

Review Article

Environmental Accounting and Corporate Disclosure: Global Research Trends and Conceptual Clusters

Ericke Fridatien^{1*}, Annisa Sila Puspita², Marah Ammar^{3,4}

¹Universitas Darul Ulum Islamic Centre Sudirman GUPPI, Tentara Pelajar Street, East Ungaran District, Semarang Regency, Central Java 50519

² Environmental Sustainability Research Group, Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang 50275, Indonesia

³ Doctoral student in Faculty of Civil Engineering, Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang 50275, Indonesia

⁴ Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Latakia University, Suriah, GRC5+Q2V, Syria

*Corresponding Author, email: erickefridatien@gmail.com



Abstract

The goal of this study is to provide a bibliometric review based on 1,891 Scopus indexed records in order to integrate the global trends and the conceptual framework that is discussed in environmental accounting and corporate disclosure research. Results show intensive research growth since 2015, mainly led by presence of Chinese, American and Australian authors. Three categories were generated through thematic analysis: environmental strategies, corporate social responsibilities and accountability modes. Results: Environmental accounting has developed from reporting towards a strategic management tool, which is closely related to corporate governance, reputation and sustainability performance. Additional findings show that the strength of international collaboration networks has increased over time, especially with Chinese and European institutions: reflecting a trend towards increasingly globalized research collaboratives. Keyword co-occurrence map indicates shifting research priorities, after early attention to environmental cost accounting to the latest emphasis on climate-related disclosure, ESG integration, and low-carbon transition strategies. It also shows the increasing academic focus on regulatory drivers including IFRS S2, the EU CSRD, and national emission policies. The cross-cluster comparison of differences implies a growing similarity in environmental responsibility accounting, corporate strategy and what different stakeholders expect which underlines moves towards more consistent and decision-useful sustainability reporting systems.

Keywords: Bibliometric; clean water; ESG; green accounting; sustainability report

1. Introduction

The concern for sustainability and the respect of the environment have been gaining increasing importance globally. KPMG (2022) reports that over 96% of the world's largest 250 companies have published their sustainability performance and disclosure, reflecting ESG as a theme in corporate governance. Environmental and sustainability accounting This is a powerful means of increasing transparency: it provides companies with the information they need to understand, measure and report their environmental impact. Sustainability reporting as an instrument to evaluate corporate environmental performance, has the potential to improve CSR's disclosure of both its internal and external aspects, enhance reputation of companies through social legitimacy and also create stakeholders' trust (Razali et al., 2025). In the context of a growing globalisation of economy and an ever-increasing stakeholder pressure, environmental accounting stakes its claim as an integral part of sustainable corporate policy (Omran & Yaaqbeh, 2023).

Environmental accounting and corporate reporting research suggests that companies are incorporating the environmental and social dimensions more extensively in their financial statement

frameworks. In fact, research has shown that there is considerable evidence the enhanced environmental transparency result in greater firm value and more close relations with investors as well as society (Manita et al., 2018; Oncioiu et al., 2020). The literature examine the rationales of transparency and disclosure of CSR sustainability practices have been widely addressed by legitimacy theory and stakeholder (Akhter et al., 2023; Bunea, 2018). Notwithstanding the increasing number of publications, research in environmental accounting is fragmented, delivering a range of methodological and theoretical orientations with the emergence of globalised initiatives (CSRDI) from Europe, it is necessary to deliver a more detailed scientific map that encompasses both the conceptual and geographical dimensions for finding out how environmental accounting research has evolved.

Previous review studies Bilal et al. (2024), which primarily mapped general sustainability accounting trends or focused on narrower themes such as carbon reporting or ESG disclosure, the current study extends the literature by employing a more comprehensive bibliometric approach that integrates performance analysis, science mapping, and conceptual structure modelling. Unlike in prior studies which focused on case study or basic analysis, the current study uses a bibliometric method to plot the progression of research in environmental accounting and corporate disclosure. Bibliometric approach offered an empirical and objective overview of publication trends, international collaboration networks, and conceptual structures in this area (Bilal et al., 2024). While earlier bibliometric reviews generally examined limited datasets (200–700 documents) or centred on specific disclosure themes, this study expands the scope significantly by reviewing 1,891 Scopus-indexed publications covering two decades of scholarship (2004–2024). This study represents one of the largest bibliometric studies on environmental accounting to date, because it reviewed 1,891 documents indexed in the Scopus database. Moreover, a full content study of ten key articles was carried out to identify the emerging themes and research directions. This dual-stage review bibliometric and qualitative synthesis) also addresses a gap identified by prior scholars, who emphasized the need to connect quantitative mapping with substantive content insights to enhance interpretive depth in environmental accounting reviews. Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods allows for a more holistic examination of how research in sustainability accounting has developed along theoretical, empirical and policy dimensions.

