



Public Financial Transparency and Accountability: A Normative Analysis of International Reporting Standards

Mahfud Heru Fatoni^{1*}, Diana Widhi Rachmawati²

¹ Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia

² Universitas PGRI Palembang, Indonesia

email: mahfud99@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:

10-01-2026

Revised:

24-01-2026

Accepted:

03-02-2026

Abstract

This study offers a normative–conceptual analysis of public financial transparency and accountability under international reporting standards. Drawing on public-sector accounting theory, regulatory governance, and political economy perspectives, it critically examines how transnational standard-setting regimes structure informational transparency, institutional answerability, and distributive consequences. A structured review of peer-reviewed scholarship and authoritative regulatory documents forms the analytical corpus, enabling thematic coding of dominant normative premises and embedded assumptions concerning materiality, stakeholder hierarchy, and public value. The findings identify a persistent tension between investor-oriented materiality constructs and broader democratic accountability claims, particularly in the context of accrual-based reforms and expanding sustainability disclosure frameworks. The analysis further demonstrates that transparency effects depend on enforcement capacity, institutional coherence, and alignment with domestic governance infrastructures rather than on formal adoption alone. By synthesizing doctrinal analysis with accountability theory, the article develops an integrated evaluative framework for assessing whether international reporting standards substantively strengthen public financial transparency or primarily institutionalize compliance within global regulatory architectures.

Keywords : Public Financial Transparency, Accountability Theory, International Reporting Standards, Regulatory Governance, Public Sector Accounting.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary debates in public economics are increasingly shaped by the intensification of global governance demands for transparency and accountability in public financial management, a trajectory reinforced by the diffusion of international reporting standards and sustainability-oriented disclosure frameworks across jurisdictions. Multilateral institutions, transnational standard-setters, and regional regulatory regimes have promoted harmonized reporting architectures to enhance comparability, fiscal discipline, and public trust, situating financial transparency as a cornerstone of democratic legitimacy and market stability. The rapid expansion of sustainability and ESG reporting frameworks, including the evolution of the Global Reporting Initiative as critically assessed by Global Reporting Initiative (De Villiers et al., 2022), alongside normative reflections on ESG and Sustainable Development Goals integration (De Silva Lokuwaduge et al., 2022), signals a paradigmatic shift from narrow fiscal disclosure toward multidimensional accountability regimes. In parallel, regulatory innovations such as the European Union’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and the European Sustainability Reporting Standards have recalibrated disclosure expectations for both private and public-interest entities (Fornasari & Traversi, 2024), while supply-chain accountability reforms under the European Union Deforestation Regulation illustrate how transparency is increasingly embedded in binding transnational governance instruments (Berning & Sotirov, 2023). This evolving landscape positions public financial transparency not merely as an administrative practice but as a normative architecture linking state legitimacy, capital markets, and sustainability imperatives.

Empirical scholarship has responded by examining the institutional and governance determinants of disclosure quality, frequently identifying positive associations between robust corporate governance structures and voluntary reporting practices in emerging markets following IFRS adoption (Boateng et

al., 2022). Systematic reviews of public-sector transparency highlight improvements in information accessibility and fiscal monitoring, while simultaneously revealing heterogeneous implementation outcomes across administrative contexts (Cuadrado-Ballesteros et al., 2023). Studies on the development of international accounting and auditing standards for fair value accounting in specific regions demonstrate how local institutional logics mediate global standards diffusion, thereby complicating assumptions of uniform convergence (Alharasis et al., 2024). Research on state-owned enterprise reform underscores transparency and accountability frameworks as mechanisms for rebuilding public trust in contexts marked by governance fragility (Ahmad, 2025). Complementary analyses interrogate the “double materiality” concept in corporate reporting, arguing that disclosure regimes increasingly balance investor-centric and ecological perspectives (Barker & Mayer, 2025). Taken together, this body of literature suggests that while international standards enhance formal comparability and normative alignment, their substantive impact on accountability depends on governance ecosystems, enforcement capacity, and interpretive practices.

