

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY DISCLOSURE QUALITY IN EMERGING MARKETS

Raden Roro Fatmasari, Fitriana

Affiliation(s): Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP; Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

Corresponding email(s): sarie801@yahoo.com; fitriana@usbykp.ac.id

Abstract

Background: Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. **Aim:** The current analysis explains how the relationship between the focal practices and sustainability disclosure quality operates in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. **Method:** A conceptual narrative synthesis draws on selected scholarly and institutional publications. Published findings is coded by mechanism, boundary condition, practice development risk, and practical implication. **Results:** The synthesis identifies six linked mechanisms: board oversight and competence, materiality governance, internal controls over nonfinancial information, stakeholder accountability, assurance readiness, connectivity with strategy and financial reporting. The synthesis indicates that outcomes depend less on nominal adoption than on practice development quality, governance, learning, and fit with local capacity. **Conclusion:** Decision makers should define the expected outcome, assign responsibility, establish a small set of auditable indicators, and revise the intervention when published findings contradicts its assumptions. **Contribution:** The synthesis provides a conditional framework without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: corporate governance; sustainability disclosure; emerging markets; materiality; board oversight; assurance

Introduction

Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. This issue is particularly important for firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. The central managerial question is not whether the focal practice is fashionable or technically available, but whether it changes information, incentives, coordination, and action in ways that improve sustainability disclosure quality.

The synthesis asks three questions. First, which mechanisms plausibly connect the focal practice with sustainability disclosure quality? Second, which organizational and institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, which practice development and measurement choices allow governance teams to distinguish genuine capability from surface-level adoption?

Literature Review

Research relevant to corporate governance and sustainability disclosure quality in emerging markets crosses strategy, organization, technology, finance, and public-policy perspectives. Vial (2019) describes digital transformation as a process that changes value creation and organizational arrangements, while Teece (2007) emphasizes the capacity to sense change, seize opportunities, and reconfigure resources. Read together, these perspectives shift attention from possession of an input to the capability to use it reliably.

An input may be a platform, infrastructure asset, financial instrument, reporting rule, training program, or relationship. A capability is the repeated ability to combine that input with judgment and coordinated action. In firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities, the distinction is decisive because adoption is observable immediately, while sustainability disclosure quality often emerges later and may be influenced by several conditions at once.

For firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities, efficiency and resilience create a specific tension. Board oversight and competence may reduce routine friction, yet materiality governance determines whether that improvement survives disruption. An intervention that raises average speed while concentrating dependence on one system, person, supplier, or channel can weaken sustainability disclosure quality. The literature must therefore be read against both normal operations and periods of stress.

Information credibility is especially relevant to internal controls over nonfinancial information and stakeholder accountability. Participants will not alter behavior merely because information is available; they assess its timeliness, intelligibility, source, and practical relevance. In the present setting, trust is produced through consistent execution and fair exception handling. This helps explain why nominal adoption can coexist with weak sustainability disclosure quality.

The resulting model places board oversight and competence, internal controls over nonfinancial information, and assurance readiness on the governance side, while materiality governance, stakeholder accountability, and connectivity with strategy and financial reporting describe execution and learning. Their interaction is expected to shape sustainability disclosure quality; no single mechanism is assumed to have the same effect across every organization, region, or user group.

Research Method

This article uses a purposive conceptual narrative synthesis of the selected publications cited in the references. It develops relationships through analytical interpretation rather than an exhaustive database search or pooled statistical estimation. No systematic screening count, interview sample, administrative dataset, or newly observed causal effect is reported. The framework and proposed indicators are intended for subsequent testing in the specified setting.

The analysis separates the focal outcome, the mechanisms that may connect actions to that outcome, the conditions that could weaken those mechanisms, and the observations needed to test the resulting propositions. These categories organize the discussion; they are not a report of independently validated coding or a quantitative evidence synthesis. Illustrative decision rules and measurement proposals should therefore be read as conceptual contributions.

Analytical theme	Central question	Operational evidence
Board oversight and competence	How does board oversight and competence influence sustainability disclosure quality?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to board oversight and competence.
Materiality governance	How does materiality governance influence sustainability disclosure quality?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to materiality governance.
Internal controls over nonfinancial information	How does internal controls over nonfinancial information influence sustainability disclosure quality?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to internal controls over nonfinancial information.
Stakeholder accountability	How does stakeholder accountability influence sustainability disclosure quality?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to stakeholder accountability.
Assurance readiness	How does assurance readiness influence sustainability disclosure quality?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to assurance readiness.
Connectivity with strategy and financial reporting	How does connectivity with strategy and financial reporting influence sustainability disclosure quality?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to connectivity with strategy and financial reporting.

