

Toward Sustainable Social Well-Being: A Study Of Digital, Green, And Supply Chain Strategies

Febryanti Simon¹, Ety Murwaningsari², Juniati Gunawan³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: juniatigunawan@trisakti.ac.id

Abstract

In the context of corporate sustainability, social and employee well-being has emerged as a strategic concern, particularly post-pandemic and with the rise of Gen Z in the workforce. This study employed quantitative content analysis of 406 sustainability reports from listed Indonesian companies in high-impact sectors during the 2020-2022 period. The independent variables analyzed were digital transformation, green innovation, and supply chain management, using keyword frequency scoring. A fixed effects panel regression model was applied. ChatGPT was used to assist in grammar correction and clarity. The findings show that supply chain management significantly impacts social and well-being performance ($p < 0.01$), while digital transformation and green innovation do not show statistically significant effects. Firm size was also found to positively affect well-being outcomes. This study addresses the gap measurement of well-being factors. Well-being is operationalized beyond physical health to include psychological safety, work-life balance, and inclusive workplace culture elements that are increasingly vital for talent retention and stakeholder trust. The study highlights the need for aligning digital and green strategies with human-centric goals to enhance social performance. It emphasizes the importance of ethical supply chains in supporting employee welfare and broader stakeholder trust.

Keywords: Digital Transformation, Green Innovation, Social Well-Being, Supply Chain Management.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the notion of social and employee well-being has been a significant focus within corporate sustainability strategies (Giraud & El-Sayed, 2021). This transformation is propelled by several global megatrends, such as increased public consciousness of inequality, workplace mental health crises, demographic changes in the labour force, and escalating demands from stakeholders, including investors, regulators, and consumers (Pagán-Castaño, Sánchez-García, Garrigos-Simon, & Guijarro-García, 2021). Contemporary employees anticipate equitable compensation and secure working environments, as well as prospects for personal development, mental health support, work-life equilibrium, and significant engagement in company culture (Lindkvist & Ekener, 2023). Social and well-being dimensions, including inclusivity, workplace safety, fair compensation, employee development, and community engagement are no longer optional, but integral indicators of organizational performance in the modern era (Obeng, Kangas, Stamm, & Tolvanen, 2023). This shift in expectations has coincided with three major trends transforming business ecosystems globally: digital transformation, green innovation, and supply chain sustainability. First, digital transformation has redefined how organizations operate and interact with stakeholders, offering scalable solutions to improve employee experiences, automate processes, and provide transparent data that can support well-being initiatives (Valtonen & Holopainen, 2025), (Robertson & Lapiña, 2023). Second, green innovation enables firms to contribute to environmental protection while creating healthier products, more sustainable work practices, and positive community impacts. Third, sustainable supply chain management ensures that ethical, environmental, and social standards are upheld not only within firms but across their entire value networks. In Indonesia, the urgency to address social and well-being issues through corporate actions has become even more significant in the wake of challenges such as post-pandemic recovery, rising mental health awareness, and increased stakeholder scrutiny of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) disclosures (Giraud & El-Sayed, 2021), (Zangara & Filice, 2024). This issue becomes even more urgent as Generation Z begins to dominate the workforce. Gen Z employees, who are known for their strong values in social justice, sustainability, and personal well-being, place higher expectations on employers to create inclusive, flexible,

and mentally supportive work environments (Zangara & Filice, 2024), (Hussein, 2022), (Velastegui-Montoya, de Lima, & Herrera-Matamoros, 2022). A 2023 report by Deloitte revealed that 46% of Gen Z employees globally experience work-related stress most of the time, with top concerns being financial insecurity, work-life imbalance, and mental health challenges (Deloitte, 2024). In Indonesia, data from the Ministry of Health and various labour advocacy groups have highlighted a growing demand for mental health support in corporate settings, particularly among younger employees entering the labour market (Yuningsih, 2024). Despite their digital fluency and adaptability, Gen Z workers are more likely to report feelings of burnout and anxiety, especially in rigid or unsupportive organizational cultures. Companies that fail to adapt to this generational shift risk higher turnover rates, reduced productivity, and reputational damage (Painter-Morland, Demuijnck, & Ornati, 2017). Therefore, investing in well-being programs, mental health initiatives, and inclusive corporate cultures is not only an ethical imperative but a strategic necessity (Hales & Birdthistle, 2023). In this regard, conducting research that empirically examines the factors influencing corporate social and well-being performance becomes highly relevant. This study offers timely insights that can serve as a wake-up call for companies to move beyond symbolic ESG commitments and begin integrating concrete, measurable actions that prioritize the social and psychological welfare of their stakeholders, especially their employees. By identifying how digital transformation, green innovation, and supply chain practices can support social and well-being outcomes, this research seeks to encourage companies to adopt a more human-centered sustainability strategy. However, empirical studies exploring how digital, green, and supply chain strategies contribute to social and well-being outcomes, particularly in the Indonesian context remain limited (Wibowo, Handayani, & Mustikasari, 2018), (Novitasari & Agustia, 2021). Therefore, this study aims to investigate the influence of digital transformation, green innovation, and supply chain management on corporate social and well-being performance, using quantitative analysis based on sustainability report disclosures.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sustainable Practices and Social Well-Being

Sustainable business practices encompass a broad set of strategies aimed at balancing economic, environmental, and social objectives (Erin & Ackers, 2024). While environmental and financial sustainability often dominate corporate priorities, the social pillar of sustainability is increasingly recognized as a determinant of long-term organizational success (Ahmad, Yaqub, & Lee, 2024). Social well-being, as part of this pillar, refers to the extent to which a company contributes to the quality of life of its stakeholders, particularly employees and surrounding communities (Thakur & Pathak, 2023).

