MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages 4369-4374

The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Strengthening ESG Disclosure and Combating Green washing

Vishnu R Unnithan *
Research Scholar
P. Ravindranath**
Professor
Department of Commerce and Management, Amrita School of Arts ,
Humanities and Commerce, Amrita Vishwa Vidhyapeetham,
Kochi, Kerala, India
vishnurunnithan@gmail.com

Abstract
For corporate entities, ESG Disclosure serves as an important tool for enforcing accountability and encouraging sustainable development. However, the legitimacy of ESG reporting is increasingly being tarnished due to companies exaggerating or misrepresenting their commitments to sustainability as 'green washing.' Such activities undermine the ESG frameworks effectiveness by eroding trust and distorting investment and stakeholder engagement. Conversely, the accuracy, reliability, and transparency of disclosures could be addressed by Artificial Intelligence (A I). This research examines the impact of A I on ESG managerial disclosure and the mitigation of green washing through thematic analysis of secondary evidence such as scholarly works, policies, and industry documents. From the analysis, 5 themes emerged including the use of A I to enhance ESG report transparency, A I automated deception detection, A I assurance and accuracy improvements, A I ethics within sustainable finance, and A I finance sustainability. The analysis shows that A I technologies particularly natural language processing, machine learning, and predictive analytics have unprecedented capacity to analyze complex and large scale ESG datasets, reveal inconsistencies, and provide real-time insights on corporate practices. Nevertheless, challenges like ethical concerns, algorithmic bias, and the governance of operationalized AI systems still require attention for the responsible use of AI. The results of the study enrich theoretical and practical discussions by placing AI at the intersection of institutions and stakeholders in the debate on the use of AI for reversing greenwashing and restoring trust in ESG systems.The study implies that within the confines of responsible paradigms, Radical change through AI is plausible, and thus can enable accurate and germane disclosure of ESG data that is impactful and responsible its governance controlled.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, ESG, green washing, machine learning, sustainable finance

1.Introduction

With the emergence of a corporation's 'duty' of care to operate ethically and sustainably, ESG reporting is a now a part of corporate reporting. Stakeholders such as investors, the public, and the government, and even regulators now consider the impact of businesses activities and the ESG disclosures act as an instrument of accountability as well as a tool for competitive advantage. Corporations now conduct business while abiding to socially responsible, environmentally sustainable, and responsible business practices alongside proper governance. The willingness of stakeholders to pay a premium for sustainable operational firms is the driving factor behind the focus on ESG disclosures as a measure of corporate responsibility, for competitive advantage, as well as sustaining long-term endurance.With the increased focus on ESG, "green-washing" emerges as a reporting challenge where over-exploitation and/or falsely claiming the adoption of sustainable ESG practices for reputation and monetary gain. Of all the different aspects of corporate social responsibility, green washing is perhaps the most troubling. It causes the greatest damage to the trust of stakeholders to manage ESG communications strategy and even dismissive return value. Under the current environment, ESG investment funds has led to an increased competition reporting ESG and an inflating accuracy of ESG claim over reporting skepticism. Lax control in this area equates to trust, and the absence of a monitoring system based a reliable evident framework to substantiate claim authentication, equals diminished reporting. Diminished accuracy reporting within the context of ESG claims is, in principal, self-skewing by the criteria of the ESG report, self-reporting qualitative exercise absent robust para-external meta reporting validation.

There is no denying the need for both the meta and para monitoring of ESG reporting, both objectively and subjectively. In this regard, Artificial Intelligence has particular relevance. It can enhance the reporting and disclosure of ESG and curb the issue of green washing. There is a wealth of information in corporate records, news publications, social media, regulatory documents, and even satellite photos, that dense machine learning, NLP, and big data analytics AI can sift through for structured and unstructured data.

These skills permit the validation and the cross-verification of claims made against sourced independently real-time data regarding the discrepancies and false claims made without the need for human supervision. Take for example, the use of AI driven text which can analyze corporate documents that satellite monitoring deforestation and emissions that exceed deforestation or emissions that are ranked contrary to the company's environmental policies. AI systems further enhance the seamless independent verification, monitoring, and ESG data supplied which become more transparent, reliable and easier to cross compare. Stakeholders have greater confidence in the sustainability reporting.

Notwithstanding the attempts to achieve some degree of alignment for the ESG reporting in relation to the GRI and SASB documents and the taxonomy for sustainable activities developed by the European Union, the issue of proper verification of the reports is still unresolved. There is a suggestion within the scholarly literature that AI could be of value within the domain, however, the space focused on the application of AI in the detection and the exposing of greenwashing for improved ESG disclosure still remains largely unexplored. This remains a key area of knowledge the current research strives to address. The possible ways AI can enhance the reliability of ESG reports will be explored through secondary data such as academic publications, specialized works, and relevant case studies.

The purpose of this research is to examine the twofold function of AI in strengthening ESG disclosures and reducing the adverse effects of greenwashing. It seeks to identify the gaps in ESG reports which facilitate greenwashing and the ways AI can bridge those gaps concerning data accuracy, transparency, and reliable reporting. This involves assessing the impact of AI-driven ESG surveillance on corporations, regulators, and investors, and the pros and cons of incorporating AI into sustainability reporting systems. Addressing these issues enhances the understanding of the intersection between technology and sustainable governance, while offering practical measures to tackle the broader concerns of responsibility in corporate sustainability efforts.