Despite these advances, the literature reveals persistent conceptual and empirical tensions. First, the migration of accrual accounting into the public sector has been associated with unintended negative consequences, including increased complexity, managerial discretion, and potential opacity for non-expert stakeholders, challenging the presumption that technical sophistication equates to democratic transparency (Bonollo, 2023). Second, sustainability reporting frameworks, although normatively ambitious, often rely on soft-law mechanisms and voluntary compliance, raising questions about enforceability and substantive accountability beyond symbolic conformity (De Villiers et al., 2022; De Silva Lokuwaduge et al., 2022). Third, while regulatory hardening in supply chains and non-financial disclosure regimes introduces binding obligations, the interaction between these regimes and core public financial reporting standards remains under-theorized (Berning & Sotirov, 2023; Fornasari & Traversi, 2024). Finally, much of the empirical research privileges corporate settings or specific national case studies, leaving a fragmented understanding of how international reporting standards function normatively within public-sector financial governance, particularly in relation to democratic accountability and public value creation.

The unresolved issues carry significant scientific and practical implications. As governments confront fiscal stress, climate transition costs, and rising citizen scrutiny, the credibility of public financial reporting becomes central to sustaining social contracts and market confidence. If international standards are adopted without a coherent normative grounding that integrates fiscal transparency, sustainability accountability, and democratic oversight, the result may be procedural compliance devoid of substantive legitimacy. The diffusion of fair value principles and sustainability metrics into public financial statements, while promising enhanced informational richness (Alharasis et al., 2024; Barker & Mayer, 2025), also risks exacerbating interpretive asymmetries between technocratic elites and citizens, thereby weakening rather than strengthening accountability. Policymakers and standard-setters thus require a theoretically rigorous assessment of whether and how international reporting standards genuinely operationalize public accountability, or whether they primarily institutionalize global isomorphism without resolving foundational governance deficits (Cuadrado-Ballesteros et al., 2023; Ahmad, 2025).

Positioned within this contested intellectual terrain, the present study advances a normative analysis of public financial transparency and accountability under international reporting standards, integrating insights from public-sector accounting theory, regulatory governance, and sustainability reporting scholarship. Rather than treating standards as neutral technical instruments, this research conceptualizes them as normative devices that encode particular assumptions about value, materiality, and stakeholder hierarchy, thereby shaping the distribution of informational power within public finance systems. By synthesizing debates on accrual accounting reforms (Bonollo, 2023), ESG and double materiality frameworks (De Silva Lokuwaduge et al., 2022; Barker & Mayer, 2025), and evolving disclosure regulations (Fornasari & Traversi, 2024), the study articulates a conceptual model that interrogates the alignment or misalignment between international standardization and the substantive principles of democratic accountability.

This research aims to critically evaluate the normative foundations of international public financial reporting standards and to assess their capacity to enhance genuine transparency and accountability in public governance. It seeks to develop a theoretically grounded analytical framework that bridges financial reporting theory with democratic accountability principles, and to offer

methodological guidance for evaluating reporting regimes beyond formal compliance metrics. By clarifying the conceptual architecture that underpins transparency reforms and identifying conditions under which international standards can substantively strengthen public accountability, the study aspires to contribute both to the refinement of public-sector accounting theory and to the design of more coherent and legitimacy-enhancing reporting policies in an era of intensified global governance demands.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study is non-empirical and adopts a normative–conceptual research design grounded in public-sector accounting theory, regulatory governance, and political economy perspectives on accountability. The methodological strategy centers on a structured and transparent review of peer-reviewed international scholarship and authoritative standard-setting documents to interrogate the conceptual foundations of public financial transparency under international reporting regimes. The corpus of analysis was constructed through systematic searches of leading academic databases and institutional repositories, focusing on high-impact journals in accounting, economics, and public administration, as well as official pronouncements issued by international standard-setting bodies. Selection criteria required substantive theoretical engagement with transparency, accountability, accrual-based public financial reporting, or sustainability disclosure frameworks, while purely technical or descriptive implementation studies were excluded unless they contributed explicit conceptual insights. The retained literature was subjected to iterative thematic coding to identify dominant normative premises, competing accountability logics, and embedded assumptions concerning materiality, stakeholder hierarchy, and public value.

