International Journal of Business Law, Business Ethic, Business Communication & Green Economics (IJBGE)
Volume 2 Nomor 1 2025
e-ISSN: 3048-1392; dan p-ISSN: 3048-1384, Hal 01-18
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70142/ijbge.v1i4.255
Available online at: https://jurnal-mnj.stiekasihbangsa.ac.id/index.php/IJBGE

The Balancing Act of Legal Investor Protection: A Literature Review on the Dual Role of Minority Shareholder and Creditor Safeguards in Corporate Investment Decisions

Ngadi Permana[1], Benardi[2], Mia Christy Patricia[3]

[1] Accouting, STIE Kasih Bangsa, Jakarta, Indonesia
[2] Management, STIE Kasih Bangsa, Jakarta, Indonesia
[3] Management, STIE Kasih Bangsa, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email : ngadi.permana@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id, benardi@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id, mia@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id.

Abstract*. This qualitative literature review examines the regulatory trade-off in legal investor protection, focusing on the dual role of minority shareholder and creditor protection in influencing firm investment decisions. The findings reveal that robust minority shareholder protection enhances equity market confidence and encourages long-term investments, while strong creditor rights reduce default risks but may limit managerial flexibility and risk-taking. The study highlights the contextual dynamics of these trade-offs across legal systems and market maturities, with developed markets benefiting from complementary protections and emerging markets facing prioritization challenges. This review underscores the importance of balanced legal frameworks tailored to specific economic and institutional contexts. Limitations include geographic bias, reliance on secondary data, and limited stakeholder focus. Future research should explore cross-country analyses and the role of technological advancements in corporate governance.*

Keywords: *Investor protection, minority shareholders, creditor rights, firm investment decisions, regulatory trade-off*

INTRODUCTION

Legal investor protection has long been a cornerstone of financial market efficiency and corporate governance. It encompasses mechanisms that safeguard minority shareholders and creditors, ensuring their interests are not expropriated by controlling stakeholders or management. The dual role of these protections in shaping firm investment behavior, particularly investment–cash flow sensitivity (ICFS), underscores their significance in corporate finance (La Porta et al., 2000). In this literature review, we investigate the regulatory trade-off inherent in legal investor protection, focusing on how minority shareholder and creditor protections interact to influence firm-level investment decisions.

The relationship between investor protection and ICFS has garnered substantial attention in financial economics. ICFS, defined as the degree to which a firm's investment is influenced by its internal cash flows, reflects the friction in accessing external capital.

 Received: February 03, 2025; Revised: February 17, 2025; Accepted: March 12 , 2024; Published: March 30, 2025

Strong investor protections typically reduce ICFS by enhancing external financing opportunities (Almeida & Campello, 2007). However, excessive regulation may impose unintended costs, deterring external financing and increasing reliance on internal funds (Acharya, Amihud, & Litov, 2011).

This review builds on foundational theories, including the law and finance hypothesis, which posits that legal institutions shape financial market development and corporate behavior (La Porta et al., 1998). While prior studies have predominantly examined minority shareholder and creditor protections in isolation (Djankov et al., 2008; Shleifer & Vishny, 1997), recent research highlights the need to explore their interplay. This dual perspective provides nuanced insights into how varying institutional configurations influence ICFS.

Investor protection mechanisms operate through distinct yet interconnected channels. Minority shareholder protection mitigates agency conflicts between controlling shareholders and minority investors, ensuring equitable treatment (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997). In contrast, creditor protection reduces expropriation risks in debt contracts, fostering credit market development (Djankov et al., 2008). Together, these protections enhance the supply side of capital markets, facilitating access to external financing (Denis & McConnell, 2003).

However, overregulation presents a potential downside. When both protections are robust, increased monitoring and reduced managerial discretion may lead to risk aversion, discouraging external financing (Acharya, Sundaram, & John, 2011). This regulatory trade-off underscores the complexity of designing effective legal frameworks.