The main purpose of this study is to provide a map of the scientific literature and research trends in environmental accounting, sustainability accounting, and the interrelation between corporate reporting and financial performance. More precisely, this research attempts to: (1) identify a temporal, geographic, and thematic evolution of publications within these domains; (2) classify previous studies into three main conceptual clusters (environmental management, green cluster; corporate social responsibility, blue cluster; and accountability strategies, red cluster); and (3) propose future research directions based on a synthesis of the gaps and opportunities discovered through this study. Thus, the results of this research are expected to contribute to a theoretical understanding and practical implications for the advancement of sustainability accounting literature and for practitioners to design more transparent and sustainability-oriented reporting systems.

2. Methods

This research conducted on studies is bibliometric which is applied in a typical research method in management and accountancy studies to identify new academic arenas (Chen et al., 2016; Hou and Wang, 2021; Tan et al., 2021). This approach allows academics to determine what the intellectual framework and thematic organization are that exist for specific subject areas. The study is guided by a strict methodological framework, commencing with conversations among researchers to determine screening criteria and research boundaries, advancing to independent replication and transparency regarding the research (Polanin et al., 2019; Wansink and Ittersum, 2016). The bibliographic information for the study has been obtained from the Scopus database which is one of the foremost databases of management and accounting research publications. The Scopus database ensures users do not select articles from only a few specific journals, which can potentially result in bias and

data deletion. The initial data collection was made during 1th November 2025 by recording all publications that are available, focusing on environmental accounting and corporate reporting. The literature search employed a combination of keywords categorized into three main groups: (a) main keywords, (b) context keywords, and (c) scope keywords, as suggested by Grames, et al (2019). The primary search string included: “environmental accounting” OR “green accounting” OR “sustainability accounting” OR “environmental management accounting” AND “corporate reporting” OR “disclosure” OR “financial performance.”

The choice of the keywords in this study followed the recommendations of Tarquinio and Posadas (2020), the determination of specific keywords of this study follows the practice of adopting diversity of terminologies with regard to the sustainability accounting literature. We did not impose any barriers towards other research fields of knowledge or publication sources and restricted language to English to preserve a consistent and homogeneous representation in the sampled literature. The first filter yielded a total of 4,829 documents that emerged to be considered, which then refined into a dataset comprising 1,891 articles reaching inclusion criteria. The analyses of all documents were conducted via Bibliometrix (R) and VOSviewer, two main tools used commonly in bibliometric research (Akbari et al., 2020; Kemeç & Altınay, 2023). The capabilities of such tools are to facilitate multi-dimensional analyses by incorporating data regarding a number of bibliometric performance measures, including annual publication trends, author collaboration networks, citation mapping, and keyword co-occurrence testing. Such an approach provides much greater analytic insight about the conceptual and intellectual configuration of the research enterprise (Bogers et al., 2017). Quantitative analysis was performed, while qualitative sectional analysis was carried out on ten influential articles to gain insight into the conceptual trend and the thematic backgrounds of those clusters. This combination of quantitative and qualitative analytical approaches forms a broad picture of trajectory research in the area of environmental accounting and sustainability reporting. An extensive research strategy was developed with respect to keywords, sources, and the volume of publications evaluated. To define the conceptual clusters, this study adopted a structured interpretative procedure combining algorithmic output and qualitative validation. First, VOSviewer generated keyword co-occurrence networks using the association-strength normalization method, which grouped frequently co-appearing terms into distinct color-coded clusters. Second, for each cluster, the authors examined the most central and frequently occurring keywords (typically the top 10–15 terms by total link strength) to identify the dominant conceptual theme. Third, cluster names were assigned based on the shared semantic patterns and thematic coherence of these keywords, supported by cross-checking with influential publications associated with each cluster. For instance, clusters characterized by terms such as “accountability,” “governance,” “standards,” and “regulation” were labeled as Accountability Strategies (Red Cluster); clusters dominated by “environmental impact,” “management,” “sustainability practices,” and “regulatory compliance” were labeled as Environmental Management (Green Cluster); while clusters with keywords including “CSR,” “stakeholder theory,” “emissions,” and “social responsibility” were defined as Corporate Social Responsibility (Blue Cluster). This combined data-driven and interpretative method ensured transparency, conceptual accuracy, and methodological rigor in assigning cluster names.