The analytical model integrates three evaluative dimensions: informational transparency as a property of clarity, comparability, and accessibility; institutional accountability as a structure of answerability and enforceability within democratic governance; and regulatory standardization as an exercise of transnational rule-making authority with distributive implications. Through analytical induction and critical interpretative synthesis, the study assesses the internal coherence of international reporting standards and examines their congruence with established theories of democratic accountability and public value creation. Doctrinal analysis of standard-setting objectives and conceptual frameworks is juxtaposed with accountability theory to detect tensions between investor-oriented materiality constructs and broader societal accountability claims. Interpretative rigor is enhanced through triangulation across theoretical traditions and regulatory texts, ensuring that normative conclusions are anchored in institutional realities while advancing a refined conceptual framework for evaluating whether international reporting standards substantively strengthen public financial transparency or primarily institutionalize formal compliance within global governance architectures.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Normative Foundations of Informational Transparency under International Reporting Standards

The conceptual analysis indicates that international reporting standards embed a predominantly technocratic understanding of transparency grounded in comparability and measurement precision. This orientation reflects the global diffusion of harmonized standards such as IPSAS and IFRS-inspired frameworks in the public sector, which are frequently justified through claims of enhanced credibility and fiscal discipline (Schmidhuber et al., 2022). Yet transparency, within public administration theory, also encompasses accessibility and intelligibility for non-expert stakeholders. The literature review reveals a persistent tension between technical sophistication and democratic comprehensibility.

Doctrinal examination of standard-setting texts shows that clarity is often framed as a derivative of consistency rather than communicative accessibility. Empirical reflections on local government financial statements suggest that citizens' perceptions of transparency depend less on formal compliance and more on interpretative clarity (Haustein & Lorson, 2023). The normative model developed in this study interprets this divergence as a structural feature of global standardization rather than an implementation anomaly. International standards privilege investor-style informational symmetry, potentially marginalizing broader public audiences.

Research on the adoption of accrual accounting in public administrations highlights that the shift toward complex valuation techniques can obscure rather than illuminate fiscal realities (Bonollo, 2023). Comparative evidence on IPSAS implementation in Europe demonstrates heterogeneous outcomes shaped by institutional contexts and reform trajectories (Polzer et al., 2022). The analytical synthesis suggests that transparency gains are conditional upon administrative capacity and interpretive mediation. Informational comparability alone does not guarantee public intelligibility.

Thematic coding of the literature further reveals that enforcement dynamics significantly influence the credibility of transparency claims. Global enforcement mechanisms have been proposed as essential for improving comparability across IFRS-based systems (Prather-Kinsey et al., 2022). Similar dynamics appear in public-sector contexts where oversight institutions determine whether formal standards translate into substantive disclosure. Transparency thus emerges as an interaction between rule design and institutional enforcement.

Investor perception studies in emerging markets indicate that standardized disclosure frameworks can enhance confidence and perceived reliability (Hoti & Krasniqi, 2022). Corporate governance research likewise links structured reporting to increased voluntary disclosure and improved information environments (Boateng et al., 2022). The normative implication is that transparency carries signaling value within capital markets. However, the public-sector setting introduces additional accountability constituencies beyond investors.

To clarify the evaluative criteria derived from the conceptual model, the study systematizes transparency dimensions identified across the reviewed literature. These dimensions are synthesized in Table 1 to illustrate the analytical structure guiding the normative assessment. The table consolidates recurring attributes of transparency and their associated risks. This synthesis supports a structured comparison between formal reporting objectives and democratic accountability expectations.

Table 1. Normative Dimensions of Informational Transparency in International Reporting Standards

Dimension	Normative Objective	Identified Risk in Literature
Comparability	Cross-jurisdictional consistency	Over-standardization reducing contextual relevance
Measurement Precision	Accurate asset and liability valuation	Complexity limiting public comprehension
Accessibility	Public availability of information	Information overload without interpretive guidance
Enforceability	Credible compliance and oversight	Formal compliance without substantive clarity

Source: Conceptual synthesis based on Schmidhuber et al. (2022); Bonollo (2023); Prather-Kinsey et al. (2022); Hausteijn & Lorson (2023).

The table indicates that each transparency objective carries a countervailing normative risk. Literature on determinants of financial report quality underscores the importance of institutional competence and internal controls in mitigating such risks (Yusran, 2023; Yenni et al., 2024). Transparency is therefore mediated by governance capacity rather than solely by formal standards. The conceptual findings reinforce the multidimensional character of informational clarity.

