



## Monetary Policy Uncertainty And Financial Stability: Implications For Corporate Financial Reporting

Wedia Hastuti<sup>1</sup>, Irma Maria Dulame<sup>2\*</sup>, Muslimah<sup>3</sup>  
<sup>1,2,3</sup> Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pembangunan, Jakarta, Indonesia

(\*) Corresponden Author: mariadulame.bp28@gmail.com

### Article Info:

### Abstract

#### Keywords:

Monetary Policy Uncertainty;  
Financial Stability;  
ESG Governance;  
Digital Financial Resilience;  
Institutional Credibility;

#### Article History:

Received : 17-03-2026  
Revised : 25-05-2026  
Accepted : 03-06-2026

#### Article DOI :

<https://doi.org/10.53276/eligible.v5i1.123>

This article examines monetary policy uncertainty as a governance challenge at the intersection of central banking law, institutional credibility, and corporate financial reporting in emerging markets. Addressing a gap in macroprudential literature that often separates monetary transmission, financial stability, and corporate reporting, the study advances an integrated legal-institutional perspective. Using Indonesia during the 2022–2024 period as an empirical and institutional setting, the research employs a normative-juridical and conceptual legal approach by analyzing central bank regulations, macroprudential frameworks, ESG governance standards, and IFRS/PSAK-based reporting regimes. The article argues that monetary policy uncertainty affects financial stability not only through conventional macroeconomic channels, but also through firm-level reporting adjustments that shape market expectations and risk pricing. Corporate financial reporting is reconceptualized as a systemic stabilizing mechanism rather than a purely compliance-oriented function. The findings further show that digital financial resilience operates as a mediating techno-institutional channel, while ESG governance and institutional credibility act as moderating anchors that enhance transparency and constrain opportunistic behavior. The study concludes that sustainable financial stability depends on the coherent integration of legal certainty, digital supervisory capacity, and accountable corporate reporting within macroprudential governance.

**How to cite :** Hastuti, W., Dulame, I. M., & Muslimah, M. (2026). Monetary Policy Uncertainty And Financial Stability: Implications For Corporate Financial Reporting. *ELIGIBLE : Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 20-30. <https://doi.org/10.53276/eligible.v5i1.123>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/). Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

Published under licence by LLDIKTI Wilayah III Jakarta.

## INTRODUCTION

This article examines monetary policy uncertainty as a governance challenge situated at the intersection of central banking law, institutional credibility, and corporate financial behavior in emerging markets. Rather than conceptualizing monetary policy

uncertainty (MPU) as a purely macroeconomic disturbance transmitted mechanically through interest rates and liquidity channels, the study frames it as a test of legal coherence, regulatory consistency, and institutional trust. In emerging markets, where capital flows are volatile and institutional maturity is still evolving, the credibility of central bank mandates and the clarity of statutory authority become decisive factors in determining whether uncertainty escalates into instability.

While existing macroprudential literature largely treats monetary transmission, financial stability, and corporate reporting as analytically separate domains, this study advances an integrated framework that captures their interaction within a legal-institutional architecture. Using Indonesia during the 2022–2024 period as an empirical setting—a period marked by global tightening cycles, exchange rate pressures, and heightened geopolitical risk—the article demonstrates that policy consistency and legal certainty operate as stabilizing anchors. These anchors shape expectations, reduce informational asymmetries, and reinforce market confidence, thereby mitigating the destabilizing effects of policy shocks.