The principal limitation is that the synthesis cannot by itself use original interviews, surveys, experiments, or administrative microdata. Its results are therefore propositions supported by synthesis and not estimates of effect size. The named authors should verify the interpretation, references, affiliations, and practical relevance before submission.

Results and Discussion

Board oversight and competence

Analysis of board oversight and competence begins with a practical distinction between formal availability and dependable use in everyday work. Operational reliability depends on how the practice is connected to adjacent workflows and existing accountabilities. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, board oversight and competence must be examined together with materiality governance, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. Teece (2007) and Vial (2019) indicate that capability must be observed through repeated performance, not inferred from expenditure or installation.

For the focal operating entities, board oversight and competence becomes material when it alters who receives information, who acts, and how quickly an exception is resolved. Within firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors,

regulators, lenders, employees, and communities, responsibility, usable records, and exception routines determine whether the mechanism functions. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, board oversight and competence is required to be examined together with internal controls over nonfinancial information, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. Evaluation should combine a leading indicator for board oversight and competence with a lagging measure of sustainability disclosure quality.

A useful test of board oversight and competence is whether participants can apply it consistently when operating conditions depart from plan. Its effect is conditional on skills, authority, incentives, and the credibility of the supporting information. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, board oversight and competence must be examined together with stakeholder accountability, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. Kraus et al. (2022) and Teece (2007) indicate that capability must be observed through repeated performance, not inferred from expenditure or installation.

Materiality governance

For the focal operating entities, materiality governance becomes material when it alters who receives information, who acts, and how quickly an exception is resolved. Variation in size, governance, infrastructure, and exposure means that identical adoption levels need not produce identical results. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, materiality governance is required to be examined together with internal controls over nonfinancial information, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. A bounded pilot, named owner, documented exception log, and explicit review threshold provide a defensible practice development path.

A useful test of materiality governance is whether participants can apply it consistently when operating conditions depart from plan. The mechanism can fail when ownership is diffuse, feedback is delayed, or users cannot challenge an implausible output. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, materiality governance is required to be examined together with stakeholder accountability, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. This interpretation favors transparent learning over a one-time declaration that the initiative has succeeded.

Analysis of materiality governance begins with a practical distinction between formal availability and dependable use in everyday work. Local constraints shape both the feasible design and the pace at which the practice is capable of being expanded. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, materiality governance is required to be examined together with assurance readiness, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. A bounded

pilot, named owner, documented exception log, and explicit review threshold provide a defensible practice development path.

Discussion by Analytical Theme

Internal controls over nonfinancial information

A useful test of internal controls over nonfinancial information is whether participants can apply it consistently when operating conditions depart from plan. Operational reliability rests on how the practice is connected to adjacent workflows and existing accountabilities. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, internal controls over nonfinancial information is required to be examined together with stakeholder accountability, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. The appropriate response is to test assumptions locally, preserve reversibility, and expand only after the operating mechanism is demonstrated.

Analysis of internal controls over nonfinancial information begins with a practical distinction between formal availability and dependable use in everyday work. Within firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities, responsibility, usable records, and exception routines determine whether the mechanism functions. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, internal controls over nonfinancial information is required to be examined together with assurance readiness, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. Managers are therefore expected to compare activity records with published findings of reliability, user response, and consequences for sustainability disclosure quality.

For the focal operating entities, internal controls over nonfinancial information becomes material when it alters who receives information, who acts, and how quickly an exception is resolved. Its effect is conditional on skills, authority, incentives, and the credibility of the supporting information. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, internal controls over nonfinancial information is required to be examined together with connectivity with strategy and financial reporting, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. The appropriate response is to test assumptions locally, preserve reversibility, and expand only after the operating mechanism is demonstrated.

Stakeholder accountability

Analysis of stakeholder accountability begins with a practical distinction between formal availability and dependable use in everyday work. Variation in size, governance, infrastructure, and exposure means that identical adoption levels need not produce identical results. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, stakeholder accountability must be examined together with assurance readiness, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. Vial (2019) and OECD (2023) indicate that capability must be observed through repeated performance, not inferred from expenditure or installation.

