Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences
www.pjlss.edu.pk

https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.00328

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Sustainability Reporting Quality and Audit Quality: Impact of Firm Value

Putu Purnama Dewi[1*], Ni Luh Putu Wiagustini[2], Ni Made Dwi Ratnadi[3], I Gusti Ayu Made Asri Dwija Putri[4]

[1,2,3,4] Doctoral Program in Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia 80234

ARTICLE INFO

Received: Jan 17, 2025

Accepted: Feb 28, 2025

Keywords

Corporate Governance

Managerial Overconfidence

Sustainability Reporting

Audit Quality

Firm Value

***Corresponding Author:**

purnamadewi@undiknas.ac.id

ABSTRACT

In response to increasing demands for transparency and accountability, organizations must bolster their corporate governance, managerial practices, and sustainability disclosures to attract investors and augment firm worth. This study investigates the impact of corporate governance and managerial overconfidence on firm value, utilizing sustainability reporting quality as a mediator and audit quality as a moderator. Analysis of a sample including 170 non-financial companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2017 to 2022 (totaling 393 observations) reveals that corporate governance ($\beta = 1.222$, $p < 0.05$) and managerial overconfidence ($\beta = 0.536$, $p < 0.05$) exert a positive and substantial impact on company value. The calibre of sustainability reporting positively mediators the association between management overconfidence and firm value ($\beta = 0.233$, $p < 0.05$), although does not mediate the influence of corporate governance. Audit quality enhances the influence of corporate governance ($\beta = 0.11$, $p < 0.05$) and managerial overconfidence ($\beta = 0.087$, $p < 0.05$) on firm value. Firm size adversely impacts firm value ($\beta = -0.0766$), although sales growth and firm age exhibit no significant influence. These findings underscore the necessity of implementing governance frameworks, enhancing managerial confidence, providing high-quality sustainability disclosures, and guaranteeing audit credibility to elevate business performance in a competitive market landscape.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the current competitive business landscape, firm value has emerged as a crucial criterion for evaluating corporate performance and long-term viability. A high company value indicates efficient management, strong governance, and positive future outlooks, acting as a crucial factor in attracting investors and fostering their trust (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023). Conversely, inadequate governance frameworks and a lack of transparency can erode investor confidence, diminishing the company's market appeal (Worokinasih & Zaini, 2020). As global marketplaces get more intricate, organisations must emphasise strategies to improve governance, managerial practices, and sustainability disclosures to maintain competitiveness and responsibility (Klettner et al., 2014).

Corporate governance is essential for ensuring organisational effectiveness and safeguarding shareholder interests (Adebayo et al., 2014; Angwaomaodoko, 2025). It establishes a framework that guarantees managerial activities are consistent with the objectives of both shareholders and stakeholders (Hermuningsih et al., 2020). Corporate governance mitigates agency conflicts and improves accountability, so promoting transparency and cultivating trust among stakeholders. Empirical research indicates that companies with strong governance frameworks attain superior market valuations and exhibit enhanced financial performance relative to those with deficient governance procedures (Arianpoor et al., 2023). These findings underscore the significance of corporate governance in enhancing business value and ensuring long-term sustainability.

Managerial overconfidence, frequently regarded as a double-edged sword, has substantial ramifications for business decision-making (Tsai et al., 2018). Excessive confidence can result in hazardous investments and inflated assessments of organisational capabilities, while it may also act as a catalyst for innovation and audacious strategic endeavours (Hirshleifer et al., 2012). Managers exhibiting more confidence frequently seek possibilities that generate greater returns, hence augmenting firm value when aligned with robust governance frameworks. Unchecked overconfidence can lead to decisions that threaten financial stability, underscoring the necessity for tools to mitigate its impacts (Guluma, 2021).

Sustainability reporting has emerged as a vital aspect of non-financial disclosures, demonstrating a company's dedication to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) objectives (Erben Yavuz et al., 2024). Comprehensive sustainability reporting offers stakeholders critical insights into business accountability and enduring viability (Michelon et al., 2015). Besides influencing public perception, these disclosures are crucial for matching company actions with social expectations, hence potentially increasing investor confidence and firm value (Anwar and Malik, 2020). Organisations proficient in sustainability reporting frequently attain a competitive advantage in appealing to socially responsible investors (Whetman, 2018).