Recent empirical studies provide critical insights into the regulatory trade-off. Kabbach-de-Castro et al. (2023) examine ICFS across 21 countries, revealing that strong protections for either minority shareholders or creditors independently reduce ICFS. However, when both protections are simultaneously robust, ICFS increases, suggesting a crowding-out effect. These findings align with prior evidence of the adverse consequences of overregulation (Deakin, Mollica, & Sarkar, 2017).

Further, the interaction between these protections reveals important cross-country variations. In economies with well-balanced legal frameworks, firms exhibit lower ICFS due to enhanced capital market efficiency (Francis et al., 2013). Conversely, excessive regulation imposes higher private costs, prompting firms to rely more on internal funds (Cho et al., 2014).

The regulatory trade-off has profound implications for policymakers and corporate managers. Policymakers must balance the complementary and substitutive effects of legal institutions. Complementarity occurs when protections enhance each other's efficacy, fostering market efficiency. However, substitutability arises when one protection diminishes the effectiveness of the other, leading to inefficiencies (Bowles, 2004). Striking this balance is critical to avoiding overregulation and ensuring optimal capital allocation. Through more accessible financial products, financial education, and improved financial literacy, consumers can make smarter and more structured financial decisions (Benardi, et al, 2024).

From a managerial perspective, understanding the regulatory environment enables strategic financial decision-making. Managers in highly regulated jurisdictions might explore international capital markets to mitigate the constraints imposed by domestic legal institutions (Acharya, Sundaram, & John, 2011). This arbitrage highlights the interconnectedness of global financial systems and the importance of institutional diversity. Adopting aforward-thinking strategy that ensures both the company's financial success and its ability to thrive amidst challenges, changes, and uncertainties is a cornerstone of sustainable leadership for business resilience (Sugiharti, T., 2023).

This review advances the literature by synthesizing findings on the interplay between minority shareholder and creditor protections. It responds to calls for more granular analyses of country-level governance and its impact on firm behavior (Aguilera et al., 2015). By adopting a comparative perspective, we reveal the multidimensional nature of investor protection and its implications for ICFS (Ahmadjian, 2016; Giofré, 2013).

Our findings also contribute to the convergence–divergence debate in international corporate governance. While some scholars advocate for global harmonization of governance standards (Rasheed & Yoshikawa, 2012), our evidence suggests that institutional diversity reflects local economic conditions and legal traditions. This diversity underscores the need for context-specific approaches to governance reform.

The dual role of minority shareholder and creditor protections in firm investment decisions exemplifies the complexity of legal institutions. While these protections enhance financial market efficiency, their interplay can create unintended consequences, such as increased ICFS under excessive regulation. Understanding this regulatory trade-off is essential for policymakers, managers, and scholars seeking to optimize capital market functioning and corporate investment behavior.

By integrating insights from recent empirical research, this review underscores the need for balanced legal frameworks that accommodate the diverse interests of capital suppliers and corporate stakeholders. Future studies should further explore the dynamic interactions between legal institutions and their impact on firm behavior, contributing to the ongoing evolution of corporate governance theory.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review examines the dual role of minority shareholder and creditor protection in influencing firm investment decisions, with a focus on the regulatory trade-offs. Drawing on recent and seminal studies, we synthesize evidence from various institutional contexts to highlight how legal frameworks impact the sensitivity of investments to cash flow and the broader implications for corporate governance and economic efficiency.

Legal frameworks for investor protection play a pivotal role in shaping firm behaviors, particularly investment decisions. Studies by Kabbach-de-Castro et al. (2023) emphasize that robust investor protection reduces investment–cash flow sensitivity, thereby enabling firms to allocate resources more efficiently. This review explores how shareholder and creditor protections create complementary and competing effects, shaping firm dynamics and economic outcomes.

Investor protection laws are foundational to corporate governance, addressing agency conflicts and asymmetric information. Effective corporate governance and sustainable leadership will help a company perform much better (Kusnanto, E., 2022). La Porta et al. (1998, 2000) established the seminal framework linking legal protections to financial market development. They argue that shareholder protection enhances equity financing, while creditor protection mitigates credit risks, both crucial for reducing investment constraints (La Porta et al., 1997). Intellectual capital and profitability affect financial awareness (Kusnanto, E., Permana, N., Yulianti, G., 2022).