Figure 1. Research Data

3. Result

3.1. Bibliometric Analysis

The results demonstrate a phenomenal leap in research in the field of environmental accounting and corporate transparency in the past two decades. The first research papers in the area were published in the early 2000s but significantly increased after 2015, coinciding with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and greater global attention in the context of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) disclosure. The consistent upward trend of annual publication tendencies suggests that environmental accounting has emerged as a key component of the mechanism for sustainability reporting and corporate environmental governance. The distribution of publications by the countries of the corresponding authors is illustrated in Figure 2. China is clearly the largest number contributor to these findings, followed by the USA and Australia. The prevalence of these three countries among SCP and MCPs is indicative of the significance of their roles as central stakeholders in national and global collaborations. Other European countries such as the UK, Italy and Germany also play an important part in the development of the sustainability accounting literature. At the same time, developing economies such as Indonesia, India and Malaysia have been increasingly

becoming more engaged in the cross-country cooperation. What follows is that, research in environmental accounting is not so much in a regional direction, but rather, has risen up from a regional one, and evolved up the academic ladder worldwide. The number of documents from the corresponding authors from each country is shown with turquoise bars corresponding to SCP and pink bars corresponding to MCP publications in Figure 2.

The analysis of the top authors, as shown in Table 1, shows Heather Keith as being the most productive and having the largest citation impact, followed by Charl de Villiers, David B. Lindenmayer, and Ralph O. Dubayah. Most of these scholars come from research institutions in Australia and the United States, confirming these countries as leaders in shaping sustainability reporting research. In addition, the co-citation analysis shows that Adams (UK), Carol (USA), and Brown (UK) are the most commonly co-cited authors, which further corroborates their theoretical prowess in the field. Table 1 shows that the top ten authors together deliver between 2% and 16% of the total publications studied.




Figure 2. Distribution of the countries of origin of correspondents in environmental accounting research.

Table 1. The top 10 authors and co-cited authors in environmental accounting research (n%).

Rank	Author	Country	N (%)	Co-cited Author	Country	Citations
1	Heather Keith	Australia	13.95%	Adams, C.A.	UK	338
2	Charl de Villiers	New Zealand	11.63%	Carol, A.	US	337
3	David B. Lindenmayer	Australia	16.28%	Brown, J.	UK	309
4	Ralph O. Dubayah	United States	16.28%	Mark, T.	US	300
5	Brendan G. Mackey	Australia	9.30%	Baker, R.	US	291
6	Carl Gordon Obst	Australia	9.30%	Anderson, M.	US	272
7	Michael J. Vardon	Australian National University, Australia	11.63%	Judy, A.	Canada	261
8	James W. Boyd	Resources for the Future, United States	4.65%	Gregory P.	US	258
9	Douglas C. Morton	NASA Goddard Space	4.65%	Asner, G.	US	241

Rank	Author	Country	N (%)	Co-cited Author	Country	Citations
10	Stephen A. Polásky	Flight Center, United States University of Minnesota, United States	2.33%	Sulaiman, A.	Malaysia	212

3.2. Conceptual Structure

We find early data from the previous section that scholarly discourse on environmental accounting and corporate disclosure has progressed through a number of conceptual lenses. This underlines the centrality of bibliometric examination for mapping out the intellectual framework that grows in response to various theoretical and methodological approaches. However, quantitative insights alone are insufficient to truly understand the global movements of this discipline. These results were connected to a more detailed qualitative analysis that sought to shed light on emerging areas of research trends recently. In this context, I apply thematic analysis and co-occurrence analysis, as those methods are common in management research (Bogers et al., 2017), to examine the conceptual configuration of a discipline. The keyword treemap revealed that carbon accounting is the most frequently recognized term (388 occurrences), followed by carbon (337 occurrences), climate change (270 occurrences), and environmental accounting (263 occurrences) (Figure 3). It can be inferred that the major importance of these keywords indicates that the decarbonization and carbon emission control are relevant contemporary environmental accounting in research. Furthermore, the use of words such as "sustainability" (228), "sustainable development" (217), and "sustainability reporting" is abundant, evidencing a burgeoning academic interest in interrelated sustainability-related topics with commercial reporting and performance measurement systems. While broader emerging topics such as accountability, environmental management, and decision-making become more popular, pointing to a move in orientation of the research away from measurements of environmental impacts to an analysis of governance, decision making, and the business dimensions of sustainability.



Figure. 3. Keyword co-occurrence treemap of environmental accounting literature




Figure 4. Thematic map of environmental accounting and corporate disclosure research




Figure 5. Co-occurrence analysis

From the thematic map (see Figure 4), the concern of the literature in environmental accounting has shifted away from the environmental impacts and towards the accountability mechanisms and sustainability reporting in general. The principles and topics of environmental accounting, sustainability, and sustainable development are central, topical, and form the basis of the environmental accounting literature. In contrast, carbon accounting and climate change (i.e., both are in the niche themes quadrant) are, at present, more specific to carbon measurement, emission disclosure, and climate change mitigation. Conversely, sustainability accounting and sustainability reporting exist in the declining themes cluster which implies that this study's research takes a shift from an agenda-driven sustainability reporting to an analytical and quantitative framework. Results support global trends emphasizing increasing utilization of international sustainability reporting standards, particularly the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards. Moreover, as illustrated in the co-occurrence analysis (Figure 5), there are three thematic clusters that are inter-related to environmental accounting literature. A cluster on environmental accounting and sustainability; a cluster on carbon accounting and emission measurement; a cluster on climate change

and natural resource management. Collectively, the clusters underscore the fundamental shift in the paradigm with classical environmental disclosure to a more strategic and holistic view of the links among economic performance, social accountability and ecological sustainability as part of larger sustainable development.

