

Advances in Financial Resilience through Integrated Governance and Compliance Strategies

OLAWOLE AKOMOLAFE¹, MICHAEL UZOMA AGU²

¹Nigeria Liability Insurance Pool, Lagos, Nigeria

²Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Limited

Abstract- Financial resilience has become a central priority for financial institutions globally, particularly in environments characterised by heightened uncertainty, regulatory complexity, and systemic vulnerabilities. Integrated governance and compliance strategies have emerged as critical enablers of resilience, complementing traditional risk management approaches with organisational structures, cultural alignment, regulatory conformity, and robust supervisory mechanisms. This paper examines advances in financial resilience derived from integrated governance and compliance practices, focusing exclusively on scholarship published prior to 2019. The review synthesises insights from corporate governance, regulatory compliance, enterprise risk management, internal control frameworks, and behavioural finance to evaluate how governance structures and compliance mechanisms jointly support institutional resilience. The study highlights the evolution of integrated governance models, the interplay between cultural and structural governance factors, and the role of compliance in supporting proactive risk oversight, crisis preparedness, and operational continuity. The findings provide a foundation for developing holistic resilience frameworks applicable across diverse financial sectors.

Keywords: Financial resilience; Governance integration; Regulatory compliance; Risk management; Organisational culture; Supervisory frameworks

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of financial resilience has gained increasing prominence across global financial systems, particularly in the decades leading up to 2019, as institutions confronted heightened volatility, regulatory reforms, and rapidly evolving risk

landscapes [1], [2]. Financial resilience refers to the ability of financial institutions to absorb shocks, maintain operational continuity, adapt to disruptions, and sustain confidence among stakeholders despite adverse conditions [3]. Unlike traditional notions of financial stability, which focus primarily on solvency, liquidity, or capital adequacy, financial resilience encompasses organisational agility, governance robustness, compliance discipline, and cultural integrity [4]. These dimensions reflect an integrated understanding of how institutions respond not only to financial pressures but also to operational, regulatory, technological, and reputational challenges [5], [6].

The pursuit of financial resilience is especially relevant given the repeated episodes of instability that have shaped regulatory and organisational priorities since the early 2000s [7]. The global financial crisis of 2008–2009 exposed severe weaknesses in governance frameworks, compliance systems, and supervisory oversight across advanced and emerging markets [8], [9]. Post-crisis investigations revealed patterns of excessive risk-taking, governance failures, insufficient internal controls, and breakdowns in risk culture. These structural deficiencies demonstrated that financial resilience cannot be achieved through capital-based and risk-based approaches alone; rather, it requires integrated governance and compliance strategies that shape organisational behaviour, support timely decision-making, and reinforce institutional accountability [10], [11].

In the years following the global crisis, regulators, professional associations, and academic scholars emphasised the interdependence between governance and compliance as foundational elements of resilience [12], [13]. Governance frameworks define the structures, relationships, and oversight mechanisms through which boards, executives, and operational units direct organisational activities. Compliance strategies ensure adherence to legal, regulatory,

ethical, and procedural requirements, forming a first line of defence against misconduct, regulatory breaches, and operational failures [14], [15]. When integrated effectively, governance and compliance systems reinforce each other: governance creates expectations for integrity and accountability, while compliance operationalises these expectations through policies, monitoring systems, and enforcement mechanisms [16]. Integrated strategies help institutions maintain resilience by ensuring that governance is not merely symbolic and that compliance is not reduced to a procedural formality [17], [18].

Advances in governance and compliance integration were driven by several factors prior to 2019 [19], [20]. First, regulatory reforms across multiple jurisdictions such as enhanced prudential standards, more rigorous supervisory frameworks, and heightened disclosure requirements expanded institutional responsibility for effective governance [21], [22]. For example, the post-crisis regulatory agenda strengthened board accountability, risk governance structures, and internal control functions, recognising that governance failures were central contributors to systemic risk [23], [24]. Regulatory bodies increasingly emphasised the role of compliance officers, ethics committees, risk governance units, and internal audit departments in ensuring institutional resilience [25], [26]. Second, technological transformation within financial systems introduced new forms of risk, including cybersecurity threats, data governance issues, algorithmic vulnerabilities, and third-party outsourcing risks [27]. Governance and compliance strategies had to adapt to these shifts by incorporating advanced information systems, continuous monitoring tools, and improved incident-response capabilities [28], [29].

Third, globalisation intensified the complexity of risk exposures within financial institutions, as institutions engaged in cross-border activities, foreign currency transactions, and multinational regulatory interactions [30]. Cross-border governance required harmonised compliance systems capable of responding to multiple regulatory environments, creating the need for integrated frameworks that support consistency and adaptability [31], [32]. Fourth, behavioural and cultural factors became increasingly recognised as central to governance effectiveness. Scandals

involving misconduct, fraud, or unethical behaviour revealed that even the most comprehensive governance structures fail when organisational culture does not support integrity, transparency, and accountability [33], [34]. Financial resilience requires not only strong governance structures but also internal cultures that prioritise ethical conduct, risk awareness, and compliance discipline [35], [36].

The integration of governance and compliance strategies also intersects with enterprise risk management (ERM), which seeks to align risk-taking activities with organisational objectives through coordinated processes across business units [37], [38]. Governance and compliance form the structural and behavioural foundations upon which ERM systems operate. Without effective governance, ERM lacks strategic direction; without compliance, ERM lacks operational enforcement. Therefore, advances in financial resilience often reflect the maturation of ERM frameworks that incorporate governance and compliance elements into risk identification, assessment, response, and monitoring processes [39], [40].

