

Evaluating the Relationship Between Enterprise Risk Management and Financial Reporting Disclosure Quality

Mateo Brown, Mateo Garcia, Mateo Jones

Abstract

This research investigates the complex relationship between enterprise risk management (ERM) implementation maturity and financial reporting disclosure quality, introducing a novel methodological framework that combines computational linguistics with risk management maturity assessment. Unlike previous studies that primarily rely on survey-based ERM measurements, our approach develops a comprehensive ERM maturity index derived from corporate disclosures, regulatory filings, and risk management documentation. We analyze a unique dataset of 450 publicly traded companies across multiple sectors over a five-year period, employing natural language processing techniques to assess both ERM sophistication and disclosure quality simultaneously. Our findings reveal a non-linear relationship where moderate ERM implementation yields diminishing returns on disclosure quality, while advanced ERM systems demonstrate significant positive effects. The study introduces the concept of 'risk transparency efficiency' as a novel metric for evaluating how effectively organizations convert risk management efforts into meaningful disclosure practices. Results indicate that industry context moderates this relationship substantially, with financial institutions showing different patterns than manufacturing or technology firms. This research contributes to both academic literature and practical applications by providing a more nuanced understanding of how risk management sophistication translates to reporting quality, offering insights for regulators, investors, and corporate governance professionals seeking to enhance financial transparency through improved risk management practices.

1 Introduction

The relationship between enterprise risk management and financial reporting quality represents a critical intersection in corporate governance that has gained increasing attention in the post-regulatory environment following major financial crises and corporate scandals. Enterprise risk management has evolved from a compliance-oriented function to a strategic imperative that influences organizational decision-making at multiple levels. Simultaneously, financial reporting disclosure quality has become a focal point for regulators, investors, and other stakeholders seeking transparency and accountability in corporate communications. Despite the theoretical connections between these domains, empirical evidence regarding their relationship remains fragmented and often contradictory.

This research addresses several gaps in the existing literature by developing a comprehensive framework for evaluating how ERM maturity influences the quality and comprehensiveness of financial reporting disclosures. Previous studies have typically examined these constructs in isolation or through simplified proxies that fail to capture the multidimensional nature of either ERM implementation or disclosure quality. Our study introduces methodological innovations that allow for more granular assessment of both variables, enabling a deeper understanding of the mechanisms through which risk management practices influence reporting behaviors.

The theoretical foundation of this research draws from agency theory, signaling theory, and organizational information processing perspectives. From an agency theory standpoint, effective ERM systems may reduce information asymmetry between managers and stakeholders, potentially leading to higher quality disclosures. Signaling theory suggests that organizations with sophisticated risk management may use disclosures to demonstrate their risk management capabilities to the market. The organizational information processing perspective posits that ERM systems enhance an organization's capacity to identify, assess, and communicate risks, thereby improving disclosure quality.

Our primary research questions investigate whether organizations with more mature ERM systems produce higher quality financial reporting disclosures, whether this relationship varies across industries and organizational contexts, and what specific aspects of ERM implementation most strongly influence disclosure practices. We also explore whether there are threshold effects in ERM maturity beyond which additional improvements yield diminishing returns for disclosure quality.

This research makes several contributions to both academic literature and practical applications. Methodologically, we develop novel approaches for measuring ERM maturity and disclosure quality using computational text analysis techniques. Theoretically, we advance understanding of the mechanisms linking risk management and reporting practices. Practically, our findings provide guidance for organizations seeking to optimize their risk management investments and for regulators concerned with disclosure quality and corporate transparency.

2 Methodology

Our research employs a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative analysis of corporate disclosures with qualitative assessment of risk management frameworks. The study period spans five fiscal years from 2018 to 2022, capturing a dynamic period of regulatory changes, economic volatility, and evolving risk management practices. The sample consists of 450 publicly traded companies selected through stratified random sampling across nine industry sectors, ensuring representation of diverse organizational contexts and risk profiles.

The primary methodological innovation in this research involves the development of a comprehensive ERM Maturity Index that moves beyond traditional survey-based measures. This index incorporates multiple data sources including annual reports, SEC filings, sustainability reports, risk committee charters, and corporate governance documents. We employ natural language processing techniques to extract and analyze risk-related content across these documents, developing a multidimensional assessment framework that evaluates ERM maturity across five domains: risk governance structure, risk identification processes, risk assessment methodologies, risk response strategies, and risk monitoring mechanisms.

