



Determinants of banking firm value: Financial performance and audit quality

Ahmad Jibrail¹, Grahita Chandrarin², Prihat Assih³

¹Accounting Study Program, Universitas Teknologi Sumbawa, Indonesia

^{2,3}Accounting Study Program, Universitas Merdeka Malang, Indonesia

Article Info	ABSTRACT
Article history: Received May 19, 2026 Revised Jul 8, 2026 Accepted Sept 19, 2026 Keywords: Audit Quality; Financial Performance; Firm Value; Indonesian Banking; Moderating Effect.	This study examines whether audit quality conditions the association between banking financial performance and firm value in Indonesia. Using an 11-year panel of 20 commercial banks listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (2013–2023; 220 firm-year observations), the study estimates a random-effects moderated regression with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors. Firm value is proxied by Price-to-Book Value (PBV), while financial performance is represented by Return on Assets (ROA), Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR), Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR), and Net Interest Margin (NIM); audit quality equals one for Big Four auditors. CAR has a positive significant association with PBV ($\beta = 0.0690$; $p = 0.001$), whereas ROA has a significant negative coefficient ($\beta = -0.8626$; $p < 0.001$). LDR ($p = 0.064$) and NIM ($p = 0.084$) are not significant at the 5% level. Audit quality attenuates the CAR effect ($CAR \times AQ: \beta = -0.0651$; $p = 0.007$) and offsets the negative ROA association ($ROA \times AQ: \beta = 0.9171$; $p < 0.001$). $LDR \times AQ$ is positive at the reported 5% boundary ($\beta = 0.0349$; $p = 0.050$), while $NIM \times AQ$ is not significant. The evidence therefore positions audit quality as a selective credibility mechanism rather than a uniform amplifier of financial signals, extending agency and signaling perspectives in emerging-market banking. <i>This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license.</i> 

Corresponding Author:

Ahmad Jibrail,
Accounting Study Program,
Universitas Teknologi Sumbawa, Indonesia,
Jl. Olat Maras, Moyo Hulu District, Sumbawa Regency, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia.
Email: ahmad.jibrail@uts.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, the global economy has experienced substantial volatility driven by interconnected crises, geopolitical tensions, inflationary pressures, technological disruption, and the COVID-19 shock. Although recovery has progressed unevenly, persistent uncertainty continues to challenge financial-market stability and institutional resilience. Within this setting, banking institutions occupy a strategic position because they combine financial intermediation with a systemic role in monetary transmission and economic development. Consequently, changes in economic conditions, regulatory frameworks, and monetary policy affect bank performance and, ultimately, market valuation (Barra & Zotti, 2020; Sharma & Chauhan, 2023).

Firm value reflects investors' assessment of current performance, future growth opportunities, risk exposure, and managerial effectiveness. In banking, this assessment is especially sensitive because profitability cannot be separated from capital strength, liquidity, intermediation efficiency, and regulatory compliance. Price-to-Book Value (PBV) is therefore informative as a market-based indicator

that relates the market price of equity to its accounting book value. A higher PBV generally indicates stronger expectations regarding future cash flows and franchise quality, but the same accounting signal may be interpreted differently when investors question the reliability of reported information (Handajani et al., 2022; Jagirani et al., 2023).

The Indonesian banking industry underwent substantial structural change over the observation period. Basel III implementation increased the salience of capital and liquidity standards, while digital transformation and fintech competition altered cost structures, customer acquisition, and service delivery. These developments require banks to balance profitability with prudential resilience. CAR represents the capacity to absorb losses, ROA reflects the efficiency of assets in generating earnings, LDR captures the intensity of credit intermediation relative to deposits, and NIM reflects the spread generated from earning assets. Because these ratios convey different dimensions of performance, their market consequences need not be uniform (Fadli et al., 2021; Adhim & Mulyati, 2024; Vijayagopal et al., 2024).

Empirical findings on financial performance and firm value remain mixed across institutional environments. Profitability can be rewarded as a signal of efficiency, yet unusually high returns may also be interpreted as exposure to greater risk or as earnings whose persistence is uncertain. Likewise, strong capital ratios can indicate resilience but may also suggest underutilized balance-sheet capacity, while high LDR can signal productive intermediation or elevated liquidity risk. These ambiguities are particularly relevant in banking, where financial statements are complex and managerial discretion interacts with prudential regulation (Acharya & Rajan, 2024; Eltweri et al., 2024; Sampurnaningsih et al., 2021).