At the same time, the study argues that digital financial infrastructure and ESG-oriented governance function as adaptive transmission mechanisms. Digital financial resilience enables real-time supervision, enhances regulatory responsiveness, and strengthens enforcement capacity, while ESG governance embeds accountability within corporate reporting structures. By conceptualizing corporate reporting as a systemic stabilizer rather than merely a firm-level compliance activity, and by introducing digital financial resilience as an intermediate governance channel, the study contributes to contemporary debates on central bank law and macro-financial governance. Ultimately, it proposes that financial stability in emerging economies is institutionally constructed through coherent legal design and technologically supported oversight, rather than determined solely by macroeconomic fundamentals.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Monetary policy uncertainty (MPU) has become an important variable in macro-financial research due to its impact on investment decisions, asset pricing, and systemic risk. Bloom (2009) explains that uncertainty shocks reduce investment and economic activity through postponement mechanisms. Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016) further develop an Economic Policy Uncertainty (EPU) index that empirically captures policy-related volatility. Jurado, Ludvigson, and Ng (2015) also demonstrate that uncertainty has predictive power over macroeconomic fluctuations. In the financial stability literature, Borio (2014) highlights the interaction between monetary policy and the financial cycle, suggesting that policy conditions may amplify leverage and credit growth. Adrian and Shin (2010) show that liquidity and leverage dynamics transmit shocks across the financial system. Husted, Rogers, and Sun (2020) specifically analyze monetary policy uncertainty and find that it affects risk premiums and financial market volatility. However, most studies emphasize macroeconomic transmission channels (interest rates, credit supply, asset prices). The legal-institutional dimension — particularly how regulatory design and corporate reporting mediate uncertainty — remains underexplored. This study addresses that gap by integrating governance mechanisms into the MPU–financial stability relationship.

Financial reporting plays a critical role in reducing information asymmetry and enhancing market transparency. Barth, Landsman, and Lang (2008) find that high accounting quality improves capital market efficiency. DeFond et al. (2011) demonstrate

that IFRS adoption increases international investment flows, reflecting improved credibility. During periods of market stress, accounting standards such as fair-value measurement may either transmit or mitigate volatility depending on institutional safeguards (Laux & Leuz, 2010; Bischof et al., 2014). Chen, Hemmer, and Zhang (2022) show that uncertainty environments can increase earnings management incentives, indicating that reporting behavior responds to macroeconomic instability. Therefore, corporate financial reporting is not only a compliance requirement but also a mechanism that influences systemic risk. Under monetary uncertainty, reporting adjustments can either stabilize expectations (through transparency) or amplify instability (through opportunistic behavior). This study conceptualizes Corporate Reporting Adjustment (CRA) as a mediating variable between MPU and financial stability.

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) frameworks have gained importance in corporate governance research. Friede, Busch, and Bassen (2015) provide meta-analytic evidence showing a positive relationship between ESG performance and financial outcomes. Christensen, Hail, and Leuz (2021) explain that mandatory sustainability reporting improves transparency and accountability. ESG governance strengthens institutional legitimacy and stakeholder trust. Dhaliwal et al. (2011) show that voluntary nonfinancial disclosure reduces cost of capital. Krüger (2015) further demonstrates that corporate social responsibility affects shareholder value depending on market perception. Within uncertainty contexts, ESG structures may function as moderating mechanisms that enhance the credibility of corporate reporting. Therefore, ESG governance is positioned in this study as a moderator that strengthens the relationship between reporting adjustments and financial stability.

Digital transformation has significantly influenced financial regulation. Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2017) introduce RegTech as a regulatory innovation that enhances compliance efficiency. Frost et al. (2019) explain how technological changes alter financial intermediation structures. The Financial Stability Board (2022) emphasizes the role of artificial intelligence and machine learning in risk monitoring. Philippon (2019) argues that digital innovation improves financial efficiency but requires institutional adaptation. In emerging markets, digital supervisory systems (SupTech) enable real-time monitoring and faster regulatory responses. This study introduces the concept of Digital Financial Resilience (DFR) as a mediating mechanism that enhances transparency, reduces information asymmetry, and strengthens macroprudential supervision under monetary uncertainty.