Sustainable practices, such as implementing fair labour standards, promoting diversity and inclusion, engaging in community development, and ensuring safe working conditions are directly linked to improved social well-being outcomes (Nes, 2010). These actions not only enhance employee morale and reduce turnover but also create stronger community relations and positive brand perception. Empirical studies have shown that firms with higher levels of social sustainability tend to perform better in talent retention, stakeholder trust, and ESG ratings. Moreover, sustainability initiatives that emphasize staff training, health programs, and ethical sourcing foster a culture of caring and accountability, so enhancing the psychological and physical well-being of individuals both within and beyond the firm (Public Health, 2018), (Sacks, Stevenson, & Wolfers, 2010), (Afrin et al., 2023). As corporate stakeholders, particularly younger generations, increasingly prioritize values, the incorporation of social well-being into fundamental company operations has transitioned from a differentiating factor to an essential requirement.

Social and Well-Being

Social and well-being performance refers to a company's ability to ensure the welfare of its stakeholders, both internal (employees) and external (communities) (Nosratahadi, Atobishi, & Hegedűs, 2023). This dimension has evolved into a key component of corporate sustainability, reflecting how businesses engage with social equity, inclusivity, employee welfare, community empowerment, and workplace safety (Hales & Birdthistle, 2023). The well-being aspect encompasses not only physical health but also psychological

safety, job satisfaction, and work-life balance, which are critical especially in post-pandemic business environments (Kang, Hsiao, & Ni, 2022). The World Health Organization (2022) and global sustainability frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) have emphasized the need for social metrics in ESG disclosures (Emeric, 2024). Companies that actively improve social and well-being conditions are more likely to retain top talent, enhance productivity, and strengthen their social license to operate (Obeng et al., 2023).

Digital Transformation

Digital transformation refers to the integration of digital technologies into all areas of a business, fundamentally changing how organizations operate and deliver value to stakeholders (Huang & Huang, 2024). It includes the adoption of tools such as cloud computing, artificial intelligence, digital platforms, and smart systems that enable operational efficiency and real-time decision-making. This variable is assessed through two key dimensions: strategy and application (Kringelum et al., 2024). The strategic dimension reflects how committed an organization is to prioritizing digitalization as a core business objective. Companies that actively promote digitalization initiatives demonstrate forward-looking leadership, often by embedding digital projects into corporate roadmaps and fostering a culture of continuous innovation (Gomez-Trujillo & Gonzalez-Perez, 2022), (Shahzad et al., 2020). These efforts enable the organization to allocate resources toward employee-oriented digital tools such as performance management systems, virtual learning platforms, and integrated communication channels (Martinez-Peláez et al., 2023), (Ullah, Ahmad, Kukreti, Sami, & Shaukat, 2024), (Ellström, Holtström, Berg, & Josefsson, 2022). Such tools not only improve operational agility but also contribute to the well-being of employees by supporting career development, feedback systems, and organizational transparency. The application dimension focuses on how digital technologies are implemented across the supply chain and internal processes (Ziadlou, 2021), (Lerman, Benitez, Müller, de Sousa, & Frank, 2024). For example, companies that utilize digital interfaces for procurement, logistics, or stakeholder engagement can enhance efficiency, reduce workload stress, and promote real-time problem solving (Zhang & Jin, 2023). Digital tools also support collaboration between departments, provide remote access for hybrid work arrangements, and enable the use of health and safety monitoring systems (Jedynak, Czakon, Kuźniarska, & Mania, 2021). These applications are particularly important in fostering an environment that accommodates employee flexibility, safety, and mental wellness, critical aspects of social and well-being performance. Consequently, digital transformation transcends a mere technological transition; it serves as a human-centric facilitator that empowers enterprises to foster inclusive, supportive, and adaptive environments, thereby improving the overall social and well-being results for employees and society as a whole

H1: Digital transformation has a positive effect on social and well-being performance.