3.3. Green cluster: Environmental Management

A research on the Green Cluster also has relevance with regard to works in sustainability accounting and environmental management. This cluster endorses the environmental roots of corporate responsibility in spite of being confronted by mounting external demands from stakeholders and regulators, and specifically those companies with substantial ecological footprints. Environmental accounting is, therefore, recognized as a critical tool to facilitate the transition toward global sustainability (Chang et al., 2016). In this regard, corporate environmental disclosures have been widely researched in terms of their association with business strategies towards sustainability and organizational legitimacy. For instance, Silva-Gao (2012) found that voluntary environmental capital expenditure disclosure of the U.S. electric utility companies is determined by regulation pressures and firms strategic response to achieve social and market legitimacy. What this clustering suggests is that, in brief, environmental accounting involves more than just reporting but is instead an end resource implicated by and highlighting the way in which these elements of corporation, society and regulators are located within a broader narrative of sustainable development. In addition to that narrow viewpoint of environmental accounting, a few studies of the Green Cluster have also shown some strategic effects from corporate environmental disclosure. He et al. (2019) argue that external pressures to comply with sustainability targets, combined with the availability of funding markets, motivate firms to signal how can they operate more sustainably and openly in terms of environment. Clay et al. (2021), study the influence of environmental regulation (Control Air Act, CAA) on disclosure framework by the corporates during reporting framework. After having reviewed the role of accounting as a critical practice they consider the challenges and benefits of transition in CAA P1 and P2. In a follow-up to the 10-K disclosures of public companies, Larson and Singer (1992) suggest that required disclosure is essential for environmental transparency. Indeed, Kraft (2018) argues that both the regulatory burden and market competition contribute to the environment reporting ratio and its nature among utility firms as well. In total, the cluster between them also supports as well that the release of environmental information should be interpreted as a management (instead of purely administrative) practice in order to prevent external pressure or competitive pressures on a company and protect a company against competition, improve and promote the reputation of this latter and sustainable value over time. Accordingly, the study in question deserves to be carried out with especial reference to shareholders, stakeholders and regulatory bodies (Clay et al., 2021; He et al., 2019; Kraft, 2018; Silva-Gao, 2012)

3.4. Red cluster: Accountability Strategies

Red Cluster researches most notably researching in relation to accountability and governance dimensions of sustainability report. This cluster features research on the manner in which organizations develop and adopt reporting frameworks and accountability standards to make their ESG performance visible. It focuses, to a large extent, on the firms' response to external pressure from regulatory authorities, investors and society at large out of internationally renowned reporting frameworks (e.g., Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards) Vigneau et al. (2023). In this case, in analyses of the cluster we see that sustainability reporting is not only a communication tool but instrument communicating and controlling what should be a nature of managerial role in creating company's strategic position with stakeholders. As a result, ESG reporting is being seen more and more as a corporate governance tool focused on long-term accountability and on public trust, not just regulation. Studies in this category largely lean on neo institutional theory which argues that acceptance of sustainability disclosure

practices comes as a result of the coercive and normative pressures by agencies (Yusoff et al., 2019). In this context, ESG reporting is a strategic behavior for companies to obtain legitimacy by complying with prevailing institutional standards and disclosure channels. Also, Al-Amosh and Mansor (2020) claim the ownership structure is treated as a single highly significant variable which moderates environmental revelations regardless of its level and design. While private companies are more self-dependent to disclose E&S information for investors and the pending legal environment, state-owned firms prefer to adhere. In general terms, these findings illustrate the influence of institutional pressure and corporate ownership structure on sustainability reporting. In addition, the red cluster also reflects that sustainability reporting is related to governance effectiveness and internal accountability mechanisms. The accountability of corporations has been explored by Kaur and Lodhia (2018) and Abeysekera How to cite this paper: (2022), who found it is an intrinsic component of whether sustainability reporting arrangements are effective in embedding strategic planning for the development towards sustainability. So, ESG reporting is seen not just as a mechanism for external disclosure but also as an unrelated part of the system of performance management. In summary, the red cluster describes a shift from compliance-based to governance-based strategic accountability accounting where such trust is established and enhanced in the longer term (Cruz Dallagnol et al., 2023; Flammer et al., 2019; Kuruppu et al., 2024).