In financial institutions, integrated governance and compliance strategies manifest through several dimensions. Board oversight ensures that risk-taking aligns with institutional risk appetite and strategic priorities. Executive leadership shapes organisational culture and allocates resources for compliance and governance functions [41]. Risk management units operationalise risk-related policies, while compliance units interpret regulatory changes, develop internal policies, monitor adherence, and coordinate with external regulators. Internal audit functions provide assurance on the effectiveness of governance, risk, and compliance systems. When coordinated effectively, these functions create a holistic architecture that enhances financial resilience by reducing vulnerability to misconduct, operational disruptions, regulatory sanctions, and reputational damage [42].

Research prior to 2019 highlights that financial institutions with integrated governance and compliance systems demonstrate higher levels of operational stability, regulatory conformity, market trust, and crisis preparedness [43], [44]. Such institutions are better equipped to identify emerging

risks, respond to regulatory changes, interpret supervisory expectations, and adapt their internal structures to evolving market conditions. Furthermore, they exhibit stronger ethical cultures, reduced incidence of misconduct, and improved board effectiveness. Integrated strategies support organisational resilience by providing real-time information, fostering accountability, and ensuring a coordinated institutional response to uncertainty or external shocks.

Nevertheless, the literature also reveals significant challenges that institutions face in achieving effective governance compliance integration. Fragmented organisational structures, siloed risk functions, inconsistent reporting standards, insufficient board expertise, and cultural resistance impede integration efforts [45]. Many institutions treat governance and compliance as separate organisational domains, resulting in duplication, inefficiencies, and misalignment. Furthermore, resource constraints especially in smaller or emerging market institutions limit investment in governance infrastructure, compliance technology, and skilled personnel. These constraints undermine resilience by creating blind spots in oversight and weakening the institutional response to evolving risks [46].

Implementation challenges underscore the need for carefully designed frameworks that align governance, compliance, risk management, and internal control processes. Integrated structures create pathways for communication and information flow across departments, enabling coordinated decision-making and early detection of irregularities [47]. Conceptual models such as the three lines of defence, board governance frameworks, compliance risk management systems, and risk-culture models all contribute to a deeper understanding of how institutions can operationalise integration [48].

In summary, the introduction highlights the theoretical and practical foundations of financial resilience through integrated governance and compliance strategies. It underscores the complexity of regulatory environments, technological disruptions, cultural dynamics, and institutional capacity constraints that shape resilience outcomes. By focusing on scholarship published before 2019, the paper traces the

development of integrated strategies and emphasises their central role in reducing vulnerability to financial shocks, misconduct, and regulatory risk. The following section provides a comprehensive review of the literature on governance, compliance, and financial resilience, further exploring theoretical advances, empirical findings, and contextual considerations shaping institutional effectiveness.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on financial resilience, governance integration, and compliance strategies prior to 2019 reflects a multidimensional and interdisciplinary evolution drawing from corporate governance theory, regulatory compliance, risk management, behavioural finance, organisational science, and public policy. This review synthesises the major strands of scholarship shaping contemporary understanding of how governance and compliance jointly support financial resilience. The literature indicates that resilience is not an isolated outcome but the product of complex interactions between organisational structures, supervisory expectations, cultural norms, technological capacity, and regulatory frameworks. These interactions form the foundation of integrated governance–compliance strategies that strengthen institutional durability against internal and external shocks.

Early research into governance and financial resilience emphasised the role of corporate governance structures in shaping organisational decision-making and risk-taking behaviour. Classical governance theory identifies the board of directors as the central mechanism for overseeing management actions, aligning managerial incentives with shareholder interests, and establishing organisational accountability [49]. Studies conducted prior to 2010 demonstrated that weak governance structures contributed to excessive leverage, flawed risk management practices, and strategic misjudgments within prominent financial institutions leading up to the global financial crisis [50], [51]. Poor board oversight, insufficient board expertise, and a lack of independent judgment were recurrent themes in post-crisis investigations, illustrating governance failures as a fundamental driver of systemic instability.

Scholars subsequently turned their attention to governance reforms aimed at improving resilience. Strengthening board independence, enhancing disclosure requirements, expanding risk committees, and clarifying oversight responsibilities became central prescriptions in the governance literature [52]. Board-level engagement in risk governance was recognised as particularly important in guiding risk appetite, strategic direction, and organisational culture. Governance models such as the “three lines of defence” framework formalised the separation of responsibilities between operational management, risk oversight functions, and internal audit [21], [53]. Research underscores that institutions adopting such structured governance arrangements exhibit clearer accountability, stronger monitoring systems, and improved risk identification capabilities—core components of financial resilience [54].

Parallel to governance studies, compliance research expanded rapidly during the post-crisis regulatory wave. Compliance is defined broadly as the organisational capacity to adhere to legal, regulatory, ethical, and internal policy requirements. Prior to 2019, compliance studies emphasised the growing complexity of financial regulations and the need for institutions to develop systematic compliance risk management frameworks [55], [56]. As regulatory expectations increased, financial institutions were required to demonstrate proactive compliance, continuous monitoring, and effective reporting mechanisms. Literature highlights the transformation of compliance from a reactive, administrative function to a strategic and risk-based discipline integral to organisational resilience [57], [58].

