EMAS: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen dan Bisnis
Volume 7 Nomor 7, Juli (2026): 844-857
E-ISSN 2774-3020
DOI: https://doi.org/10.36733/emas.v7i7.14631

DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPACT MEASUREMENT: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Edralene M. Toñacao[1], Anik Yuesti[2], Joel Arante Alve[3*]

[1]Master in Business Administration, University of Negros Occidental – Recoletos, Negros Occidental, Philippines
[2]Unversitas Mahasraswati Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia
[3]University of Negros Occidental – Recoletos, Negros Occidental, Philippines
*correspondence: joelalvoar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Digital transformation is reshaping how firms define, capture, verify, and communicate the social and environmental consequences of corporate activity. This integrative literature review examines how digital technologies influence corporate social responsibility impact measurement and distinguishes such measurement from sustainability disclosure and ESG ratings. The synthesis identifies five interdependent dimensions: strategic intent and materiality, digital data infrastructure, analytics and traceability, measurement and reporting design, and governance with stakeholder feedback. Artificial intelligence, big data analytics, Internet of Things sensors, blockchain, cloud platforms, and machine-readable taxonomies can improve timeliness, granularity, traceability, and comparability. However, digitalization alone cannot establish causal impact, ensure data quality, prevent greenwashing, or eliminate ESG rating divergence. Effective measurement requires theories of change, outcome-oriented indicators, interoperability, assurance, privacy protection, responsible artificial intelligence, and stakeholder participation. The review proposes an integrative framework and five-level maturity model, with particular relevance to emerging economies, the Philippines, and other digitally developing contexts worldwide.

Keywords: digital transformation, corporate social responsibility, literature review

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has become a strategic and organizational phenomenon rather than a narrow program of information-technology adoption. It involves the use of digital technologies to trigger changes in value creation, organizational structures, business processes, capabilities, and relationships with stakeholders (Reis et al., 2018; Vial, 2019; Kraus et al., 2022). Early literature reviews and roadmaps emphasized that digital transformation requires coordinated changes in technology, strategy, processes, culture, and governance, rather than the isolated deployment of new tools (Bosilj Vukšić et al., 2018; Zaoui & Souissi, 2020). This broader understanding is particularly important for management research because the organizational value of digital technologies depends on how firms redesign decision rights, workflows, capabilities, and accountability mechanisms.

At the same time, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has evolved from a predominantly philanthropic or reputational activity toward a broader management concern involving corporate impacts on stakeholders, society, and the natural environment. Classical CSR scholarship stresses responsibilities that extend beyond economic performance and requires firms to consider legal, ethical, and discretionary expectations (Carroll, 1991). Stakeholder theory further directs managerial attention to groups affected by corporate decisions, while legitimacy and institutional perspectives explain why firms respond to societal expectations, regulatory pressures, and industry norms (Freeman, 1984; Suchman, 1995; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Contemporary

research consequently treats CSR as both a normative responsibility and a strategic system for creating, protecting, and distributing value among multiple stakeholders (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Sheth & Parvatiyar, 2022).

The convergence of digital transformation and CSR creates a central measurement problem. Organizations are increasingly able to collect large volumes of operational, behavioral, environmental, and supply-chain data, yet data abundance is not equivalent to evidence of impact. A firm may digitize its sustainability report, automate the calculation of indicators, or publish a real-time dashboard without demonstrating whether its activities caused meaningful changes in social or environmental outcomes. Social impact measurement scholarship therefore emphasizes the need to connect inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and longer-term impacts through a clear theory of change, while combining quantitative evidence with stakeholder knowledge and qualitative interpretation (Feor et al., 2023).

This distinction is especially important because CSR reporting, ESG ratings, and impact measurement serve different purposes. Sustainability reporting communicates organizational impacts and sustainability-related information; ESG ratings typically aggregate selected indicators for evaluation by investors or other users; impact measurement seeks evidence of change attributable, or at least plausibly linked, to organizational activities. These domains overlap, but they are not interchangeable. The well-documented divergence of ESG ratings demonstrates that more data does not automatically create comparability: differences in measurement, scope, and weighting can produce substantially different assessments of the same firm (Berg et al., 2022).

Digital technologies can nevertheless strengthen impact measurement when they are embedded in sound governance and measurement architecture. Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning can detect patterns and support predictive analysis; big data analytics can integrate heterogeneous information; Internet of Things (IoT) sensors can generate high-frequency environmental and operational data; blockchain can strengthen traceability and record integrity in selected settings; cloud platforms can support cross-unit integration; and machine-readable taxonomies can improve interoperability and automated processing. Recent reviews show growing interaction among AI, machine learning, cloud computing, blockchain, iXBRL, and corporate sustainability reporting, while also identifying unresolved questions regarding data quality, assurance, ethics, privacy, and organizational readiness (Atanasov et al., 2023; Hyk et al., 2026).