The uniqueness, and thus significance, of this research is derived from its potential impact on policy, regulation, and practice related to the field of sustainability. The research furthers the understanding of how internal corporate AI systems could assist in augmenting the internal ESG reporting as well as reputation risk management pertaining to greenwashing. From a regulatory perspective the research identifies the gaps in the monitoring and reporting of compliance with the sustainable technology in the compliance and reporting framework. This research treats investors and other stakeholders as instruments to aid in the demarcation of authentic and dubious sustainability claims to improve the overall ESG disclosure decision-making framework. This research situates artificial intelligence at the core of ESG disclosures and greenwashing, and in doing so, highlights the ready lack of advanced technology which makes sustainability communication devoid of action, and thus, operationally unreliable.

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages 4369-4374

2.Literature Review

The ESG disclosures and the following examination of the disclosures which are distinct policy and research and research across multiple domains interactive datasets of ESG policy on the global accountability of businesses were not the first. Many researchers in non-financials reporting contention the reporting as voluntary and unstructured. Companies tend to report 'good' and 'bad' news so that it is reputation favorable' (Cheng, Ioannou, and Serafeim 2025). At the same time, their actions were aligned to the early days of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the GRI and Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) and the Task force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and other initiatives aimed at the integration of non-financial reporting. While these measures enhanced the structuring of ESG reporting, they were insufficient to address the EU's 2022 ESG reporting cross-border regulatory and cross industry ESG reporting comparability and reliability deficiencies.

The issue of 'greenwashing' is one of the foremost, if not the foremost, barriers to research and the study of ESG. In their piece, Lee and Xu (2023) explain that 'greenwashing' means both the overstating of actions and the downright lying about actions that help sustain a certain level of sustainability.

The intangibly verifiable claims, as well as the selective disclosures and omissions, are the signs of greenwashing. The greenwashing phenomenon, by and large, undermines the ESG rating frameworks and the analytical value thereof, as well as the investors who need to make sense of such disclosures (Wang & Li, 2025). Accordingly, the primary structural driver of this greenwashing practice disconnects with the discretionary ESG greenwashing of the sustainability self-reported and self-assessed frameworks, which PwC (2024) describes as weak ESG reporting standards. Finally, KPMG (2023) insufficient verification process problem between evidence of assurance and review attests to the concrete transformative value. Such is the value of these insights reinforced with the theory.

Per the stakeholder theory, a corporation owes the submission of ESG disclosures as a form of responsibility to a broader range of constituents apart from shareholders, such as employees, the general public, as well as the state (Freeman, 1984). Legitimacy theory suggests that a business entity partially relinquishes control over itself to a particular country in return for a social contract by practicing ESG reporting to avoid losing legitimacy and the capacity to operate (Suchman, 1995). From signaling perspective, the burden is on the frameworks. It is the outcome of deliberate actions by such frameworks where firm strategies determine the deliberate communication of outstanding responsibility to self differentiate from peers (Spence, 2002).

Simultaneously, the reputational damages that arise from such disclosures can serve as a strong counterproductive motivation for firms to engage in symbolic reporting, or what Lee and Xu (2023) refer to as "green washing," which aims to perpetuate the illusion of responsibility for the environmental damages without actually taking meaningful actions to reduce such harm.

New developments within artificial intelligence(AI) technology, especially within the corporate sphere focused on governance and sustainability reporting, are beginning to help with addressing some of these challenges. Advanced AI technologies, especially machine learning and natural language processing(NLP), are capable of offering insight into complex and Elated ESG data(KPMG 2024). For instance, Lee and Xu (2023) discuss the application of NLP on sustainability reports to search for vague language or exaggeration not supported by external databases. Also, some machine learning models are capable of monitoring and assessing emission, supply chain, and energy data to ascertain the validity of company claims. There are also other models of increased value and enhanced accountability, such as AI-based external verification unsupervised adjoined with satellite data on land & emission verification, that can corroborate and debunk corporate assertions(PwC 2024).

In the context of the reputational value of an organization, company, or other legal entity as a social construct that is appreciated by other social entities, the value of constant monitoring and close assessment of what the client and competing businesses are doing becomes a matter of strategic posture.

The use of these technologies provide public analysis on public sentiment relating to the scope and nuances of brand claims and corporate 'sustainables' policies with a remarkable degree of timeliness and precision. All these achievements, together, attests to the 'mechanical' AI technology capabilities in 'assurances' of public narratives of the corporations vis a vis the public 'assurances' offered to stakeholders on self-reported ESG skepticism of the corporations. There exists, even in the fiction literature, an element of skepticism and a great many questions concerning the dismal realities of the situation. One cannot deny the unsettling ethical context that seems to be at the heart of the deployment of advanced technologies and the almost paranoid suspicion of algorithm and mechanical biases with more insidious designs these ever more sophisticated tools. The Advanced AI phenomena, in this case, is inherently suspicious when there are no sophisticated frameworks of critical thinking and computerized sentience. As any other social constituent in the market, corporations also take advantage of exorbitant volumes of data, more importantly, cherry-picked data that fits their preconceived notions.

This is to say that the firm is an unmatched source of AI 'understanding' of a fictional narrative, the output is more thoughtless reflex.

Academics have unreasonably accepted the claim that advanced corporations would deploy the latest artificial intelligence systems and technologies seamlessly without any reflection. Smaller corporations which are resource constrained will continue to muddle around the doubts regarding their inability to meet the minimum relevant ESG standards.