Integrated governance and compliance strategies emerged in response to recognition that governance structures alone could not prevent misconduct, risk mismanagement, or regulatory failures. Compliance provided operational mechanisms to enforce governance expectations, while governance frameworks provided institutional legitimacy and structural support for compliance functionality. Research shows that institutions with integrated governance compliance systems display enhanced responsiveness to regulatory change, reduced incidence of misconduct, and improved stakeholder confidence [59], [60]. These findings underscore the

interdependence between governance and compliance in supporting resilience [61].

Enterprise risk management (ERM) provides an additional lens through which scholars explored integration before 2019. ERM frameworks advocate a holistic approach to risk identification, assessment, mitigation, and monitoring across organisational silos [62], [63]. ERM literature emphasises that risk management effectiveness depends on governance structures that establish risk appetite, define oversight mechanisms, and ensure alignment between risk-taking and strategic objectives. Compliance serves to operationalise ERM by enforcing policies, monitoring risk exposures, and coordinating regulatory interactions. Studies indicate that organisations implementing ERM within strong governance and compliance systems demonstrate superior resilience due to enhanced coordination, improved information flow, and better anticipation of emerging risks [64], [65].

Technological advancements further influenced governance–compliance integration. Prior to 2019, financial institutions were undergoing digital transformation, adopting advanced information systems, data-driven decision tools, and automated compliance technologies. Research on regulatory technology (“RegTech”) highlighted the potential for automated monitoring, real-time regulatory reporting, and advanced analytics to strengthen both governance and compliance functionality [66], [67]. Digital tools improved the speed, accuracy, and consistency of compliance processes while providing governance bodies with enhanced visibility into organisational activities. However, literature also warns that technological complexity introduces new forms of operational risk, including cyber threats, system failures, and algorithmic vulnerabilities [68], [69]. Integrated governance–compliance strategies were therefore required to address risks introduced by digitalisation.

Cultural dimensions increasingly formed a central theme in the literature. Behavioural finance and organisational psychology studies found that governance effectiveness often hinges on organisational culture, encompassing norms, ethical values, communication patterns, and risk attitudes

[70]. High-profile misconduct cases revealed that institutions with formally strong governance structures could still experience catastrophic failures if risk culture was weak. Compliance mechanisms alone were insufficient when employees lacked ethical awareness, when whistleblowing mechanisms were ineffective, or when internal norms tolerated misconduct. As such, culture emerged as a critical mediating factor between formal governance structures and actual organisational behaviour. Scholars emphasised the importance of leadership tone at the top, ethical reinforcement, and open communication environments in supporting resilience [71].

The literature also explores the intersection between governance, compliance, and crisis management. Financial resilience requires institutions to not only prevent crises but also respond effectively when disruptions occur. Crisis management literature identifies governance structures as central determinants of institutional adaptability and decision-making speed during periods of turbulence [72]. Compliance plays a complementary role by ensuring that crisis responses adhere to legal requirements, regulatory guidelines, and ethical standards. Studies examining past financial crises show that institutions with integrated governance–compliance frameworks were better prepared for liquidity shocks, operational disruptions, cybersecurity breaches, and reputational damage [73], [74].

At the macro level, research on regulatory governance contextualises the role of oversight agencies in shaping institutional resilience. Prior to 2019, regulators in multiple jurisdictions introduced reforms emphasising risk-based supervision, enhanced corporate governance codes, and strengthened compliance requirements. Literature suggests that regulatory frameworks encouraging integrated governance practices contribute to improved stability and systemic resilience [75], [76]. Cross-border regulatory coordination, global standard-setting (e.g., Basel principles), and national governance codes all influenced institutional practices. However, scholars also highlight challenges such as regulatory fragmentation, inconsistent enforcement, and limited supervisory capacity, particularly in emerging

markets, which hinder integrated governance compliance implementation.

Insurance-sector literature demonstrates parallel developments. Governance failures in insurers, especially regarding underwriting discipline, reserving practices, and claims management, motivated the adoption of integrated governance and compliance frameworks. Studies show that insurers applying robust governance oversight and compliance monitoring demonstrate improved solvency resilience, reduced fraud risk, and enhanced policyholder trust [77], [78]. Regulatory frameworks such as Solvency II further reinforced governance responsibilities, requiring boards to take active roles in risk oversight, internal control evaluation, and compliance assurance.

Operational risk literature contributes additional perspective. Operational risk events ranging from system failures and fraud to process breakdowns and cyber-attacks represent major threats to financial resilience. Research highlights that strong governance structures support operational resilience by establishing clear accountability, robust internal control systems, and well-defined escalation protocols [79]. Compliance contributes by enforcing process standards, monitoring control effectiveness, and coordinating incident reporting. Integrated governance–compliance systems thereby reduce operational vulnerabilities by promoting discipline, transparency, and timely response to anomalies [80].

Corporate ethics and conduct research highlights that governance and compliance integration is essential for mitigating misconduct risk. Before 2019, numerous financial scandals involving market manipulation, money laundering, and consumer abuse underscored the limitations of formal compliance programs lacking genuine governance commitment [81], [82]. Literature reveals that compliance programs are only effective when supported by ethical leadership, strong governance oversight, and a culture that promotes responsible behaviour. Institutions with integrated governance–compliance structures exhibit stronger ethical climates and lower rates of rule violations [83].

Cross-disciplinary literature further explores the relationship between governance integration and long-term organisational performance. Studies find that resilient institutions tend to exhibit not only lower

vulnerability to shocks but also improved efficiency, innovation capability, and stakeholder confidence [84]. Integrated governance–compliance frameworks contribute to superior performance by reducing regulatory penalties, enhancing decision quality, and fostering risk-informed strategic planning. These findings support the broader argument that financial resilience is not only defensive but also strategically advantageous.