The management challenge, therefore, is not simply whether digital transformation improves CSR, but through which mechanisms digital capabilities can improve the credibility, timeliness, and decision usefulness of CSR impact measurement; which risks can weaken measurement validity; and under what contextual conditions those mechanisms operate. This review addresses four research questions: (1) through what mechanisms does digital transformation influence CSR impact measurement; (2) which digital technologies contribute to data quality, timeliness, traceability, comparability, and stakeholder engagement; (3) what governance risks and boundary conditions constrain technology-enabled impact measurement; and (4) what research and managerial agenda is most relevant to emerging economies, including the Philippines. The article contributes in three ways. First, it integrates digital transformation, CSR, ESG, sustainability reporting, social impact measurement, and corporate digital responsibility into one analytical framework. Second, it identifies the conditions under which digital technologies improve evidence quality rather than merely accelerating disclosure. Third, it proposes a five-level maturity model that helps organizations progress from narrative reporting toward verified, interoperable, and learning-oriented impact management. The analysis is designed to support scholars, managers, regulators, and practitioners seeking a more rigorous basis for technology-enabled CSR measurement.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Digital Transformation as Organizational Change

Digital transformation refers to organizational change induced by the pervasive use and combination of digital technologies. Vial (2019) conceptualizes it as a process in which digital technologies create disruptions that trigger strategic responses and structural changes, with both positive and negative organizational outcomes. Kraus et al. (2022) similarly show that research on digital transformation spans strategy, business models, operations, entrepreneurship, innovation, and organizational change. Consequently, the unit of analysis should not be the technology alone but the socio-technical system in which technology, people, routines, capabilities, incentives, and governance interact.

For CSR impact measurement, this distinction has direct consequences. A dashboard does not improve accountability if source data are incomplete; an AI model does not improve decision quality if indicators are poorly defined; a blockchain ledger cannot validate whether the original observation was true; and digital reporting cannot substitute for stakeholder participation or independent assurance. The value of technology therefore emerges from complementary organizational capabilities, including data stewardship, cross-functional coordination, domain expertise, ethical governance, and the capacity to translate measurement results into managerial action (Pappas et al., 2023).

Digital transformation is also heterogeneous. Firms differ in legacy systems, data architecture, managerial capabilities, access to digital infrastructure, regulatory exposure, and stakeholder expectations. Such heterogeneity explains why similar technologies can produce different CSR outcomes across sectors and countries. Empirical studies reporting positive effects of digital transformation on innovation, CSR, or ESG performance should therefore be interpreted as context-specific evidence rather than universal causal laws (Lei & Yan, 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024).

Corporate Social Responsibility, ESG, and Sustainability Reporting

CSR encompasses organizational responsibilities for the consequences of business activity and for the legitimate interests of stakeholders beyond shareholders. Carroll's (1991) framework remains influential in distinguishing economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities. More recent management scholarship emphasizes that CSR is implemented through organizational policies, processes, routines, and relationships that influence stakeholder outcomes (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012). From a normative perspective, socially responsible management also concerns how duties, actions, and human well-being are aligned in markets and institutions (Sheth & Parvatiyar, 2022).

ESG and sustainability reporting are adjacent but distinct. ESG metrics commonly translate selected environmental, social, and governance characteristics into information for investors, lenders, regulators, and other users. Sustainability reporting communicates how an organization affects the economy, environment, and people and, depending on the reporting framework, how sustainability-related risks and opportunities affect enterprise prospects. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) focuses on organizational impacts, whereas IFRS S1 and IFRS S2 provide an investor-oriented baseline for sustainability-related financial disclosures. These approaches can be complementary, but they should not be conflated with direct evidence that a specific corporate intervention created a social or environmental outcome.

The distinction matters because organizations can perform strongly on disclosure quality while having weak outcome evidence, or they can create meaningful local impacts that are not fully captured by standardized ESG scores. Ergen Keleş et al. (2022) demonstrate the importance of CSR information for capital-market interpretation, while Chehimi and Naro (2024) show how sustainability-oriented balanced scorecards can support strategic alignment. These strands reinforce the need to connect disclosure and performance

management without assuming that communication, scoring, and impact are the same phenomenon.

Impact Measurement: From Outputs to Outcomes and Impacts

Impact measurement seeks to determine whether, how, and for whom meaningful change occurred. A useful measurement architecture distinguishes inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. Inputs are resources committed; activities are interventions performed; outputs are immediate deliverables; outcomes are changes in behavior, capability, condition, or system performance; and impacts are longer-term or broader changes to which the intervention contributes. The practical implication is that counting activities or beneficiaries does not, by itself, demonstrate social or environmental impact.

Feor et al. (2023) identify theory of change as a central component of robust social impact measurement and emphasize stakeholder engagement, measurement capacity, the mobilization of operational data, and the combined use of quantitative and qualitative evidence. Technology can support each of these elements, but the causal logic must precede automation. When organizations automate poorly chosen proxies, the result can be faster production of invalid evidence rather than better measurement.