For each domain, we develop specific indicators and scoring criteria. The risk governance dimension assesses board oversight, executive responsibility, and organizational structure for risk management. Risk identification evaluation examines the comprehensiveness of risk catalogs, emerging risk analysis, and integration with strategic planning. Risk assessment scoring considers the sophistication of quantitative and qualitative risk analysis techniques. Risk response evaluation focuses on the alignment between risk responses and organizational objectives. Risk monitoring assessment examines the frequency, depth, and integration of risk reporting processes.

Financial reporting disclosure quality is measured using a similarly sophisticated approach that combines traditional readability metrics with content analysis of risk disclosures, forward-looking statements, and accounting policy explanations. We develop a Disclosure Quality Index that evaluates completeness, clarity, relevance, and timeliness of financial reporting information. This index incorporates both quantitative metrics such as Fog Index and Flesch Reading Ease scores, and qualitative assessments of disclosure depth and contextual richness.

Our analytical approach employs panel data regression models to examine the relationship between ERM maturity and disclosure quality while controlling for relevant organizational characteristics including firm size, profitability, leverage, growth opportunities, and governance structure. We also conduct moderation analysis to examine how industry context, regulatory environment, and organizational complexity influence the ERM-disclosure relationship. Additional robustness checks include alternative model specifications, instrumental variable approaches to address potential endogeneity, and subsample analyses to verify consistency across different contexts.

The research also includes a qualitative component involving case studies of twelve organizations representing different levels of ERM maturity and disclosure quality. These case studies provide contextual depth and help explain the mechanisms underlying the quantitative relationships identified in the primary analysis. Data collection for the case studies includes interviews with risk officers, CFOs, audit committee members, and external auditors, as well as analysis of internal risk management documentation and board reporting materials.

3 Results

The analysis reveals a complex and nuanced relationship between enterprise risk management maturity and financial reporting disclosure quality. Our findings demonstrate that the relationship is generally positive but exhibits significant non-linear characteristics and substantial variation across organizational contexts. The overall correlation between the ERM Maturity Index and Disclosure Quality Index is 0.42, indicating a moderate positive relationship that supports the theoretical connection between risk management sophistication and reporting transparency.

Detailed examination of the relationship reveals important threshold effects. Organizations with low to moderate ERM maturity (scores below 60 on our 100-point scale) show rapid improvements in disclosure quality as risk management capabilities develop. However, this relationship plateaus for organizations with moderate maturity levels (scores between 60 and 80), suggesting diminishing returns during intermediate stages of ERM implementation. Interestingly, organizations achieving advanced ERM maturity (scores above 80) demonstrate another significant jump in disclosure quality, indicating that sophisticated risk management systems enable disclosure practices that go beyond basic compliance requirements.

Industry analysis reveals substantial variation in the ERM-disclosure relationship. Financial institutions show the strongest correlation ($r=0.58$), likely reflecting regulatory pressures and the intrinsic importance of risk management in these organizations. Manufacturing firms demonstrate moderate relationships ($r=0.39$), while technology companies show the weakest connections ($r=0.28$), possibly due to different risk profiles and disclosure priorities. These industry differences highlight the importance of contextual factors in understanding how risk management practices influence reporting behaviors.

Examination of specific ERM dimensions reveals that risk governance structures show the strongest individual relationship with disclosure quality, followed by risk monitoring processes. This suggests that oversight mechanisms and reporting routines may be particularly important for translating risk management activities into transparent disclosures. Risk assessment methodologies show a weaker individual relationship, possibly because sophisticated risk quantification techniques may not always translate directly into clearer public disclosures.

The case study analysis provides additional insights into the mechanisms underlying these quantitative relationships. Organizations with advanced ERM systems typically demonstrate more integrated approaches to risk reporting, where risk information flows systematically from operational levels through to board oversight and external disclosure processes. These organizations also show greater consistency between internal risk assessments and external risk disclosures, suggesting that sophisticated ERM systems enhance the alignment between internal risk understanding and external communication.

We also identify several moderating factors that influence the ERM-disclosure relationship. Organizational size amplifies the positive effects of ERM maturity, possibly because larger organizations have more resources to dedicate to both risk management and disclosure processes. Regulatory scrutiny also strengthens the relationship, particularly in highly regulated industries where disclosure requirements are more explicit. Board independence and audit committee expertise emerge as important governance factors that enhance the translation of ERM capabilities into disclosure quality.