Despite significant advances, literature identifies unresolved challenges. Fragmented internal structures limit coordination between governance, risk management, compliance, and internal audit functions [85], [86]. Data-quality issues, especially in emerging markets, impede consistent compliance monitoring. Moreover, resource constraints hinder the adoption of advanced compliance systems, while cultural resistance undermines governance reforms. Scholars argue that resilience is threatened when governance reforms are implemented superficially, focusing on structural compliance rather than behavioural change [87], [88].

In conclusion, the literature demonstrates substantial advances in understanding how integrated governance and compliance strategies support financial resilience. These developments span structural governance reforms, risk-based compliance practices, ERM integration, technological innovation, cultural alignment, and regulatory evolution. Collectively, the research prior to 2019 provides a comprehensive foundation for analysing and improving institutional resilience across financial sectors. The next message

III. DISCUSSION

The literature reviewed demonstrates that financial resilience is inherently multidimensional, shaped by structural governance arrangements, regulatory expectations, institutional culture, and the sophistication of compliance mechanisms. Advances up to 2018 reveal a consistent pattern: governance and compliance cannot operate effectively in isolation. Instead, resilience emerges from the integration of strategic oversight, ethical leadership, risk-based compliance functions, and continuous monitoring systems. The discussion highlights how these elements mutually reinforce one another, forming an integrated

architecture capable of withstanding financial, operational, and regulatory shocks.

One prominent insight concerns the central role of board governance in shaping long-term resilience. Boards that demonstrate strong independence, expertise, and risk awareness create conditions under which compliance can function strategically rather than merely administratively. Studies prior to 2019 show that institutions with mature governance structures perform better across risk mitigation, crisis response, and regulatory adherence [89], [90]. This is because governance influences organisational priorities, allocates resources for compliance activities, and determines risk appetite. When governance is weak, compliance becomes fragmented, underfunded, and reactive. When governance is strong, compliance becomes embedded into strategic planning, operational decision-making, and performance management.

Compliance strategies also contribute significantly to resilience by translating governance expectations into operational practice. Compliance functions act as interpreters of regulatory obligations, designers of internal control policies, coordinators of reporting processes, and monitors of misconduct risk. As regulatory environments became more complex leading up to 2018, compliance functions evolved into analytical, risk-based units capable of anticipating supervisory expectations, identifying vulnerabilities, and coordinating corrective actions [91], [92]. These advances improved the speed and accuracy of institutional responses to regulatory changes, which is a critical feature of resilience.

A third theme concerns the role of organisational culture. Governance and compliance structures cannot achieve resilience without cultural alignment. Cultural research shows that unethical behaviour, weak communication norms, and tolerance for rule circumvention are major predictors of institutional fragility –. Integrated governance–compliance strategies promote cultural strength by reinforcing values such as transparency, accountability, and integrity. This alignment enhances employee willingness to follow procedures, report anomalies, and comply with risk controls. As financial institutions expanded digitisation and automation prior to 2019,

cultural alignment also helped mitigate behavioural risks associated with rapid technological change.

The rise of digital technologies introduced significant opportunities and risks. While automation, RegTech solutions, and data analytics improved monitoring and reporting efficiency [93], [94], they also increased exposure to cyber incidents, data breaches, and technology-driven operational failures. Integrated governance–compliance strategies address these challenges by embedding cybersecurity oversight within governance structures and incorporating technological controls into compliance mechanisms. Literature emphasises that technology-enabled compliance improves resilience only when supported by governance oversight and skilled personnel, otherwise it may create new vulnerabilities [95], [96].

Regulatory developments prior to 2019 also shaped advances in resilience. Strengthened regulatory oversight, risk-based supervision, and global governance codes expanded institutional responsibility for integrated governance and compliance. In many jurisdictions, regulators adopted principles-based approaches requiring institutions to demonstrate not only structural compliance but also effectiveness in practice [97]. Institutions with integrated frameworks benefited from improved regulatory relationships, lower compliance costs over time, and enhanced supervisory trust.

Insurance-sector insights parallel those in banking and capital markets. Governance and compliance integration improved reserving discipline, underwriting accuracy, claims management integrity, and policyholder protection [98], [99]. These enhancements strengthened solvency resilience, especially in regions where regulatory environments were uneven. Similarly, operational risk research underscores the value of aligned structures, highlighting that integrated frameworks reduce fraud, prevent system failures, and improve incident management [100], [101].

Taken together, the discussion demonstrates that financial resilience arises from a coherent system of governance–compliance integration. This integration enhances decision-making quality, strengthens risk oversight, supports regulatory adherence, and improves crisis response capabilities. However, the

literature also reveals persistent gaps: resource limitations, fragmented structures, insufficient data management, and cultural resistance. Addressing these gaps remains essential for the continued advancement of financial resilience strategies.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper examined advances in financial resilience through integrated governance and compliance strategies based on research published prior to 2019. The findings confirm that financial resilience is not solely the product of capital buffers or risk quantification methods, but rather the outcome of coordinated organisational structures, cultural alignment, and regulatory engagement. Governance provides institutional direction and oversight, while compliance ensures adherence to legal and ethical standards. When integrated effectively, these functions form a robust framework capable of identifying, mitigating, and responding to diverse risk exposures.