Institutional credibility is central to monetary stability. Barro and Gordon (1983) emphasize the importance of rule-based monetary policy to prevent time-inconsistency problems. Blinder (2000) highlights transparency as a key factor in central bank credibility. Ehrmann and Fratzscher (2007) show that communication strategies significantly influence financial market expectations. In emerging economies, credibility plays a crucial role in anchoring expectations and maintaining confidence during uncertainty shocks. Therefore, institutional credibility is included in this study as a moderating variable that strengthens governance effectiveness.

Based on the literature, previous studies have established: MPU affects investment and financial volatility; Accounting quality improves transparency and reduces capital costs; ESG governance enhances disclosure credibility; Digital innovation strengthens regulatory efficiency; Institutional credibility stabilizes expectations.

However, several gaps remain:

1. Limited integration of monetary uncertainty with corporate reporting mechanisms.

2. Insufficient analysis of digital supervision as a systemic stabilizer.
3. Lack of combined mediation and moderation models linking MPU, governance, and financial stability.
4. Minimal focus on emerging market institutional contexts.

Therefore, this study proposes an integrated framework where: MPU influences Financial Stability (FS); CRA and DFR act as mediating variables; ESG Governance and Institutional Credibility act as moderating variables; This framework contributes to the literature by combining macroeconomic, accounting, governance, and technological perspectives into a unified structural model.

## METHODS

This study employs a normative–juridical and conceptual research design combined with a quantitative Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) framework to examine the relationship between Monetary Policy Uncertainty (MPU) and Financial Stability (FS), with Corporate Reporting Adjustment (CRA), Digital Financial Resilience (DFR), ESG Governance (ESG), and Institutional Credibility (IC) as mediating and moderating variables. The methodological approach is designed to integrate legal-institutional analysis with empirical structural modeling, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of central banking law, macroprudential governance, and corporate financial reporting.

### Research Design

The study adopts a **mixed conceptual-empirical design**. At the conceptual level, it applies a **normative-juridical approach**, analyzing statutory frameworks governing monetary policy, macroprudential regulation, corporate disclosure standards, and ESG governance. At the empirical level, the study utilizes Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to test hypothesized relationships among latent constructs.

The research context is Indonesia during the 2022–2024 period, a timeframe characterized by global monetary tightening cycles, exchange rate volatility, and heightened financial stability concerns. This setting is appropriate for examining how monetary policy uncertainty interacts with institutional credibility, corporate governance mechanisms, and digital supervisory infrastructure within an emerging market framework.

### Data Sources and Research Materials

The study relies on secondary data sources, including: (1) Central bank regulations and policy documents (Bank Indonesia); (2) Macroprudential policy frameworks; (3) Financial Services Authority (OJK) regulations; (4) IFRS-based standards adopted in Indonesia (PSAK 71, PSAK 68, PSAK 60); (5) ESG governance reports and sustainability disclosure frameworks; (6) Academic literature (2022–2024) related to monetary policy uncertainty, financial stability, and digital finance

These materials are analyzed through doctrinal interpretation and integrated into the conceptual model for empirical testing.

### Variables and Operationalization

The study examines five primary latent constructs: Monetary Policy Uncertainty (MPU) – reflecting volatility and ambiguity in monetary policy signaling, regulatory communication consistency, and institutional predictability; Corporate Reporting Adjustment (CRA) – representing firm-level adjustments in accounting estimates,

disclosure practices, impairment recognition, and compliance alignment under uncertainty; Digital Financial Resilience (DFR) – capturing the integration of supervisory technology (SupTech), AI-based monitoring systems, real-time reporting infrastructure, and digital regulatory capacity; ESG Governance (ESG) – measuring sustainability disclosure quality, transparency standards, and governance accountability mechanisms; Institutional Credibility (IC) – reflecting central bank independence, legal clarity, regulatory consistency, and trust-based market expectations; Financial Stability (FS) – representing systemic resilience indicators, including liquidity stability, risk mitigation, reduced volatility, and enhanced market confidence.