Green Innovation

Green innovation refers to the development and implementation of products and processes that minimize negative environmental impacts while promoting resource efficiency, sustainability, and corporate responsibility (Maldonado-Guzmán, Garza-Reyes, & Pinzón-Castro, 2023). This concept has become central to sustainable business strategies as organizations seek to align profitability with environmental and social values (Gurler, 2024), (Omonijo & Zhang, 2024). In this study, green innovation is measured through two key dimensions: green product innovation and green process innovation. The product innovation dimension focuses on the development of environmentally friendly products, including the use of recyclable materials, reduction of toxic or hazardous substances, and sustainable packaging designs (Rustiarini, Bhegawati, & Mendra, 2022). By offering products that are safer for consumers and less damaging to the environment, companies not only contribute to environmental goals but also demonstrate social responsibility. For instance, creating non-toxic or biodegradable products can reduce health risks for end-users and local communities, especially in sectors like food, cosmetics, or chemicals. Furthermore, such practices resonate strongly with socially conscious consumers and employees, enhancing the company's ethical image and internal morale (Bonsu, Guo, & Zhu, 2024), (Wu, Yi, Hu, Lyulyov, & Pimonenko, 2024). The process innovation dimension involves modifying production

methods to reduce emissions, conserve energy, recycle waste, and optimize the use of natural resources such as water and fuel (Zameer & Yasmeen, 2022). These innovations can significantly improve workplace conditions by reducing exposure to pollutants and creating safer, more efficient environments for employees. From a social well-being perspective, cleaner production processes contribute to better occupational health, lower accident risks, and improved employee satisfaction (Gurler, 2024). Moreover, process-oriented green innovations often involve training and upskilling, which supports career development and employee empowerment, key components of workplace well-being.

Together, both dimensions of green innovation contribute to the broader goals of social well-being. Internally, they create safer, healthier, and more engaging workplaces, while externally they signal a company's commitment to sustainable development and community welfare. As employee and stakeholder expectations increasingly shift toward ethical and environmentally responsible practices, green innovation serves as a bridge between ecological responsibility and human-centered sustainability (Omonijo & Zhang, 2024).

H2: Green innovation has a positive effect on social and well-being performance.

Supply Chain Management

Supply Chain Management (SCM) refers to the integration of environmental, social, and ethical considerations into supply chain operations, from sourcing to delivery (Zangara & Filice, 2024). In this study, SCM is measured through two primary dimensions: guidelines and reporting, each playing a crucial role in shaping the social and well-being performance of a firm and its stakeholders. The guideline dimension emphasizes the establishment of formal standards, audits, and certifications that ensure suppliers align with corporate values on sustainability, quality, and ethical labour (Carter & Rogers, 2008). Examples include supplier selection processes based on ISO 14000 standards, documented sustainability codes of conduct, and the implementation of due diligence mechanisms. These guidelines help companies ensure that their upstream partners comply with labour rights, safety regulations, and environmental obligations. Such practices mitigate risks related to worker exploitation, unsafe labour conditions, and environmental harm, thereby protecting the well-being of workers across the supply chain and reinforcing the company's social responsibility (Shebeshe & Sharma, 2024). The reporting dimension focuses on the company's disclosure of supply chain sustainability efforts, such as prioritizing local suppliers, disclosing environmental or social risks in procurement, and transparently assessing supplier compliance (do Nascimento, Oliveira, Pettit, & Bronzo, 2021). This form of public accountability promotes trust and allows stakeholders to evaluate the company's broader social impact (Murad & Zou, 2023). Reporting also encourages continuous improvement in supplier behaviour and ensures that the benefits of sustainability reach local communities through employment, fair trade, and empowerment of small and medium enterprises (SMEs), particularly in developing countries like Indonesia (do Nascimento, Oliveira, Pettit, & Bronzo, 2021). Both dimensions are strongly connected to social and well-being outcomes. Internally, robust supply chain practices reduce operational disruptions and improve employee safety through more predictable and ethical procurement flows (do Nascimento, Oliveira, Pettit, & Bronzo, 2021). Externally, they create shared value by ensuring that all parties involved in the value chain, especially suppliers, workers, and local communities, benefit from responsible business conduct. Additionally, employees are more likely to feel aligned and engaged when they know their organization sources ethically and supports broader societal good, which enhances morale, pride, and well-being at work (Dubey, Gunasekaran, & Papadopoulos, 2017).

H3: Supply chain management has a positive effect on social and well-being performance.

METHOD

This study employs a quantitative research approach using content analysis of corporate sustainability reports to examine the influence of digital transformation, green innovation, and supply chain management on social and well-being performance. The study adopts a causal research design, aiming to empirically test the relationships between the independent and dependent variables through statistical modelling (Bougie, 2013).

The population in this study includes companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX), particularly from sectors with high public exposure and sustainability relevance, such as basic materials, industrials, consumer cyclical, and consumer non-cyclical. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, focusing on companies that have published sustainability reports (standalone or integrated) during the observation period. The observation period spans three years, from 2020 to 2022, to ensure a representative and recent data set. Companies with incomplete data or missing reports during the period are excluded. Data are collected through secondary sources, namely published sustainability reports available on company websites or the official IDX portal. In this study, content analysis will be conducted by analyzing the frequency of keyword appearances in the sustainability reports. The analysis will identify how many times specific keywords appear, and the results will then be translated into a scoring system for further content evaluation. This method adopts a keyword repetition approach as a measurement tool, as it focuses on assessing the extent of corporate initiatives in enhancing sustainability performance, as well as in implementing digital transformation, green innovation, and improved supply chain management (He, 2024).