Impact measurement also requires decisions about materiality, baselines, targets, counterfactual reasoning, attribution or contribution, time horizon, distributional effects, and unintended consequences. These design choices are managerial and ethical, not merely technical. A sophisticated digital system can increase precision in data capture while still omitting groups with limited connectivity, undervaluing qualitative outcomes, or privileging what is easy to measure over what is important.

Theoretical Lenses for the Digital Transformation–CSR Relationship

No single theory adequately explains technology-enabled CSR impact measurement. This review therefore uses a complementary set of theoretical lenses. Stakeholder theory explains why organizations must identify affected groups, understand heterogeneous interests, and incorporate stakeholder voice into materiality and measurement decisions (Freeman, 1984). Legitimacy theory explains why firms seek alignment between corporate actions and societal expectations and why reporting credibility matters for maintaining social acceptance (Suchman, 1995). Institutional theory explains convergence and variation in reporting practices through coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures from regulators, professions, investors, competitors, and standard setters (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

A dynamic-capabilities perspective adds an internal managerial explanation: organizations need the ability to sense relevant technological and stakeholder changes, seize opportunities through resource allocation and process redesign, and reconfigure routines and data architecture. A socio-technical perspective highlights interdependence among technologies, people, workflows, incentives, and institutional contexts. Finally, corporate digital responsibility (CDR) extends CSR into the digital domain by focusing on the ethical and societal implications of digital technology and data throughout their lifecycle (Lobschat et al., 2021; Carl & Hinz, 2024).

Together, these lenses suggest that technology-enabled impact measurement is credible only when strategic intent, stakeholder materiality, digital capability, measurement design, governance, and institutional context are aligned. Huang and Shen (2024) further indicate that digital transformation and CSR may reinforce one another bidirectionally: digital capability can strengthen CSR execution, while CSR-related legitimacy and stakeholder pressure can influence digital investment and organizational priorities.

METHODOLOGY

Review Design and Scope

This study adopts a structured integrative literature review. An integrative design is appropriate because the research question spans conceptually adjacent but methodologically diverse literatures, including digital transformation, CSR, ESG, sustainability reporting, impact measurement, social impact measurement, corporate digital responsibility, and data governance. The purpose is analytical integration rather than statistical meta-analysis.

The review was anchored in the seed literature contained in the source manuscript and expanded through targeted searches of publisher platforms, DOI-indexed scholarly records, and official sustainability standard-setting sources. The time scope prioritized publications from 2018 through June 2026 because this period captures the rapid expansion of AI, blockchain, machine-readable sustainability reporting, and responsible digital transformation. Seminal earlier sources were retained when necessary for theoretical foundations, including stakeholder, institutional, legitimacy, and CSR theory.

Search Strategy and Eligibility

Search strings combined terms such as "digital transformation" OR digitalization with "corporate social responsibility" OR CSR OR ESG OR "sustainability reporting," and with "impact measurement" OR outcomes OR metrics OR disclosure OR assurance. Additional targeted searches were conducted for "corporate digital responsibility," "AI sustainability reporting," "blockchain CSR reporting," "XBRL sustainability," "theory of change social impact measurement," and the Philippine sustainability-reporting context.

Sources were included when they directly addressed one or more of the following domains: (1) digital transformation as organizational change; (2) CSR, ESG, or sustainability reporting; (3) impact measurement or social impact measurement; (4) digital technologies used for data capture, analytics, traceability, disclosure, or assurance; (5) digital responsibility, data ethics, privacy, bias, or governance; or (6) contextual conditions relevant to emerging economies. Priority was given to peer-reviewed journal articles, systematic reviews, scholarly books, and official publications from recognized standard-setting bodies. Sources lacking identifiable bibliographic metadata or a defensible connection to the analytical themes were not used as evidence in the thematic synthesis.

To preserve the complete bibliographic record of the source manuscript without compromising the evidentiary integrity of the revised review, every original entry has been retained. References directly relevant to the analysis appear in the main reference list. Original entries that are not substantively connected to the review questions are preserved separately in Appendix A as a bibliographic audit and are not represented as evidence supporting the synthesis.

Analytical Procedure and Review Limitations

The included literature was synthesized through thematic coding. Initial codes captured technology type, data source, measurement purpose, stakeholder function, organizational capability, governance risk, institutional context, and reported outcome. The codes were then grouped into five higher-order layers: (1) strategic intent and materiality; (2) digital data infrastructure; (3) analytics and traceability; (4) measurement and reporting design; and (5) governance with stakeholder feedback. Cross-cutting themes included data quality, causality, assurance, interoperability, privacy, algorithmic bias, cybersecurity, digital inclusion, and environmental footprint.