Furthermore, the structural complexity of AI systems, especially opacity, could sabotage the efforts of some ESG stakeholders to appraise the AI's trustworthiness in performing ESG assessments Cheng et al., 2023). This is still more complex because of the AI systems policy milieu. Within the EU, for example, the CSRD magically has some AI systems tasked with ensuring the streamlining, standardization, and verifiable disclosure of relevant data, which is not the case in the United States where the ESG reporting is still quite piecemeal (European Commission, 2022). Due to the growing interest of investors in green washing, the SEC has also recently introduced some disclosure rules.

As for Asia, Singapore and Japan are formulating their own styles of sustainability legislation, suggesting that, in contrast with the rest of the word, the region is heterogeneous and the gaps in the region could be filled with AI (Wang & Li, 2023). Whistle while Regulatory scholars recognized the AI's potential for monitoring and enforcement, reinforced the need for the governing frameworks to be strengthened in the use of such technology (KPMG, 2023). One of the emerging research fields investigates the effects of AI-driven ESG data validation on investors and the financial market, whereas there is a burgeoning research focusing on the impacts of AI in validating ESG compliance on investors and the financial market.Investors depend on ESG ratings from third party providers regardless of the fact that most of these ratings are poorly constructed and opaque (PwC, 2024). AI systems speed up and automate the ESG Assess Assess Assess ESG evaluations by Obtaining and Processing live data from KPMG (2024). This enables further "differentiation relative to competition" which could lead to the reallocation of capital from certain investors to corporate ESG leaders as opposed to ESG report "tick-boxers" (Wang and Li, 2025). AI and ML technologies, as noted by Wang and Li (2024), are capable of re-aligning ESG investments and deploying investment discipline to the market so as to improve the capacities ecosystem to sustain global sustainability performance. Still, there are some scholars who warn about the AI or "new" technological risk of green washing. "Virtue signaling" can be, for instance, ESG "tools" which are poorly designed and implemented as reporting operational mechanisms (Lee and Xu, 2023). AI generated ESG dashboards may depict a company's ESG score for a period of time, but it is disengaged from the reality of stagnation in the active engagement of the company's practices.

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages 4369-4374

These examples illuminate the need to understand the system of AI outcomes from both perspectives—reason for integration versus objectives. Overall, as the literature presents, the intricacies of the two-sided account are inescapable.

First, the transformation impact of AI on the accuracy, transparency, and comparability of ESG disclosures and the level of green washing is potentially profound. Second, the scholarly work touches on the governance and ethical AI deficiencies which are, in disregarding these, AI poured over. The duality of the boundary problem demonstrates the need for interdisciplinary conceptualizations of AI that go beyond its technological boundaries, for instance, stakeholder theory, legitimacy theory, signal theory, and far beyond the technological and toolbox boundaries of AI. This paper sets out to fill the gap in the literature through the lens of a punctuated equilibrium approach, which focuses on the potential of AI to improve ESG disclosure and mitigate green washing in a manner that is ethically responsible.

3.Findings and Thematic Analysis

The secondary research demonstrated the manner AI can improve the process of ESG disclosure and the green washing problem by means of five successive themes. These themes pertain to the transparency of disclosure, detection of green washing, auditing and assurance, new ethical and regulatory frontiers, and new boundaries in sustainable finance. Also important is the augmented AI is corporate accountability and sustainable finance. Achieving such goals, however, requires a governance framework that deals with the risks related to AI and the technologies that are adjacent to it.

3.1 AI and the Enhancement of Transparency in ESG Disclosure : The remarkable level of advancements in administration alongside the practice of ESG disclosure is a lot easier to recognize than the duration of the global pandemic, for which there has been a significant lag. The saying, “the absence of transparency is the absence of trust,” holds a lot of truth. The “green washing” claims, the pampered sustainability narrative, as well as the hypocrisy of the Emissions Trading Schemes (ETS), is still fresh (Gonzalez, 2021). NLP programs, alongside AI, the analytics of big data, and machine learning, among others, provide limitless solutions to the ESL conundrum (Adams, 2021).

The relevant AI functions address the problem of examining unstructured corporate disclosures. AI systems has the capacity to determine the presence and use of vague and aspirational language in annual reports, sustainability rhetoric, and press statements through the application of artificial intelligence and machine learning. Companies claim “we aim to reduce emissions” or “we are committed to diversity” yet do not provide specific measurable indicators or timeframes to evaluate progress or success. Such claims provide the illusion of a more substantive than symbolic commitment to the issue. AI does deepens the ambiguity in the language used to vary the visibility of progress and fictitious progress to stakeholders. In addition, AI streamlines the integration of new data and enhances the accuracy of cross-checking corporate disclosures with other independent sources, facilitating accuracy with the compilation of corporate disclosures.

The mismatches in the self-reported emissions can easily be validated though satellite images, publicly available emissions data, the government reports and even various third-party databases. This method of cross validation minimizes the self-report inaccuracies on emissions and yields a more nuanced and balanced understanding of the corporate reality. The ability to monitor and access data in real time, without traditional time lags is yet another unique transformative feature of AI. Unlike traditional systems which mechanistically and on a period basis, annually or biannually, report on the emissions of goods and services, AI systems can report on the emissions, energy and labor inputs in the production of the goods and services, and monitor the entire system on a real time basis.

Research shows that if government, investors and citizen are to be brought to the fold, deep engagement and complete transparency are key. The public is able to “monitor the fulfillment of the promises organizations make to them” (Freeman, 1984; Donaldson, Preston 1995). There is Also the AI directed Interweaving of the data Shift the Post fencing the Activities of Building the corporation’s Argument for the So-Called License to Operate and the Accompanying Suchman (1995) Wildfire. The Reports Documents of Transparency as the First and Still the Only of Its Kind of Self-Correcting Mechanism. AI “bestows” Obligation Reporting Policies With Greater Proposals That Coordinates Greater Alignment with The Outcomes." AI goes beyond monitoring socially irresponsible behavior. It changes behavior and thus fosters true rather than mere token compliance to sustainability performance.

