation - bringing improved transparency, operational efficiency, and trust of stakeholders and better governance of ethics.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative evidence sheds light on the nature of the pathways through which AI exerts its influence. It helps improve data accuracy, encourage real-time monitoring, enhance stakeholder engagement, and strengthen governance oversight - all important ingredients for achieving comprehensive and credible ESG performance.

The positive correlation is aligned with the Resource-Based View (RBV), which assumes that AI resources such as proprietary algorithms, data ecosystems, and advanced analytics can be unique, valuable, and inimitable to copy, driving competitive advantage, and that they must be constructed to attain sustainability goals. The results corroborate other empirical studies suggesting that technological innovation, especially AI, is key to improving operational efficiency in transparency, stakeholder involvement, and risk controls.

Findings support the need for transparency and standardization of instructions and disclosure guidelines regarding AI and ESG. Regulatory frameworks that encourage trustworthy AI and establish standards for transparency, auditability, and fairness would result in responsible AI deployment and minimize risks arising from bias, privacy, and environmental impact. Policymakers should encourage the incorporation of AI ethics into general sustainability policies to establish a receptive environment that uses technology to change the world in ways that align with societal values.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study and Future Research

Though the research yields some interesting discoveries, one must acknowledge its limitations. Its reliance on easily accessible eco-social responsibility ratings and self-reported AI reporting may introduce bias into the measurement, which is further increased by inconsistency and the risk of greenwashing during or through ESG reporting. Observational design limits causal inference; if lagged analyses yield causal results, there is a possibility of unmeasured confounders.

The existence of sectoral heterogeneity implies a greater presence of the same in sectors that are more intensive in AI-like technologies; hence, the necessity to analyze these sectors in future research. It is not easy to assess the long-term impact, especially given the accelerated evolution of AI technologies and regulatory environments, given the relatively short longitudinal window (2018-2024).

In subsequent research, more rigorous quasi-experimental designs (e.g., difference-in-differences or instrumental variables) should be pursued to more strongly establish causality. Data from internal firms on AI investments, organizational routines, and stakeholder perceptions may contribute to our understanding of the mechanisms at work. Also, it will be intriguing to expand the range of private corporations, start-ups, and developing economies towards a more generalizable and holistic perspective of the contribution of AI to enhancing sustainability on the planet.

Significance and Conclusion

This research contributes to a growing body of literature that argues that AI is not a technological innovation and can be employed as a strategic asset to upset corporate practices and make them sustainable. The point of convergence between AI and ESG is a paradigm shift: away from soloed thinking towards integrated thinking, using data and being ethically driven, to align corporate performance and wellbeing with the current global state.

This study illustrates the positive relationships that can be identified in AI and that AI may be a driving force behind enhanced transparency, efficiency, and trustworthiness among stakeholders and toward good governance. Nevertheless, it is immensely significant that such potential could be actualized in a way that addresses the ethical issues surrounding it, enabling management to operate within credibility standards and for AI to be integrated into organizational routines to advance society's values.

Their implications go beyond the academic setting, calling on managers, policymakers, investors, and regulators to implement AI responsibly and enhance the sustainability agenda. This includes encouraging transparent, fair, and environmentally sustainable innovation and maximizing the benefits of AI while minimizing risks.

To sum up, this study identifies the transformational prospect of AI as a strategic facilitator of corporate sustainability. As AI's continued use and implementation in organizations' core practices, a keen eye will be maintained through governance, and stakeholders will need to be involved to ensure AI is a constructive part of sustainable development and social advancement. As part of a responsible and equitable harnessing of AI's promise, future research and policy work should focus on developing the requisite standards, frameworks, and organizational capacities.

This comprehensive investigation further demonstrates that AI is a strategic asset with significant potential to improve ESG performance. The positive association across sectors and geographies is encouraging that AI can be a catalyst for sustainable transformation - bringing improved transparency, operational efficiency, and trust of stakeholders and better governance of ethics.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative evidence sheds light on the nature of the pathways through which AI exerts its influence. It helps improve data accuracy, encourage real-time monitoring, enhance stakeholder engagement, and strengthen governance oversight - all important ingredients for achieving comprehensive and credible ESG performance.