3.5. Blue cluster: corporate social responsibility

The Blue Cluster is related to the CSR research about sustainability reporting. This cluster reflects a paradigm shift of the enterprise, from financial oriented conflicts with being intensified to balance on three different performance level (accession towards economy, society and environment). From the network visualization given in Figure 5, we find that “carbon accounting”, “carbon emission,” “gas emissions” and “control” are main terminologies. The findings suggest that the corporate social responsibility has shifted from a broad-based function to an interest in reducing climate change and managing carbon emissions (Jakučionytė-Skodienė & Liobikienė, 2021). The studies of this cluster are very legitimacy theory/ stakeholder theory-driven as legitimacy and stakeholders perceptions put a lot of emphases on the relationship between CSR reporting and society trust. Yu et al. (2018) and Alsayegh et al. The latter (2020) argue that firms are induced to reporting their environmental and social records more transparently because of increasing pressures from investors, customers, as well as international finance bodies. Arevalo and Aravind (2017) also claim that CSR reporting is a combined device for the companies to add value to their reputation, as well as stock performance through the quantitative data on operational emissions and energy. In the Blue Cluster we can observe that CSR has moved from being philanthropy to be accountability; a part of strategy and governance. As Aslaksen et al. (2021), CSR has been increasingly recognized as a value-added factor for achieving long-run sustainability, and mitigating the risk of reputational loss. In addition, by bringing CSR together with environmental reporting, global standards like the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and IFRS S2: Climate-related Disclosures may also be incorporated to expand even further the future-oriented development of social reporting as a strategic tool for corporate planning and public policy. Thus, the blue cluster signals a transformation from CSR as symbolic or moral gesture to CSR as strategic accounting of pathway to low carbon economy. (Baranova and Meadows, 2017; Fu et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2022).

4. Discussion

This bibliometric study seeks to aid knowledge and help to define the state of research in environmental accounting and sustainability reporting; hence, providing evidence for the evolution of the relevant literature. This chapter offers an initial snapshot of the current trends in research, especially towards the implementation of accountability mechanisms and sustainability reporting practices in different sectors of industry. This matter is becoming increasingly important with the

emergence of more global initiatives being initiated by international policy institutions and the increasing acceptance of sustainability reporting frameworks. First reflection stresses the importance of a management element, which is managerial aspect, in the field of sustainability reporting. It means that companies especially in the environmental and energy sectors face intense external pressure from the public and regulators. At the same time, ESG reporting is not just an instrument of disclosure, but a method in management for controlling a company's reputation and enhancing its social legitimacy. These results validate previous research illustrating a vital role for stakeholder engagement in sustainability reporting and its relevance for organizational transparency and accountability (Camilleri, 2015; Silva-Gao, 2012).

Second reflection, the second underlines the importance of link between sustainability reporting and corporate governance. The proliferation of accountability mechanisms demonstrates the growing pressure for additional research exploring how elements of ESG reporting can influence managerial decision-making processes. Prior empirically studies have demonstrated that ESG reports serve as a means for external communication and information resources internally with more favourable mechanisms to also increase the effectiveness of decision-making. (Hsieh, 2024; In et al., 2019). The final reflection focuses on the place of accountability processes in corporate business models. The recent history is, that the academic and practising communities also recognized that sustainability reports are (quasi) turning into more than an external communications instrument, as they are strategic sources of information for evaluating how a company's business activities impact on the environment and society. Accordingly, the future studies will examine how much ESG reporting affects the corporate strategy for value creation in the long-run. It helps to extend sustainability as not just a part of corporate efficiency, but also a process towards business model innovation that enables firms for relocation into green economy (Luo and Cheng, 2023; Söderholm, 2020). While the field changes quickly and quite concrete due to a strong activity in recent years with its concentration around medical image analysis. The presence of these three clusters also means that, still it is evolving fast we have some fragmentation and we need to develop stronger integration - perhaps by thinking about solutions that are more integrative per se (based on a variety of disciplinary approach). The Nomological Net of Sustainability Research A literature stream is also promising methodological orientations, sectoral settings and reporting context to contribute with the semblance of a divergence in sustainability research and implying for theoretical unification (de Villiers et al., 2022; Dumay et al., 2023). Thus, rather than a study the theory of this article also develops a future pragmatic research that seeks 641 how accounting can facilitate for and activate or led to result change over to sustainable development. Future work on such research should thus tap into notions of governance environmental management and corporate responsibility to build more integrated sustainability accounting systems and to investigate how the reporting of ESG is contributing to deep long-term strategic transformation towards a green and resilient economy (Khan et al., 2023; Boiral & Heras-Saizarbitoria, 2020).