3.2 How AI is Used to Detect and Fix Green Washing : ‘Eco-friendly’ is often mired with contradiction, as self-greenwashing, where a corporation describes itself as ‘eco-friendly’ while accumulating dubious reports detailing its pollution activities (Delmas & Burbano, 2011). This self-contradiction is the crux of the substantive issues self-assessed compliance with the ESG framework. There is autopilot narrative generation from ESG report templates reasoning that explains why the generated reports do not yield plausible reports. As more companies in the twenty first century try to dissect the calculus behind misinformation, they find that tailored reports are increasingly unable to distinguish public proxies. The lack of transparency in the non-disclosure surrounds frameworks and engines of artificial intelligence, exposed by the self-fulfilling prophecies of AI applied to green washing disinformation. Metaphorically, the green washing global chessboard is built on self-claimed, and self-contradictory assertions, or, ‘ESG compliance narratives, ‘that are conjoined by ESG compliance ‘nouns and attributes.‘ These threads are illustrated as nets of intricate choke points, ARIMA mathematical constructs that animate as nets within nets, ARIMA filters that discriminate on the basis of ESG metric plausibility contradictions.

The rational choice paradigm in this case is hollow. Like pollution spill, the onus of rational procrastination is on greenwashing corporations, even where the complicity of wrongdoing is concealed. Delmas and Burbano (2011) argue that rational spenders, constrained by time, engage less, outsiders and AI integrated with the thunderous roar of fast, cheap, and accuracy automate the dim light of disinformation engines. It is epoch shifting, proven, foundational metrics and frameworks that overcome rational choice inertia. The automation of anomaly detection in machine learning is diagnostic of the zero lag of ESG metric algorithms, towards the gauntlet of disclaimed attributes. Routine criticism as a lagging indicator becomes a disqualified metric. Anonymity evaporates where the attribution of consequences of lagging becomes heroic.

Lv et al. (2023) elaborates on how these models can analyze on historical datasets to identify anomalies, such as spikes in reporting ‘key performance indicators’ with no actual processes supporting them. This can result from ‘creative’ reporting, which is the practice of over or under reporting information in order to mislead stakeholders to fabricated so-called progress.

Regarding the maintenance of a supply chain, the application of AI for the purpose of monitoring the ‘ethical sourcing’ propaganda disguised green washing practice is sophisticated. Blockchain based AI tools supply irrefutable, even irrefutable evidence of the origins of all the components. Along with IoT (Internet of Things) technologies that monitor and aggregate the movements of materials in complex supply chains, all allegations about ethical labor, carbon neutral production, and sophisticated ethical sourcing become ‘audit proof’ (Reuter & Foerstl, 2022). AI technology is capable of embedding into the system, like a spacecraft, to determine and monitor compliance throughout the supply chains. This significantly reduces the probability of deception. AI technology also helps in deterrence. The focused interest of stakeholders from outside the company motivates the company to self-correct in order to avoid deception.In this case, changing the game reflects the institutional perspective that’s normatively expected to ‘spin’ noncompliance as losing legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In this case, we expect that the institution which governs the firm will appropriately address any organizational noncompliance with the institution. AI does still assist with identifying instances of greenwashing, but it is also attempting to change the institutional context which surrounds corporate sustainability. This is a fundamental change to the framework of ESG communications and obligations.

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages 4369-4374

3.3 The Application of AI in Auditing and Assurance of ESG Data: In order to reinforce the role AI plays in ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) assurance, the assurance frameworks themselves must extend beyond the verification of corporate data and attest to the trustworthiness of the AI systems doing the verifications. Trust in the ESG disclosures relies to a growing degree on the stakeholders' trust in the algorithms and models that compute extensive and complex data sets. In the absence of validation of the AI systems and platforms, the verification process will be as easily doubtful as the sustainabilty claims it is trying to verify.

In addition, the structure of current international auditing and assurance standards (such as ISAE 3000) and forthcoming ESG-centered standards, to which the fulfillment of assurance AI applies, extend the assurance principles of accountability, transparency, and independence. This further enhances the credibility of ESG disclosures and mitigates the risk of multiple inconsistent disclosures that have long been criticized from a lack of unified methodology from various rating agencies. AI increases the uniformity and reliability of sustainability assessments by applying the same standards across many datasets. This, in turn, enhances the trustworthiness of green bonds, ESG-linked loans, and thematic funds.

A further complex aspect is the emerging demand for trust-enhancing AI assurance mechanisms systems. Unlike traditional sampling audits, ESG assurance services employ AI to validate environmental change in real-time. Breakthroughs in assurance practices include platforms that corroborate minted and satellite-attributed carbon emission records against independent, satellite-based atmospheric carbon concentration level database records. These practices reporting and evidence-based metrics driven assessments to claim robust corporate performance reporting.

The integration of AI and ESG assurance captures previously unaccounted for elements of the ESG value chain. Whereas other assurance mechanisms were constrained to cost, scope, and manual reviews, AI extends coverage to entire datasets, improves anomaly detection, and corroborates assessed claims of sustainability. Corporate disclosures are made more robust and aligned to prevailing stakeholder expectations concerning verifiable accuracy. Stakeholders are now provided assurance frameworks with AI-enhanced tools which strengthen the functionality of sustainability reporting as a tool to promote ESG performance accountability and foster a positive future.