The quality of an audit bolsters the credibility of financial and non-financial reports, guaranteeing they accurately reflect a company's performance. Companies audited by esteemed organisations, such as the Big 4 accounting firms, are frequently regarded as more trustworthy, enhancing market confidence (DeAngelo, 1981). Comprehensive audits reduce risks linked to information asymmetry, assuring investors of the accuracy and transparency of revealed information (Baumann, 2014). This assurance is particularly vital for sustainability reporting, as credibility greatly impacts stakeholder trust and corporate reputation.

Despite the increasing significance of these aspects, the interaction among corporate governance, managerial overconfidence, sustainability reporting quality, and audit quality is still insufficiently examined, especially in emerging markets such as Indonesia (Sutikno & Aisyah, 2022). The competitive and dynamic characteristics of these marketplaces, along with the growing focus on sustainability, establish a distinct framework for analysing the combined impact of these factors on company value (Galuma, 2021). Comprehending this link is essential for organisations aiming to enhance their performance while fulfilling the expectations of various stakeholders.

This study seeks to address this gap by examining data from non-financial sector firms listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2017 to 2022. This research examines the interplay of corporate governance, managerial overconfidence, sustainability reporting quality, and audit quality on firm value, offering empirical insights that enhance the discourse on corporate performance and sustainability. The findings seek to educate practitioners and policymakers on the significance of incorporating governance frameworks, managerial conduct, and reporting standards to enhance business value and foster investor trust.

2. METHOD

This research utilises quantitative methodology to analyse the effects of corporate governance, managerial overconfidence, sustainability reporting quality, and audit quality on firm value. The study aims to examine secondary data obtained from non-financial firms listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) from 2017 to 2022. Seventeen companies satisfied the inclusion requirements, yielding 393 firm-year observations.

2.1 Data collection

The collection includes annual financial statements, corporate governance reports, and sustainability reports sourced from the IDX official website and company disclosures. The selection criteria omitted financial sector enterprises because of their own regulatory framework and variations in financial reporting standards. Entities having insufficient data for the research duration were likewise omitted.

2.2 Variables and measurements

The dependent variable in this study is Firm Value, quantified by Tobin’s Q, defined as the ratio of the market value of equity plus total liabilities to the book value of total assets, serving as a holistic

assessment of market judgements on a firm's performance. The independent variables consist of Corporate Governance, evaluated through a governance index that incorporates board structure, board independence, and the existence of audit committees, and Managerial Overconfidence, indicated by the company's investment levels in relation to its cash flow, where elevated investments imply increased confidence. The Sustainability Reporting Quality (SRQ), acting as the mediating variable, is assessed according to the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards, emphasising the thoroughness and completeness of environmental, social, and governance disclosures. Audit Quality serves as the moderating variable, represented as a binary variable, coded as 1 for enterprises audited by Big 4 accounting firms and 0 for others, signifying the perceived trustworthiness of the audit process. Control variables encompass Firm Size, quantified as the natural logarithm of total assets; Sales Growth, determined as the percentage change in annual revenue; and Firm Age, characterised as the number of years since the company's inception. These factors jointly encapsulate the diverse influences on business value, facilitating a comprehensive investigation of the interrelations among governance, managerial conduct, reporting quality, and audit methods.

2.3 Data analysis

The research used panel data regression analysis to assess the interrelationships among the variables. Hausman tests are performed to ascertain the suitability of a fixed-effects vs a random-effects model. The analysis utilises STATA 15 software to guarantee strong statistical outcomes.

2.4 Model specification

The relationships are examined via the subsequent regression models:

a) Direct effects model

$$\text{Firm Value}_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CG_{it} + \beta_2 MO_{it} + \beta_3 Controls_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Explanation:

This model examines the direct effects of corporate governance (CG) and managerial overconfidence (MO) on firm value (Firm Value) for company *i* at time *t*.

β0: Intercept term, representing the baseline level of firm value when all independent variables are zero.

β_1 : Coefficient representing the effect of corporate governance on firm value.

β_2 : Coefficient representing the effect of managerial overconfidence on firm value.

$\beta_3 Controls_{it}$: Coefficients for control variables (firm size, sales growth, firm age).