In conclusion, this research is an affirmation that not only is AI a technological innovation, but it is an enabling strategy for sustainable, responsible, and stakeholder-centric business practices in the corporate world. As organizations recover and continue to adopt AI in core operations, a greater understanding and management of its ramifications for ESG will prove instrumental in ensuring long-term resilience and societal trust.

References

- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108
- Baxter, G., & Sommerville, I. (2011). Socio-technical systems: From design methods to systems engineering. *Interacting with Computers, 23*(1), 4–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intcom.2010.07.003
- Bessen, J. E. (2019). *AI and jobs: The role of demand* (NBER Working Paper No. 24235). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w24235
- Bouri, E., Gupta, R., Lau, C. K. M., Roubaud, D., & Wang, S. (2020). Investing in carbon neutrality: The role of artificial intelligence and ESG performance. *Finance Research Letters, 36*, 101338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2019.101338
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *Machine, platform, crowd: Harnessing our digital future*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Clark, G. L., Feiner, A., & Viehs, M. (2015). *From the stockholder to the stakeholder: How sustainability can drive financial outperformance*. Oxford University and Arabesque Partners.
- Crawford, K., & Paglen, T. (2019). Excavating AI: The politics of images in machine learning training sets. *International Journal of Communication, 13*, 2149–2166.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dalton, D. R., Daily, C. M., Ellstrand, A. E., & Johnson, J. L. (1998). Meta-analytic reviews of board composition, leadership structure, and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 19*(3), 269–290.
- Davenport, T. H., Guha, A., Grewal, D., & Bressgott, T. (2020). How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48*, 24–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00696-0
- Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California Management Review, 54*(1), 64–87. https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64
- European Commission. (2019). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*. https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai
- European Commission. (2020). *Sustainable finance action plan*. https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/2020-sustainable-finance-action-plan_en
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2,000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 5*(4), 210–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917
- Ghosh, A., & Gupta, P. (2021). AI and sustainability: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Business Ethics, 169*, 221–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04551-0

- Goss, P., & Roberts, G. (2011). The role of executive risk-taking in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *103*, 267–281. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0978-8
- Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). A strategic framework for artificial intelligence in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *49*, 30–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00749-x
- Klerkx, L., Rose, D., & Janssen, H. (2019). Environmental sustainability and artificial intelligence in agriculture. *Global Food Security*, *23*, 113–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.01.005
- Kotsantonis, S., Pinney, C., & Serafeim, G. (2016). ESG integration in investment management: Myths and realities. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, *28*(2), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/jacf.12109
- Kraus, S., Palmer, C., Kailer, N., Kallinger, R., & Spitzer, J. (2021). Digital transformation and sustainability: The moderating role of artificial intelligence. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, *63*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-021-00700-0
- Liu, B., Liu, Y., & Huang, G. (2020). Sentiment analysis for ESG disclosures in social media. *Information Processing & Management*, *57*(2), 102186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2019.102186
- Manyika, J., Chui, M., Miremadi, M., Bughin, J., George, K., Willmott, P., & Dewhurst, M. (2017). *A future that works: Automation, employment, and productivity*. McKinsey Global Institute.
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- OECD. (2023). *Responsible artificial intelligence: Framework and principles*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264629331-en
- Rolnick, D., Modarres, M., Kochanski, G., Lintz, H., Velickovic, J., & Sohl-Dickstein, J. (2019). Tackling climate change with machine learning. *arXiv Preprint*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.05433
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2020). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Shirazi, F., & O'Neill, M. (2020). Responsible AI and corporate governance: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *161*, 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3964-4
- Sparkes, R., & Cowton, C. J. (2004). The maturing of responsible investment: What price ethics? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *52*(1), 45–57. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000048842.79128.80
- Strubell, E., Ganesh, A., & McCallum, A. (2019). Energy and policy considerations for deep learning training. *arXiv Preprint*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02243
- Sullivan, R., & Mackenzie, C. (2017). Responsible investment: An overview of the ESG landscape. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, *7*(2), 153–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2016.1222584
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *28*(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.777
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations General Assembly. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda
- Zhang, D., Mohsin, M., Rasheed, A. K., Chang, Y., & Taghizadeh-Hesary, F. (2021). Public spending and green economic growth in BRI region: The role of green finance and institutional quality. *Economic Research–Ekonomska Istraživanja, 34*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2021.1938099