3.4 Ethical and Regulatory Challenges of AI in ESG Disclosure: Similar to other novel technologies, even the use of AI in ESG disclosures has its advantages and disadvantages. The disadvantages take the form of ethical and governance disputes, particularly the ethics of AI and its use in providing assurance on ESG matters. Perhaps the most concerning ethical issue relates to the potential for bias in AI. AI technologies are only as good as the data on which they are trained. If the data is limited and one-sided – for example, only comprising data from the developed world – they do not acknowledge the realities of the rest of the world. ESG-Normative AI are designed for countries where there is minimal ESG uptake and could potentially produce results which reinforce the prevailing inequities within the world (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018). This negates the very purpose of ESG frameworks. Simply put, it puts the credibility of the sustainability disclosures at a greater risk.

Equally significant is the issue of privacy and confidentiality. AI works best with sensitive corporate information, such as the environmental impact, supply chain and the corporate social responsibility footprint. However, author Mittelstadt (2019) correctly points out that with no strict ethical boundaries and data governance, such access creates a myriad of vulnerabilities that can lead to data breaches, misuse, misuse, or systemic risk. Moreover, it is counterproductive to deny access to vital information, given that it weakens the ability of AI to operate as an effective assurance framework, thereby heightening the need to reinforce ESG (environmental, social and governments) responsibilities.

Another ethical issue is the phenomenon of "technological greenwashing." In this situation, corporations implement AI reporting systems as a way of showing accountability while fundamentally avoiding real sustainability challenges. In these instances, AI is used primarily for public relations, as it does not enhance the needed transparency and oversight (Christensen et al., 2021).

The use of AI in interfacing with ESG frameworks presents numerous opportunities and challenges from a regulatory outlook. The EU CSRD and SEC proposed climate disclosure rules, for example, are major advances in an increasingly harmonized approach to ESG reporting (European Commission, 2023). The application of AI to such frameworks, however, still remains a work in progress. While AI can transform compliance monitoring and reporting, regulatory AI frameworks should ensure responsible, controlled, and accountable oversight of automated systems to avoid misuse and abuse of such systems. Another regulatory problem is the problem of unequal capability of firms. Big firms with sufficient capital and advanced technology can easily implement AI-enabled ESG reporting and thus acquire a reputation that is not easily accessed by smaller firms, which are constrained by various resources. OECD (2023) argues that, in the absence of any action to address such inequalities, the ESG reporting would differ on the basis of accessibility to reporting technology, rather than genuine reporting on sustainability performance.As a result, the regulatory framework of applying AI to business functions, especially to ESG reporting, raises critical overall governance issues, and the ethical responsibility is with the humans— the corporations, the regulators, and the stakeholders—who systemically design, deploy, and manage the AI-enabled systems. The 'shadow' of AI, should ethically, only operationalize the assurance of sustainability, and never take the place of responsibility. The application of AI to ESG disclosure demonstrates the importance of the fact that innovation and the ethical (or regulatory) boundaries of its application should go together. Applied AI on assurance can, without discrimination, help tackle the issues of greenwashing, information asymmetry, and trust on corporate sustainability claims, if assured, inclusiveness and transparency are foundational.

3.5 Future Pathways: AI-Driven Sustainable Finance: The final theme pertains to what role artificial intelligence plays in the advancement of sustainable finance. Around the world, countries are integrating ESG considerations into the decision making about the allocation of capital. Friede et al. 2015 stated, "AI's ability to process different and complex datasets makes it indispensable in the sustainable finance ecosystem." In addition to traditional financial datasets, AI can assess whether the proceeds of ESG-linked financial instruments, such as green bonds or sustainability-linked loans, are being utilized to fund projects with genuine social and environmental outcomes. Artificial Intelligence makes it possible to assign personalized ESG performance ratings to investors in a more granular way. Through the application of AI, auxiliary datasets, such as satellite images, social media, and government ESG compliance reports can be synthesized with primary corporate ESG data to produce more reliable and robust assessments of corporate sustainability performance (PRI, 2022). Investors can escape the ESG compliance box-ticking ritual and more intelligently deploy their capital to a growing number of corporates with demonstrable social and environmental impact.Feroria has stated that "the credibility of eco-finance instruments, including green bonds, sustainability-linked loans, and ESG funds, could also be enhanced by AI." These instruments require verification and monitoring systems that are strong enough to confirm that the funds invested in any given project contribute favorably to the ecosystem. AI systems monitor and assess compliance with environmental and social standards, thus limiting the risk of firms misreporting and the "greenwashing" that has permeated the capital markets (World Bank, 2022). Looking ahead, scholars suggest that AI could revolutionize the dynamics of businesses, investors, and governments. AI has the power to extend the deepening of sustainability's embeddedness in the market systems by integrating Infrastructure of transparency, verification, and responsibility systems around the financial ecosystem. Such a shift would transform the financial systems to be so aligned with the development objectives that it would greatly speed up the progress towards the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including the 2030 agenda for sustainable development (UNCTAD, 2023).The value of the incorporation of technology alongside the governance surrounding its deployment is discipline-specific. Will future applications of AI just as efficiently as supervise the use of AI in sustainable finance, or nurture inequity within the system? The expanding use of AI within sustainable finance will, unchecked, likely reinforce inequality by disproportionately favoring large, technologically-advanced corporations and neglecting small and medium size enterprises.