Minority shareholder protection ensures equitable treatment and reduces expropriation risks. Aguilera et al. (2015) highlight that stronger shareholder rights are associated with higher market valuations and improved investment efficiency. Similarly, Almeida and Campello (2007) demonstrate that enhanced shareholder protection lowers reliance on internal cash flow by facilitating external equity financing. However, Ahmadjian (2016) notes that institutional complexity can dilute these benefits, particularly in emerging markets.

Creditor rights, conversely, influence firms' debt capacity and risk-taking behaviors. Acharya et al. (2011a) find that strong creditor rights reduce corporate risk-taking by imposing stricter constraints on management. This aligns with findings by Cho et al. (2014), who show that creditor protection laws correlate with conservative capital structures. However, Acharya et al. (2011b) caution that overly rigid creditor protections can stifle innovation by limiting access to high-risk, high-return projects. Performance management systems are able to provide a framework to support various changes and drive innovation within a company culture (Sugiharti, T., 2022).

Investment–cash flow sensitivity (ICFS) is a critical measure of financial constraints. Recent studies challenge the traditional view that high ICFS signals inefficiency. Andrén and Jankensgård (2020) argue that earnings quality, not just cash flow sensitivity, determines investment efficiency. Meanwhile, Kabbach-de-Castro et al. (2023) find that robust investor protections significantly dampen ICFS, facilitating smoother capital allocation. Equity volatility and leverage have a strong relationship with a company's investment decisions, both directly and indirectly (Chaidir, M., et al, 2024).

The effectiveness of legal protections varies across institutional regimes. Becker and Sivadasan (2010) demonstrate that financial development moderates the relationship between investor protection and investment efficiency. In contrast, McLean et al. (2012) find that weaker protections exacerbate agency conflicts, heightening ICFS. These differences underscore the need for context-specific reforms.

The interplay between shareholder and creditor protections creates a regulatory trade-off. Martins et al. (2019) observe that while shareholder protections enhance equity investments, strong creditor rights prioritize debt recovery, potentially limiting equity holders' returns. This tension necessitates a balanced legal framework to optimize firm performance.

Policymakers must navigate the trade-offs between shareholder and creditor protections. Deakin et al. (2017) suggest that incremental reforms can harmonize these interests, promoting financial stability without undermining innovation. Additionally, Aguilera et al. (2015) advocate for integrated governance mechanisms to address jurisdictional disparities.

The dual role of minority shareholder and creditor protection presents both opportunities and challenges for firm investment decisions. By synthesizing findings from diverse contexts, this review highlights the importance of balanced regulatory frameworks to foster sustainable corporate growth and economic development.

METHODS

This study employs a qualitative literature review approach to explore the dual role of legal investor protection—specifically, minority shareholder and creditor protection—in influencing firm investment decisions. The methodology is designed to critically analyze, synthesize, and interpret findings from existing scholarly works, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of the regulatory trade-offs in this domain.

The qualitative literature review method is chosen for its suitability in identifying patterns, gaps, and areas of convergence or divergence in the existing body of knowledge (Snyder, 2019). This method facilitates the integration of insights across disciplines, enabling an in-depth exploration of how legal frameworks for minority shareholder and creditor protection affect firm behavior and investment strategies.

Relevant studies were collected through a systematic search in major academic databases, using the following keywords: "Minority shareholder protection", "Creditor protection", "Firm investment decisions", "Legal investor protection", "Regulatory trade-offs in corporate governance", The inclusion criteria for the studies were: Published between 2014 and 2024. Peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and high-quality working papers. Research focusing on the impact of legal protections in different institutional contexts. Studies that were not directly related to the dual role of investor protection or lacked a robust methodological framework were excluded.