The scoring for the content analysis is based on the method proposed by (Hastig & Sodhi, 2020), (Hamed, 2021) and is defined as follows:

- 0 = if the keyword does not appear at all in the annual or sustainability report
- 1 = if the keyword related to the indicator appears 1–2 times in the report
- 2 = if the keyword appears 3–4 times in the report
- 3 = if the keyword appears more than 4 times in the report

This study encompasses descriptive statistical analyses and hypothesis testing. Data analysis denotes the procedure of analyzing data to generate information that facilitates conclusions about the study problem. This study employs statistical analysis with Stata software. The multiple linear regression equation used in this study is as follows:

$$\text{SocWB} = \beta_0 + \beta_1\text{DT} + \beta_2\text{GI} + \beta_3\text{SCM} + \text{SIZE} + e \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

Description:

- SocWB : Social and Well-Being Performances
- DT : Digital Transformation
- GI : Green Innovation
- SCM : Supply Chain Management
- Size : Company Size

Social and well-being performance in this study refers to a company’s efforts to support the welfare of both internal stakeholders (such as employees) and external stakeholders (such as local communities) (Nosratabadi, Atobishi, & Hegedűs, 2023). This includes initiatives related to equality, workplace safety, employee development, health benefits, and community engagement. The indicators employed derive from disclosures in sustainability or annual reports and are evaluated based on the presence and frequency of pertinent keywords, as detailed in the table below.

Table 1 Social and Well-Being Performances Indicators

Dimensions	Indicators
Social	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The company has a program that pays attention to vulnerable communities (communities that are at higher risk of negative environmental or social impacts and have limitations in dealing with these risks) 2. The company support cultural activities 3. The company pays attention to local communities 4. There is gender equality 5. The company provides assistance to victims of the disaster at night 6. The company provides religious facilities or religious events for employees 7. The company employs employees with special needs 8. The company strives to improve the quality of life of the community around the business location where it operates.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. The company strives to utilize products or materials from the surrounding community. 10. The company discloses employee turnover rate data. 11. The company discloses the differences between permanent and non-permanent employees. 12. There are safety and evacuation guidelines for employees in the event of a disaster 13. Availability of occupational safety and security guidelines 14. There is training held regarding work safety and security. 15. Employees receive assessments on performance and career development. 16. The company holds regular training for employees. 17. The company conducts training related to carbon emission calculations. 18. The company provides training in implementing integrated systems for business process efficiency. 19. There are programs to improve employee skills
Well-Being	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is an increase in employee salaries every year 2. There is a stock ownership program for employees 3. The company has a home or vehicle ownership program for employees. 4. The company has a pension program for employees 5. The company has post-employment health benefits 6. The company has long leave benefits for employees 7. There is insurance provided to employees 8. The company supports employees to exercise (provides facilities or infrastructure for employees to exercise) 9. There is an employee mental health program 10. The company provides convenience for female employees (maternity leave, childcare facilities, or flexible working hours) 11. Employees have the right to participate in training programs organized by the company. 12. The company provides a scholarship program for employees' children.

Digital transformation in this study is measured through two dimensions: strategy and application. It reflects the company's efforts to prioritize digital initiatives and apply technology in business processes, particularly in supply chain and internal operations. Keyword frequency in the sustainability reports is used to assess these initiatives, as detailed in table below:

Table 2 Digital Transformation Indicators

Dimensions	Indicators
Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The company has promoted digitalization in its business processes. 2. The company continues to innovate in digitalization 3. Companies make digital projects a top priority in their business.
Application	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The company has used technology in the supply chain process 2. The company creates strong communication in various supply chain sectors with digital technology. 3. Public companies in utilizing the use of information technology 4. The company will improve the system technology interface with customers.

Green innovation is measured through two dimensions: product innovation and process innovation. This variable captures the company's efforts to develop environmentally friendly products and implement sustainable production processes. The presence and frequency of related keywords in sustainability reports are used to assess the level of green innovation disclosure, as detailed in table below:

Table 3 Green Innovation Indicators

Dimensions	Indicators
Product Innovation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Products produced by the company have reduced or no use of polluting or toxic materials. 2. The company's products use environmentally friendly packaging. 3. When designing new products, companies recycle or dispose of them at the end of their useful life. 4. The company's products use recyclable materials.
Process Innovation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The company's production process effectively reduces emissions of hazardous substances or waste. 2. The company's production process recycles waste and emissions that can be processed and reused. 3. In the production process, the company has reduced the use of water, electricity, oil and/or coal.

Supply chain management is assessed through two dimensions: guidelines and reporting. This reflects the company's efforts to implement responsible sourcing practices and disclose supplier-related sustainability information. Keyword appearances in the reports indicate the extent of the company's commitment to socially and environmentally responsible supply chain practices.

Table 4 Supply Chain Management Indicators

Dimensions	Indicators
Guidelines	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a series of audit processes in supplier selection that ensure that suppliers have reliability, quality management, or environmental management. 2. The company implements ISO 14000 in supply chain management 3. There is a performance report for each supplier 4. The company has a special procurement policy for suppliers. 5. The company has a specific sustainability code standard that supports suppliers.
Reporting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The company revealed that in selecting suppliers, the company prioritizes suppliers who have environmental protection programs. 2. Companies empower local suppliers (example: farmers) 3. There is a disclosure that the company is involved in supporting supplier sustainability. 4. There is disclosure regarding risks from the supply chain. 5. There is a compliance assessment in conducting due diligence in the tender process.