3.6 Discussion

Research has shown how essential artificial intelligence technology is in enhancing the accuracy and reliability of AI technologies and in detecting and correcting abuse of ESG disclosures as a form of greenwashing. These conclusions must still be viewed in relation to the governance of sustainable development, the accountability of the corporations, and the widespread integration of the new technologies. There are, in this regard, three rather important discussions about the disclosures of AI within the ESG framework, the methodologies of greenwashing abuse and the governance and ethics of AI technology in relation to ESG, and the employing and abusing of ESG AI systems.

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages 4369-4374

The body of knowledge has to be contested in regard to the theory of artificial intelligence and the discourse on ESG disclosures within the frameworks of artificial intelligence and institutionalism. This theory is concerned about how an organization becomes accepted in the social fabric and the routinization of this process in the compliance to a set of rules and regulations. ESG reporting is one of the reporting vehicles a corporation can use in order to demonstrate its compliance to the social and environmental obligations of conducting business.But the increasing prevalence of greenwashing is a much narrower form of decoupling, which is described as the act of practicing some form of sustainable actions without making any real changes to the underlying core of the business.Through this means of advanced technology, AI, in this case, is unique in its ability to reduce the disruption in the gap between symbolic disclosure and performance, and in this case, ESG performance. AI systems that verify claims on ESG compliance with external independent datasets, particularly satellite and media-derived imagery, tighten the noose on the capacity of organizations to practice symbolic compliance or what is oftentimes referred to as 'reporting for compliance.' This is a case in which AI not only increases the transparency of reports, but also restructures the relationship between transparency of organizational legitimacy and how the organization is regarded. It becomes more difficult for organizations to provide loosely coupled, symbolic adherence to ESG frameworks. The use of stakeholder theory widens the impact of AI in this particular instance. AI serves to tighten the noose on peripheral accountability by collecting and improving the cross-sectional accessibility and cross organizational variability of sustainability data.

Civil society and investment stakeholders access data with the ESG AI analytic for reasoned investment, while regulators with ESG analytics for compliance. Critical civil society organizations also 'gate-keep' through AI analytics to monitor and hold corporations accountable. Contrary to other researchers, this analysis demonstrates the use of AI as a technical tool. Instead, it is a mode of governance that restructures the power dynamics between stakeholders. For years, Corporations had almost a monopoly on hosting and cross-referenced public knowledge that was freely accessible. Thanks to Artificial Intelligence, governance is shifting towards a more pluralistic approach whereby numerous actors can access, interpret, and contest ESG assertions. This is a governance model change that is further aligned with the shifting governance towards more integrated participatory systems wherein all actors have some threshold of sustainable responsibility and transparency.

There are still a number of unresolved questions with respect to the application of Artificial Intelligence to the problems of the ESG disclosure systems. One problem that consistently reoccurs is the opacity and the possible biases that exist in the algorithms constituting the Artificial Intelligence. The socio-technical systems theory tackles this paradox by attempting to focus on the interrelationship between the development of technology, society, and social structures. AI is not a passive instrument, but rather, it is influenced by the socio-technical paradigms, theories, goals, and the dataset of the stakeholders and users. In the presence of the biased data vacuum regarding the ESG assessment, a systemic bias is guaranteed to be embedded.While there is a disclosure infrastructure deficit at all levels within companies' in emerging economies, companies that are infrastructure viable will derive a relative advantage economically. Practices at the local level that are economically sustainable can ignore the problem in question. After all, the question of fairness, equity, and inclusion is even more visible in the area of AI-based assessments.

The other asymmetries the Algorithmic bias and opacity are likely to lead to other gaps in which Stakeholders do not take into account the constituent parts of the evaluation and scoring frameworks of ESG. This is the exact situation that the ESG systems try to resolve with the transparency of disclosure. It can be sustained that in this instance the AI system augments certain aspects of the accountability or in the alternative those aspects are gaps. It is in the absence of robust governance and transparency that such gaps are further pronounced.

The finding that there are limits that the emergence of AI technologies places on the financialization of sustainability is also rather telling. The application of AI technology in the analysis of ESG has AI owing to the inflow of capital into the fintech sector. Thus, many investors are using AI technologies to tackle more complex and sophisticated investment opportunities. This, AI integration in meeting the investment sides and bottom, triple bottom line, social and environmental bottom lines, has greatly simplified the investment process. This ties in well with the overall growth trend in capital, technological supply and investment, which is underpinned by the supply side. With that being said, this does raise two very important issues. First, the investment in enterprises, and with AI technology, is almost wholly tethered to machine learning and predictive analytics. This very much frames a commodification model to financing sustainable ventures. The second, and much more concerning, is that finance in itself is so deep in its parameters, that it forgets the goal, the as of yet answered question which is the sustainable criterion? The qualitative sides seems to be missing, the strengthening of the local community and local culture, which is the most important argument, is so interred that is practically buried, because it in unquantifiable. The answer to this paradox is what I have termed the balance approach, which enables the working with qualitative assessments so that the sustainable finance in which the ESG investment is cross border amalgamated, is actually embraced by the country.