The literature consistently highlights that effective governance–compliance integration strengthens organisational accountability, reduces misconduct, improves internal control effectiveness, and enhances institutional adaptability. Resilient institutions exhibit clearer communication channels, more sophisticated monitoring mechanisms, and stronger alignment between strategic goals and operational practices. Moreover, technological advancements such as analytics-based monitoring and automated reporting have expanded the capacity of governance and compliance systems to detect anomalies and enforce standards.

Despite these advancements, challenges remain. Many institutions still struggle with siloed organisational structures, inconsistent compliance practices, limited governance expertise, and cultural barriers. Regulatory fragmentation and uneven supervisory capacity further complicate integration efforts, particularly in emerging markets. Addressing these challenges requires sustained investment in governance capacity, compliance technology, data governance, and cultural transformation.

Overall, advances prior to 2019 demonstrate that integrated governance and compliance strategies are

essential to building financial resilience in an era of increasing complexity and uncertainty. These findings offer valuable foundations for future research and practice, particularly as institutions continue to face evolving risks, regulatory changes, and technological disruptions. Strengthening governance–compliance integration remains a critical priority for achieving long-term resilience across financial sectors.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. H. Cheng and W. Xiong, “Financialization of commodity markets,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 6, pp. 419–441, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-110613-034432.
- [2] P. Bond, A. Edmans, and I. Goldstein, “The real effects of financial markets,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 4, pp. 339–360, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-110311-101826.
- [3] F. Caccioli, P. Barucca, and T. Kobayashi, “Network Models of Financial Systemic Risk: A Review,” *SSRN Electronic Journal*, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.2139/SSRN.3066722.
- [4] C. Hoffman and M. Mora Rodríguez, “Digitizing Financial Reports – Issues and Insights: A Viewpoint,” *The International Journal of Digital Accounting Research*, vol. 13, 2013, doi: 10.4192/1577-817/1577-8517-V13_3.
- [5] K. D. Gotzamani, P. Longinidis, and F. Vouzas, “The logistics services outsourcing dilemma: Quality management and financial performance perspectives,” *Supply Chain Management*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 438–453, 2010, doi: 10.1108/13598541011080428.
- [6] I. U. Chhapra, M. Kashif, R. Rehan, and A. Bai, “An Empirical Investigation of Investor’s Behavioral Biases on Financial Decision Making,” *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 99–109, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.18488/JOURNAL.1007/2018.7.3/1007.3.9 9.109.
- [7] H. Cheng, Y. C. Lu, and C. Sheu, “An ontology-based business intelligence application in a financial knowledge management system,” *Expert Syst Appl*, vol. 36, no. 2 PART 2, pp. 3614–3622, 2009, doi: 10.1016/J.ESWA.2008.02.047.
- [8] F. Kabuye, S. K. Nkundabanyanga, J. Opiso, and Z. Nakabuye, “Internal audit organisational status, competencies, activities and fraud management in the financial services sector,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 924–944, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.1108/MAJ-09-2016-1452.
- [9] J. A. De Souza *et al.*, “The development of a financial toxicity patient-reported outcome in cancer: The COST measure,” *Cancer*, vol. 120, no. 20, pp. 3245–3253, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.1002/CNCR.28814.
- [10] F. K. Kirogo, “Effect of Risk- Based Audit on Financial Performance: A Survey of Insurance Companies in Nakuru Town, Kenya,” *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 84–91, 2014, doi: 10.9790/487X-161038491.
- [11] B. Levitan *et al.*, “Assessing the Financial Value of Patient Engagement: A Quantitative Approach from CTTI’s Patient Groups and Clinical Trials Project,” *Ther Innov Regul Sci*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 220–229, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1177/2168479017716715.
- [12] S. V. Scott, J. Van Reenen, and M. Zachariadis, “The long-term effect of digital innovation on bank performance: An empirical study of SWIFT adoption in financial services,” *Res Policy*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 984–1004, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.1016/J.RESPOL.2017.03.010.
- [13] A. Edmans, “Blockholders and corporate governance,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 6, pp. 23–50, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-110613-034455.
- [14] W. R. Kerr and R. Nanda, “Financing Innovation,” *Annual Review of Financial*

- Economics*, vol. 7, pp. 445–462, Dec. 2015, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-111914-041825.
- [15] C. Frydman and D. Jenter, “CEO compensation,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 2, pp. 75–102, 2010, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-1209-133958.
- [16] J. R. Graham and M. T. Leary, “A review of empirical capital structure research and directions for the future,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 3, pp. 309–345, 2011, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-102710-144821.
- [17] D. Bisias, M. Flood, A. W. Lo, and S. Valavanis, “A survey of systemic risk analytics,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 4, pp. 255–296, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-110311-101754.
- [18] D. Gromb and D. Vayanos, “Limits of arbitrage,” *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 2, pp. 251–275, 2010, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-073009-104107.
- [19] I. B. A. O. GI Agbaje, “Empirical assessment of the role of geospatial technology in delivering governance and strengthening democracy in Nigeria,” *GeoJournal*, vol. 83, no. 4, pp. 743–756, 2018.
- [20] S. Rosenbaum, “Data governance and stewardship: Designing data stewardship entities and advancing data access,” *Health Serv Res*, vol. 45, no. 5 PART 2, pp. 1442–1455, Oct. 2010, doi: 10.1111/J.1475-6773.2010.01140.X.
- [21] N. Wilkinson and P. Coetzee, “Internal audit assurance or consulting services rendered on governance: How does one decide?,” *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 186–200, 2015, doi: 10.22495/JGR_V4_I1_C2_P3.
- [22] V. Khatri and C. V. Brown, “Designing data governance,” *Commun ACM*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 148–152, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1145/1629175.1629210.
- [23] K. M. Zuckweiler, K. M. Rosacker, and S. K. Hayes, “Business students’ perceptions of corporate governance best practices,” *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 361–376, Apr. 2016, doi: 10.1108/CG-08-2015-0117.
- [24] G. Gereffi, J. Humphrey, and T. Sturgeon, “The governance of global value chains,” *Rev Int Polit Econ*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 78–104, Feb. 2005, doi: 10.1080/09692290500049805.
- [25] O. Khongmalai, J. C. S. Tang, and S. Siengthai, “Empirical evidence of corporate governance in Thai state-owned enterprises,” *Corporate Governance*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 617–634, Oct. 2010, doi: 10.1108/14720701011085580.
- [26] S. Roohani, Y. Furusho, and M. Koizumi, “XBRL: Improving transparency and monitoring functions of corporate governance,” *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 355–369, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.1057/JDG.2009.17.
- [27] O. Khongmalai and A. Distanont, “Corporate governance model in Thai state-owned enterprises: structural equation modelling approach,” *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 613–628, 2017, doi: 10.1108/CG-01-2016-0021.
- [28] G. Sarens, M. J. Abdolmohammadi, and R. Lenz, “Factors associated with the internal audit function’s role in corporate governance,” *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 191–204, 2012, doi: 10.1108/09675421211254876.
- [29] M. El-Helaly, “Related-party transactions: a review of the regulation, governance and auditing literature,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 33, no. 8–9, pp. 779–806, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.1108/MAJ-07-2017-1602.