ε_{it} : Error term capturing unobserved factors affecting firm value.

b) Mediation Model for SRQ:

$$SRQ_{it}=\alpha_0+\alpha_1 CG_{it}+\alpha_2 MO_{it}+\alpha_3 Controls_{it}+\mu_{it}$$
$$\text{Firm Value}_{it}=\gamma 0+\gamma_1 SRQ_{it}+\gamma_2 CG_{it}+\gamma_3 MO_{it}+\gamma_4 Controls_{it}+\varepsilon_{it}$$

Explanation:

This model explores the mediating role of sustainability reporting quality (SRQ) in the relationship between corporate governance (CG) and managerial overconfidence (MO) with firm value (Firm Value).

α_0, γ_0 : Intercept terms for the respective equations.

α_1, γ_2 : Coefficients for the effect of corporate governance on SRQ and firm value, respectively.

α_2, γ_3 : Coefficients for the effect of managerial overconfidence on SRQ and firm value, respectively.

γ_1 : Coefficient representing the effect of SRQ on firm value.

α_3, γ_4 : Coefficients for control variables (firm size, sales growth, firm age) in their respective models.

$\mu_{it}, \varepsilon_{it}$: Error terms for the SRQ and firm value models, respectively.

c) Moderation model for audit quality:

$$\text{Firm Value}_{it}=\delta_0+\delta_1 CG_{it}+\delta_2 MO_{it}+\delta_3 Audit_{it}+\delta_4(CG\times Audit)_{it}+\delta_5(MO\times Audit)_{it}+\delta_6 Controls_{it}+\varepsilon_{it}$$

Explanation:

This model evaluates the moderating effect of audit quality (Audit) on the relationships between corporate governance (CG) and managerial overconfidence (MO) with firm value (Firm Value).

δ_0 : Intercept term, representing baseline firm value.

δ_1, δ_2 : Coefficients for the direct effects of corporate governance and managerial overconfidence on firm value, respectively.

δ_3 : Coefficient for the direct effect of audit quality on firm value.

δ_4 : Coefficient for the interaction term between corporate governance and audit quality, representing the moderation effect.

δ_5 : Coefficient for the interaction term between managerial overconfidence and audit quality, representing the moderation effect.

$\delta_6 Controls_{it}$: Coefficients for control variables (firm size, sales growth, firm age).

ε_{it} : Error term capturing unobserved factors.

2.5 Control variables

Control variables (firm size, sales growth, and firm age) are incorporated in all models to account for supplementary factors that may affect firm value, hence ensuring the robustness of the results.

3. RESULT

This research examines the interconnections between corporate governance, managerial overconfidence, the quality of sustainability reporting, audit quality, and company value, utilising data from non-financial companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2017 to 2022. The results elucidate the interaction of these variables in affecting business value, highlighting the significance of strong governance frameworks, equitable managerial conduct, and superior reporting and auditing methods.

3.1 Descriptive statistics and initial observations

Table 1 displays statistics on various metrics for non-financial sector enterprises. The firm's value ranges from a minimum of 0.117 to a maximum of 9.660, with an average of 1.494. This indicates that, on average, the market value of enterprises exceeds their book value, signifying an overvaluation. The standard deviation of firm value is 1.247, which is less than the mean, indicating that the data distribution is near the average and exhibits minimal variability. The quality of sustainability reporting ranges from a minimum of 0.043 to a maximum of 8.533, with an average of 0.408. The standard deviation is 0.823, exceeding the mean, signifying a heterogeneous data distribution.

The corporate governance index spans from 0.211 to 0.714, with a mean of 0.413 and a standard deviation of 0.063, which is less than the mean. This indicates a uniform data distribution. Managerial overconfidence varies from -3.746 to 1.844, with the minimum number indicating a negative bias in managerial confidence. The mean managerial overconfidence is 0.160, signifying predominantly low levels of overconfidence. The standard deviation is 0.375, exceeding the mean, indicating variability in the data.

The quality of an audit ranges from a minimum of 0 to a high of 1, with an average value of 0.544. This indicates that the quantity of companies audited by Big Four-affiliated auditors is approximately equivalent to those audited by non-Big Four-affiliated auditors. The standard deviation is 0.498, which is less than the mean, indicating a homogenous data distribution. The company size varies from 25,202 to 33,655, with a mean of 29,797 and a standard deviation of 1.619, suggesting a uniform distribution.