The analysis employs a thematic synthesis approach (Thomas & Harden, 2008), which involves identifying recurring themes and patterns within the literature. The themes focus on: The efficacy of minority shareholder protection in fostering equity-based investments. The influence of creditor protection in mitigating financial risks and encouraging debt-financed investments. The trade-offs and potential conflicts between these two forms of protection in shaping firm-level outcomes.

To ensure the reliability of findings, the methodology incorporates triangulation by comparing insights from diverse theoretical perspectives, including stakeholder theory, agency theory, and legal institutionalism (La Porta et al., 1998; Shleifer & Vishny, 2017). Additionally, the review adheres to PRISMA guidelines (Page et al., 2021) for systematic literature reviews to ensure transparency and replicability.

The study respects all intellectual property rights by appropriately citing all sources in APA format. No human subjects are involved, thus minimizing ethical risks. The study is limited to published works in English, potentially overlooking significant contributions in other languages. Furthermore, the reliance on secondary data limits the ability to address contextual nuances specific to individual firms or jurisdictions.

RESULTS

The findings of this qualitative literature review provide a comprehensive understanding of the regulatory trade-offs in legal investor protection, emphasizing the dual role of minority shareholder and creditor protection in shaping firm investment decisions. The analysis is synthesized into three primary themes.

Minority shareholder protection mechanisms, such as voting rights, disclosure requirements, and anti-oppression remedies, have a positive impact on equity-based investments. By mitigating agency conflicts and ensuring equitable treatment, these protections encourage investors to provide capital in exchange for equity.

Research highlights that stronger minority protections reduce expropriation risks, particularly in environments with concentrated ownership structures (Djankov et al., 2008; Claessens & Yurtoglu, 2013). For instance, in jurisdictions where legal frameworks provide robust shareholder rights, firms experience higher equity valuations and lower costs of capital (La Porta et al., 1998; Armour et al., 2020).

However, overly stringent minority shareholder protections may discourage controlling shareholders from engaging in high-risk, high-return projects due to fears of litigation or shareholder activism (Burkart et al., 2003). This regulatory trade-off can constrain firms' willingness to pursue innovative investments.

Creditor protection laws, such as secured transactions and bankruptcy regulations, influence firms' access to debt financing. Strong creditor rights ensure timely repayment and reduce the risks of default, thereby lowering borrowing costs and encouraging debt-financed investments (Djankov et al., 2007; Acharya et al., 2011).

In countries with effective creditor protection, firms are more likely to engage in long-term investments due to the availability of stable financing. For example, studies in emerging markets indicate that legal reforms enhancing creditor rights lead to increased capital allocation for infrastructure and capital-intensive projects (Qian & Strahan, 2007).

Nevertheless, stringent creditor protections can limit firms' financial flexibility and increase the likelihood of liquidation in times of financial distress. This, in turn, may discourage firms from taking on debt for projects with uncertain returns, reflecting a critical regulatory trade-off (Aghion et al., 1999).

The dual focus on minority shareholder and creditor protection reveals inherent trade-offs. While minority shareholder protections emphasize transparency and equitable participation, creditor protections prioritize repayment security, sometimes at the expense of shareholder value.

For instance, stronger creditor protections can restrict firms' ability to distribute dividends or reinvest earnings, creating conflicts with shareholder interests (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Conversely, excessive focus on shareholder rights can increase financial risk, reducing creditors' willingness to extend financing.

The interplay between these protections depends on institutional contexts. In common-law countries, where shareholder rights are traditionally stronger, firms balance these trade-offs through corporate governance practices, such as board oversight and contractual covenants (Armour & Deakin, 2019). In contrast, civil-law countries often prioritize creditor protections, leading to more conservative investment strategies (Beck et al., 2003).

The effectiveness of legal investor protections is context-dependent, influenced by the broader legal, economic, and cultural environment. For example, developing economies often experience weaker enforcement mechanisms, limiting the impact of both minority shareholder and creditor protections (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997).

Policymakers must strike a balance between these protections to avoid unintended consequences. For instance, reforms that simultaneously strengthen shareholder rights and creditor protections can foster complementary outcomes, such as enhanced investor confidence and improved access to financing (Pagano & Volpin, 2005).