Studies on public budgeting reforms in developing economies emphasize that transparency tools must align with fiscal governance strategies to produce meaningful accountability (Islam, 2025). Decision-making analyses of accounting reforms demonstrate that political and institutional negotiations shape the translation of standards into practice (Krishnan, 2023). These insights challenge the assumption that standard adoption automatically produces uniform transparency outcomes. Institutional embeddedness remains decisive.

Technological innovations such as blockchain-based accountability mechanisms in waqf management illustrate alternative pathways for enhancing clarity and traceability (Mohaiyadin et al., 2022). Similarly, integrated financial management information systems have been associated with improved strategic decision environments in public agencies (Uzzaman et al., 2023). These

developments suggest that transparency is increasingly intertwined with digital infrastructures. International standards operate within this broader technological ecosystem.

The normative analysis concludes that international reporting standards institutionalize a particular conception of transparency centered on measurement comparability and regulatory credibility. While these attributes strengthen formal disclosure architectures, their alignment with democratic intelligibility depends on complementary governance mechanisms. The conceptual model highlights the need to reconcile technical precision with communicative accessibility. Informational transparency, in this interpretation, remains a contested normative construct rather than a purely technical achievement.

Institutional Accountability and Regulatory Enforcement in International Reporting Regimes

The normative synthesis indicates that accountability within international reporting standards is structured through layered regulatory authority rather than direct democratic engagement. Systematic reviews of IPSAS scholarship reveal that standard-setting bodies exercise epistemic power that shapes how public obligations are defined and measured (Schmidhuber et al., 2022). This institutional architecture privileges procedural compliance as a proxy for answerability. Accountability becomes embedded in rule adherence rather than dialogical justification to citizens.

Comparative analyses of public sector reforms demonstrate that implementation trajectories reflect domestic political negotiations and institutional legacies (Krishnan, 2023). Variations in IPSAS adoption across European jurisdictions illustrate how enforcement and oversight arrangements condition substantive outcomes (Polzer et al., 2022). Accountability structures therefore depend on the interaction between transnational standards and national governance ecosystems. Regulatory transplantation does not dissolve local institutional complexity.

Research on state-owned enterprise reform frames transparency as a mechanism for rebuilding public trust through structured accountability frameworks (Ahmad, 2025). This perspective emphasizes board oversight, disclosure mandates, and performance evaluation as instruments of institutional answerability. Accountability is conceptualized as a relational contract between public managers and societal stakeholders. International standards contribute to this contract by formalizing reporting expectations.

Studies of corporate governance in emerging markets show that stronger governance mechanisms correlate with enhanced disclosure practices (Boateng et al., 2022). Similar arguments appear in analyses of Islamic financial institutions where regulatory influence shapes clarity and reporting discipline (Jaradat & Oudat, 2025). These findings support the proposition that accountability is mediated by supervisory intensity and normative enforcement cultures. Standardization without monitoring risks symbolic conformity.

Normative debates on sustainability reporting caution that transparency regimes grounded in voluntary compliance may function as self-regulatory narratives rather than binding accountability systems (Vigneau & Adams, 2023). European regulatory developments illustrate attempts to harden disclosure through mandatory due diligence and expanded reporting obligations (Villiers, 2022). Accountability thus evolves along a continuum from soft coordination to coercive enforcement. International reporting standards operate within this evolving regulatory spectrum.

To synthesize the institutional patterns identified across the literature, the study maps core accountability mechanisms associated with international reporting regimes. These mechanisms are systematized in Table 2 to clarify the analytical distinctions between formal compliance and substantive answerability. The table highlights how enforcement design shapes accountability depth. This classification informs the normative evaluation of regulatory effectiveness.

Table 2. Institutional Mechanisms of Accountability in International Reporting Frameworks

Mechanism	Regulatory Characteristic	Accountability Implication
Standard-Setting Authority	Transnational epistemic governance	Defines scope and metrics of public obligations
Supervisory Oversight	Audit and monitoring institutions	Conditions credibility of disclosed information

Mandatory Disclosure Mandates	Binding reporting requirements	Expands formal answerability to stakeholders
Voluntary Compliance Frameworks	Soft-law guidance and principles	Risk of symbolic transparency without sanctions

Source: Conceptual synthesis based on Ahmad (2025); Villiers (2022); Vigneau & Adams (2023); Polzer et al. (2022).