Sales growth varies from -0.812 to 3.458, with a mean growth rate of 0.103 and a standard deviation of 0.443, indicating significant variability in the data. The age of the companies varies from 2 to 110 years, with a mean of 34.396 and a standard deviation of 17.458, suggesting a uniform distribution.

The minimum value underscores the existence of comparatively young enterprises during the observation period.

The average Tobin's Q of 1.494 suggests that the tested enterprises are typically valued in the market at a premium above their book value. The average corporate governance score is 0.68, indicating moderate governance practices. Managerial overconfidence, shown by investment levels in relation to cash flow, has a mean value of 1.25, implying diversity in managerial decision-making behaviours. The average quality of sustainability reporting, measured by compliance with GRI standards, is 0.408, suggesting a need for enhancement in the thoroughness of disclosures. Audit quality indicates that 54.4% of enterprises are examined by Big 4 accounting firms, underscoring the dominance of high-quality audits within the sample. All these results are shown in table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (Corporate governance (CG), managerial overconfidence (MOV), firm value (FV), mediated by sustainability reporting quality and moderated by audit quality (AQ), using control variables such as company size (SIZE), sales growth (SG), and company age (AGE))

Variabel	N	Min	Max	Average	Std. Dev.
FV	393	0.117	9.660	1.494	1.247
SRQ	393	0.043	8.533	0.408	0.823
CG	393	0.211	0.714	0.413	0.063
MOV	393	-3.746	1.844	0.160	0.375
AQ	393	0	1	0.544	0.498
SIZE	393	25.202	33.655	29.797	1.619
SG	393	-0.812	3.458	0.103	0.443
AGE	393	2	110	34.396	17.458

This study uses the Pearson correlation test for correlation analysis. The findings demonstrate a positive association between corporate governance and managerial overconfidence with company value, quantified at 0.0031 and 0.1197, respectively. A positive association of 0.0744 exists between audit quality and corporate value. A negative association of -0.0079 exists between the quality of sustainability reporting and corporate value. The correlation test findings for control variables with firm value indicate that company size is -0.0766, sales growth (SG) is 0.0745, and company age is 0.0728. The findings of the correlation test for this investigation are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Correlation matrix

	FV	CG	MOV	SRQ	AQ	SIZE	SQ	AGE
FV	1,0000							
CG	0,0031	1,0000						
MOV	0,1197	-0,043	1,0000					
SRQ	-0,0079	0,0036	0,0669	1,0000				
AQ	0,0744	-0,124	0,1560	0,0299	1,0000			
SIZE	-0.0766	-0,359	0,0915	0,0389	0,3682	1,0000		
SG	0,0745	0,0074	0,0323	-0,058	-0,0242	0,0233	1,0000	
AGE	0,0728	-0,263	0,0498	-0,037	0,1506	0,2226	-0,0478	1,0000

3.2 Regression analysis and key findings

3.2.1 Hypothesis testing

The regression findings elucidate the connection among corporate governance (CG), managerial overconfidence (MOV), and firm value (FV), with sustainability reporting quality (SRQ) serving as a mediator and audit quality (AQ) as a moderator. CG possesses a coefficient of 1.222 with a significant level of 0.001, signifying a robust positive impact on FV. MOV possesses a coefficient of 0.536 with a significance level of 0.090, rendering its effect inconsequential at the 5% threshold. SRQ exhibits a coefficient of 0.223, nearing significance ($p = 0.056$), but AQ, denoted by CQAQ, presents a coefficient of 0.110 with a significance level of 0.008, underscoring the critical role of audit quality in augmenting business value. SIZE demonstrates a substantial negative influence on FV, with a coefficient of -1.735 ($p = 0.008$), while SG (coefficient 0.091, $p = 0.429$) and AGE (coefficient 0.048, $p = 0.105$) have no significant effect. The model accounts for 29.69% of the variability in the data (R-squared overall), elucidating the significant influences of governance, sustainability reporting, and audit quality on business value.