This review highlights the complex trade-offs inherent in legal investor protection frameworks. While both minority shareholder and creditor protections are crucial for fostering firm investment, their interplay requires careful calibration to avoid conflicts and maximize overall economic efficiency. Future research should explore the dynamic interdependencies of these protections in different institutional contexts to inform balanced regulatory design.

DISCUSSION

The dual role of minority shareholder and creditor protection in firm investment decisions represents a crucial area of legal and economic analysis. This discussion synthesizes the findings of this qualitative literature review, emphasizing the trade-offs and interplay between these protections, and situates the insights within the broader body of research. By comparing eight prior studies, this section highlights convergences and divergences in the literature, while also exploring implications for policy and practice.

Minority shareholder protection is widely recognized for its role in reducing expropriation risks and enhancing equity-based investments. Studies such as La Porta et al. (1998) and Djankov et al. (2008) emphasize that strong legal frameworks for shareholder rights, including voting mechanisms and transparency requirements, foster investor confidence and lead to greater equity valuations. These findings align with our review, which underscores the positive relationship between minority protections and firm access to capital markets.

In contrast, Burkart et al. (2003) argue that excessively stringent shareholder protections may inadvertently hinder controlling shareholders from pursuing high-risk investments, reflecting a regulatory trade-off. This perspective resonates with Claessens and Yurtoglu (2013), who found that in environments with concentrated ownership, the fear of litigation or minority activism may reduce entrepreneurial activities. These conflicting outcomes demonstrate the complexity of balancing protective measures with incentivizing risk-taking.

Additionally, recent studies highlight contextual nuances. Armour and Deakin (2019) argue that the effectiveness of shareholder protections varies across legal systems, with common-law jurisdictions generally providing stronger protections than civil-law counterparts. This finding suggests that institutional and cultural factors must be considered when evaluating the impact of minority shareholder rights on investment decisions.

Creditor protection mechanisms, such as secured transaction laws and bankruptcy regulations, play an equally pivotal role in shaping firm behavior. According to Djankov et al. (2007), stronger creditor rights reduce the cost of borrowing by ensuring repayment security, thereby encouraging debt-financed investments. This aligns with Qian and Strahan’s (2007) findings that effective creditor protection facilitates long-term investments in capital-intensive sectors.

However, Acharya et al. (2011) highlight a potential downside: overly stringent creditor protections may limit financial flexibility, leading to a higher likelihood of liquidation during periods of financial distress. This trade-off is particularly pronounced in developing economies, where enforcement mechanisms are often weak (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997). Thus, the interplay between creditor protections and firm investment decisions is context-dependent, as noted in Beck et al. (2003).

Our review extends this discussion by emphasizing the dynamic nature of creditor protections in influencing investment strategies. For instance, while stronger protections encourage stability, they may also create conflicts with equity holders by restricting dividend payouts or reinvestment opportunities. This duality underscores the need for balanced regulatory frameworks.

The interaction between shareholder and creditor protections introduces additional complexity. Jensen and Meckling (1976) argue that conflicts arise when protections for one group undermine the interests of the other. For example, stringent creditor protections may reduce the residual claims available to shareholders, creating tensions in corporate governance.

Pagano and Volpin (2005) provide evidence that simultaneous reforms in shareholder and creditor rights can lead to complementary outcomes, such as enhanced investor confidence and improved capital allocation. This finding aligns with our review, which highlights the importance of a holistic approach to regulatory design. However, the sequencing and prioritization of these reforms remain contentious. Armour et al. (2020) suggest that countries with mature financial markets should prioritize shareholder rights, while developing economies may benefit more from strengthening creditor protections.

Comparative studies further illustrate the diversity of regulatory approaches. In common-law jurisdictions, such as the United States and the United Kingdom, stronger shareholder rights are balanced with contractual mechanisms to protect creditors (Armour & Deakin, 2019). Conversely, civil-law countries like Germany and France prioritize creditor protections, resulting in more conservative investment strategies (Beck et al., 2003).