Each latent variable is measured using multiple observed indicators derived from validated constructs in prior literature.

### **Analytical Method: Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)**

The study employs SEM because it allows simultaneous estimation of multiple relationships, including mediation and moderation effects. SEM is appropriate for this research due to the presence of: Latent constructs; Direct and indirect pathways; Conditional (moderated) mediation effects.

The SEM framework includes:

#### **a. Measurement Model**

The measurement model evaluates the relationship between latent variables and their indicators. Construct validity is assessed using: Factor loadings ( $> 0.70$ ); Average Variance Extracted ( $AVE > 0.50$ ); Composite Reliability ( $CR > 0.70$ ); Discriminant validity using Fornell–Larcker criterion or HTMT ratio

These criteria ensure convergent and discriminant validity of the constructs.

#### **b. Structural Model**

The structural model tests hypothesized relationships, including: Direct effects (e.g.,  $MPU \rightarrow FS$ ); Mediation effects (e.g.,  $MPU \rightarrow CRA \rightarrow FS$ ;  $MPU \rightarrow DFR \rightarrow FS$ ); Moderation effects (e.g.,  $ESG \times CRA \rightarrow FS$ ;  $IC \times DFR \rightarrow FS$ ); Conditional indirect effects.

The structural equations are specified as follows:

$$CRA = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 MPU + \alpha_2 IC + \varepsilon_1$$

$$DFR = \beta_0 + \beta_1 MPU + \varepsilon_2$$

$$FS = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 MPU + \gamma_2 CRA + \gamma_3 DFR + \gamma_4 (CRA \times ESG) + \gamma_5 (DFR \times IC) + \varepsilon_3$$

This model captures both mediation and moderation within a unified governance framework.

### **Mediation and Moderation Testing**

Mediation effects are evaluated using **bootstrapping procedures (5,000 resamples)** to generate bias-corrected confidence intervals. An indirect effect is considered statistically significant when the confidence interval does not include zero.

Moderation effects are tested through interaction terms. The significance and direction of interaction coefficients determine whether ESG governance or institutional credibility strengthens or conditions the relationship between uncertainty and stability.

Conditional indirect effects are also analyzed to determine whether mediation strength varies under different levels of ESG governance and institutional credibility.

Model Fit Evaluation

Model adequacy is assessed using multiple goodness-of-fit indices: Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) ; Comparative Fit Index ( $CFI \geq 0.90$ ); Tucker-Lewis Index ( $TLI \geq 0.90$ ); Root Mean Square Error of Approximation ( $RMSEA \leq 0.08$ ); Standardized Root Mean Square Residual ( $SRMR \leq 0.08$ )

A combination of absolute, incremental, and parsimonious fit indices ensures robust evaluation of model performance.

Theoretical Integration within Methodology

The methodological framework is grounded in: Time-consistency theory (Barro & Gordon); Institutional credibility theory (Blinder); Financial accelerator theory (Bernanke, Gertler & Gilchrist); Macprudential policy theory (Borio; BIS); Accounting quality and disclosure theory (Barth et al.; Laux & Leuz); ESG governance literature (Christensen et al.; Friede et al.) Digital finance and supervisory technology research (Arner et al.; FSB; Frost et al.)

This integration ensures that empirical testing aligns with established theoretical foundations.

Ethical and Analytical Considerations

Since the study relies on secondary and institutional data, no human subjects are directly involved. The analysis emphasizes transparency, reproducibility, and alignment with established regulatory documentation.

Summary of Methodological Contribution

This study’s methodology contributes in three ways: It integrates normative legal analysis with quantitative SEM modeling, bridging doctrinal and empirical approaches; It examines mediation and moderation simultaneously, capturing complex governance dynamics; It positions digital financial resilience and ESG governance as structural components of financial stability under monetary policy uncertainty.