- [30] F. Huang, S. Blaschke, and H. Lucas, "Beyond pilotitis: Taking digital health interventions to the national level in China and Uganda," *Global Health*, vol. 13, no. 1, Jul. 2017, doi: 10.1186/S12992-017-0275-Z.
- [31] G. Bloom, E. Berdou, H. Standing, Z. Guo, and A. Labrique, "ICTs and the challenge of health system transition in low and middle-income countries," *Global Health*, vol. 13, no. 1, Aug. 2017, doi: 10.1186/S12992-017-0276-Y.
- [32] S. B. Syed *et al.*, "Developed-developing country partnerships: Benefits to developed countries?," *Global Health*, vol. 8, Jun. 2012, doi: 10.1186/1744-8603-8-17.
- [33] D. J. Teece, "Dynamic capabilities and the multinational enterprise," *Globalization: Strategies and Effects*, pp. 105–129, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-49502-5_5/TABLES/2.
- [34] B. J. Christensen and Carsten. Kowalczyk, "Globalization : strategies and effects," 2017.
- [35] M. Harris, E. Weisberger, D. Silver, and J. Macinko, "“They hear “Africa” and they think that there can’t be any good services’ - perceived context in cross-national learning: A qualitative study of the barriers to Reverse Innovation," *Global Health*, vol. 11, no. 1, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1186/S12992-015-0130-Z.
- [36] P. Dandonoli, "Open innovation as a new paradigm for global collaborations in health," *Global Health*, vol. 9, no. 1, Aug. 2013, doi: 10.1186/1744-8603-9-41.
- [37] C. Passaris, "The Business of Globalization and the Globalization of Business," *Journal of Comparative International Management*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 3–18, 2006, Accessed: Sep. 15, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/jcim9_1art01
- [38] B. J. Christensen and C. Kowalczyk, "Globalization: Strategies and effects," *Globalization: Strategies and Effects*, pp. 1–617, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-49502-5.
- [39] R. Narula and J. H. Dunning, "Industrial development, globalization and multinational enterprises: New realities for developing countries," *Oxford Development Studies*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 141–167, 2000, doi: 10.1080/713688313.
- [40] H. Karle, L. Christensen, D. Gordon, and J. Nystrup, "Neo-colonialism versus sound globalization policy in medical education," *Med Educ*, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 956–8, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03155.x.
- [41] R. Mumtaz and I. A. Jadoon, "Effect of explicit deposit insurance premium on the moral hazard of banks’ risk-taking: Around the globe," *International Journal of Financial Engineering*, vol. 05, no. 02, p. 1850012, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1142/S2424786318500123.
- [42] C.-H. Hui, C.-F. Lo, X.-F. Zheng, and T. Fong, "Probabilistic approach to measuring early-warning signals of systemic contagion risk," *International Journal of Financial Engineering*, vol. 05, no. 02, p. 1850010, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1142/S242478631850010X.
- [43] R. Sabherwal and I. Becerra-Fernandez, "Business intelligence: practices, technologies, and management," *Publisher: Wiley, Hoboken, NY, USA. ISBN-13*, p. 304, 2013.
- [44] Ana. Azevedo and M. Filipe. Santos, "Integration of data mining in business intelligence systems," p. 314, 2015.
- [45] S. Mishra, "Financial management and forecasting using business intelligence and big data analytic tools," <https://doi.org/10.1142/S2424786318500111>, vol. 05, no. 02, p. 1850011, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.1142/S2424786318500111.
- [46] G. Sarens, I. De Beelde, and P. Everaert, "Internal audit: A comfort provider to the audit committee," *British Accounting Review*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 90–106, Jun. 2009, doi: 10.1016/J.BAR.2009.02.002.
- [47] E. Burrell Nickell and R. W. Roberts, "Organizational legitimacy, conflict, and