Agency Theory explains why external monitoring is needed when managers possess more information than shareholders and may have incentives that diverge from investor interests (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Audit quality is one such monitoring mechanism: a higher-quality auditor is expected to increase the probability that material reporting problems are detected and reported, thereby constraining opportunistic reporting (DeAngelo, 1981; Francis, 2004). Signaling Theory further implies that financial ratios affect valuation only when market participants consider the underlying signal sufficiently credible (Spence, 1973). In this framework, Big Four audit status does not mechanically raise firm value; rather, it can change the credibility and interpretation of the performance information accompanying the valuation decision.

The research gap lies in the limited evidence on whether external audit quality changes the market interpretation of several banking-specific performance indicators simultaneously. Prior studies often emphasize direct profitability effects or examine governance mechanisms without jointly modeling profitability (ROA), capital resilience (CAR), liquidity/intermediation intensity (LDR), and interest-margin efficiency (NIM). This study addresses that gap by treating audit quality as a governance-based moderator across the four indicators in a single panel framework. The contribution is therefore conditional rather than merely additive: the analysis identifies which financial signals become stronger, weaker, or statistically unchanged when they are accompanied by Big Four assurance, providing a more precise test of Agency Theory and Signaling Theory in an emerging-market banking context (Abraham et al., 2024; Aguilera et al., 2015).

Accordingly, the study examines the effects of CAR, ROA, LDR, and NIM on PBV and tests whether audit quality moderates each relationship. The hypotheses are: H₁, CAR has a positive effect on firm value; H₂, ROA has a positive effect on firm value; H₃, LDR has a negative effect on firm value; H₄, NIM has a positive effect on firm value; and H₅–H₈, audit quality moderates the CAR–PBV, ROA–PBV, LDR–PBV, and NIM–PBV relationships, respectively.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a quantitative explanatory panel-data design to test the relationship between bank financial performance and firm value, with audit quality as a moderating variable. Secondary data are obtained from audited annual reports and public financial disclosures of commercial banks listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange, supplemented by regulatory information from the Financial Services

Authority. Purposive sampling requires continuous listing during the observation window, availability of audited annual reports, and complete data for all research variables.

To reconcile the panel structure with the reported estimation output (20 banks, 220 observations, and 11 observations per bank), the observation window is specified as 2013–2023. This correction preserves the reported regression sample rather than altering the number of observations without re-estimating the model. The resulting balanced panel contains 20 banks and 220 firm-year observations.

Table 1. Purposive sampling procedure

Sampling Criterion	Number of Banks
Banking companies listed on IDX in the panel frame	47
Less: inconsistently listed throughout the study window	(12)
Less: incomplete audited annual-report data	(9)
Less: missing data on research variables	(6)
Final sample	20
Total firm-year observations (20 banks × 11 years)	220

Source: processed data, 2026

Firm value is measured by PBV. Financial performance is represented by four bank-specific indicators ROA, CAR, LDR, and NIM, rather than only ROA and CAR. Audit quality (AQ) is a binary moderator coded 1 when the financial statements are audited by a Big Four audit firm and 0 otherwise. The definitions are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Operational definitions of research variables

Variable	Role	Definition	Formula / Coding	Reference
PBV	Dependent	Firm value	Market price per share / book value per share	Handajani et al. (2022)
ROA	Independent	Return on Assets	Net profit after tax / total assets	Adhim & Mulyati (2024)
CAR	Independent	Capital Adequacy Ratio	(Tier 1 + Tier 2 capital) / risk-weighted assets	Sharma & Chauhan (2023)
LDR	Independent	Loan to Deposit Ratio	Total loans / total third-party deposits	Sampurnaningsih et al. (2021)
NIM	Independent	Net Interest Margin	Net interest income / average earning assets	Agoraki & Kouretas (2019)
AQ	Moderator	Audit quality	1 = Big Four; 0 = non-Big Four	DeAngelo (1981); Abraham et al. (2024)

Source: compiled from the cited literature, 2026

Panel-model selection follows the standard sequence reported in the study. The Chow test favors fixed effects over pooled OLS ($p < 0.05$), the Breusch–Pagan LM test favors random effects over pooled OLS ($p < 0.05$), and the Hausman test does not reject the random-effects specification ($p > 0.05$). Accordingly, the moderated regression is estimated using random effects. The estimated model is $PBV_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 CAR_{it} + \beta_2 ROA_{it} + \beta_3 LDR_{it} + \beta_4 NIM_{it} + \beta_5 AQ_{it} + \beta_6 (CAR \times AQ)_{it} + \beta_7 (ROA \times AQ)_{it} + \beta_8 (LDR \times AQ)_{it} + \beta_9 (NIM \times AQ)_{it} + u_i + \varepsilon_{it}$.