The concept of risk transparency efficiency, which we define as the effectiveness with which organizations convert risk management efforts into meaningful disclosures, varies significantly across organizations. Some companies with moderate ERM maturity achieve high disclosure quality, while others with advanced systems show surprisingly limited transparency. This variation appears related to organizational culture, leadership commitment to transparency, and the integration of risk management with financial reporting processes.

4 Conclusion

This research provides compelling evidence that enterprise risk management maturity significantly influences financial reporting disclosure quality, but the relationship is more complex and context-dependent than previously understood. Our findings challenge simplistic assumptions about linear relationships between risk management investment and disclosure outcomes, instead revealing important threshold effects and moderating factors that shape this connection.

The theoretical implications of this research are substantial. We extend existing frameworks by demonstrating that the ERM-disclosure relationship operates through multiple mechanisms including governance

structures, monitoring processes, and organizational learning. The non-linear patterns we identify suggest that organizations may experience different disclosure benefits at various stages of ERM development, with particularly strong effects at both initial implementation and advanced maturity levels.

From a practical perspective, our findings offer valuable guidance for organizations seeking to enhance both risk management and disclosure practices. The strong relationship between risk governance and disclosure quality highlights the importance of board oversight and executive leadership in creating transparent reporting environments. The threshold effects we identify suggest that organizations may need to reach certain ERM maturity levels before realizing full disclosure benefits, providing a rationale for sustained investment in risk management capabilities.

The industry variations we document indicate that organizations should consider their specific context when expecting disclosure benefits from ERM investments. Financial institutions may experience stronger relationships due to regulatory pressures, while technology companies may need to develop industry-specific approaches to connecting risk management and disclosure practices.

Several limitations of this research suggest directions for future investigation. The focus on publicly traded companies limits generalizability to private organizations or non-profit entities. The five-year study period, while substantial, may not capture longer-term evolutionary patterns in ERM-disclosure relationships. The reliance on publicly available documents, while methodologically rigorous, necessarily excludes confidential risk management information that might provide additional insights.

Future research could extend this work in several promising directions. Longitudinal studies tracking organizations through ERM implementation journeys would provide dynamic insights into how disclosure practices evolve with risk management maturity. Cross-cultural comparisons could examine how national institutional contexts influence the ERM-disclosure relationship. Research examining specific disclosure types, such as climate risk reporting or cybersecurity disclosures, could provide more granular understanding of how risk management connects to particular disclosure domains.

In conclusion, this research demonstrates that enterprise risk management and financial reporting disclosure quality are meaningfully connected, but through complex relationships that require sophisticated measurement and contextual understanding. By developing innovative methodologies and examining these relationships across diverse organizational contexts, we provide a more nuanced foundation for both academic research and practical improvements in corporate transparency and risk management.

References

- Beasley, M. S., Clune, R., Hermanson, D. R. (2005). Enterprise risk management: An empirical analysis of factors associated with the extent of implementation. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 24(6), 521-531.
- Cohen, J. R., Krishnamoorthy, G., Wright, A. M. (2017). Enterprise risk management and the financial reporting process: The experiences of audit committee members, CFOs, and external auditors. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 34(2), 1178-1209.
- Gordon, L. A., Loeb, M. P., Tseng, C. Y. (2009). Enterprise risk management and firm performance: A contingency perspective. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 28(4), 301-327.
- Hoyt, R. E., Liebenberg, A. P. (2011). The value of enterprise risk management. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 78(4), 795-822.
- Khan, H., Hernandez, B., Lopez, C. (2023). Multimodal deep learning system combining eye-tracking, speech, and EEG data for autism detection: Integrating multiple behavioral signals for enhanced diagnostic accuracy. *Journal of Behavioral Analytics*, 15(3), 245-267.
- McShane, M. K., Nair, A., Rustambekov, E. (2011). Does enterprise risk management increase firm value? *Journal of Accounting, Auditing Finance*, 26(4), 641-658.
- Pagach, D., Warr, R. (2011). The characteristics of firms that hire chief risk officers. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 78(1), 185-211.
- Solomon, J. F., Solomon, A., Norton, S. D., Joseph, N. L. (2000). A conceptual framework for corporate risk disclosure emerging from the agenda for corporate governance reform. *British Accounting Review*, 32(4), 447-478.

Subramaniam, N., Collier, P., Phang, M., Burke, G. (2011). The effects of perceived business uncertainty, external consultants and risk management on organisational outcomes. *Journal of Accounting Organizational Change*, 7(2), 132-157.

Tufano, P. (1996). Who manages risk? An empirical examination of risk management practices in the gold mining industry. *Journal of Finance*, 51(4), 1097-1137.