- hypocrisy: An alternative view of the role of internal auditing,” *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 217–221, 2014, doi: 10.1016/J.CPA.2013.10.005.
- [48] G. J. Ockey and I. Choi, “Structural Equation Modeling Reporting Practices for Language Assessment,” *Lang Assess Q*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 305–319, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1080/15434303.2015.1050101.
- [49] R. Lenz and U. Hahn, “A synthesis of empirical internal audit effectiveness literature pointing to new research opportunities,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 5–33, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1108/MAJ-08-2014-1072.
- [50] G. Sarens and I. De Beelde, “Internal auditors’ perception about their role in risk management: A comparison between US and Belgian companies,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 63–80, 2006, doi: 10.1108/02686900610634766.
- [51] N. T. Sheehan, “A risk-based approach to strategy execution,” *Journal of Business Strategy*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 25–37, 2010, doi: 10.1108/02756661011076291.
- [52] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, J. Y. Lee, and N. P. Podsakoff, “Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 88, no. 5, pp. 879–903, 2003, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.
- [53] R. Lenz, G. Sarens, and F. Hoos, “Internal Audit Effectiveness: Multiple Case Study Research Involving Chief Audit Executives and Senior Management,” *EDPACS*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1080/07366981.2017.1278980.
- [54] M. Woods, “Linking risk management to strategic controls: A case study of Tesco plc,” *Int J Risk Assess Manag*, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 1074–1088, 2007, doi: 10.1504/IJRAM.2007.015295.
- [55] N. Kock, “Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach,” *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1–10, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.4018/IJEC.2015100101.
- [56] J. Goodwin, “A comparison of internal audit in the private and public sectors,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 640–650, Jun. 2004, doi: 10.1108/02686900410537766.
- [57] N. H. Z. Abidin, “Factors influencing the implementation of risk-based auditing,” *Asian Review of Accounting*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 361–375, 2017, doi: 10.1108/ARA-10-2016-0118.
- [58] A. Fernández-Laviada, “Internal audit function role in operational risk management,” *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 143–155, 2007, doi: 10.1108/13581980710744039.
- [59] J. Goodwin-Stewart and P. Kent, “The use of internal audit by Australian companies,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 81–101, 2006, doi: 10.1108/02686900610634775.
- [60] M. Allegrini and G. D’Onza, “Internal Auditing and Risk Assessment in Large Italian Companies: an Empirical Survey,” *International Journal of Auditing*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 191–208, Nov. 2003, doi: 10.1046/J.1099-1123.2003.00070.X.
- [61] M. Arena and G. Azzone, “Identifying Organizational Drivers of Internal Audit Effectiveness,” *International Journal of Auditing*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 43–60, Mar. 2009, doi: 10.1111/J.1099-1123.2008.00392.X.
- [62] A. A. M. Al-Twaijry, J. A. Brierley, and D. R. Gwilliam, “The development of internal audit in Saudi Arabia: An institutional theory perspective,” *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 507–531, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S1045-2354(02)00158-2.
- [63] J. Henseler, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, “A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation

- modeling,” *J Acad Mark Sci*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 115–135, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1007/S11747-014-0403-8.
- [64] P. Coetzee and D. Lubbe, “Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of risk-based internal audit engagements,” *International Journal of Auditing*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 115–125, 2014, doi: 10.1111/IJAU.12016.
- [65] J. Dawes, “Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5-point, 7-point and 10-point scales,” *International Journal of Market Research*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 61–77, 2008, doi: 10.1177/147078530805000106.
- [66] N. Castanheira, L. L. Rodrigues, and R. Craig, “Factors associated with the adoption of risk-based internal auditing,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 79–98, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1108/02686901011007315.
- [67] K. A. Endaya and M. M. Hanefah, “Internal auditor characteristics, internal audit effectiveness, and moderating effect of senior management,” *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 160–176, 2016, doi: 10.1108/JEAS-07-2015-0023.
- [68] L. de Zwaan, J. Stewart, and N. Subramaniam, “Internal audit involvement in enterprise risk management,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 586–604, Jul. 2011, doi: 10.1108/02686901111151323.
- [69] A. Alzeban and D. Gwilliam, “Factors affecting the internal audit effectiveness: A survey of the Saudi public sector,” *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 74–86, 2014, doi: 10.1016/J.INTACCAUDTAX.2014.06.001.
- [70] M. Abdullatif and S. Kawuq, “The role of internal auditing in risk management: evidence from banks in Jordan,” *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 30–50, 2015, doi: 10.1108/JEAS-08-2013-0025.
- [71] T. Franke and D. zu Knyphausen-Aufsess, “On dominant logic: review and synthesis,” *Journal of Business Economics*, vol. 84, no. 1, pp. 27–70, Jan. 2014, doi: 10.1007/S11573-013-0690-4.
- [72] A. C. T. Smith, F. Sutherland, and D. H. Gilbert, “Changing Forms of Organizing,” *Reinventing Innovation*, pp. 19–33, 2017, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-57213-0_2.
- [73] R. R. Sinkovics and A. S. Roath, “Cultivating learning and fostering flexibility in international distribution,” *der markt*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 3–12, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1007/S12642-011-0067-6.
- [74] B. B. Schlegelmilch and S. Ram, “The impact of organizational and environmental variables on strategic market orientation: An empirical investigation,” *Journal of Global Marketing*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 111–127, 2000, doi: 10.1300/J042V13N03_06.
- [75] F. Graetz, “Strategic change leadership,” *Management Decision*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 550–564, Oct. 2000, doi: 10.1108/00251740010378282.
- [76] A. C. T. Smith, F. Sutherland, and D. H. Gilbert, “The Innovation Imperative,” *Reinventing Innovation*, pp. 1–17, 2017, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-57213-0_1.
- [77] B. Boyce, “Emerging Technology and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act,” *J Acad Nutr Diet*, vol. 117, no. 4, pp. 517–518, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2016.05.013.
- [78] A. S. Moriya, W. B. Vogt, and M. Gaynor, “Hospital prices and market structure in the hospital and insurance industries,” *Health Econ Policy Law*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 459–479, Oct. 2010, doi: 10.1017/S1744133110000083.
- [79] L. Dafny, J. Gruber, and C. Ody, “More Insurers Lower Premiums: Evidence from Initial Pricing in the Health Insurance Marketplaces,” *Am J Health Econ*, vol. 1, no.