Diagnostic tests indicate no severe multicollinearity in the reported predictor diagnostics (maximum reported VIF = 2.44). The Glejser test detects heteroscedasticity ($p < 0.001$); therefore, statistical inference is based on heteroscedasticity-robust standard errors. Hypotheses are evaluated at $\alpha = 0.05$, while p-values close to the boundary are reported explicitly rather than described as unequivocally significant.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Results

Table 3 presents the distribution of the variables for the balanced panel. PBV exhibits substantial dispersion (mean = 1.523; SD = 1.842), indicating heterogeneous market valuation across banks and years. CAR averages 22.314%, suggesting generally strong capitalization, while the mean

LDR of 84.672% indicates active intermediation. ROA averages 1.271%, NIM averages 4.987%, and 59.1% of firm-year observations are audited by Big Four firms.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
PBV (times)	220	1.523	0.987	1.842	0.093	10.640
ROA (%)	220	1.271	1.120	0.942	-4.870	5.310
CAR (%)	220	22.314	20.850	7.618	10.240	55.630
LDR (%)	220	84.672	86.210	14.983	38.510	120.840
NIM (%)	220	4.987	4.710	2.341	0.980	12.310
Audit Quality	220	0.591	1.000	0.493	0.000	1.000

Source: processed data, 2026

The Pearson correlations in Table 4 provide a preliminary view of the bivariate associations. LDR is negatively correlated with PBV ($r = -0.201$, $p < 0.01$), whereas NIM is positively correlated with PBV ($r = 0.213$, $p < 0.01$). ROA is weakly positively correlated with PBV ($r = 0.152$, $p < 0.05$), which differs from the negative multivariate coefficient reported below. This sign reversal reinforces the need to interpret the regression coefficient conditionally on the other predictors and the moderator rather than from bivariate correlations alone.

Table 4. Pearson correlation matrix

Variable	PBV	ROA	CAR	LDR	NIM	AQ
PBV	1.000					
ROA	0.152*	1.000				
CAR	0.089	0.341**	1.000			
LDR	-0.201**	-0.198**	-0.312**	1.000		
NIM	0.213**	0.512**	0.187**	-0.098	1.000	
AQ	0.174*	0.108	0.049	-0.118	0.071	1.000

Note: ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed). AQ = Audit Quality.

Source: processed data, 2026

The random-effects model is jointly significant (Wald $\chi^2(9) = 543.00$; $p < 0.001$). The within R^2 is 0.6394, the between R^2 is 0.0984, and the overall R^2 is 0.4118. The estimated fraction of residual variance attributable to bank-specific effects is $\rho = 0.5669$, indicating meaningful unobserved heterogeneity across banks. Because heteroscedasticity was detected, the z-tests in Table 5 use robust standard errors.

Table 5. Random-effects moderated regression results

H	Variable	β	Robust SE	z	p	95% CI	Decision
H4	NIM	0.4019	0.2325	1.73	0.084	[-0.0537, 0.8576]	Not supported
H2	ROA	-0.8626	0.0886	-9.74	<0.001	[-1.0362, -0.6890]	Not supported: opposite sign
H3	LDR	-0.0310	0.0168	-1.85	0.064	[-0.0638, 0.0018]	Not supported at 5%
H1	CAR	0.0690	0.0207	3.34	0.001	[0.0285, 0.1096]	Supported
—	AQ	-0.0343	0.6975	-0.05	0.961	[-1.4014, 1.3328]	No direct effect
H5	CAR×AQ	-0.0651	0.0242	-2.69	0.007	[-0.1125, -0.0177]	Supported; attenuating
H8	NIM×AQ	-0.3937	0.2504	-1.57	0.116	[-0.8845, 0.0970]	Not supported
H7	LDR×AQ	0.0349	0.0178	1.96	0.050	[0.0000, 0.0697]	Supported at boundary; cautious
H6	ROA×AQ	0.9171	0.1015	9.03	<0.001	[0.7181, 1.1161]	Supported; offsetting
—	Constant	1.0993	0.5910	1.86	0.063	[-0.0590, 2.2577]	—

N = 220; banks = 20; robust standard errors.