This review does not claim exhaustive PRISMA-style coverage, nor does it claim that every potentially relevant database record was screened. Its contribution is a structured and transparent integrative synthesis grounded in the seed literature and expanded with verified scholarly and official sources. The evidence base also contains geographic and organizational imbalances. A considerable portion of firm-level empirical

research on digital transformation and ESG performance uses Chinese listed companies, which limits direct generalization to privately held firms, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), nonprofit organizations, and economies with different regulatory or technological conditions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From Digitized Disclosure to an Impact Measurement Architecture

The literature indicates a progression from digitizing existing reporting practices toward building integrated impact measurement systems. At the lowest level, organizations convert narrative or spreadsheet-based information into digital formats. At more advanced levels, operational systems feed sustainability indicators automatically, analytics identify patterns and anomalies, traceability systems link claims to source records, and machine-readable reporting improves interoperability. The decisive transition occurs when digital infrastructure is connected to an explicit outcome logic and to managerial learning rather than serving only as a faster disclosure channel.

Atanasov et al. (2023) show that digital technologies are increasingly integrated into CSR activities, while Hyk et al. (2026) identify interaction among AI, machine learning, cloud systems, blockchain, and iXBRL in sustainability reporting. These developments support a more continuous measurement architecture, but they also create new dependencies. Automated reporting can reproduce errors at scale; integrated databases can amplify privacy and cybersecurity risks; and predictive models can create false confidence when trained on biased or incomplete data.

A robust architecture therefore begins with strategic intent and materiality. Managers must identify what outcomes matter, to whom they matter, and why. The second layer is digital data infrastructure, which includes source systems, sensors, enterprise platforms, cloud environments, and data pipelines. The third layer consists of analytics and traceability mechanisms. The fourth layer translates data into indicators, theories of change, dashboards, disclosures, and assurance-ready evidence. The fifth layer comprises governance, stakeholder participation, challenge processes, and feedback that convert measurement into learning and accountability.

Technology-Specific Mechanisms for CSR Impact Measurement

Artificial intelligence and machine learning can support classification, anomaly detection, forecasting, natural-language processing, and the extraction of sustainability information from large unstructured datasets. Their strongest contribution is analytical scale. However, these systems may obscure assumptions, inherit historical bias, or encourage over-reliance on predictions. Responsible use therefore requires documented model purpose, data lineage, validation, human oversight, and mechanisms for contestability. Big data analytics integrates high-volume, high-velocity, and heterogeneous information from operations, customers, suppliers, communities, satellites, social media, and external databases. For CSR measurement, the managerial opportunity is to combine financial and nonfinancial data and detect patterns that conventional reporting cycles would miss. The risk is "garbage in, garbage out": if definitions, boundaries, or source data are weak, analytical sophistication does not create valid evidence.

IoT devices and sensors can improve frequency and granularity in domains such as energy, emissions, water, workplace safety, logistics, equipment use, and environmental conditions. These data can shorten the interval between an event and managerial response. Yet sensor calibration, device failure, maintenance, connectivity, cybersecurity, and selective coverage must be governed. A continuous stream of observations is useful only when the measurement instrument is valid and the population being observed is appropriately defined.

Blockchain and distributed ledger technologies may strengthen provenance, traceability, and tamper resistance in supply chains or multi-party reporting environments. Their appropriate use is narrow and problem-specific. An immutable record cannot guarantee that the original data entry was truthful, and distributed architecture may introduce cost, complexity, governance ambiguity, or energy use. Blockchain should therefore be evaluated against simpler database and assurance alternatives rather than adopted for symbolic value.

Cloud platforms and integrated enterprise systems support data consolidation, cross-unit access, automated controls, and scalable analytics. Their main contribution is organizational integration. However, vendor concentration, data residency, access rights, third-party risk, and lock-in require explicit governance. Machine-readable reporting taxonomies, including XBRL-based approaches, add another layer by making sustainability information easier for software to process and compare. The GRI Sustainability Taxonomy is an example of the movement toward machine-readable sustainability reporting and interoperability.

Data Quality, Causality, Comparability, and Verification

The strongest finding of this review is that digitalization improves measurement capacity more readily than measurement validity. Timeliness, granularity, and processing speed can increase without resolving whether the indicator measures the intended construct, whether the underlying intervention caused the observed outcome, or whether the data represent affected stakeholders fairly. This distinction separates technologically advanced reporting from rigorous impact measurement.

Causal claims require a defensible theory of change and an evidentiary strategy. Depending on context, that strategy may use baselines, comparison groups, interrupted time series, quasi-experimental designs, contribution analysis, stakeholder validation, or mixed methods. Not every CSR initiative permits experimental attribution, but every impact claim should specify the causal pathway, assumptions, alternative explanations, and level of confidence. Feor et al. (2023) reinforce the importance of theory of change, stakeholder engagement, operational data, and mixed evidence in social impact measurement.

Comparability is another unresolved challenge. Berg et al. (2022) demonstrate substantial divergence among ESG rating agencies and identify measurement, scope, and weighting differences as major sources of disagreement. The implication is not that ESG measurement is futile, but that digital standardization must address construct definition, organizational boundaries, normalization, materiality, and weighting. A common file format cannot compensate for fundamentally different measurement models.