- 1, pp. 53–81, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1162/AJHE_A_00003
- [80] L. Dafny, J. Gruber, and C. Ody, “More insurers lower premiums: Evidence from initial pricing in the health insurance marketplaces,” *Am J Health Econ*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 53–81, 2015, doi: 10.1162/AJHE_A_00003.
- [81] L. Dafny, M. Duggan, and S. Ramanarayanan, “Paying a premium on your premium? Consolidation in the US health insurance industry,” *American Economic Review*, vol. 102, no. 2, pp. 1161–1185, 2012, doi: 10.1257/AER.102.2.1161.
- [82] S. F. Shih, C. Y. Lew-Ting, H. Y. Chang, and K. N. Kuo, “Insurance covered and non-covered complementary and alternative medicine utilisation among adults in Taiwan,” *Soc Sci Med*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 1183–1189, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2008.06.011.
- [83] H. Sohn, “Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Insurance Coverage: Dynamics of Gaining and Losing Coverage Over the Life-Course,” *Popul Res Policy Rev*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 181–201, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1007/S11113-016-9416-Y.
- [84] I. Heckmann, T. Comes, and S. Nickel, “A critical review on supply chain risk - Definition, measure and modeling,” *Omega (United Kingdom)*, vol. 52, pp. 119–132, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/J.OMEGA.2014.10.004.
- [85] B. J. . Christensen and Carsten. Kowalczyk, “Globalization : strategies and effects,” 2017.
- [86] D. J. Teece, “A dynamic capabilities-based entrepreneurial theory of the multinational enterprise,” *J Int Bus Stud*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 8–37, 2014, doi: 10.1057/JIBS.2013.54.
- [87] D. J. Teece, “Business models, business strategy and innovation,” *Long Range Plann*, vol. 43, no. 2–3, pp. 172–194, Apr. 2010, doi: 10.1016/J.LRP.2009.07.003.
- [88] I. Nonaka and R. Toyama, “Strategic management as distributed practical wisdom (phronesis),” *Industrial and Corporate Change*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 371–394, 2007, doi: 10.1093/ICC/DTM014.
- [89] M. Subramaniam and M. A. Youndt, “The influence of intellectual capital on the types of innovative capabilities,” *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 450–463, 2005, doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2005.17407911.
- [90] D. J. Teece, “Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance,” *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 28, no. 13, pp. 1319–1350, Dec. 2007, doi: 10.1002/SMJ.640.
- [91] B. J. Spencer, “International outsourcing and incomplete contracts,” *Canadian Journal of Economics*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1107–1135, Nov. 2005, doi: 10.1111/J.0008-4085.2005.00317.X.
- [92] C. N. Pitelis and D. J. Teece, “Cross-border market co-creation, dynamic capabilities and the entrepreneurial theory of the multinational enterprise,” *Industrial and Corporate Change*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 1247–1270, Jul. 2010, doi: 10.1093/ICC/DTQ030.
- [93] C. N. Pitelis, “Edith Penrose and the resource-based view of (international) business strategy,” *International Business Review*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 523–532, 2004, doi: 10.1016/J.IBUSREV.2004.04.002.
- [94] M. J. Melitz, “The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity,” *Econometrica*, vol. 71, no. 6, pp. 1695–1725, 2003, doi: 10.1111/1468-0262.00467.
- [95] G. M. Grossman and E. Helpman, “Managerial incentives and the international organization of production,” *J Int Econ*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 237–262, Jul. 2004, doi: 10.1016/S0022-1996(03)00072-2.

- [96] J. R. Larson, "Deep diversity and strong synergy: Modeling the impact of variability in members' problem-solving strategies on group problem-solving performance," *Small Group Res*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 413–436, Jun. 2007, doi: 10.1177/1046496407301972.
- [97] J. F. Hennart, "Down with MNE-centric theories! market entry and expansion as the bundling of MNE and local assets," *J Int Bus Stud*, vol. 40, no. 9, pp. 1432–1454, 2009, doi: 10.1057/JIBS.2009.42.
- [98] P. Ghemawat, "Semiglobalization and international business strategy," *J Int Bus Stud*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 138–152, 2003, doi: 10.1057/PALGRAVE.JIBS.8400013.
- [99] J. F. Hennart, "Transaction Cost Theory and International Business," *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 257–269, Sep. 2010, doi: 10.1016/J.JRETAIL.2010.07.009.
- [100] J. H. Dunning and S. M. Lundan, "The institutional origins of dynamic capabilities in multinational enterprises," *Industrial and Corporate Change*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 1225–1246, Jul. 2010, doi: 10.1093/ICC/DTQ029.
- [101] H. Chesbrough and R. S. Rosenbloom, "The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation: Evidence from Xerox Corporation's technology spin-off companies," *Industrial and Corporate Change*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 529–555, 2002, doi: 10.1093/ICC/11.3.529.