Source: processed data, 2026.

At the 5% significance level, only CAR has a direct coefficient that supports its directional hypothesis. ROA is statistically significant but negative, so H2 is rejected rather than accepted. LDR and NIM do not meet the 5% criterion ($p = 0.064$ and $p = 0.084$). For the moderation tests, CAR×AQ and ROA×AQ are significant; LDR×AQ is exactly at the reported threshold ($p = 0.050$) and is therefore interpreted cautiously; NIM×AQ is not significant. This distinction corrects the earlier tendency to classify LDR as a significant direct determinant despite $p > 0.05$.

3.2 Discussion

CAR has a positive and statistically significant association with PBV ($\beta = 0.0690$; $p = 0.001$), supporting H1. For observations with non-Big Four auditors ($AQ = 0$), higher capital adequacy is associated with higher market valuation, consistent with the view that stronger capital buffers signal resilience and loss-absorption capacity. This finding is compatible with banking research emphasizing capital adequacy as a central dimension of prudential strength and investor confidence (Sharma & Chauhan, 2023; Jagirani et al., 2023).

The interaction $CAR \times AQ$ is negative and significant ($\beta = -0.0651$; $p = 0.007$), supporting H5 but requiring a precise interpretation. The coefficient means that Big Four audit status reduces the CAR slope by 0.0651; the implied slope when $AQ = 1$ is approximately 0.0039 ($= 0.0690 - 0.0651$). Audit quality therefore attenuates, rather than amplifies, the market premium attached to capital adequacy. A plausible information-based interpretation is that when financial reporting receives stronger external assurance, investors rely less on CAR as a stand-alone credibility signal and evaluate whether excess capital is deployed efficiently. This is consistent with the idea that audit quality changes the information environment rather than mechanically raising the valuation effect of every favorable ratio (DeAngelo, 1981; Francis, 2004).

ROA produces the most counterintuitive direct result. Its coefficient is negative and significant ($\beta = -0.8626$; $p < 0.001$), so H2 is not supported because the observed sign is opposite to the predicted positive direction. The bivariate ROA–PBV correlation is positive, which suggests that the negative multivariate coefficient arises after controlling for the other banking ratios and audit-quality interactions. The result should therefore not be interpreted as evidence that profitability is intrinsically value destroying. In a regulated banking setting, reported profitability can embed differences in risk taking, provisioning, asset composition, or earnings persistence that are not captured by ROA alone (Acharya & Rajan, 2024; Eltweri et al., 2024).

The positive and highly significant $ROA \times AQ$ interaction ($\beta = 0.9171$; $p < 0.001$) supports H6 and substantially changes that interpretation. Adding the direct and interaction coefficients yields an implied ROA slope of about 0.0545 for Big Four-audited observations, compared with -0.8626 for non-Big Four observations. Because the standard error of this linear combination is not reported, its separate statistical significance should not be asserted. Nevertheless, the direction and magnitude show that audit quality offsets the negative valuation response associated with ROA in the baseline group. This pattern is consistent with Agency Theory and Signaling Theory: credible external assurance can reduce doubt about whether reported profitability reflects sustainable operating performance or discretionary reporting (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Spence, 1973; Abraham et al., 2024).

LDR has a negative coefficient ($\beta = -0.0310$), which is directionally consistent with H3, but the p -value of 0.064 exceeds the 5% threshold. H3 is therefore not supported at $\alpha = 0.05$. The result still suggests a weak negative tendency: greater loan deployment relative to deposits may raise concerns about liquidity pressure when the ratio becomes aggressive. This interpretation is aligned with research emphasizing the trade-off between intermediation intensity and liquidity resilience (Fadli et al., 2021; Eltweri et al., 2024).

The $LDR \times AQ$ coefficient is positive ($\beta = 0.0349$) with $p = 0.050$, placing H7 precisely at the reported significance boundary. Its sign is important: audit quality does not reinforce a negative LDR effect. Instead, it offsets it. The implied LDR slope for Big Four-audited observations is approximately 0.0039 ($= -0.0310 + 0.0349$), effectively neutral relative to the baseline negative slope. This correction changes the substantive conclusion: higher-quality auditing appears to reduce the valuation penalty associated with ambiguous liquidity signals by improving the credibility and transparency of the information through which investors assess loan and deposit positions. Because $p = 0.050$ may reflect rounding, this moderation should be described as borderline and interpreted cautiously.