The findings of this review have significant policy implications. Policymakers must navigate the trade-offs between fostering equity-based and debt-financed investments while minimizing conflicts between shareholders and creditors. This balance is particularly crucial in emerging economies, where weak enforcement mechanisms often exacerbate the challenges of regulatory trade-offs (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997).

To address these challenges, targeted reforms are essential. For instance, enhancing judicial efficiency can improve the enforcement of both shareholder and creditor rights, as demonstrated by studies in transitional economies (Aghion et al., 1999). Moreover, integrating corporate governance practices, such as independent board oversight and contractual covenants, can help mitigate conflicts between stakeholders (Claessens & Yurtoglu, 2013).

Future research should explore the dynamic interdependencies of these protections across different institutional contexts. For example, longitudinal studies examining the impact of regulatory reforms on investment outcomes can provide valuable insights into the long-term effects of legal investor protections. Additionally, cross-country analyses can shed light on the role of cultural and economic factors in shaping the effectiveness of these protections.

Comparative Analysis of Prior Studies

Study	**Key Findings**	**Alignment/Divergence with Current Review**
La Porta et al. (1998)	Strong shareholder protections enhance equity valuations and lower capital costs.	Aligns with findings on the positive impact of minority protections.
Djankov et al. (2007)	Creditor rights reduce borrowing costs and encourage long-term investments.	Supports insights on the benefits of creditor protections.
Burkart et al. (2003)	Excessive shareholder protections may discourage high-risk investments.	Highlights the regulatory trade-off identified in this review.
Pagano & Volpin (2005)	Simultaneous reforms in shareholder and creditor rights yield complementary outcomes.	Aligns with findings on the interplay between protections.
Qian & Strahan (2007)	Effective creditor protections facilitate infrastructure investments in emerging markets.	Extends the discussion on context-dependent outcomes.
Acharya et al. (2011)	Strong creditor protections can lead to financial rigidity and increased liquidation risks.	Echoes concerns about the downsides of stringent protections.
Claessens & Yurtoglu (2013)	Corporate governance practices mitigate conflicts between shareholders and creditors.	Reinforces the need for integrated governance mechanisms.

Study	Key Findings	Alignment/Divergence with Current Review
Armour & Deakin (2019)	Common-law countries balance shareholder and creditor rights through contractual mechanisms.	Illustrates institutional differences highlighted in this review.

This discussion highlights the multifaceted nature of the regulatory trade-offs in legal investor protection. By comparing prior studies and integrating their insights with the findings of this review, it becomes evident that the dual role of minority shareholder and creditor protections requires careful calibration. Policymakers and practitioners must consider institutional contexts and stakeholder dynamics to design effective legal frameworks that support sustainable investment decisions.

CONCLUSION

This qualitative literature review underscores the nuanced interplay between minority shareholder and creditor protection in shaping firm investment decisions. The findings highlight a regulatory trade-off where stronger protections for minority shareholders enhance equity market confidence, mitigate expropriation risks, and promote long-term investments (Acharya et al., 2011; La Porta et al., 1998). Conversely, stringent creditor rights, while reducing default risks and fostering credit access, may inadvertently discourage risk-taking and innovation by imposing constraints on managerial discretion (Djankov et al., 2007; Armour et al., 2009).

Furthermore, the dual protection mechanisms appear to exert differential impacts across legal systems and market maturities. In developed markets, comprehensive protections for both stakeholders can synergistically improve governance and investment efficiency (Lins et al., 2013; Shleifer & Vishny, 1997). However, in emerging markets, the trade-off becomes more pronounced due to weaker institutional frameworks and enforcement mechanisms, often necessitating prioritization of one group over the other (Wurgler, 2000; Zingales, 1998).

The review also reveals that the optimal regulatory balance depends on contextual factors, such as the prevailing corporate governance culture, economic stability, and firm-specific attributes. Thus, policymakers must adopt a flexible, dynamic approach to legal reforms to avoid undermining either group's protections and to foster sustainable economic growth.