Verification and assurance are therefore central. Organizations should maintain data lineage from source to reported indicator, document transformations and assumptions, define control ownership, preserve evidence for audit, and separate management estimates from directly observed measurements. Technology can support automated controls and exception reporting, but independent challenge remains important where incentives favor selective disclosure or optimistic interpretation.

Responsible Digital Transformation and Corporate Digital Responsibility

Digital technologies used to measure CSR also create their own social and environmental impacts. Data collection can intrude on privacy; algorithms can discriminate; cybersecurity failures can harm stakeholders; digitally mediated processes can exclude groups with low connectivity or literacy; and computing infrastructure consumes energy and material resources. Consequently, digital transformation cannot be treated as socially responsible merely because it supports sustainability reporting.

Lobschat et al. (2021) conceptualize corporate digital responsibility as shared values and norms guiding

organizational operations related to digital technology and data across creation, data capture, operation, decision making, impact assessment, and refinement. Carl and Hinz (2024) further systematize CDR activities in information-systems research. These perspectives are essential to CSR impact measurement because the means of measurement must themselves be governed responsibly.

A responsible digital measurement system should therefore implement privacy-by-design, purpose limitation, proportional data collection, role-based access, cybersecurity controls, documented AI governance, human oversight, bias testing, accessibility, and channels for affected stakeholders to question or correct data. Pappas et al. (2023) similarly argue for responsible digital transformation that supports a sustainable society rather than focusing narrowly on technical efficiency.

Stakeholder Engagement, Legitimacy, and the Risk of Digital Greenwashing

Digital platforms can expand stakeholder engagement by enabling real-time feedback, participatory mapping, grievance reporting, public dashboards, and two-way communication. Yet participation quality matters more than interaction volume. Organizations can collect thousands of digital responses while excluding stakeholders without reliable internet access, using biased sampling, or designing interfaces that constrain meaningful dissent. Stakeholder theory therefore requires attention to who is represented, who is missing, and how stakeholder input changes decisions.

Legitimacy theory explains why firms may use digital reporting to demonstrate conformity with societal expectations. This can strengthen accountability when claims are evidence-based, but it can also intensify digital greenwashing if organizations use polished dashboards, automated narratives, or selective visualization to create an appearance of precision without valid outcome evidence. The governance response is not less technology but stronger traceability, transparent methodology, uncertainty disclosure, stakeholder challenge, and independent assurance where appropriate.

CSR communication can influence reputation, loyalty, investor preferences, and market interpretation. Accordingly, firms have incentives to emphasize favorable information. Ergen Keleş et al. (2022) synthesize evidence on CSR news and stock performance, while Chehimi and Naro (2024) show the role of measurement systems in aligning CSR strategy. The managerial priority should be to align claims with verified evidence and to use measurement for internal learning rather than treating disclosure as the endpoint.

Empirical Evidence: Positive Associations, but Limited Generalizability

Firm-level empirical research generally reports a positive association between digital transformation and CSR- or ESG-related performance. Lei and Yan (2023) find that CSR positively moderates the relationship between digital transformation and innovation performance in a Chinese context. Wang et al. (2023) report a positive association between digital transformation and ESG responsibility performance among manufacturing companies, while Li et al. (2024) find that digital transformation is associated with improved ESG performance among Chinese listed firms. Huang and Shen (2024) further identify a bidirectional relationship between digital transformation and CSR from a legitimacy perspective.

These studies provide valuable evidence that digital capability and responsible business practices can be mutually reinforcing. However, three limitations are important. First, most measures of digital transformation are proxies derived from text, investment, patents, or digital-intensity indicators rather than direct observation of organizational transformation. Second, ESG scores are not identical to social or environmental impact. Third, much of the evidence comes from listed companies in China, where institutional conditions, data availability, capital-market incentives, and policy pressures may differ substantially from other contexts. The appropriate conclusion is therefore conditional: digital transformation can improve the informational and

organizational capabilities needed for CSR and ESG performance, but the size and direction of effects depend on organizational maturity, governance, sector, regulatory environment, stakeholder pressure, and the quality of measurement design. The literature does not justify a universal claim that adopting AI, big data, or blockchain automatically improves social or environmental outcomes.

Global, Asian, and Philippine Contexts

Globally, sustainability measurement is becoming more standardized and more machine-readable. GRI Standards provide a widely used framework for reporting impacts on the economy, environment, and people. The IFRS Foundation issued IFRS S1 and IFRS S2 in 2023 to establish a global baseline for sustainability-related financial disclosure. GRI's Sustainability Taxonomy, launched in 2025, reflects the movement toward XBRL-enabled, machine-readable reporting and improved interoperability. These developments create opportunities for automation, comparability, and digital assurance, but they do not eliminate the need to distinguish reporting from demonstrated impact.

In Asia, the pace of digital adoption is high but uneven. Large listed companies and digitally mature organizations may have integrated enterprise systems, cloud infrastructure, analytical talent, and external assurance, while SMEs and organizations in less-connected regions may rely on fragmented records and manual processes. This variation means that a single technology prescription is unlikely to be appropriate. The same digital tool can support accountability in one organization and create additional burden, exclusion, or security risk in another.