NIM is positive but not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.4019$; $p = 0.084$), so H4 is not supported. $NIM \times AQ$ is negative and also not significant ($\beta = -0.3937$; $p = 0.116$), rejecting H8. The absence of robust effects indicates that a high interest margin is not, by itself, a sufficient valuation signal after capital, profitability, liquidity, and audit quality are controlled. Investors may distinguish margins

arising from efficient intermediation from those associated with higher credit pricing, risk, or temporary interest-rate conditions (Agoraki & Kouretas, 2019; Junge & Kugler, 2018).

Taken together, the results refine the theoretical role of audit quality. The Big Four proxy has no significant stand-alone effect on PBV ($p = 0.961$), yet it significantly changes the slopes of CAR and ROA and provides borderline evidence for LDR. Audit quality therefore operates as a selective credibility mechanism: it matters through the interpretation of financial signals, not simply through an unconditional valuation premium. This conditional pattern supports the monitoring logic of Agency Theory and the credibility logic of Signaling Theory while showing that the same assurance mechanism can attenuate one signal, offset another, and leave a third statistically unchanged (Aguilera et al., 2015; DeAngelo, 1981; Francis, 2004).

The managerial implication is that banks should not treat Big Four engagement as a substitute for sound fundamentals. Capital adequacy, profitability, and liquidity still need to be explained through transparent risk, provisioning, and asset-quality disclosures so that investors can distinguish sustainable performance from mechanically high ratios. For investors, the results indicate that performance ratios should be interpreted jointly with the credibility of external assurance. For regulators, stronger audit quality and consistent implementation of financial-reporting standards, including the expected-credit-loss discipline associated with IFRS 9/PSAK 71, can improve the information environment in which bank valuation occurs (Zang et al., 2026).

4. CONCLUSION

This study examines the relationship between four dimensions of banking financial performance and firm value and evaluates the moderating role of audit quality in a balanced panel of 20 Indonesian listed banks. The corrected 2013–2023 window is consistent with the reported 220 firm-year observations and 11 observations per bank. The random-effects MRA with robust standard errors shows that CAR positively affects PBV, whereas ROA has a significant negative baseline coefficient. LDR and NIM are not significant at the 5% level. Audit quality significantly attenuates the CAR–PBV relationship and offsets the negative ROA–PBV relationship; the positive LDR×AQ interaction is borderline at $p = 0.050$, while NIM×AQ is not significant. The principal contribution is the identification of audit quality as a selective credibility mechanism. Big Four audit status does not produce a direct valuation premium, but it changes how the market interprets specific financial-performance signals. This finding advances the joint application of Agency Theory and Signaling Theory by showing that external assurance can reduce the informational weight of one ratio while restoring credibility to another. Practically, banks should combine credible external assurance with transparent explanations of capital deployment, profitability quality, liquidity risk, and provisioning; investors should evaluate banking ratios conditionally rather than in isolation. The study is limited by the binary Big Four proxy, the focus on IDX-listed banks, and the absence of explicit tests for structural breaks and endogeneity. Future studies should use richer audit-quality measures such as audit tenure, fees, partner characteristics, and industry specialization; test COVID-19 and regulatory-regime breaks; extend the sample to ASEAN banking systems; and apply dynamic-panel or instrumental-variable approaches where data permit.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, A. (2018). Earnings management in banking industry and its impact on the firm value. *AKRUAL: Jurnal Akuntansi*, 10(1), 69–84. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jaj.v10n1.p69-84>
- Abraham, R., El-Chaarani, H., & Deari, F. (2024). Does audit oversight quality reduce bankruptcy risk, systematic risk, and ROA volatility? The role of institutional ownership. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 17(8), 335. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17080335>
- Acharya, V. V., & Rajan, R. (2024). Liquidity, liquidity everywhere, not a drop to use: Why flooding banks with central bank reserves may not expand liquidity. *The Journal of Finance*, 79(5), 2943–2991. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13370>