The typology demonstrates that accountability intensity increases with the presence of binding oversight and sanctioning capacity. Comparative analyses of insurance sectors show how balancing compliance and transparency requires credible regulatory monitoring (Iqbal et al., 2025). Similar patterns appear in supply chain accountability reforms under European deforestation regulation, where enforceable obligations recalibrate corporate behavior (Berning & Sotirov, 2023). Regulatory design therefore determines whether standards translate into effective accountability.

Empirical examinations of public budgeting strategies in developing economies emphasize tools that enhance fiscal governance through procedural discipline and disclosure integration (Islam, 2025). Accountability is strengthened when reporting systems are aligned with budgeting and performance management structures. Fragmented reforms risk producing parallel compliance regimes lacking strategic coherence. Institutional integration emerges as a precondition for meaningful answerability.

Studies on fair value standard development in specific regional contexts reveal that interpretative discretion can widen accountability gaps when valuation complexity exceeds oversight capacity (Alharasis et al., 2024). Accountability is compromised when measurement ambiguity allows managerial opportunism. The normative model interprets such discretion as a governance risk embedded within technical standardization. Enforcement mechanisms must therefore address epistemic asymmetries.

Research on determinants of financial reporting quality highlights the role of internal control systems and human resource competence in sustaining credible accountability (Yenni et al., 2024; Yusran, 2023). Institutional capacity shapes whether standards function as substantive governance tools or procedural checklists. Accountability requires both normative clarity and operational capability. International reporting standards contribute structure, yet their effectiveness remains contingent upon robust institutional ecosystems that translate formal rules into enforceable public obligations.

Materiality, Public Value, and the Reconfiguration of Stakeholder Hierarchies

The normative analysis identifies materiality as a central conceptual hinge through which international reporting standards shape stakeholder prioritization. Contemporary debates on double materiality reveal competing interpretations of whose interests reporting systems are designed to serve (Barker & Mayer, 2025). Investor-oriented materiality emphasizes financial risk relevance, while public value theory broadens the evaluative lens to societal and environmental consequences. This conceptual divergence restructures the hierarchy of stakeholders embedded within reporting architectures.

Sustainability reporting scholarship documents the expansion of disclosure boundaries toward environmental and social impacts aligned with global development agendas (De Silva Lokuwaduge et al., 2022). Critical reflections on the evolution of sustainability standard-setting illustrate how institutional actors negotiate between inclusivity and technical feasibility (De Villiers et al., 2022). Materiality thresholds are therefore not neutral measurement tools but normative filters that define relevance. Reporting standards encode value judgments regarding which impacts warrant visibility.

European regulatory reforms mandating expanded non-financial disclosure intensify this shift by embedding sustainability within binding corporate reporting regimes (Fornasari & Traversi, 2024). Regulatory complexity, however, generates interpretative burdens that may obscure rather than clarify accountability relationships (Villiers, 2022). The normative model interprets this complexity as a structural consequence of integrating heterogeneous stakeholder claims into unified reporting templates. Materiality becomes a contested arena where economic, environmental, and social logics intersect.

Comparative analyses of transparency as self-regulation caution that disclosure expansion does not automatically produce transformative accountability (Vigneau & Adams, 2023). When sustainability metrics operate within compliance-driven cultures, symbolic adherence may eclipse substantive engagement. Materiality assessments risk devolving into procedural checklists rather than

deliberative evaluations of public impact. The conceptual synthesis underscores the importance of linking materiality to enforceable accountability mechanisms.

The integration of Islamic financial reporting principles demonstrates how regulatory influence can recalibrate transparency norms to align with ethical and social objectives (Jaradat & Oudat, 2025). Similar dynamics appear in comparative studies of insurance models balancing compliance and transparency within differentiated institutional contexts (Iqbal et al., 2025). These cases illustrate that materiality is shaped by normative traditions and regulatory expectations. International standards interact with localized value frameworks rather than displacing them.

To clarify how materiality constructs reconfigure stakeholder hierarchies, the study synthesizes conceptual patterns identified across the literature. These patterns are summarized in Table 3 to illustrate how reporting standards prioritize or marginalize distinct constituencies. The table captures the normative implications of alternative materiality logics. This structured comparison informs the evaluation of public value alignment.