Firm size is incorporated as a control variable to address variations in organizational capabilities that may affect the extent of sustainability activities and reporting. This study measures firm size by use the natural logarithm of total assets, consistent with established practices in previous sustainability studies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Statistic Descriptive

Descriptive statistics were conducted to provide an overview of the distribution and variation of each variable used in the study. The variables analyzed include Digital Transformation (DT), Green Innovation (GI), Supply Chain Management (SCM), Social and Well-Being Performance (Y) and Size (as a control variable). The results are as follows:

Table 5 Statistic Descriptive

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Y	406	0	42	20.90	6.84
DT	406	0	16	4.35	3.18
GI	406	0	21	7.14	3.92
SCM	406	0	20	6.48	3.79
Size	406	17.98	32.86	28.42	1.93

Digital Transformation (DT) has a mean value of 4.35, with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 16, and a standard deviation of 3.18. This indicates a moderate level of digital initiatives among the sampled companies, with some firms showing limited or no disclosure and others reporting more extensive adoption. Green Innovation (GI) shows a mean of 7.14, ranging from 0 to 21, with a standard deviation of 3.92. The higher average and wider range suggest that green innovation practices are more prevalent and varied among the firms, indicating differing levels of commitment to environmental sustainability. Supply Chain Management (SCM) has a mean score of 6.48, with values ranging from 0 to 20, and a standard deviation of 3.79. This reflects a relatively consistent but still varied level of sustainable supply chain practices. Social and Well-Being Performance (Y) demonstrates a mean of 20.90, with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 42, and a standard deviation of 6.84. These figures suggest that, on average, companies are making substantial efforts toward social and well-being initiatives, though significant variability remains across the sample. The standard deviations across all variables demonstrate a significant dispersion in the extent of disclosures and procedures among organizations, underscoring the necessity for additional study via regression to elucidate the factors behind these discrepancies.

Model Selection Test and Classical Assumption Test

A set of diagnostic tests were run to ascertain the suitable panel data regression model. The Chow Test was initially employed to compare the Common Effect Model (CEM) with the Fixed Effect Model (FEM). The test findings demonstrated that FEM is superior to CEM, indicating the existence of individual effects among companies in the panel data with rho value 0.86 (rho>0.05). The Hausman Test was subsequently utilized to compare the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) with the Random Effect Model (REM). The Hausman test results endorsed the application of Fixed Effects Model (FEM) with chi2 value 0.007 (Prob<Chi2), suggesting that individual effects are associated with the independent variables, hence yielding more consistent estimators.

According to the aforementioned tests, the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) was deemed the most appropriate regression model for this investigation. A series of classical assumption tests were conducted to validate the regression model:

1. Multicollinearity Assessment: The findings indicated an absence of multicollinearity, affirming that the independent variables exhibit little correlation with one another.
2. The heteroskedasticity test results demonstrated no evidence of heteroskedasticity, indicating that the variance of the residuals remains consistent across data.

The results validate that the regression model satisfies the requisite classical assumptions for panel data analysis.

Regression Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Using the Fixed Effect Model (FEM), the regression analysis was conducted to test the effect of digital transformation, green innovation, and supply chain management on social and well-being performance.

Table 6 Regression Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Variable		Direction	Coefficient	P-Value	Information	
H ₁	Y	←	DT	+	0.167	0.385	Rejected
H ₂	Y	←	GI	+	0.142	0.215	Rejected
H ₃	Y	←	SCM	+	0.997	0.000***	Accepted
	Y	←	Size	+	0.916	0.018**	

Information:
 Y: Social and Well-Being Performances; DT: Digital Transformation; GI: Green Innovation; SCM: Supply Chain Management;
 ***significance level 1%, **significance level 5%, *significance level 10%

The findings indicate that digital transformation does not exert a statistically significant impact on social and well-being performance, resulting in the rejection of Hypothesis 1. This finding indicates that, while numerous companies are starting to implement digital strategies and applications, such as automation, digital communication tools, and system integration, these efforts have not yet been adequately focused