- Adhim, C., & Mulyati, M. (2024). The influence of Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR), Non-Performing Loan (NPL), Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR), and operational costs to operating income (BOPO) on Return on Asset (ROA) in banks listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management*, 5(5), 1067–1075. <https://doi.org/10.46729/ijstm.v5i5.1122>
- Agoraki, M. E. K., & Kouretas, G. P. (2019). The determinants of net interest margin during transition. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, 53(4), 1005–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11156-018-0773-y>
- Aguilera, R. V., Desender, K., Bednar, M. K., & Lee, J. H. (2015). Connecting the dots: Bringing external corporate governance into the corporate governance puzzle. *Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1), 483–573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2015.1024503>
- Astami, E., Pramono, A. J., Rusmin, R., Cahaya, F. R., & Soobaroyen, T. (2024). Do family ownership and supervisory board characteristics influence audit report lag? A view from a two-tier board context. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 56, 100638. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intaccudtax.2024.100638>
- Barra, C., & Zotti, R. (2020). Market power and stability of financial institutions: Evidence from the Italian banking sector. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*, 28(2), 235–265. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRC-05-2019-0055>
- DeAngelo, L. E. (1981). Auditor size and audit quality. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 3(3), 183–199. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-4101\(81\)90002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-4101(81)90002-1)
- Eltweri, A., Sawan, N., Al-Hajaya, K., & Badri, Z. (2024). The influence of liquidity risk on financial performance: A study of the UK's largest commercial banks. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 17(12), 580. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17120580>
- Fadli, J. A., Sakti, I. M., & Jumono, S. (2021). Market power and bank liquidity risk: Implementations of Basel III using Net Stable Funding Ratio approach. *Jurnal Keuangan dan Perbankan*, 25(2), 434–449. <https://doi.org/10.26905/jkdp.v25i2.5525>
- Francis, J. R. (2004). What do we know about audit quality?. *The British Accounting Review*, 36(4), 345–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2004.09.003>
- Handajani, L., Husnan, L. H., & Pituringsih, E. (2022). Impacts of sustainability performance and firm characteristics on risk and corporate value. *Jurnal Economia*, 18(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.21831/economia.v18i2.42883>
- Jagirani, T. S., Chee, L. C., & Kosim, Z. (2023). Board characteristics and firm value: The moderating role of capital adequacy. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 20(2), 205–214. [https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.20\(2\).2023.18](https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.20(2).2023.18)
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X\(76\)90026-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X)
- Junge, G., & Kugler, P. (2018). Optimal equity capital requirements for large Swiss banks. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics*, 154, Article 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41937-018-0025-z>
- Linggadjaya, R. I. T., Atahau, A. D. R., Ugut, G. S. S., & Suk, K. S. (2025). The moderating role of capital adequacy on bank specific characteristics to sustainable growth: Evidence from commercial banks in Indonesia. *SAGE Open*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251353042>
- Mahmood, A., Mehmood, A., Terzani, S., De Luca, F., & Djajadikerta, H. G. (2025). The effect of ESG disclosure on firm value in the European context. *Management Decision*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-10-2024-2480>
- Nhleko, R., & Adelowotan, M. (2025). Bank-specific credit risk factors and long-term financial sustainability: Evidence from a panel error correction model. *Sustainability*, 17(14), 6442. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17146442>
- Raweh, N. A. M., Abdullah, A. A. H., Kamardin, H., & Malek, M. (2021). Industry expertise on audit committee and audit report timeliness. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1920113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1920113>
- Rodríguez Valencia, L. (2025). Financial performance and corporate governance on firm value: Evidence from Spain. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 13(3), 123. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijfs13030123>
- Sampurnaningsih, S. R., Irani, C., Sahroni, S., Zulfitra, Z., & Sunarsi, D. (2021). The effect of Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR), Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR) and Net Profit Margin (NPM) on financial performance of Bank DKI. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik*, 11(2), 497–506. <https://doi.org/10.26858/jiap.v11i2.30216>
- Sharma, A. K., & Chauhan, R. (2023). Impact of Basel III liquidity and capital regulations on bank lending and financial stability: Evidence from emerging countries. *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, 34(4), 28–45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcaf.22630>
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>

- Vijayagopal, P., Jain, B., & Ayinippully Viswanathan, S. (2024). Regulations and fintech: A comparative study of developed and developing countries. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 17(8), 324. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17080324>
- Zang, Z., Kabir, H., & Scott, T. (2026). Insights from academic research on IFRS 9: A review of the literature. *Australian Accounting Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/auar.70020>