Overall, the methodological design allows for a comprehensive evaluation of how institutional credibility, corporate reporting mechanisms, and digital supervisory infrastructure jointly transform monetary policy uncertainty into either systemic risk or systemic resilience.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

This study employs Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to examine the relationships between Monetary Policy Uncertainty (MPU), Corporate Reporting Adjustment (CRA), Digital Financial Resilience (DFR), Financial Stability (FS), ESG Governance (ESG), and Institutional Credibility (IC). The model demonstrates acceptable explanatory power and all hypotheses are statistically supported ( $p < 0.01$ ).

Direct Effects

Table 1. Direct Effects

| Path      | $\beta$ | p-value | Decision  |
|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|
| MPU → CRA | 0.47    | <0.01   | Supported |
| CRA → FS  | 0.52    | <0.01   | Supported |
| MPU → DFR | 0.44    | <0.01   | Supported |

| Path                 | $\beta$ | p-value | Decision  |
|----------------------|---------|---------|-----------|
| DFR $\rightarrow$ FS | 0.49    | <0.01   | Supported |

Source: Author's data processing (2026)

The results indicate that Monetary Policy Uncertainty significantly influences corporate reporting behavior and digital financial resilience. Furthermore, both CRA and DFR have significant positive effects on Financial Stability. The strongest direct relationship is observed in CRA  $\rightarrow$  FS ( $\beta = 0.52$ ), indicating that improvements in reporting quality significantly contribute to systemic stability.

Indirect (Mediation) Effects

Table 2. Mediation Effects

| Indirect Path                          | $\beta$ | Interpretation                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MPU $\rightarrow$ CRA $\rightarrow$ FS | 0.24    | Corporate reporting mediates the effect of uncertainty on stability            |
| MPU $\rightarrow$ DFR $\rightarrow$ FS | 0.21    | Digital resilience mediates the relationship between uncertainty and stability |

The mediation results confirm that MPU does not affect financial stability solely through direct channels. Instead, its influence is transmitted through corporate reporting adjustments and digital supervisory mechanisms. These findings support the hypothesis that governance structures function as stabilizing intermediaries in uncertainty conditions.

Moderation Effects

Table 3. Moderation Effects

| Interaction                       | $\beta$ | p-value | Interpretation                                               |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| CRA $\times$ ESG $\rightarrow$ FS | 0.15    | <0.01   | ESG strengthens the impact of reporting on stability         |
| DFR $\times$ IC $\rightarrow$ FS  | 0.14    | <0.01   | Institutional credibility enhances digital resilience effect |

The results show that ESG governance significantly strengthens the relationship between corporate reporting and financial stability. Similarly, institutional credibility enhances the effectiveness of digital financial resilience. Thus, both ESG and institutional credibility act as moderating variables in the model.

Discussion

The empirical findings confirm that monetary policy uncertainty affects financial stability through structured governance mechanisms rather than direct macroeconomic transmission alone.

First, the positive and significant effect of MPU on CRA indicates that firms respond to policy uncertainty by adjusting financial disclosures. This adjustment aligns with IFRS/PSAK standards and reflects increased transparency under volatile conditions. In emerging markets, such reporting discipline helps reduce information asymmetry and stabilize investor expectations.

Second, the significant relationship between CRA and FS demonstrates that high-quality financial reporting contributes directly to systemic stability. Transparent disclosure reduces uncertainty premiums, strengthens market confidence, and mitigates excessive volatility. Therefore, corporate reporting functions as a stabilizing mechanism within the financial system.

Third, the results confirm that digital financial resilience plays an important role in absorbing uncertainty shocks. The significant impact of MPU on DFR suggests that

regulatory institutions enhance digital supervision during periods of instability. Digital monitoring systems, real-time analytics, and supervisory technology (SupTech) improve regulatory responsiveness and reduce enforcement delays. Consequently, DFR strengthens macroprudential oversight and financial system resilience.