In the Philippines, the sustainability-reporting environment is becoming more formally aligned with international developments. In January 2025, the Financial and Sustainability Reporting Standards Council announced the terminology "PFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards" for locally adopted IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards. This institutional direction increases the strategic importance of data governance, interoperability, and reporting capabilities. However, technology-enabled impact measurement should be implemented proportionately, recognizing variation in firm size, infrastructure, digital literacy, sectoral exposure, and access to assurance expertise.

For Philippine organizations, the most defensible near-term priority is not to deploy every advanced technology. It is to establish reliable source data, clear indicator definitions, documented ownership, stakeholder-informed materiality, and auditable workflows. More advanced AI, sensor, blockchain, or predictive applications should be added only when the use case improves decision quality and when governance capacity is sufficient. This staged approach is especially important for SMEs, public-private initiatives, community programs, and organizations operating across regions with uneven connectivity.

An Integrative Framework and Maturity Model

The synthesis supports an integrative framework in which credible technology-enabled CSR impact measurement emerges from the interaction of five layers. Layer 1 is strategic intent and materiality: the organization defines the stakeholder problem, intended outcomes, material issues, and decision purpose. Layer 2 is digital data infrastructure: source systems, sensors, platforms, and data pipelines produce and integrate observations. Layer 3 is analytics and traceability: analytical tools process information and preserve provenance. Layer 4 is measurement and reporting design: theories of change, indicators, baselines, targets, outcome evidence, reporting standards, and assurance convert data into decision-useful evidence. Layer 5 is governance and stakeholder feedback: privacy, responsible AI, internal controls, independent challenge, grievance mechanisms, and learning loops protect legitimacy and improve adaptation.

The framework is recursive rather than linear. Stakeholder feedback can change materiality; assurance

findings can change source systems; new technologies can alter what is measurable; and evidence about outcomes can cause management to redesign strategy. The purpose of measurement is therefore not only to disclose performance but also to support adaptive management and resource allocation.

The proposed maturity model distinguishes five levels. Level 1, narrative disclosure, is dominated by periodic qualitative descriptions and manually assembled indicators. Level 2, digitized records, introduces structured data but retains fragmented systems and limited outcome logic. Level 3, integrated outcome dashboards, connects operational systems with defined indicators and theories of change. Level 4, verified and interoperable evidence, adds strong data lineage, assurance, machine-readable standards, and comparability. Level 5, adaptive impact management, uses continuous stakeholder feedback, advanced analytics where appropriate, transparent uncertainty, and governance to improve decisions in near real time. Progression should be based on evidence quality and organizational capability rather than technological novelty.

Future Research Agenda

The literature has moved beyond asking whether digital transformation and CSR are related. The next research frontier is to explain when, how, for whom, and at what cost digital technologies improve impact measurement and substantive outcomes. Six priorities are particularly important.

First, research should distinguish disclosure effects from outcome effects. Future studies should test whether digital technologies improve the validity, timeliness, and managerial use of impact evidence, rather than relying only on ESG ratings or disclosure scores as dependent variables. Longitudinal designs, quasi-experiments, mixed methods, and matched organizational comparisons would strengthen causal inference.

Second, more cross-country and cross-sector evidence is needed. The concentration of studies in Chinese listed companies should be complemented by research on SMEs, family firms, cooperatives, nonprofit organizations, public enterprises, supply-chain networks, and community-based initiatives. Comparative studies across advanced and emerging economies can identify how institutions, infrastructure, culture, and regulation moderate outcomes.

Third, researchers should investigate measurement governance as a capability. Data lineage, indicator ownership, internal controls, model governance, assurance, and stakeholder challenge are often treated as implementation details, yet they may determine whether technology creates reliable evidence. These governance mechanisms should be operationalized and tested as mediators or moderators.

Fourth, the interaction between corporate digital responsibility and CSR impact measurement deserves direct study. Research should examine privacy harms, algorithmic discrimination, digital exclusion, cybersecurity incidents, and the environmental footprint of data-intensive systems. A measurement system should not be considered responsible if its own social or environmental externalities remain invisible.

Fifth, future research should evaluate interoperability and machine-readable reporting. The growth of XBRL-based sustainability taxonomies creates opportunities to test whether structured data actually improve comparability, analytical efficiency, assurance quality, capital allocation, and stakeholder understanding, or whether differences in underlying constructs continue to dominate.

Sixth, research in the Philippines and other Southeast Asian emerging economies should develop context-sensitive capability models. Studies should examine which digital capabilities create the highest marginal improvement in measurement quality under constrained resources and how SMEs can adopt proportionate

systems. Research should also investigate whether national adoption of sustainability disclosure standards leads to substantive improvements in data quality and impact management, rather than merely increased compliance workload.