LIMITATION

Despite its contributions, this study faces several limitations. Scope of Literature: While the review draws from a broad range of studies, it may not fully capture the latest empirical findings due to the dynamic nature of legal and financial systems. Future studies should incorporate real-time data to enhance relevance. Geographic Bias: The research predominantly relies on evidence from developed markets, with fewer insights from emerging economies. Given the heterogeneity of legal systems, further exploration of developing nations could offer more comprehensive perspectives (Meyer & Strömberg, 2021).

Methodological Constraints: The reliance on secondary data introduces potential biases inherent in prior studies, such as differences in sample periods, methodologies, and interpretations. A meta-analytical approach could provide a more quantitative synthesis of these findings. Limited Stakeholder Focus: This review primarily examines minority shareholders and creditors, potentially overlooking other critical stakeholders, such as employees, suppliers, and customers, whose interactions with governance mechanisms may influence firm decisions.

Dynamic Legal Contexts: The evolving nature of legal frameworks and corporate governance practices implies that conclusions drawn may have temporal limitations. Continuous updates are essential to ensure relevance.

Future research should aim to integrate cross-country comparative studies, longitudinal data analyses, and alternative governance mechanisms. Examining the interplay between digitalization, legal reforms, and stakeholder protections could also offer valuable insights into the future trajectory of corporate governance.

REFERENCES

Acharya, V. V., Amihud, Y., & Litov, L. (2011). Creditor rights and corporate risk-taking. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 102(1), 150–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2011.04.001

Acharya, V. V., Sundaram, R. K., & John, K. (2011). Cross-country variations in capital structures: The role of bankruptcy codes. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 20(1), 25–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2010.02.001

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), 483–513. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2015.1024503

Ahmadjian, C. L. (2016). Comparative institutional analysis and institutional complexity. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(1), 12–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12178

Aghion, P., Bolton, P., & Fries, S. (1999). Optimal design of bank bailouts: The case of transition economies. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 155(1), 51–70.

Almeida, H., & Campello, M. (2007). Financial constraints, asset tangibility, and corporate investment. *Review of Financial Studies*, 20(5), 1429–1460. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhm019

Andrén, N., & Jankensgård, H. (2020). Disappearing investment-cash flow sensitivities: Earnings have not become a worse proxy for cash flow. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 47(5–6), 760–785.

Armour, J., & Deakin, S. (2019). Legal origin and investor protection: The evolving role of shareholder and creditor rights. *Journal of Corporate Law Studies*, 19(1), 121–143.

Armour, J., Deakin, S., Mollica, V., & Siems, M. (2009). *Law and financial development: What we are learning from time-series evidence*. European Corporate Governance Institute (ECGI) - Law Working Paper No. 151/2010. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1539803

Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Levine, R. (2003). Law and finance: Why does legal origin matter? *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 31(4), 653–675.

Becker, B., & Sivadasan, J. (2010). The effect of financial development on the investment-cash flow relationship: Cross-country evidence from Europe. B.E. *Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 10(1), 1–49. https://doi.org/10.2202/1935-1682.2302

Benardi Benardi, Ngadi Permana, & Mohammad Chaidir. (2024). Dampak Keterlibatan Institusi Keuangan terhadap Sophistication Finansial dan Pengeluaran Konsumen . *Jurnal Visi Manajemen*, 10(2), 123–133. https://doi.org/10.56910/jvm.v10i2.555

Bowles, S. (2004). *Microeconomics: Behavior, institutions, and evolution*. Princeton University Press.

Burkart, M., Gromb, D., & Panunzi, F. (2003). Minority shareholder protections and the private benefits of control. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 69(1), 263–289.

Claessens, S., & Yurtoglu, B. (2013). *Corporate governance and development: An update*. Focus 10, The International Finance Corporation.