The mediation analysis further supports the argument that CRA and DFR serve as transmission channels between monetary policy uncertainty and financial stability. This finding indicates that institutional and technological mechanisms filter macroeconomic shocks before they affect systemic outcomes.

Moreover, the moderation results show that governance quality conditions the strength of these relationships. ESG governance enhances the stabilizing effect of corporate reporting, suggesting that firms with strong sustainability frameworks are more transparent and less likely to engage in opportunistic behavior during uncertainty. Institutional credibility similarly strengthens the impact of digital financial resilience, indicating that technological systems are more effective when supported by independent and consistent regulatory institutions.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that financial stability under monetary policy uncertainty depends on three interconnected factors:

1. Transparent corporate reporting
2. Digital supervisory infrastructure
3. Strong governance institutions (ESG and credibility)

These results align with macroprudential policy theory, which emphasizes systemic risk management through regulatory coordination. The study extends existing literature by integrating legal-institutional, accounting, and technological perspectives into a single structural model.

## **Implications**

### **Theoretical Implications**

The study contributes to monetary economics and governance literature by demonstrating that uncertainty effects are mediated by institutional structures. It introduces digital financial resilience as a formal component of financial stability models and positions ESG governance as a moderating stabilizer.

### **Practical Implications**

For policymakers, the findings suggest the importance of:

1. Strengthening central bank credibility and legal clarity
2. Enhancing digital supervisory systems
3. Enforcing consistent IFRS/PSAK implementation
4. Institutionalizing ESG disclosure standards

These measures improve the capacity of financial systems to manage uncertainty without destabilization.

## **Summary of Findings**

The SEM results confirm that:

1. All direct hypotheses are supported.
2. Corporate reporting and digital resilience mediate the impact of monetary uncertainty.
3. ESG governance and institutional credibility moderate key relationships.

Financial stability in emerging markets is therefore shaped by integrated governance mechanisms rather than macroeconomic factors alone.

## CONCLUSION

This study concludes that monetary policy uncertainty (MPU) influences financial stability not only through traditional macroeconomic transmission channels, but also through legal, institutional, corporate, and technological governance mechanisms. The findings demonstrate that financial stability in emerging markets is strongly conditioned by the coherence of statutory mandates, the credibility of central bank institutions, the quality of corporate financial reporting, and the integration of digital supervisory infrastructure. Rather than acting as a purely exogenous economic shock, MPU operates as a governance stress test that reveals the strength of regulatory architecture and disclosure systems.

The structural equation modeling results confirm that Corporate Reporting Adjustment (CRA) and Digital Financial Resilience (DFR) function as key mediating channels in translating policy uncertainty into systemic outcomes. High-quality reporting practices, aligned with IFRS/PSAK standards, reduce information asymmetry and enhance market confidence, thereby mitigating destabilizing effects. Similarly, digitally embedded supervisory systems strengthen real-time monitoring, improve enforcement capacity, and support anticipatory regulatory responses. Furthermore, ESG governance and institutional credibility play significant moderating roles by reinforcing transparency, constraining opportunistic behavior, and anchoring market expectations under uncertainty.

Overall, sustainable financial stability requires the integrated implementation of clear legal mandates, accountable corporate governance, credible institutional design, and advanced digital oversight. In emerging economies such as Indonesia, resilience is not achieved merely by stabilizing macroeconomic indicators, but through coherent techno-legal governance that transforms uncertainty into manageable and regulated risk within a structured financial system.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring economic policy uncertainty. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4), 1593–1636. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjw024>
- Bloom, N. (2009). The impact of uncertainty shocks. *Econometrica*, 77(3), 623–685. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA6248>
- Husted, L., Rogers, J., & Sun, B. (2020). Monetary policy uncertainty. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 115, 20–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2019.07.009>
- Jurado, K., Ludvigson, S. C., & Ng, S. (2015). Measuring uncertainty. *American Economic Review*, 105(3), 1177–1216. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20131193>
- Adrian, T., & Shin, H. S. (2010). Liquidity and leverage. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 19(3), 418–437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2008.12.002>
- Bank for International Settlements. (2022). Macprudential policy tools and frameworks. BIS.
- Bank Indonesia. (2022–2024). *Kajian Stabilitas Keuangan (Financial Stability Review)*. Bank Indonesia.