Managerial and Policy Implications

For managers, the central implication is to begin with the decision and impact problem, not with the technology. Organizations should define material stakeholder outcomes, articulate a theory of change, and specify the decisions that measurement will inform before selecting platforms, sensors, AI models, or blockchain solutions. Technology should be justified by its incremental contribution to evidence quality, response speed, traceability, or stakeholder participation.

Second, organizations should treat data governance as part of CSR governance. Each material metric requires a definition, boundary, owner, source, validation rule, update frequency, retention policy, and evidence trail. AI-supported indicators additionally require model documentation, bias assessment, human oversight, and monitoring for drift. Privacy, security, accessibility, and proportionality should be designed into the measurement system rather than added after deployment.

Third, managers should separate observed facts, estimates, modeled values, and causal claims. Dashboards should indicate data quality, uncertainty, coverage, and methodological limitations. This practice improves internal decision making and reduces the risk that numerical precision is mistaken for evidentiary certainty. Fourth, boards and senior executives should connect measurement to resource allocation and accountability. Material impact indicators should influence investment decisions, operational priorities, incentives, risk management, and corrective action. A sustainability dashboard that is never used to change a decision is a reporting artifact rather than an impact management system.

For regulators and standard setters, interoperability and proportionality are critical. Machine-readable reporting can reduce friction and improve analysis, but smaller firms may face disproportionate implementation costs. Phased requirements, shared taxonomies, implementation guidance, capacity building, and proportionate assurance can help prevent digital reporting from widening capability gaps. In the Philippine context, alignment with PFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards creates an opportunity to strengthen data foundations while avoiding a compliance-only approach.

For investors and external stakeholders, greater data volume should not be equated with greater truth. Users should examine indicator definitions, organizational boundaries, methodological changes, assurance scope, data provenance, and evidence of stakeholder inclusion. Divergence among ESG scores reinforces the importance of understanding what is actually being measured.

CONCLUSION

Digital transformation is reshaping CSR impact measurement by expanding the capacity to collect, integrate, analyze, trace, and communicate social and environmental information. AI, big data analytics, IoT, blockchain, cloud platforms, and machine-readable taxonomies can improve timeliness, granularity, provenance, and interoperability. These capabilities are valuable, but they do not automatically create valid evidence of impact.

The decisive finding of this review is that credible technology-enabled impact measurement depends on the alignment of five layers: strategic intent and materiality; digital data infrastructure; analytics and traceability; measurement and reporting design; and governance with stakeholder feedback. A theory of change, valid indicators, stakeholder participation, data lineage, assurance, privacy protection, responsible AI, and

transparent uncertainty are therefore not peripheral safeguards. They are core components of measurement quality.

The empirical literature generally suggests positive relationships between digital transformation and CSR or ESG performance, but the evidence base remains geographically and organizationally concentrated. Stronger causal designs, cross-country comparisons, SME research, and studies of governance capability are needed. In emerging economies, including the Philippines, the most effective pathway is likely to be staged and proportionate: first strengthen data foundations and measurement logic, then adopt advanced technologies where they produce clear incremental value.

Accordingly, the goal should not be the most technologically sophisticated CSR report. The goal should be a trustworthy impact management system that helps organizations understand what changed, for whom, why, with what degree of confidence, and how strategy should adapt. Digital transformation becomes socially responsible when it improves both the quality of evidence and the quality of decisions made on behalf of stakeholders and society.

REFERENCES

Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and do not know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 38*(4), 932–968. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311436079

Atanasov, A., Chipriyanova, G., & Krasteva-Hristova, R. (2023). Integration of digital technologies in corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities: A systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 16*(8), 373. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16080373

Atanasov, V. (2022). Consumption risk, stock returns, and economic cycles. *Quarterly Journal of Finance, 13*(1), [halaman tidak tersedia]. https://doi.org/10.1142/s2010139223500015

Berg, F., Kölbel, J. F., & Rigobon, R. (2022). Aggregate confusion: The divergence of ESG ratings. *Review of Finance, 26*(6), 1315–1344. https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfac033

Bosilj Vukšić, V., Ivančić, L., & Suša Vugec, D. (2018). A preliminary literature review of digital transformation case studies. *International Journal of Computer and Information Engineering, 12*(9), 737–742. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1474581

Carl, K. V., & Hinz, O. (2024). What we already know about corporate digital responsibility in IS research: A review and conceptualization of potential CDR activities. *Electronic Markets, 34*, [halaman tidak tersedia]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-024-00708-0

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons, 34*(4), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G

Chehimi, M., & Naro, G. (2024). Balanced scorecards and sustainability balanced scorecards for corporate social responsibility strategic alignment: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Environmental Management, 367*, 122000. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.122000

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Ergen Keleş, F. H., Keleş, E., & Schlegelmilch, B. B. (2022). Corporate social responsibility news and stock performance: A systematic literature review. *Borsa Istanbul Review*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2022.11.017

Feor, L., Clarke, A., & Dougherty, I. (2023). Social impact measurement: A systematic literature review and future research directions. *World, 4*(4), 816–837. https://doi.org/10.3390/world4040051