A separate and certainly related problem rests with the legal and ethical implications of the use of AI in the ESG report automation process.Research shows that AI can meaningfully aid the mitigation of greenwashing through deploying greenwashing AI, but only under a strict legal regime. The international legal regime governing ESG reporting is a patchwork quilt of various domains with conflicting rules, even within a single country, anomalous in the case of the EU with the CSRD's stringent disclosure obligations. They run headlong into the thin obligations of disclosure in the rest of the world. This incoherent patchwork legal regime constitutes a severe constraint on AI's functionality, as the same corporations operate in multiple jurisdictions with different, arbitrary, and discordant legal systems. On the other hand, the extent to which AI is ethically deployed in ESG compliance monitoring is restrained by worrying substandards of ethical compliance, particularly relating to control, surveillance, privacy, and consent in the supply chains that hold the greatest potential of human rights violations due to overarching surveillance systems.Policymakers and legislators need to fill this gap by establishing reporting frameworks that address the core legal tenets of democracy, balance, and fairness, thereby upholding the principles of Social Justice and Responsible AI, particularly in the context of Regulated Democracy. Having a balance in the policies should assist regulators and policymakers in tackling the issue of Social Justice and Equity within the Social pillars of responsible Democracy. There is a relationship with "nexus" and "collaboration" that advocates the integration of technology with governance and with the practitioners of sustainability. The use of AI to assist with the disclosure of ESG policies and activities is part of the social, environmental, and ethical issues and needs to be designed. There is a need for social and technical integration of the AI. The involvement of civil society organisations in the design of AI auditing systems would socialise the consideration of the relevant local context and stakeholders' perspectives in the sustainability assessment to be done. There is a gap that needs to be filled by joint efforts of policymakers and technology practitioners to enhance synergy and reduce likelihood of conflicting and discordant ESG assessments. Evidence points to a future with participatory oversight eco-governance frameworks for AI relevant to ESG disclosure as integration with technology. There is still an available gap that these pieces of evidence attempt to fill which is within the domain that concerns technology for sustainable development. The rapid development of digital technologies, in particular AI, is viewed with optimism by some as a potential catalyst for change within sustainability systems. Concerns on the other hand, have been made with regard to technological determinism and the supremacy of technology within the social and structural frameworks that exist.This work is based on the latter conclusion and contends that while the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to promote corporate transparency and accountability is a positive step, it scarcely scratches the surface of the causes of the greenwashing problem such as an overly short-term view and the weak enforcement of sustainability regulations. AI, therefore, is an additional tool that must be placed within the context of wider governance arrangements for sustainability. It is an add-on, not a replacement, as an instrument of governance on the advocacy for and the shifting paradigm of corporate social responsibility (CSR).

Conclusion and Implications

Integrating the artificial intelligence tools into the very essence of ESG disclosures and the issue of green washing: the character of AI disclosing ESG Assistive with Green washing Paradoxes. In the case of the Assistive Green washing Paradoxes of sophistication, the issue is the ESG paradox of sophisticated green washing. The sophisticated Assistive Green washing paradox has a paradox of assistive green washing.

The outcome outlines impacts of AI on ESG disclosure. First, AI prime aids in amalgamating data sets on disparate standards within ESG reporting, thus increasing the data's relative worth to investors and regulators. In the second, AI defends green washing by performing real time verification of corporate claims through independent satellite, social media, and automated data mining systems. In the last instance, AI boosts the confidence on auditing and assurance with scale which is traditionally lacking in manual processes. Collectively, these contributions argue AI as a governance instrument to transform and

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, 2026, Pages 4369-4374

redistribute corporate accountability.These contributions are valuable not only to the realm of scholarship but also policy as well as commercial activities.Participants in the new research study benefit from the ongoing discussion on the debate about the new institution of sustainable disclosure, the autonomy of the transformed institution, and the evolving socio-technical systems, especially on the re-balancing of the symbolic and substantive ESG embracing. This shows the effects of AI beyond the instrumental and as structural and deeply transformation in the governance of power and sustainability. This indicates geo and sectoral intersections of analysis on the AI impact of green washing in the reporting region, along with cross regional analysis, and attempts to bridge the theoretical with the practical discourse of the AI.

The study underscores the need for the governance of cross-border collaboration on belt and road initiatives, as well as the factors of governance that AI has the potential to furnish. AI adds to the governance layer, but only to the extent that the datasets, reporting, and compliance required are of good quality and fused under unified, cross-border, and treaty-level monitoring. In the absence of alignment, the corporations face disorganized compliance burdens, while the stakeholders are inevitably confronted with conflicting assessments about the same entity.