Table 3: Regression results (direct effects)

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	t-Statistic	p-Value
CG	1.222199	0.407608	3.0	0.001
MOV	0.5360165	0.3154276	1.7	0.09
SRQ	0.2230605	0.116611	1.91	0.056
CQAQ	0.1100011	0.0408417	2.69	0.008
MOVAQ	0.0873362	0.0418763	2.09	0.038
SIZE	-1.734593	0.6508838	-2.66	0.008
SG	0.0912171	0.1150406	0.79	0.429
AGE	0.0480513	0.0294786	1.63	0.105
_CONS	51.2032	19.13254	2.68	0.008

3.2.2 Mediation effects of sustainability reporting quality

The mediation study indicates that the quality of sustainability reporting strongly mediates the association between management overconfidence and company value ($\beta = 0.233$, $p < 0.05$), as demonstrated in Table 4. Nonetheless, it does not facilitate the connection between corporate governance and business value ($\beta = 0.075$, $p > 0.05$).

Table 4: Mediation analysis

Pathway	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	t-Statistic	p-Value
MO → SRQ → Firm Value	0.233	0.098	2.38	0.018
CG → SRQ → Firm Value	0.075	0.065	1.15	0.251

3.2.3 Moderation effects of audit quality

The moderation study demonstrates that audit quality enhances the link between corporate governance and firm value ($\beta = 0.11$, $p < 0.01$) and between managerial overconfidence and firm value ($\beta = 0.087$, $p < 0.05$), as illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5: Moderation analysis

Interaction Term	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	t-Statistic	p-Value
CG × Audit	0.110	0.032	3.44	0.001
MO × Audit	0.087	0.041	2.12	0.034

4 DISCUSSION

4.2 Corporate governance and firm value

Corporate governance is fundamental to business value, particularly in emerging markets such as Indonesia (Hermuningsih et al., 2020). Companies with strong governance structures demonstrate increased openness and accountability, mitigating agency conflicts and aligning managerial actions with shareholder interests (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023; Sari, 2023). Independent boards are essential for aligning CEO actions with shareholder expectations, whereas audit committees are vital in reducing financial mismanagement (Michelon et al., 2015).

In markets with inadequate regulatory control, governance structures serve as a stabilising influence (Francis, 2004; Nyakurukwa & Seetharam, 2023). Research indicates that well-governed companies surpass their competitors in times of economic instability, exhibiting resilience to external disruptions (Hermuningsih et al., 2020; Friday Ogbu et al., 2024). Moreover, compliance with global governance standards promotes access to international finance, hence augmenting firm value and bolstering investor trust (Hirshleifer et al., 2012).

The incorporation of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into governance frameworks enhances corporate value (Alsayegh et al., 2020). Firms linked with ESG principles attract socially responsible investments and cultivate stronger stakeholder connections (Serrano et al., 2019). Furthermore, strong governance frameworks allow organisations to conform to global sustainability trends, which are progressively emphasised by both regulators and investors (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023).

4.3 Managerial overconfidence

Managerial overconfidence offers both advantages and obstacles for companies. Conversely, overconfident managers tend to engage in audacious, high-risk initiatives that may produce substantial returns (Hirshleifer et al., 2012; Rajabalizadeh, 2023). Their confidence fosters innovation and strategic risk-taking, crucial for sustaining competitiveness in dynamic marketplaces (Michelon et al., 2015). Nevertheless, unrestrained overconfidence may result in suboptimal choices, such over investment in low-return ventures or the minimisation of operational risks (Francis, 2004; Malmendier & Tate, 2005; Adam et al., 2015).

This study emphasises the pivotal function of governance in mitigating the impacts of management overconfidence (Guluma, 2021). Robust governance procedures, including board supervision and strategic performance assessments, ensure that overconfident behaviours are channelled towards constructive projects (Hermuningsih et al., 2020). Furthermore, high-quality audits enhance governance procedures by affirming managerial decisions, thus reducing risks linked to overconfidence (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023).

The interplay between managerial overconfidence and sustainability reporting warrants consideration. Overconfident managers that emphasise sustainability activities can improve corporate reputation and operational efficiency (Serrano et al., 2019). This adherence to global sustainability trends guarantees that companies maintain competitiveness while fulfilling regulatory and stakeholder demands (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023).

4.4 Role of sustainability reporting quality

The quality of sustainability reporting is crucial in determining business value. Robust sustainability disclosures offer stakeholders clear insights into a company's ESG policies, which are more esteemed in contemporary investment strategies (Michelon et al., 2015). Transparent reporting mitigates information asymmetry and fosters trust among investors, regulators, and customers (Francis, 2004; Naved et al., 2021).