Table 3. Materiality Logics and Stakeholder Prioritization in International Reporting Standards

Materiality Logic	Primary Stakeholder Focus	Normative Implication for Public Value
Financial Risk Materiality	Investors and creditors	Emphasis on capital protection and fiscal risk
Double Materiality	Investors and affected society	Integration of environmental and social impacts
Ethical-Religious Materiality	Community and faith-based actors	Alignment with moral accountability principles
Regulatory Compliance Logic	Supervisory authorities	Prioritization of procedural conformity

Source: Conceptual synthesis based on Barker & Mayer (2025); De Silva Lokuwaduge et al. (2022); Jaradat & Oudat (2025); Iqbal et al. (2025); Vigneau & Adams (2023).

The typology indicates that expanding materiality logics broadens the accountability horizon yet intensifies coordination challenges. Public administrations adopting accrual-based and sustainability-oriented standards must reconcile fiscal risk assessment with societal impact reporting (Bonollo, 2023). This dual orientation may generate epistemic tensions between quantitative valuation and qualitative impact narratives. Materiality thus functions as a mediating concept linking financial metrics and normative accountability claims.

Analyses of global enforcement dynamics emphasize that harmonized standards require credible institutional support to achieve substantive comparability (Prather-Kinsey et al., 2022). When applied to public-sector contexts, enforcement capacity determines whether expanded materiality criteria translate into meaningful disclosures. Without supervisory reinforcement, broadened stakeholder recognition may remain declaratory. Institutional robustness shapes the operationalization of public value.

Evidence on governance quality and disclosure determinants underscores that competence, internal control, and administrative culture influence how reporting standards are interpreted and implemented (Yenni et al., 2024; Yusran, 2023). Materiality judgments are exercised within organizational environments characterized by varying capacities and incentives. Public value orientation depends on the interplay between normative frameworks and managerial practice. Reporting standards alone cannot recalibrate stakeholder hierarchies without institutional alignment.

Research on transparency in public administrations highlights that citizens evaluate accountability through perceived responsiveness and clarity rather than abstract compliance (Cuadrado-Ballesteros et al., 2023). Materiality frameworks that neglect communicative accessibility risk reinforcing technocratic insulation. Integrating societal concerns into reporting requires interpretative engagement beyond metric expansion. Democratic legitimacy remains contingent upon participatory understanding.

The normative findings indicate that international reporting standards are progressively redefining stakeholder hierarchies through evolving materiality constructs. This redefinition broadens the conceptual scope of accountability while introducing complexity that challenges coherence and enforceability. Public financial transparency acquires new dimensions when societal impacts are recognized as material to fiscal governance. The sustainability of this transformation depends on aligning regulatory authority, institutional capacity, and normative clarity within an integrated public value framework.

CONCLUSION

This normative–conceptual inquiry demonstrates that international reporting standards shape public financial transparency not merely as a technical reporting enhancement but as a contested governance architecture embedding particular accountability logics and materiality hierarchies. Through critical synthesis of public-sector accounting theory, regulatory governance scholarship, and political economy perspectives, the analysis reveals persistent tensions between investor-oriented standardization, democratic answerability, and societal value creation, especially where accrual-based reforms and sustainability disclosures intersect within transnational regulatory regimes. The findings indicate that transparency gains are contingent upon institutional capacity, enforcement coherence, and alignment between formal disclosure requirements and broader public accountability expectations, rather than arising automatically from standard adoption. By integrating doctrinal examination of standard-setting rationales with accountability theory, this study advances a refined evaluative framework that clarifies when international reporting standards substantively enhance public financial transparency and when they primarily consolidate procedural compliance within global governance structures.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, N. R. (2025). Rebuilding public trust through state-owned enterprise reform: A transparency and accountability framework for Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs*, 10(3), 56-69.
- Alharasis, E. E., Prokofieva, M., Clark, C., Haddad, H., & Alramahi, N. (2024). The development of international accounting and auditing standards for fair value accounting in the Arab Middle East, Jordan: a systematic review. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2391564.
- Barker, R., & Mayer, C. (2025, March). Seeing double corporate reporting through the materiality lenses of both investors and nature. In *Accounting Forum* (Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 259-289). Routledge.
- Berning, L., & Sotirov, M. (2023). Hardening corporate accountability in commodity supply chains under the European Union Deforestation Regulation. *Regulation & Governance*, 17(4), 870-890.
- Boateng, R. N., Tawiah, V., & Tackie, G. (2022). Corporate governance and voluntary disclosures in annual reports: a post-International Financial Reporting Standard adoption evidence from an emerging capital market. *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, 30(2), 252-276.
- Bonollo, E. (2023). Negative effects of the adoption of accrual accounting in the public sector: a systematic literature review and future prospects. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 35(6), 1-27.
- Cuadrado-Ballesteros, B., Ríos, A. M., & Guillamón, M. D. (2023). Transparency in public administrations: a structured literature review. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 35(5), 537-567.
- De Silva Lokuwaduge, C., Smark, C., & Mir, M. (2022). The surge of environmental social and governance reporting and sustainable development goals: some normative thoughts. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, 16(2), 3-11.
- De Villiers, C., La Torre, M., & Molinari, M. (2022). The Global Reporting Initiative's (GRI) past, present and future: critical reflections and a research agenda on sustainability reporting (standard-setting). *Pacific accounting review*, 34(5), 728-747.
- Fornasari, T., & Traversi, M. (2024). The Impact of the CSRD and the ESRS on Non-Financial Disclosure. *Symphony*, (1), 117-133.