Policymakers have a responsibility to integrate the global converged ESG reporting framework with effective mechanisms for the governing AI used for sustainability reporting. Dominant policy frameworks should exclude algorithmic inclusion and algorithmic opacity to minimize the risk of developing systemic biases counter to the organization's ESG objectives. In this case, the lack of transparency and accountability oversight on ai's oversight on sustainability reporting is what ai reporting seeks to resolve. Executive leaders have serious issues of their own. Businesses that perpetuate the simplistic communication of ESG do so at great risk to unrecognized stakeholder access to AI proofing tools. The reputation damage, legal penalties, and funding withdrawal due to such overt acts of digital green washing is staggering. Businesses that take on the integration of AI powered sustainability analytic in their reports position themselves to gain stakeholder trust due to responsible ESG practices. They are also well positioned to take advantage of changes in the regulatory landscape.The same goes for value chain decision makers who have chosen the technologically compelled route of 'switching on' AI. The 'whys' of data privacy, unchecked biases, exclusion, and discrimination in their value chains are a consideration for every value chain actor. These gaps in oversight are illustrative of critical gaps in thinking that need to be filled. The contextual nuances of the complexities practitioners face when employing AI in ESG reporting are absent without primary data. Thematic Analysis, in this case, is not without its subjective considerations. The future of this line of research may come from the addition of more case studies and interviews to its bulk of evidence, alongside other 'mixed-method' methodologies that are more integrative. Longitudinal research may focus on the use of AI technology in ESG disclosure in tandem to evolving ESG Frameworks, the AI technology being integrated and the surrounding market innovation and regulation that is on the rise in this domain. Having these in mind, future research into this area is best anchored on three foundational pillars. The first is the incorporation of AI in unique disclosure frameworks, the emphasis being on the double materiality framework that considers the financial performance and the wider socio-ecological consequences of corporate activities.The methods AI will employ to practically realize and embody such nuanced concepts in reporting need to be established. AI's fragmentation from sustainable finance, especially the architecture of decision making systems, and the potential biases of the capital provisioning system, also need considerable attention. Finally, the socio-political domain of AI, in this case, focusing on the trimmed down issues of ESG disclosure, surveillance, personal autonomy of the workers, and over socio-technical dependence on automation, still needs exposure. Such an inquiry will respond to the theoretical neglect of the field while providing concrete avenues for advocacy on sustainability concerning the responsible use of AI to the policy and practice contours constituents. The study claims that and the ability of AI to enhance the disclosure of ESG and to diminish green washing is nothing short of remarkable. The opportunity to transform transparency, accountability, and governance sophistication of sustainability is equally broad. This potential, however, needs to be emphasized with caution that it is neither guaranteed nor uncomplicated. This potential is yet to be achieved with the passage of time on ethical dilemmas, more governance with better inclusion on design and implementation of AI systems. AI systems used in conjunction with ESG should be viewed through the lens of progress on the socio-technical integration of systems above a singular point technology integration. This integration would require a broad range of stakeholders and disciplines and even span multiple legal boundaries. Only to the extent that such integration is embraced would AI systems sustain the value creation fight where ESG disclosures, in the realm of compliance, would institutionalize the standard in the 21st century business environment."

References

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

European Commission. (2022). *Directive (EU) 2022/2464 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 December 2022 on corporate sustainability reporting (CSRD)*. *Official Journal of the European Union*. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2022/2464/oj

PwC. (2024). *Peril and promise of AI for ESG*. PwC. https://www.pwc.nl/nl/actueel-publicaties/assets/pdfs/peril-and-promise-of-ai-for-esg-2024.pdf

KPMG. (2024). *ESG in the age of AI: AI and ESG are reshaping the world around us* [PDF]. KPMG. https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmgsites/in/pdf/2024/08/esg-in-the-age-of-ai.pdf

KPMG. (2023). *Global survey of sustainability reporting 2022* [PDF]. KPMG. https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/se/pdf/komm/2022/Global-Survey-of-Sustainability-Reporting-2022.pdf

KPMG. (2024). *All eyes on: Tech-enabled ESG assurance*. KPMG. https://kpmg.com/xx/en/our-insights/ai-and-technology/all-eyes-on-tech-enabled-esg-assurance.html

Lee, C., & Xu, L. (2023). Greenwashing, sustainability reporting, and artificial intelligence: A bibliometric and thematic analysis. *Sustainability, 15*(2), 1481. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021481

Cheng, B., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2025). Green public procurement and corporate ESG information disclosure: Implications from institutional theory. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2025.2539342

Authors, M. D. P. I. (2023). Exploring stakeholder and organizational influences on ESG reporting: A theoretical model grounded in stakeholder theory and resource-based view. *Sustainability, 17*(9), 4243. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17094243

Wang, J., & Li, X. (2025). AI implementation and corporate ESG performance: Evidence from listed firms. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/16081625.2025.2473334

Li, N., Kim, M., Dai, J., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in ESG assurance. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting, 21*(2), 83–99. https://doi.org/10.2308/JETA-2022-054

Li, D., Zhang, Z., & Gao, X. (2024). Does artificial intelligence deter greenwashing? *Finance Research Letters, 67,* 105954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2024.105954

Moodaley, W., & Telukdarie, A. (2023). Greenwashing, sustainability reporting, and artificial intelligence: A systematic literature review. *Sustainability, 15*(2), 1481. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021481

Segaran, B. R., Mohd Rum, S. N., Ninggal, M. I. H., et al. (2025). Efficient ML technique in blockchain-based solution in carbon credit for mitigating greenwashing. *Discover Sustainability, 6,* 281. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-01044-9

Minkkinen, M., Niukkanen, A., & Mäntymäki, M. (2024). What about investors? ESG analyses as tools for ethics-based AI auditing. *AI & Society, 39,* 329–343. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01415-0

Zou, Y., Shi, M., Chen, Z., et al. (2023). ESGReveal: An LLM-based approach for extracting structured data from ESG reports. *arXiv Preprint.* https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.17264

Lam, K., Lange, B., Blili-Hamelin, B., et al. (2024). A framework for assurance audits of algorithmic systems. *arXiv Preprint.* https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.14908

Mokander, J., & Floridi, L. (2024). Operationalising AI governance through ethics-based auditing: An industry case study. *arXiv Preprint.* https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.06232

Zhang, A., Cojoianu, T., Hoepner, A., & Ifrim, G. (2023). Towards greenwashing detection: A deep learning-based mechanism for greenwashing identification. *DSSGx Warwick Project Report.* https://anhzhang1994.github.io/project/greenwashing

Zhang, Y., Cojoianu, T., Hoepner, A., & Ifrim, G. (2020). Greenwatch-shing: Using AI to detect greenwashing. *Accountancy Plus, June,* 22–23. https://researchrepository.ucd.ie/entities/publication/e5ce5a37-da74-42da-b4b5-12cbc3b0f025