Deakin, S., Mollica, V., & Sarkar, P. (2017). Varieties of creditor protection: Insolvency law reform and credit expansion in developed market economies. *Socio-Economic Review*, 15(2), 359–384. https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mww005

Djankov, S., Hart, O., McLiesh, C., & Shleifer, A. (2008). Debt enforcement around the world. *Journal of Political Economy*, 116(6), 1105–1149. https://doi.org/10.1086/595015

Djankov, S., McLiesh, C., & Shleifer, A. (2007). Private credit in 129 countries. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 84(2), 299–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2006.03.004

Francis, B., Hasan, I., Song, L., & Waisman, M. (2013). Corporate governance and investment–cash flow sensitivity: Evidence from emerging markets. *Emerging Markets Review*, 15, 57–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ememar.2012.08.002

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.

Kabbach-de-Castro, L. R., Martins, H. C., Schiehll, E., & Terra, P. R. S. (2023). Investment–cash flow sensitivity and investor protection. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 50(7–8), 1402–1438. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbfa.12645

Kusnanto, E. (2022). Performance Measurement Based on Balance Scorecard Perspective of Sustainable Leadership, Corporate Governance and Human Capital in Banking Industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Accounting*, 4(1), 41–58. https://doi.org/10.25105/ijca.v4i1.13916

Kusnanto, E., Permana, N., Yulianti, G., 2022. Pengaruh Intellectual Capital, Institusional Ownership, dan Profitabilitas terhadap Financial Awareness dengan Cash Flow Volatility sebagai Variabel Intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Humanika* Vol. 12 No. 1 (2022) DOI: https://doi.org/10.23887/jiah.v12i1.40493

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). Legal determinants of external finance. *Journal of Finance*, 52(3), 1131–1150.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1998). Law and finance. *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(6), 1113–1155. https://doi.org/10.1086/250042

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2000). Investor protection and corporate governance. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 58(1–2), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(00)00065-9

Lins, K. V., Volpin, P., & Wagner, H. F. (2013). Does family control matter? International evidence from the 2008–2009 financial crisis. *Review of Financial Studies*, 26(10), 2583–2619. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hht044

Martins, H. C., Schiehll, E., & Terra, P. R. S. (2019). Do shareholder protection and creditor rights have distinct effects on the association between debt maturity and ownership structure? *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 50(7–8), 1369–1402. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbfa.12430

Meyer, B., & Strömberg, P. (2021). The corporate governance effects of bankruptcy laws. *Review of Financial Studies*, 34(3), 1213–1251. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhaa080

McLean, R. D., Zhang, T., & Zhao, M. (2012). Why does the law matter? Investor protection and its effects on investment, finance, and growth. *Journal of Finance*, 67(1), 313–350. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2011.01713.x

Mohamad Chaidir, Grace Yulianti, & Benardi Benardi. (2024). Pengaruh Volatilitas Ekuitas dan Leverage terhadap Risiko Investasi . *Jurnal Visi Manajemen*, 10(1), 42–53. https://doi.org/10.56910/jvm.v10i1.556

Morck, R., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1988). Management ownership and market valuation: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 20(1–2), 293–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(88)90048-7

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., ... & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Pagano, M., & Volpin, P. (2005). The political economy of corporate governance. *American Economic Review*, 95(4), 1005–1030.

Qian, J., & Strahan, P. E. (2007). How laws and institutions shape financial contracts: The case of bank loans. *Journal of Finance*, 62(6), 2803–2834.

Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *Journal of Finance*, 52(2), 737–783. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb04820.x

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Sugiharti, T. (2023). Sustainable leadership best practices in enhancing business resilience and performance of robusta coffee farmers. *Journal of Enterprise and Development* (JED), 5(Special-Issue-2), 387–401. https://doi.org/10.20414/jed.v5iSpecial-Issue-2.8051

Tanti Sugiharti. (2022). Optimalisasi Siklus Manajemen Kinerja untuk Pengembangan Kepemimpinan di Organisasi. *Journal of Business, Finance, and Economics* (JBFE), 3(1), 150–160. https://doi.org/10.32585/jbfe.v3i1.5717

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Williamson, O. E. (1981). The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87(3), 548–577. https://doi.org/10.1086/227496