- Haustein, E., & C. Lorson, P. (2023). Transparency of local government financial statements: Analyzing citizens' perceptions. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 39(2), 375-393.
- Hoti, A., & Krasniqi, L. (2022). Impact of international financial reporting standards adoption on the perception of investors to invest in small-to-medium enterprise adopting transparency in disclosure policies. *International Journal of System Assurance Engineering and Management*, 13(Suppl 1), 506-515.
- Iqbal, H. M. A., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Balancing Compliance and Transparency: A Comparative Analysis of Takaful and Conventional Insurance in Pakistan. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, 3(03), 475-506.
- Islam, S. (2025). A systematic review of public budgeting strategies in developing economies: Tools for transparent fiscal governance. *American Journal of Advanced Technology and Engineering Solutions*, 1(01), 602-635.
- Jaradat, H., & Oudat, M. S. (2025). Enhancing clarity and transparency in Islamic financial practices: the role of regulatory influence. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*.
- Krishnan, S. R. (2023). Decision-making processes of public sector accounting reforms in India—Institutional perspectives. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 39(1), 167-194.
- Mohaiyadin, N. M. H., Aman, A., Palil, M. R., & Said, S. M. (2022). Addressing accountability and transparency challenges in waqf management using blockchain technology. *Journal of Islamic Monetary Economics and Finance*, 8, 53-80.
- Polzer, T., Grossi, G., & Reichard, C. (2022, January). Implementation of the international public sector accounting standards in Europe. Variations on a global theme. In *Accounting Forum* (Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 57-82). Routledge.
- Prather-Kinsey, J., De Luca, F., & Phan, H. T. P. (2022). Improving the global comparability of IFRS-based financial reporting through global enforcement: a proposed organizational dynamic. *International journal of disclosure and governance*, 19(3), 330-351.
- Schmidhuber, L., Hilgers, D., & Hofmann, S. (2022). International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSASs): A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 38(1), 119-142.
- Uzzaman, A., Akhter, T., Rahman, M. M., & Waliullah, M. (2023). Impact Of GFMIS-Driven Financial Transparency On Strategic Marketing Decisions In Government Agencies. *Review of Applied Science and Technology*, 2(01), 85-112.
- Vigneau, L., & Adams, C. A. (2023). The failure of transparency as self-regulation. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 14(4), 852-876.
- Villiers, C. (2022). New directions in the European Union's regulatory framework for corporate reporting, due diligence and accountability: The challenge of complexity. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 13(4), 548-566.
- Yenni, E., Junaedi, A. T., & Wijaya, E. (2024). The impact of government accounting standards implementation, internal control systems, and human resource competence on regional financial report quality. *Journal of Applied Business and Technology*, 5(3), 134-145.
- Yusran, I. N. (2023). Determinants of the quality of financial reports. *International Journal of Professional Business Review: Int. J. Prof. Bus. Rev.*, 8(3), 11.