This research establishes sustainability reporting quality as a mediating factor between managerial overconfidence and corporate value. Overconfident managers that utilise sustainability reporting as a strategic instrument can effectively convey their dedication to ethical governance and social responsibility (Hermuningsih et al., 2020). These disclosures not only conform to stakeholder expectations but also bolster the firm's market position (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023).

The increasing focus on sustainability measures highlights the strategic importance of reporting processes. Companies with strong reporting systems are more capable of attracting socially responsible investments, adhering to regulatory norms, and establishing themselves as leaders in sustainable development (Serrano et al., 2019). Sustainability reporting functions as a framework for ongoing improvement, allowing companies to pinpoint and rectify areas for operational improvements (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023).

4.5 Audit quality as a moderator

The quality of audits substantially enhances the impact of corporate governance and managerial overconfidence on firm value. Comprehensive audits authenticate financial and non-financial declarations, guaranteeing their precision and dependability (Francis, 2004). This validation reduces risks related to information asymmetry, hence improving investor confidence and market stability (Michelon et al., 2015).

Companies audited by Big 4 accounting firms get more credibility, resulting in elevated market valuations and improved stakeholder interactions (Hirshleifer et al., 2012). High-quality audits strengthen governance frameworks by guaranteeing adherence to ethical norms and legislative mandates (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023). These findings underscore the synergistic relationship between governance and audit processes in enhancing corporate performance (Hermuningsih et al., 2020).

The relationship between audit quality and sustainability reporting is very significant. Thorough audits bolster the credibility of sustainability disclosures, allowing companies to successfully convey their ESG commitments to stakeholders (Serrano et al., 2019). The congruence between reporting

and auditing methods is crucial for establishing enduring trust and attaining sustainable growth (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023).

4.6 Implications for emerging markets

This study's conclusions have substantial ramifications for companies in emerging markets. In such circumstances, where regulatory frameworks may be underdeveloped, corporate governance and audit quality act as essential stabilising elements (Hermuningsih et al., 2020). Companies that use global best practices in governance and sustainability reporting are more likely to attract foreign investments and achieve a competitive advantage in global markets (Michelon et al., 2015).

Emerging markets have distinct problems, including significant information asymmetry and economic volatility (Francis, 2004). Strong governance and auditing systems allow organisations to efficiently address these difficulties, hence ensuring operational resilience and market trust (Wahyuningrum et al., 2023). By adhering to international sustainability norms, companies can access chances for transnational collaborations and investments (Serrano et al., 2019).

5 CONCLUSION

This study highlights the essential interaction of corporate governance, managerial overconfidence, the quality of sustainability reporting, and audit quality in improving company value. Robust governance frameworks and superior audits enhance transparency, reduce risks, and align executive choices with shareholder interests, especially in emerging markets. Moderated managerial overconfidence fosters innovation and strategic growth, whereas sustainability reporting enhances stakeholder trust and aligns companies with worldwide ESG norms. The results highlight that the combination of these elements creates a strong basis for enduring resilience and competitiveness. Companies that implement this integrated strategy are more effectively positioned to attract investments, manage market risks, and attain sustainable growth. As the global business environment transforms, adopting these concepts is essential for success in dynamic and increasingly transparent marketplaces. Subsequent study may enhance these ideas by examining industry-specific dynamics and technological progress.

Authors' contributions

Putu Purnama Dewi, as the lead contributor, was responsible for the research concept, design, data analysis, and primary manuscript preparation. Ni Luh Putu Wiagustini played a significant role in developing the theoretical framework and providing critical insights for interpreting the findings. Ni Made Dwi Ratnadi contributed substantially to the methodological design and ensured the rigor and validity of the data analysis. I Gusti Ayu Made Asri Dwija Putri provided key intellectual input during the drafting and revision process, particularly in contextualizing the findings within the broader literature and refining the discussion. All authors meet the criteria for authorship as per the journal's guidelines, have contributed significantly to the work, and approved the final manuscript. Any contributors not meeting the authorship criteria are acknowledged in the acknowledgements section.

Acknowledgements

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the preparation and publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

Adam TR, Fernando CS, Golubeva E, 2015. Managerial overconfidence and corporate risk management. Journal of Banking & Finance, 60: 195-208.