on improving social welfare outcomes, particularly concerning employee well-being or community development (Rohayati & Abdillah, 2024). A potential explanation is that digital transformation in numerous firms remains concentrated on efficiency and competitiveness rather than human-centric results. Parida et al. (2019) indicate that organizations in the initial phases of digital transformation frequently emphasize operational enhancements while overlooking the social aspect of sustainability (Parida, Sjödin, Lenka, & Wincent, 2015). Furthermore, in the absence of deliberate coordination between digital tools and social policies such as employee assistance programs, mental health services, or community digital inclusion, technology alone is unlikely to produce significant social impact (Abdul Aziz & Ong, 2025), (Mental Health Reform, 2023). Hypothesis 2 is rejected, as the findings demonstrate that green innovation does not significantly influence social and well-being performance. While green innovation, via eco-friendly product design and sustainable production methods is essential for environmental sustainability, its direct influence on social aspects like employee welfare or community health may be constrained unless explicitly included into social strategy (Gu, 2023). This discovery corresponds with earlier research by (Khanchel, Lassoued, & Baccar, 2023), which indicated that although green innovation frequently yields long-term ecological advantages, its short-term social returns necessitate supplementary initiatives in workforce development, inclusive policies, and stakeholder involvement. In the Indonesian setting, firms may prioritize green innovation for compliance or branding reasons, without clearly linking these breakthroughs to human-centric advantages such as occupational safety or enhancements in quality of life. In contrast to the preceding two factors, supply chain management demonstrates a positive and significant impact on social and well-being performance, hence corroborating Hypothesis 3. This outcome indicates that firms with explicit supplier protocols, ethical sourcing criteria, and transparent sustainability reports generally exhibit enhanced social responsibility results. By promoting equitable labour practices, endorsing local suppliers, and mitigating supply chain risks, these companies enhance the overall social ecosystem, encompassing workforce stability and community advancement (Kähkönen, Lintukangas, & Hallikas, 2018). This finding supports the argument of Yawar and Seuring (Yawar & Seuring, 2017), who emphasized that socially responsible supply chain practices can extend a company's positive impact beyond its internal operations. Furthermore, transparent reporting and proactive risk management in supply chains are often associated with lower employee turnover, stronger stakeholder trust, and enhanced corporate reputation—all of which contribute to social and well-being performance (Shekarian, Ijadi, Zare, & Majava, 2022). This study's findings corroborate earlier research indicating that sustainability oriented strategies, such as digital transformation, green innovation, and supply chain management are essential in influencing social and well-being performance. Digital initiatives facilitate enhanced employee involvement, remote work adaptability, and safety oversight. Green innovation improves environmental results as well as workplace conditions and employee morale. Supply chain transparency guarantees equity and accountability, broadening the company's social duty beyond its internal operations. These findings correspond with the values of younger workforce generations, especially Gen Z, who emphasize mental wellness, ethical corporate practices, and inclusive work settings. Organizations that allocate resources to these domains may secure enduring benefits in talent retention, stakeholder confidence, and sustainability outcomes (Makinde, 2024). This study's findings offer significant implications for business practitioners and corporate decision-makers, especially in emerging economies like Indonesia. The minimal impact of digital transformation and green innovation on social and well-being performance suggests that technology and environmental initiatives alone are inadequate for producing major social results. Organizations must transcend mere technical execution by integrating these activities with human-centric objectives. Digital transformation must be incorporated with staff development initiatives, mental health support frameworks, and digital inclusion policies to effectively improve well-being (Lindkvist & Ekener, 2023). Likewise, green innovation must prioritize not only ecological results but also social dimensions, including worker safety, inclusive design, and community health. Secondly, the beneficial effects of supply chain management underscore the essential function of ethical sourcing and supplier collaboration in promoting social objectives. Managers must prioritize the establishment of transparent, accountable, and

inclusive supply networks (Rau & Yu, 2024). This entails the formulation of social compliance criteria, the provision of support to local and marginalized suppliers, and the disclosure of social risks along the supply chain. These activities enhance external stakeholder interests while simultaneously increasing internal employee satisfaction, mitigating reputational risk, and bolstering long-term sustainability performance (Zhou, Rashid, Zobair, Sobhani, & Siddik, 2023). Companies are urged to incorporate social performance indicators, including well-being measurements, into their ESG reporting frameworks. Implementing this approach will provide a more equitable and thorough assessment of sustainability performance, perhaps attracting investors and people that prioritize values. Beside of managerial implication, this study contributes to the existing literature in several ways. First, it expands the application of Corporate Disclosure Theory by demonstrating how the disclosure of sustainability practices particularly those related to supply chain management can serve as a mechanism for communicating a firm's social responsibility commitments. It also reinforces the idea that transparent and purposeful sustainability disclosures can lead to enhanced stakeholder trust and legitimacy. Second, the study highlights the importance of differentiating between the presence of sustainability initiatives and their strategic integration into broader corporate goals. While digital transformation and green innovation are often studied for their environmental or operational benefits, this research shows that their social impacts depend heavily on how well they are aligned with internal well-being objectives. Third, by using content analysis and keyword frequency scoring as a methodological approach, this study contributes to methodological development in sustainability accounting research, particularly in contexts with limited quantitative ESG datasets such as Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that while digital transformation, green innovation, and ethical supply chain management are integral to advancing sustainability goals, their effectiveness in enhancing social and well-being performance is contingent upon strategic alignment with human-centered values. Merely adopting technological or environmental initiatives is insufficient; instead, firms must integrate these efforts with inclusive, employee-focused policies that address mental health, safety, and equitable opportunities. The pronounced impact of supply chain transparency highlights the importance of ethical sourcing and stakeholder collaboration in shaping responsible corporate behavior, especially in emerging economies like Indonesia. The study also contributes to the literature by extending Corporate Disclosure Theory, emphasizing that transparent sustainability reporting—particularly regarding social practices—can build stakeholder trust and legitimacy. It also differentiates between the superficial presence of sustainability efforts and their deep integration into organizational culture and objectives. Methodologically, the use of content analysis and keyword scoring offers a practical approach for examining ESG issues in data-constrained environments. These findings reinforce the need for organizations to embed social performance indicators into their ESG frameworks to achieve holistic and credible sustainability outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Abdul Aziz, A. F., & Ong, T. (2025). Access to employee assistance programs and employee wellbeing: A cross-sectional study of employees in Southeast Asia. *BMC Public Health*, 25(1), 398. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-21358-7>
2. Afrin, S., Kassim, M. A. B. M., Yusof, M. F., Hassan, M. S., Islam, M. A., & Khairuddin, K. N. B. (2023). Investigating the determinants of employee performance for sustainability: A study on the Bangladesh insurance industry. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15075674>
3. Ahmad, H., Yaqub, M., & Lee, S. H. (2024). Environmental-, social-, and governance-related factors for business investment and sustainability: A scientometric review of global trends. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 26(2), 2965-2987. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-023-02921-x>
4. Bonsu, M. O. A., Guo, Y., & Zhu, X. (2024). Does green innovation mediate corporate social responsibility and environmental performance? Empirical evidence from emerging markets. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 25(2), 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-10-2022-0271>
5. Bougie, S. (2013). Research methods for business: A skill-building approach. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 34(7), 700-701. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2013-0079>