For the focal operating entities, stakeholder accountability becomes material when it alters who receives information, who acts, and how quickly an exception is resolved. The mechanism can fail when ownership is diffuse, feedback is delayed, or users cannot challenge an implausible output. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, stakeholder accountability is required to be examined together with connectivity with strategy and financial reporting, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. Evaluation should combine a leading indicator for stakeholder accountability with a lagging measure of sustainability disclosure quality.

A useful test of stakeholder accountability is whether participants can apply it consistently when operating conditions depart from plan. Local constraints shape both the feasible design and the pace at which the practice can be expanded. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, stakeholder accountability must be examined together with board oversight and competence, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. OECD (2023) and World Bank (2022) indicate that capability must be observed through repeated performance, not inferred from expenditure or installation.

Discussion by Analytical Theme

Assurance readiness

For the focal operating entities, assurance readiness becomes material when it alters who receives information, who acts, and how quickly an exception is resolved. Operational reliability rests on how the practice is connected to adjacent workflows and existing accountabilities. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, assurance readiness is required to be examined together with connectivity with strategy and financial reporting, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. A bounded pilot, named owner, documented exception log, and explicit review threshold provide a defensible practice development path.

A useful test of assurance readiness is whether participants can apply it consistently when operating conditions depart from plan. Within firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities, responsibility, usable records, and exception routines determine whether the mechanism functions. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, assurance readiness is required to be examined together with board oversight and competence, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. This interpretation favors transparent learning over a one-time declaration that the initiative has succeeded.

Analysis of assurance readiness begins with a practical distinction between formal availability and dependable use in everyday work. Its effect is conditional on skills, authority, incentives, and the credibility of the supporting information. Disclosure volume

can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, assurance readiness is required to be examined together with materiality governance, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. A bounded pilot, named owner, documented exception log, and explicit review threshold provide a defensible practice development path.

Connectivity with strategy and financial reporting

A useful test of connectivity with strategy and financial reporting is whether participants can apply it consistently when operating conditions depart from plan. Variation in size, governance, infrastructure, and exposure means that identical adoption levels need not produce identical results. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, connectivity with strategy and financial reporting is required to be examined together with board oversight and competence, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. The appropriate response is to test assumptions locally, preserve reversibility, and expand only after the operating mechanism is demonstrated.

Analysis of connectivity with strategy and financial reporting begins with a practical distinction between formal availability and dependable use in everyday work. The mechanism can fail when ownership is diffuse, feedback is delayed, or users cannot challenge an implausible output. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, connectivity with strategy and financial reporting is required to be examined together with materiality governance, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. Managers are therefore expected to compare activity records with published findings of reliability, user response, and consequences for sustainability disclosure quality.

For the focal operating entities, connectivity with strategy and financial reporting becomes material when it alters who receives information, who acts, and how quickly an exception is resolved. Local constraints shape both the feasible design and the pace at which the practice is capable of being expanded. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. For this topic, connectivity with strategy and financial reporting is required to be examined together with internal controls over nonfinancial information, because both shape sustainability disclosure quality in firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities. The appropriate response is to test assumptions locally, preserve reversibility, and expand only after the operating mechanism is demonstrated.

Integrated Mechanism Framework

The six mechanisms form a connected operating system for firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities, not a checklist. Weakness in board oversight and competence can restrict materiality governance, while poor assurance readiness may prevent lessons from reaching connectivity with strategy and financial reporting. For sustainability disclosure quality, the value of one mechanism therefore rests on whether neighboring routines supply credible information, authority, and feedback.

The first pathway connects information to judgment. Board oversight and competence and materiality governance improve visibility, but decision quality also requires interpretation and an agreed response. The second pathway connects organization to execution through internal controls over nonfinancial information and stakeholder accountability. The third pathway connects accountability to adaptation through assurance readiness and connectivity with strategy and financial reporting.

The mechanism map predicts that sustainability disclosure quality will be strongest when all three pathways reach a minimum viable level. Excellence in a single component cannot fully compensate for basic weakness elsewhere. This complementarity explains why operating entities may invest substantially yet observe limited results: resources are allocated to the visible technology or program while less visible routines, responsibilities, and feedback processes remain unchanged.