Table 2. Future research directions.

Green Cluster: Environmental Management	Blue Cluster: Corporate Social Responsibility	Red Cluster: Accountability Strategies
Exploring environmental performance indicators used by companies with high emission levels (Silva-Gao, 2012).	Evaluating the role of practitioners in strengthening sustainability reporting practices (Pérez-López et al., 2015).	Highlighting specific accountability mechanisms implemented by public companies (Stafford and Stapleton, 2017).

Green Cluster: Environmental Management	Blue Cluster: Corporate Social Responsibility	Red Cluster: Accountability Strategies
Examining the relationship between sustainability reporting and ESG indicators across industries (Buallay, 2020).	Assessing the relationship between climate change mitigation strategies and carbon reporting (Long et al., 2018).	Evaluating the impact of implementing reporting standards such as GRI on public utility companies (Mamun, 2023).
Expanding scientific research on the relationship between stakeholder engagement and sustainability reporting (Kaur and Lodhia, 2018).	Assessing the effectiveness of social and environmental disclosure on corporate reputation and market value (Ghuslan et al., 2021).	Assessing differences in accountability practices between private and public companies (Cooley, 2020).

5. Conclusions

Sustainability reporting has been one of the key focuses in contemporary areas in the studies of accounting and management in terms of contemporary issues. This paper illustrates the main role of environmental accounting in the integration of economic, social, and ecological aspects of corporate performance. In line with the research objectives, this study provides a comprehensive mapping of scientific developments in environmental accounting and sustainability reporting and identifies the dominant conceptual structures driving the evolution of the field. Through a bibliometric framework, this study illustrates mapping of empirical trends in the scientific evolution of environmental accounting knowledge and offers new avenues to investigation in the context of environmental management, corporate social responsibility, and corporate accountability systems as emerging areas of research. Then take that one step further, and the measure is that based on how the practice is done is a good beginning to address this and that data sets, data sets can be a good base to make improvement on and for the process improvements of reporting and accountability which organizations can use to their advantage. Structured environmental data enhance transparency, reputation and build trust regarding sustainable practices with the community, employees and investors. These observations highlight the increasing importance of standardized, comparable sustainability information, which aligns with the aim of identifying emerging trends and future research opportunities. Not only is there value in scholars, practitioners and policymakers coming together to respond to the future issues of generating a common reporting standard that reflects changes in global and individual domestic situations. However, specific limitations of the data and the analyses are addressed in the present research. This study suggests further research to broaden its sectoral and geographic coverage, as well as to develop an extensive set of quantitative and qualitative data.

Ethnic approval

This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Ericke Fridatien: Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, resources, software; **Annisa Sila Puspita:** writing – review & editing, formal analysis, project administration, resources, supervision; **Marah Ammar:** Project administration, resources.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used Chat GPT-3.0 to improve readability and language understanding. After utilizing this AI technology, the author(s) meticulously reviewed and

amended the content as required, ensuring its accuracy and completeness. The author(s) assume(s) complete accountability for the content of the publication.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

The author(s) thank all participants for their valuable support.

References

Abeysekera, I., 2022. A framework for sustainability reporting. *Sustain. Accounting, Manag. Policy J.* 13, 1386–1409.

Akbari, M., Khodayari, M., Danesh, M., Davari, A., Padash, H., 2020. A bibliometric study of sustainable technology research. *Cogent Bus. Manag.* 7.

Akhter, F., Hossain, M.R., Elrehail, H., Rehman, S.U., Almansour, B., 2023. Environmental disclosures and corporate attributes, from the lens of legitimacy theory: a longitudinal analysis on a developing country. *Eur. J. Manag. Bus. Econ.* 32, 342–369.

Al-Amosh, H., Mansor, N., 2020. The Implications of Ownership Structure on the Environmental Disclosure in Jordan. *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.* 10.

Alsayegh, M.F., Rahman, R.A., Homayoun, S., 2020. Corporate economic, environmental, and social sustainability performance transformation through ESG disclosure. *Sustain.* 12.

Arevalo, J.A., Aravind, D., 2017. Strategic Outcomes in Voluntary CSR: Reporting Economic and Reputational Benefits in Principles-Based Initiatives. *J. Bus. Ethics* 144, 201–217.

Aslaksen, H.M., Hildebrandt, C., Johnsen, H.C.G., 2021. The long-term transformation of the concept of CSR: towards a more comprehensive emphasis on sustainability. *Int. J. Corp. Soc. Responsib.* 6.

Baranova, P., Meadows, M., 2017. Engaging with environmental stakeholders: Routes to building environmental capabilities in the context of the low carbon economy. *Bus. Ethics* 26, 112–129.