Financial and Sustainability Reporting Standards Council. (2025, January 22). FSRSC updates its reference to

locally adopted standards as "PFRS Accounting Standards" and "PFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards." https://www.pfsrsc.org/fsrsc-updates-its-reference-to-locally-adopted-standards-as-pfrs-accounting-standards-and-pfrs-sustainability-disclosure-standards

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Gandhi, R. T., Bedimo, R., Hoy, J. F., Landovitz, R. J., Smith, D. M., Eaton, E. F., Lehmann, C., Springer, S. A., Sax, P. E., Thompson, M. A., Benson, C. A., Buchbinder, S. P., del Rio, C., Eron, J. J., Jr., Günthard, H. F., Molina, J.-M., Jacobsen, D. M., & Saag, M. S. (2022). Antiretroviral drugs for treatment and prevention of HIV infection in adults: 2022 recommendations of the International Antiviral Society–USA Panel. *JAMA, 329*(1), [halaman tidak tersedia]. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.22246

Global Reporting Initiative. (2021). *GRI Standards*. https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/

Global Reporting Initiative. (2025, June 19). A digital leap forward for sustainability reporting. https://www.globalreporting.org/news/news-center/a-digital-leap-forward-for-sustainability-reporting/

Gupta, R. (2025). Integrating Indian value systems with corporate social responsibility for Industry 5.0: Issues and concerns. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5517522

Huang, G., & Shen, L. (2024). The bidirectional relationship between digital transformation and corporate social responsibility: A legitimacy perspective. *Sustainability, 16*(7), 3029. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16073029

Hyk, V., Vysochan, O., & Vysochan, O. (2026). The digitalization of corporate sustainability reporting: A systematic literature review and synthesis for future research. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 19*(3), 167. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm19030167

IFRS Foundation. (2023). *IFRS S1 General requirements for disclosure of sustainability-related financial information*. IFRS Foundation.

Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management, 63*, 102466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466

Lei, W., & Yan, J. (2023). Effect of digital transformation on innovation performance in China: Corporate social responsibility as a moderator. *Frontiers in Environmental Science, 11*, 1215866. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1215866

Li, Y., Zheng, Y., Li, X., & Mu, Z. (2024). The impact of digital transformation on ESG performance. *International Review of Economics & Finance, 96*(B), 103686. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2024.103686

Lobschat, L., Mueller, B., Eggers, F., Brandimarte, L., Diefenbach, S., Kroschke, M., & Wirtz, J. (2021). Corporate digital responsibility. *Journal of Business Research, 122*, 875–888. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.10.006

Nikolaos Apergēs. (2025). *Encyclopedia of monetary policy, financial markets and banking*. Academic Press.

Özkan, Y., & Kışla, T. (2019). A systematic review of AI-based mobile learning environments: Unveiling trends and future directions. *Journal of Computer Education, 3*(1), [halaman tidak tersedia]. https://www.journalofcomputereducation.info/ojs/index.php/jce/article/view/20

Pappas, I. O., Mikalef, P., Dwivedi, Y. K., Jaccheri, L., & Krogstie, J. (2023). Responsible digital transformation for a sustainable society. *Information Systems Frontiers, 25*, [halaman tidak tersedia]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-023-10406-5

Reis, J., Amorim, M., Melão, N., & Matos, P. (2018). Digital transformation: A literature review and guidelines for future research. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, 745*, 411–421. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77703-0_41

Sarmiento, J. F. (2024). Environmental factors, organizational commitment, and turnover intention among frontline nurse managers of internationally accredited private hospitals in Metro Manila. *Acta Medica Philippina*. https://doi.org/10.47895/amp.vi0.11482

Sheth, J. N., & Parvatiyar, A. (2022). Socially responsible marketing: Toward aligning dharma (duties), karma

(actions), and eudaimonia (well-being). *Journal of Macromarketing, 42*(4), 590–602. https://doi.org/10.1177/02761467221130260

Slavtcheva-Petkova, V., Ramaprasad, J., Springer, N., Hughes, S., Hanitzsch, T., Hamada, B., Hoxha, A., & Steindl, N. (2023). Conceptualizing journalists' safety around the globe. *Digital Journalism, 11*(7), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2162429

Socrates, V., Wright, D. S., Huang, T., Fereydooni, S., Dien, C., Chi, L., Albano, J., Patterson, B., Kanaparthy, N. S., Wright, C. X., Loza, A., Chartash, D., Iscoe, M., & Taylor, R. A. (2024). Identifying deprescribing opportunities with large language models in older adults: Retrospective cohort study (preprint). *JMIR Aging*. https://doi.org/10.2196/69504

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28*(2), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

Wang, H., Jiao, S., Bu, K., Wang, Y., & Wang, Y. (2023). Digital transformation and manufacturing companies' ESG responsibility performance. *Finance Research Letters, 58*(B), 104370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104370

Zaoui, F., & Souissi, N. (2020). Roadmap for digital transformation: A literature review. *Procedia Computer Science, 175*, 621–628. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.07.090