6. Carter, C. R., & Rogers, D. S. (2008). A framework of sustainable supply chain management: Moving toward new theory. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 38(5), 360–387. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09600030810882816>
7. Deloitte. (2024). 2024 Gen Z and Millennial Survey. <https://www.deloitte.com/content/dam/assets-shared/docs/campaigns/2024/deloitte-2024-genz-millennial-survey.pdf?dlva=1>
8. do Nascimento, A. P., Oliveira, M. P., Pettit, T. J., & Bronzo, M. (2021). Practices and mechanisms for increasing supply chain resilience: The supply chain resilience sheaf. *Continuity & Resilience Review*, 3(1), 79–100. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CRR-12-2020-0035>
9. Dubey, R., Gunasekaran, A., & Papadopoulos, T. (2017). Green supply chain management: Theoretical framework and further research directions. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 24(1), 184–218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2016-0011>
10. Ellström, D., Holtström, J., Berg, E., & Josefsson, C. (2022). Dynamic capabilities for digital transformation. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 15(2), 272–286. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-04-2021-0089>
11. Emeric, D. (n.d.). What is the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)? Retrieved from https://esgthereport.com/what-is-the-global-reporting-initiative/?utm_source
12. Erin, O. A., & Ackers, B. (2024). Corporate board, assurance and sustainability reporting practices: A focus on selected African countries. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 20(6), 85–118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAOC-07-2023-0123>
13. Giraud, E. G., & El-Sayed, S. (2021). Gardening for food well-being in the COVID-19 era.
14. Gomez-Trujillo, A. M., & Gonzalez-Perez, M. A. (2022). Digital transformation as a strategy to reach sustainability. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, 11(4), 1137–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SASBE-01-2021-0011>
15. Gu, S. (2023). Green innovation; A way to enhance economic performance of Chinese hotels. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 15(3), 406–426. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-07-2021-0128>
16. Gurler, H. E. (2024). The impact of corporate social responsibility on green innovation: Do industry, data type and region matter? A meta-analysis research. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-024-05277-y>
17. Hales, R., & Birdthistle, N. (2023). The sustainable development goal - SDG#3 good health and well-being. In *Attaining 2030 sustainable development goal: Good health and well-being* (pp. 1–12). <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80455-209-420231001>
18. Hamed, D. (2021). Keywords and collocations in US presidential discourse since 1993: A corpus-assisted analysis. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*, 3(2), 137–158. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHASS-01-2020-0019>
19. Hastig, G. M., & Sodhi, M. M. S. (2020). Blockchain for supply chain traceability: Business requirements and critical success factors. *Production and Operations Management*, 29(4), 935–954. <https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.13147>
20. He, M. (2024). Firm environmental disclosure and government's sustainable leadership: An analysis of keywords in Chinese government work reports. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 15(4), 436–465. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-06-2023-0110>
21. Health, P. (2018). The genetics of well-being. [Abstract, January].
22. Huang, C. H., & Huang, Y. C. (2024). Exploring the linkages among green digital transformation capability, ambidextrous green learning and sustainability performance: A case study of manufacturing firms in Taiwan. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 35(5), 1103–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-10-2023-0452>
23. Hussein, S. (2022). The global demand for migrant care workers: Drivers and implications on migrants' well-being. *Sustainability*, 14(17). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710612>
24. Jedynek, M., Czakon, W., Kuźniarska, A., & Mania, K. (2021). Digital transformation of organizations: What do we know and where to go next? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 34(3), 629–652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-10-2020-0336>
25. Kähkönen, A. K., Lintukangas, K., & Hallikas, J. (2018). Sustainable supply management practices: Making a difference in a firm's sustainability performance. *Supply Chain Management*, 23(6), 518–530. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-01-2018-0036>
26. Kang, Y. C., Hsiao, H. S., & Ni, J. Y. (2022). The role of sustainable training and reward in influencing employee accountability perception and behavior for corporate sustainability. *Sustainability*, 14(18). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811589>
27. Khanchel, I., Lassoued, N., & Baccar, I. (2023). Sustainability and firm performance: The role of environmental, social and governance disclosure and green innovation. *Management Decision*, 61(9), 2720–2739. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2021-1252>
28. Kringleum, L. B., Holm, C. G., Holmgren, J., Friis, O., & Jensen, K. F. (2024). Digital transformation: Strategy comes first to lay the groundwork. *Journal of Business Strategy*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBS-09-2023-0199>
29. Lerman, L. V., Benitez, G. B., Müller, J. M., de Sousa, P. R., & Frank, A. G. (2024). When digital transformation meets supply chain needs in emerging markets: Contributions for social and economic performance. *Supply Chain Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-03-2024-0164>
30. Lindkvist, M., & Ekener, E. (2023). Analysis of human well-being as the area of protection in social life cycle assessment. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*, 28(10), 1428–1442. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11367-023-02213-6>