Bilal, Gerged, A.M., Arslan, H.M., Abbas, A., Chen, S., Manzoor, S., 2024. A bibliometric review of corporate environmental disclosure literature. *J. Account. Lit.* 46, 214–237.

Bogers, M., Zobel, A.K., Afuah, A., Almirall, E., Brunswicker, S., Dahlander, L., Frederiksen, L., Gawer, A., Gruber, M., Haefliger, S., Hagedoorn, J., Hilgers, D., Laursen, K., Magnusson, M.G., Majchrzak, A., McCarthy, I.P., Moeslein, K.M., Nambisan, S., Piller, F.T., Radziwon, A., Rossi-Lamastra, C., Sims, J., Ter Wal, A.L.J., 2017. The open innovation research landscape: established perspectives and emerging themes across different levels of analysis. *Ind. Innov.* 24, 8–40.

Buallay, A., 2020. Sustainability reporting and firm's performance: Comparative study between manufacturing and banking sectors. *Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag.* 69, 431–445.

Bunea, A., 2018. Legitimacy through targeted transparency? Regulatory effectiveness and sustainability of lobbying regulation in the European Union. *Eur. J. Polit. Res.* 57, 378–403.

Camilleri, M.A., 2015. Valuing Stakeholder Engagement and Sustainability Reporting. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* 18, 210–222.

Chang, R.D., Soebarto, V., Zhao, Z.Y., Zillante, G., 2016. Facilitating the transition to sustainable construction: China's policies. *J. Clean. Prod.* 131, 534–544.

Chen, D., Liu, Z., Luo, Z., Webber, M., Chen, J., 2016. Bibliometric and visualized analysis of energy research. *Ecol. Eng.* 90, 285–293.

Clay, K.B., Jha, A., Lewis, J., Severnini, E., 2021. Impacts of the Clean Air Act on the Power Sector from 1938-1994: Anticipation and Adaptation. *SSRN Electron. J.*

Cooley, A., 2020. Comparative analysis of online accountability practices in three sectors: private, public

and nonprofit. *Accounting, Audit. Account. J.* 33, 1423–1445.

Cruz Dallagnol, E., Portulhak, H., Cezar Severo Peixe, B., 2023. How is public value associated with accountability? A systematic literature review. *Public Money Manag.* 43, 251–258.

Flammer, C., Hong, B., Minor, D., 2019. Corporate governance and the rise of integrating corporate social responsibility criteria in executive compensation: Effectiveness and implications for firm outcomes. *Strateg. Manag. J.* 40, 1097–1122.

Fu, S., Tian, M., Ge, Y., Yao, T., Tian, J., 2024. Influencing Factors and Mechanisms of Corporate Social Responsibility Reputation under Green and Low-Carbon Transition: Evidence from Chinese Listed Companies. *Energies* 17.

Ghuslan, M.I., Jaffar, R., Saleh, N.M., Yaacob, M.H., 2021. Corporate governance and corporate reputation: The role of environmental and social reporting quality. *Sustain.* 13, 1–24.

Grames, E.M., Stillman, A.N., Tingley, M.W., Elphick, C.S., 2019. An automated approach to identifying search terms for systematic reviews using keyword co-occurrence networks. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 10, 1645–1654.

He, Z., Xu, S., Shen, W., Wang, M., Li, C., 2019. Exploring external and internal pressures on the environmental behavior of paper enterprises in China: A qualitative study. *Bus. Strateg. Environ.* 28, 951–969.

Hou, Y., Wang, Q., 2021. A bibliometric study about energy, environment, and climate change. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 28, 34187–34199.

Hsieh, M.Y., 2024. An empirical investigation into the enhancement of decision-making capabilities in corporate sustainability leadership through Internet of Things (IoT) integration. *Internet Things (The Netherlands)* 28, 101382.

In, S.Y., Rook, D., Monk, A., 2019. Integrating Alternative Data (Also Known as ESG Data) in Investment Decision Making. *Glob. Econ. Rev.* 48, 237–260.

Jakučionytė-Skodienė, M., Liobikienė, G., 2021. Climate change concern, personal responsibility and actions related to climate change mitigation in EU countries: Cross-cultural analysis. *J. Clean. Prod.* 281.

Kaur, A., Lodhia, S., 2018. Stakeholder engagement in sustainability accounting and reporting: A study of Australian local councils. *Accounting, Audit. Account. J.* 31, 338–368.

Kemeç, A., Altınay, A.T., 2023. Sustainable Energy Research Trend: A Bibliometric Analysis Using VOSviewer, RStudio Bibliometrix, and CiteSpace Software Tools. *Sustain.* 15.