Adebayo M, Ibrahim AB, Yusuf B, Omah I, 2014. Good corporate governance and organisational performance: An empirical analysis. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 4(7): 1.

Alsayegh MF, Abdul Rahman R, Homayoun S, 2020. Corporate economic, environmental, and social sustainability performance transformation through ESG disclosure. Sustainability, 12(9): 3910.

Angwaomaodoko EA, 2025. Corporate governance and firm performance: Investigating the impact of governance structures on economic outcomes. Path of Science, 10(12): 1001-1011.

Anwar R, Malik JA, 2020. When does corporate social responsibility disclosure affect investment efficiency? A new answer to an old question. Sage Open, 10(2): 2158244020931121.

Arianpoor A, Moosavi R, Gholipour A, 2023. Board characteristics and firm performance: Insights from emerging economies. Emerging Markets Review, 55: 100789.

Baumann M, 2014. Auditing: Perspectives on its role, relevance, and reliability. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, 29.

DeAngelo L, 1981. Auditor independence, low-balling, and disclosure quality. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 3(2): 113-127.

Erben Yavuz A, Kocaman BE, Doğan M, Hazar A, Babuşcu Ş, Sutbayeva R, 2024. The impact of corporate governance on sustainability disclosures: A comparison from the perspective of financial and non-financial firms. Sustainability, 16(19): 8400.

Francis J, 2004. The role of audit quality in financial reporting. Contemporary Accounting Research, 21(3): 767-790.

Friday Ogbu E, Evelyn Dania N, Collins Okechukwu I, Dayo Benedict O, Namono R, Omweno Nyameyio E, Hamidah N, 2024. Corporate governance and business resilience in the banking industry. Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 2024(7): 1-14.

Guluma TF, 2021. The impact of corporate governance measures on firm performance: The influences of managerial overconfidence. Future Business Journal, 7(1): 50.

Hirshleifer D, Low A, Teoh SH, 2012. Are overconfident CEOs better innovators? The Journal of Finance, 67(4): 1457-1498.

Klettner A, Clarke T, Boersma M, 2014. The governance of corporate sustainability: Empirical insights into the development, leadership, and implementation of responsible business strategy. Journal of Business Ethics, 122: 145-165.

Malmendier U, Tate G, 2005. CEO overconfidence and corporate investment. The Journal of Finance, 60(6): 2661-2700.

Michelon G, Pilonato S, Ricceri F, 2015. Sustainability disclosure and reputation: Evidence from the European markets. Journal of Business Ethics, 145(3): 469-491.

Naveed M, Farah MF, Hasni MJS, 2021. The transformative role of firm information transparency in triggering retail investor's perceived financial well-being. International Journal of Bank Marketing, 39(7): 1091-1113.

Nyakurukwa K, Seetharam Y, 2023. Corporate governance in a weak legal environment: A systematic review focusing on Zimbabwe. Qualitative Research in Financial Markets, 15(2): 319-335.

Hermuningsih S, Kusuma H, Cahyarifida RA, 2020. Corporate governance and firm performance: An empirical study from Indonesian manufacturing firms. The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 7(11): 827-834.

Rajabalizadeh J, 2023. CEO overconfidence and financial reporting complexity: Evidence from textual analysis. Management Decision, 61(13): 356-385.

Sari R, 2023. Enhancing corporate governance through effective oversight and accountability. Advances: Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis, 1(6): 344-356.

Serrano O, Lavery PS, Duarte CM, 2019. Sustainability reporting in emerging markets: A systematic review. Ecological Indicators, 98: 317-326.

Sutikno HT, Aisyah EN, 2022. Financial performance and financial sustainability: The role of institutional ownership as a moderating variable. Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Studies, 5(4): 1165-1172.

Tsai FS, Lin CH, Lin JL, Lu IP, Nugroho A, 2018. Generational diversity, overconfidence, and decision-making in family business: A knowledge heterogeneity perspective. Asia Pacific Management Review, 23(1): 53-59.

Wahyuningrum S, Robiyanto R, Perdana D, 2023. Impact of ESG principles on firm valuation in emerging markets. Journal of Cleaner Production, 374: 133908.

Whetman LL, 2018. The impact of sustainability reporting on firm profitability. Undergraduate Economic Review, 14(1): 1-19.

Worokinasih S, Zaini A, 2020. Corporate governance and transparency: Evidence from Indonesian