Sequence matters for corporate governance and sustainability disclosure quality in emerging markets. A credible practice development starts with the concrete problem: Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. It then documents the current process, assigns ownership for board oversight and competence, pilots changes affecting materiality governance, and records exceptions before wider adoption. Published findings from the pilot should determine whether expansion is justified.

Governance in this framework protects the purpose of improving sustainability disclosure quality. It specifies authority for internal controls over nonfinancial information, acceptable risk around stakeholder accountability, documentation for assurance readiness, and escalation when connectivity with strategy and financial reporting reveals failure. Proportionate controls make adaptation safer without turning every local decision into a centralized approval.

Managerial and Policy Implications

Decision makers should translate the objective of improving sustainability disclosure quality into a small measurement architecture. Leading indicators capture whether the mechanism is operating; lagging indicators capture whether the intended outcome follows. Both are needed because an early increase in activity may reflect practice development effort and not sustainable value.

Priority	Owner	Leading indicator	Review question
Board oversight and competence	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for board oversight and competence	Is board oversight and competence changing decisions or only activity?

Priority	Owner	Leading indicator	Review question
Materiality governance	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for materiality governance	Is materiality governance changing decisions or only activity?
Internal controls over nonfinancial information	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for internal controls over nonfinancial information	Is internal controls over nonfinancial information changing decisions or only activity?
Stakeholder accountability	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for stakeholder accountability	Is stakeholder accountability changing decisions or only activity?
Assurance readiness	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for assurance readiness	Is assurance readiness changing decisions or only activity?
Connectivity with strategy and financial reporting	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for connectivity with strategy and financial reporting	Is connectivity with strategy and financial reporting changing decisions or only activity?

For managers, the immediate task is to establish a baseline, choose one bounded practice development unit, and review published findings at a frequency matched to the decision cycle. For policy makers and industry bodies, the priority is to reduce avoidable coordination costs, improve access to reliable guidance, and support capability development and not measuring success only by enrollment, installation, or nominal adoption.

Future research on corporate governance and sustainability disclosure quality in emerging markets should define populations and measures explicitly. Longitudinal observation is needed to determine whether connectivity with strategy and financial reporting produces durable learning or only a temporary response. Mixed methods could connect changes in sustainability disclosure quality to the routines through which board oversight and competence and stakeholder accountability are enacted.

Limitations and Future Research

Three limitations qualify the synthesis. Published findings concerning firms in emerging markets preparing sustainability disclosures for investors, regulators, lenders, employees, and communities is heterogeneous and cannot establish one effect size for sustainability disclosure quality. Institutional sources clarify context but cannot replace unit-level causal published findings. In addition, the selected mechanisms may omit practices visible only through fieldwork, particularly where internal controls over nonfinancial information or assurance readiness is informal. The propositions are therefore expected to guide inquiry and not be treated as universal estimates.

Future research should operationalize sustainability disclosure quality with measures that distinguish activity, capability, and outcome. Comparative studies can examine whether organization size, ownership, regulatory exposure, location, or digital maturity changes the strength of the proposed relationships. Longitudinal observation is needed to separate temporary practice development disruption from durable improvement.

Conclusion

The current analysis examined corporate governance and sustainability disclosure quality in emerging markets through a conceptual narrative synthesis. The synthesis shows that sustainability disclosure quality cannot by itself arise automatically from formal adoption or expenditure. It rests on the interaction of board oversight and competence, materiality governance, internal controls over nonfinancial information, stakeholder accountability, assurance readiness, connectivity with strategy and financial reporting.

The central conclusion is conditional. Disclosure volume can increase without improving comparability, balance, connectivity to financial information, or oversight of material sustainability risks. Operating entities are therefore expected to define the decision problem, build proportionate governance, test practice development in stages, and combine leading indicators with outcome published findings. This approach treats uncertainty as something to manage through learning and not conceal through overly precise claims.

The mechanism map contributes a practical bridge between broad research findings and local decisions. It cannot by itself replace author judgment, peer review, or empirical validation. Its value lies in making mechanisms and assumptions explicit so that managers, policy makers, and researchers can examine where an intervention is likely to work, where it may fail, and what published findings should trigger revision.

References

- Global Reporting Initiative. (2021). GRI 1 Foundation 2021. GRI.
- International Sustainability Standards Board. (2023). IFRS S1 General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information. IFRS Foundation.
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- OECD. (2023). OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118-144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>
- World Bank. (2022). World Development Report 2022: Finance for an Equitable Recovery. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1730-4>