KPMG, 2022. Key global trends in sustainability reporting [WWW Document]. KPMG.com. URL <https://kpmg.com/xx/en/our-insights/esg/survey-of-sustainability-reporting-2022/global-trends.html>

Kraft, B., 2018. Shedding Light on Stakeholder Power in a Regulated Market: A Study of Variation in Electric Utilities' Climate Change Disclosures. *Organ. Environ.* 31, 314–338.

Kuruppu, S.C., Milne, M.J., Tilt, C.A., 2024. Sustainability control systems in short-term operational and long-term strategic decision-making. *Meditari Account. Res.* 32, 234–265.

Long, T.B., Looijen, A., Blok, V., 2018. Critical success factors for the transition to business models for sustainability in the food and beverage industry in the Netherlands. *J. Clean. Prod.* 175, 82–95.

Luo, W., Cheng, J., 2023. Transition to sustainable business models for green economic recovery: role of financial literacy, innovation and environmental sustainability. *Econ. Chang. Restruct.* 56, 3787–3810.

Mamun, M., 2023. Sustainability reporting of major electricity retailers in line with GRI: Australia evidence. *J. Account. Organ. Chang.* 19, 474–493.

Manita, R., Bruna, M.G., Dang, R., Houanti, L., 2018. Board gender diversity and ESG disclosure: evidence from the USA. *J. Appl. Account. Res.* 19, 206–224.

Omran, M.S.Y., Yaaqbeh, M.N.S., 2023. Climate change and business accountability, empirical evidence on the roles of environmental strategy and environmental accounting. *Bus. Ethics, Environ.*

Responsib. 32, 1592–1608.

Oncioiu, I., Popescu, D.M., Aviana, A.E., Șerban, A., Rotaru, F., Petrescu, M., Marin-Pantelescu, A., 2020. The role of environmental, social, and governance disclosure in financial transparency. Sustain. 12, 1–16.

Pérez-López, D., Moreno-Romero, A., Barkemeyer, R., 2015. Exploring the Relationship between Sustainability Reporting and Sustainability Management Practices. Bus. Strateg. Environ. 24, 720–734.

Polanin, J.R., Pigott, T.D., Espelage, D.L., Grotpeter, J.K., 2019. Research Synthesis Methods - 2019 - Polanin - Best practice guidelines for abstract screening large-evidence systematic.pdf. Res. Synth. Methods 10, 330–342.

Razali, M.W.M., Fauzan, N.F., Joseph, C., Yau, D.L.I., Hassan, N.A., 2025. Audit committee characteristics and environmental disclosure practices: Insights from Malaysian listed firms. Edelweiss Appl. Sci. Technol. 9, 231–243.

Silva-Gao, L., 2012. The Disclosure of Environmental Capital Expenditures: Evidence from the Electric Utility Sector in the USA. Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Manag. 19, 240–252.

Söderholm, P., 2020. The green economy transition: the challenges of technological change for sustainability. Sustain. Earth 3.

Stafford, A., Stapleton, P., 2017. Examining the Use of Corporate Governance Mechanisms in Public-Private Partnerships: Why Do They Not Deliver Public Accountability? Aust. J. Public Adm. 76, 378–391.

Tan, H., Li, Jialing, He, M., Li, Jiayu, Zhi, D., Qin, F., Zhang, C., 2021. Global evolution of research on green energy and environmental technologies: A bibliometric study. J. Environ. Manage. 297, 113382.

Tarquinio, L., Posadas, S.C., 2020. Exploring the term “non-financial information”: an academics’ view. Meditari Account. Res. 28, 727–749.

Vigneau, L., Humphreys, M., Moon, J., 2015. How Do Firms Comply with International Sustainability Standards? Processes and Consequences of Adopting the Global Reporting Initiative. J. Bus. Ethics 131, 469–486.

Wansink, B., Ittersum, K. Van, 2016. Boundary research: Tools and rules to impact emerging fields. J. Consum. Behav. 15, 396–410.

Yu, E.P. yi, Guo, C.Q., Luu, B. Van, 2018. Environmental, social and governance transparency and firm value. Bus. Strateg. Environ. 27, 987–1004.

Yuan, Y., Zhang, B., Wang, Lei, Wang, Li, 2022. Low-Carbon Strategies Considering Corporate Environmental Responsibility: Based on Carbon Trading and Carbon Reduction Technology Investment. Sustain. 14.

Yusoff, R., Yusoff, H., Abd Rahman, S.A., Darus, F., 2019. Investigating Sustainability Reporting from the Lens of Stakeholder Pressures and Isomorphism. J. Asia-Pacific Bus. 20, 302–321.

Zaid, M.A.A., Issa, A., 2023. A roadmap for triggering the convergence of global ESG disclosure standards: lessons from the IFRS foundation and stakeholder engagement. Corp. Gov. 23, 1648–1669.