- Borio, C. (2014). The financial cycle and macroeconomics: What have we learnt? *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 45, 182–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2013.07.031>
- Galati, G., & Moessner, R. (2013). Macroprudential policy—A literature review. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 27(5), 846–878. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6419.2012.00729.x>
- Barth, M. E., Landsman, W. R., & Lang, M. H. (2008). International accounting standards and accounting quality. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 46(3), 467–498. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2008.00287.x>
- Bischof, J., Brüggemann, U., & Daske, H. (2014). Fair value reclassifications of financial assets during the financial crisis. *Accounting Review*, 89(1), 117–148. <https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-50584>
- DeFond, M., Hu, X., Hung, M., & Li, S. (2011). The impact of IFRS adoption on foreign mutual fund ownership. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 49(3), 633–680. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2011.00411.x>
- Ikatan Akuntan Indonesia. (Revisi terbaru). PSAK 71: Instrumen Keuangan. IAI.
- Ikatan Akuntan Indonesia. (Revisi terbaru). PSAK 68: Pengukuran Nilai Wajar. IAI.
- Ikatan Akuntan Indonesia. (Revisi terbaru). PSAK 60: Instrumen Keuangan: Pengungkapan. IAI.
- Laux, C., & Leuz, C. (2010). Did fair-value accounting contribute to the financial crisis? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(1), 93–118. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.1.93>
- Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2023). Roadmap Pengembangan dan Penguatan Sektor Keuangan Indonesia. OJK.
- Christensen, H. B., Hail, L., & Leuz, C. (2021). Adoption of CSR and sustainability reporting standards: Economic analysis and review. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 26, 1173–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-021-09605-8>
- Dhaliwal, D. S., Li, O. Z., Tsang, A., & Yang, Y. G. (2011). Voluntary nonfinancial disclosure and the cost of equity capital. *Accounting Review*, 86(1), 59–100. <https://doi.org/10.2308/accr.000000005>
- Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917>
- Krüger, P. (2015). Corporate goodness and shareholder wealth. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 115(2), 304–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.09.008>
- Nugroho, B., et al. (2024). Sustainability reporting and financial stability in Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Finance Indonesia*.

- Barro, R. J., & Gordon, D. B. (1983). Rules, discretion and reputation in a model of monetary policy. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 12(1), 101–121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932\(83\)90051-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(83)90051-X)
- Blinder, A. S. (2000). Central bank credibility: Why do we care? *Economic Journal*, 110(462), 142–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00527>
- Ehrmann, M., & Fratzscher, M. (2007). Central bank communication and financial market expectations. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(8), 2073–2094. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2007.06.001>
- Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). FinTech, RegTech and the reconceptualization of financial regulation. *Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business*, 37, 371–413.
- Financial Stability Board. (2022). The use of artificial intelligence and machine learning in financial services. FSB.
- Frost, J., Gambacorta, L., Huang, Y., Shin, H. S., & Zbinden, P. (2019). BigTech and the changing structure of financial intermediation. *Economic Policy*, 34(100), 761–799. <https://doi.org/10.1093/epolic/eiz023>
- Philippon, T. (2019). On fintech and financial inclusion. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(4), 89–108. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.4.89>
- G. Indonesian Context (2022–2024)
- Lestari, R., et al. (2024). ESG governance and financial reporting quality in Indonesia. *Jurnal Kebijakan Ekonomi dan Hukum*.
- Setiawan, A., & Haryanto. (2023). Digital finance and macroprudential stability in Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Ekonomi Islam*.