31. Makinde, O. (2024). Employee well-being matters in corporate strategy. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/oludolapomakinde/2024/06/30/employee-well-being-matters-in-corporate-strategy/>
32. Maldonado-Guzmán, G., Garza-Reyes, J. A., & Pinzón-Castro, S. Y. (2023). Green innovation and firm performance: The mediating role of sustainability in the automotive industry. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 34(6), 1690–1711. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-02-2023-0058>
33. Martínez-Peláez, R., et al. (2023). Role of digital transformation for achieving sustainability: Mediated role of stakeholders, key capabilities, and technology. *Sustainability*, 15(14). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151411221>
34. Mental Health Reform. (2023, October). Digital inclusion and access to mental health services: Reducing barriers and leveraging the positive potential.
35. Murad, M., & Zou, S. (2023). Untangling the influence of green human capital on green supply chain management practices through environmental education and internal environmental management. *International Journal of Innovation Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-01-2023-0026>
36. Nes, R. B. (2010). Happiness in behaviour genetics: Findings and implications. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11(3), 369–381. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-009-9145-6>
37. Nosratabadi, S., Atobishi, T., & Hegedűs, S. (2023). Social sustainability of digital transformation: Empirical evidence from EU-27 countries. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13050126>
38. Novitasari, M., & Agustia, D. (2021). Green supply chain management and firm performance: The mediating effect of green innovation. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 14(2), 391–403. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jiem.3384>
39. Obeng, J. K., Kangas, K., Stamm, L., & Tolvanen, A. (2023). Promoting sustainable well-being through nature-based interventions for young people in precarious situations: Implications for social work. A systematic review. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 24(8). Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-023-00683-x>
40. Omonijo, O. N., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Exploring how green innovation moderates the relationship between innovation strategies and CSR performance in the African states. *Discover Sustainability*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00391-3>
41. Pagán-Castaño, E., Sánchez-García, J., Garrigos-Simon, F. J., & Guijarro-García, M. (2021). The influence of management on teacher well-being and the development of sustainable schools. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052909>
42. Painter-Morland, M., Demuijnck, G., & Ornati, S. (2017). Sustainable development and well-being: A philosophical challenge. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 146(2), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3658-4>
43. Paiva, E. L., Alcázar, R., De Freitas, K. A., Sincorá, L. A., & Elias, A. A. (2024). Can the supply chain management field be more critical? Building new bridges with critical management studies. *Supply Chain Management*, 29(1), 176–206. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-02-2023-0117>
44. Parida, V., Sjödin, D. R., Lenka, S., & Wincent, J. (2015). Developing global service innovation capabilities: How global manufacturers address the challenges of market heterogeneity. *Research-Technology Management*, 58(5), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.5437/08956308X5805360>
45. Rau, P. R., & Yu, T. (2024). A survey on ESG: Investors, institutions and firms. *China Finance Review International*, 14(1), 3–33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CFRI-12-2022-0260>
46. Robertsons, G., & Lapiņa, I. (2023). Digital transformation as a catalyst for sustainability and open innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 9(1), 100017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2023.100017>
47. Rohayati, Y., & Abdillah, A. (2024). Digital transformation for era Society 5.0 and resilience: Urgent issues from Indonesia. *Societies*, 14(12), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14120266>
48. Rustiarini, N. W., Bhegawati, D. A. S., & Mendra, N. P. Y. (2022). Does green innovation improve SME performance? *Economies*, 10(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies10120316>
49. Sacks, D. W., Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2010). Subjective well-being, income, economic development and growth. *Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Working Paper Series*, 1–53. <https://doi.org/10.24148/wp2010-28>
50. Shahzad, M., Qu, Y., Zafar, A. U., Rehman, S. U., & Islam, T. (2020). Exploring the influence of knowledge management process on corporate sustainable performance through green innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(9), 2079–2106. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2019-0624>
51. Shebeshe, E. N., & Sharma, D. (2024). Impact of sustainable supply chain management practices on competitive advantage and organizational performance in the manufacturing sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance*