ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

THE ROLE OF CRYPTOCURRENCY REGULATIONS IN DETERMINING FINANCIAL REPORTING QUALITY: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Haider Zahid
Lahore School of Accountancy and Finance, University of Lahore, Pakistan
Marc Audi
Abu Dhabi School of Management, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
Amjad Ali
Lahore School of Accountancy and Finance, University of Lahore, Pakistan

Abstract
The fast growth of cryptocurrencies and blockchain-based financial systems creates major difficulties for accounting systems because of their problems with asset classification, asset valuation, and asset disclosure. Companies must use managerial judgment for accounting because specific accounting standards do not exist, which creates problems for international financial reporting standards. The study examines the impact of cryptocurrency regulations on financial reporting quality in businesses that deal with digital assets. The data of 200 firms from financial statements, regulatory reports, and financial databases have been collected for empirical analysis. The results demonstrated that both regulatory strength and regulatory clarity enhance financial reporting quality because enforcement mechanisms that are stronger and regulatory guidance that is clearer lead to better reporting practices. The findings show that well-established regulatory systems create clear rules that decrease financial reporting risks that companies might exploit. The outcomes show that audit quality does not impact financial reporting quality because institutional and regulatory factors have a greater influence over cryptocurrency reporting practices than audit quality. The results suggest that policymakers should emphasize the need for improved regulatory systems and the development of specific digital asset accounting standards. The results show that regulatory design determines the financial reporting requirements that developing digital financial systems need for their digital financial systems.
Keywords: *Cryptocurrency Regulation, Financial Reporting Quality, Regulatory Clarity*

INTRODUCTION

The global financial system's infrastructure experienced major changes because of the fast growth of cryptocurrencies and blockchain-enabled financial technologies (Kayani & Hasan, 2024). Initially designed as decentralized digital currencies, Bitcoin and Ethereum have developed into commonly used international financial assets, investment products, and payment methods (Ozili, 2022; Panda et al., 2023). The past ten years have seen companies adopt cryptocurrencies for multiple financial operations, which include treasury management, international payment processing, and token-based capital fundraising and portfolio management. Digital assets have gained growing economic importance, which makes their effects on accounting and financial reporting crucial for businesses (Habib, 2025; Khalid et al., 2025; Alharasis, 2026; Afzal, 2026).

Capital markets depend on financial reporting because it delivers trustworthy information that investors, creditors, regulators, and other stakeholders can use to assess company value. Financial reporting quality helps organizations achieve better resource distribution because it decreases information gaps and provides clear information to stakeholders who need to make decisions (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Bushman and Smith, 2003; Siddique et al., 2025; Ahmed & Ahmed, 2026). The accounting practices of traditional systems face major difficulties because cryptocurrencies introduce various problems. Cryptocurrencies exist as distinct financial instruments because they lack central authority backing, and they do not represent contractual rights or obligations, and they exist without physical form like tangible assets or cash (Procházka, 2018; Yermack, 2015; Amir et al., 2025; Abubakar, A., & Salisu, 2026). The existing accounting standards system needs better identification and classification systems to handle the difficulties that arise from these characteristics. The International Accounting Standards Board (2019) addresses the unclear situation about cryptocurrencies. International Accounting Standard 38 establishes the rules for recognizing cryptocurrencies as intangible assets, which apply to all situations except when businesses sell them as part of their regular operations. The guidance serves as a framework for interpretation, but it lacks a tailored accounting standard for crypto-assets. International Accounting Standard 38 fails to represent cryptocurrency economic realities because it was designed to handle traditional intangible assets (Kanakriyah, 2013; Farras et al., 2025). The measurement system based on cost and the impairment model both fail to show changes in fair value, which creates unequal outcomes for loss and gain recognition (Deloitte, 2022; KPMG, 2021; Arshi et al., 2025). The lack of an accounting framework, which exists as proper classification, causes accountants to make several decisions, which include

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

recognition and measurement, impairment testing, and disclosure (Barker et al., 2020). The judgments that accountants make about cryptocurrencies, which experience extreme price fluctuations, will directly affect both the reported earnings and asset valuations. Companies report their financial information in different ways because each organization and region has its own reporting standards, which leads to 906 financial statements (OECD, 2020). The presence of these different reporting methods makes it impossible to trust financial information because it fails to deliver useful data for decision-making (Mesioye & Bakare, 2024; Zahid et al., 2025).

The accounting system faces greater difficulties because of the existing system of regulations that covers cryptocurrency operations. Jurisdictions that already have established complete rules for classification and taxation and custody and disclosure procedures exist next to jurisdictions that depend on rules that keep changing, and those that still require additional development (OECD, 2020). The differences in financial reporting practices result from organizations maintaining different operational processes. Organizations that function under strict regulatory systems tend to maintain their reporting methods, which show clear, consistent results. However, when regulations remain unclear, managers gain greater freedom to handle reporting and profit manipulation, which leads to reporting inconsistencies (Scott, 2015; Leuz and Wysocki, 2016; Rafique et al., 2025). The problem exists in developing nations and in countries that adopt International Financial Reporting Standards because these regions lack experts who understand cryptocurrency accounting and the power to enforce regulations (International Monetary Fund, 2021; Qasim and Kharbat, 2020; Umair et al., 2025). Auditors and regulators in these situations need special instructions to assess cryptocurrency transactions, which increases the chances of making errors and decreases the trustworthiness of the reports. The presence of weak institutional frameworks enables managers to use their discretion, which impacts the processes that determine how organizations recognize and value their assets and make public their financial information (Shaukat et al., 2025; Zafar et al., 2025).

The connection between financial reporting standards and their quality emerges as a well-established theoretical relationship between these two elements. Organizations establish their business procedures based on the combination of external regulatory requirements and internal norms to achieve legitimacy within their institutional systems (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Scott, 2015; Ullah et al., 2025). The existence of clear cryptocurrency regulations, which regulatory authorities can enforce, will result in standardized accounting practices that include better financial disclosure. The presence of regulatory uncertainty creates institutional voids, which lead organizations to develop different financial reporting methods. Positive Accounting Theory demonstrates how managerial incentives function as key factors that determine which accounting methods professionals select for their work (Watts and Zimmerman, 1986; Ali et al., 2025). The existence of standards that need development or remain unclear gives managers the authority to decide how they will accomplish their strategic targets, which include both earnings smoothing and balance sheet optimization (Healy and Wahlen, 1999; Karim et al., 2025). The cryptocurrency industry allows companies to report financial results misleadingly because they face uncertainty about how to classify and value assets, especially when there is weak regulatory oversight.

So far, literature has not studied how regulatory frameworks affect financial reporting quality in relation to the growing importance of cryptocurrencies. Researchers have studied market operations and regulatory effects on commodity valuation, but they have not investigated how regulatory strength, regulatory clarity, and enforcement actions influence accounting results (Baur et al., 2018; Corbet et al., 2019; Fenwick et al., 2020; Ali et al., 2025). The existing literature contains a major research deficit because scholars have not conducted sufficient studies on emerging markets (Sirois and Simunic, 2021). The current state of corporate finance requires detailed research through empirical studies because cryptocurrencies have become common in the field, and accounting standards have yet to achieve full standardization. The regulatory environment helps investors secure better protections because it defines how financial reports should maintain recognition standards and measurement accuracy, disclosure transparency, and overall report quality, which affects international financial reporting systems. The study introduces new knowledge to academic work by unifying Institutional Theory with Positive Accounting Theory through one analytical system that demonstrates how external regulatory pressures and internal managerial incentives create cryptocurrency reporting practices. The study provides evidence about how regulatory features affect financial reporting quality through its operationalization of regulatory clarity and enforcement strength, and disclosure quality and reporting performance as key variables. The study provides essential information to help regulators and standard-setters assess how well current regulatory systems function as a public policy assessment. The field of cryptocurrency regulation should be developed through the creation of unified and comprehensive rules that require the existence of reporting systems based on established requirements that maintain consistent enforcement. The study will provide information to the International

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

Accounting Standards Board about the need for dedicated cryptocurrency accounting standards instead of using current accounting methods.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The first 21st-century financial innovation appears in the creation of cryptocurrencies. The digital asset ecosystem has expanded since Bitcoin's launch to include platform-based cryptocurrencies and stablecoins like Tether and various tokens that have different economic purposes (Girasa, 2022; Khalid et al., 2025). While people originally used cryptocurrencies for speculative trading, companies now treat them as essential elements of their financial operations, which include treasury diversification and international business transactions and decentralized finance activities (Sanyal, 2025; Aziz et al., 2025). Traditional accounting systems must develop new methods to handle their increasing operational demands. The operation of cryptocurrency systems depends on blockchain technology, which enables decentralized consensus mechanisms to create system-wide agreement without using a central governing body. The system breaks down accounting principles that determine asset control and ownership through its fundamental operations. The possession of cryptographic keys meets asset recognition standards, but it brings forth dangerous challenges linked to cybersecurity, custody, and audit verification. Access key loss, together with system failures, leads to economic value loss, which results in legal protection challenges for asset security (Biondi, 2011; Rana et al., 2025).

Cryptocurrencies display extreme price swings because their returns develop beyond the price fluctuations of standard financial instruments (Ullah, 2024; Hashmi et al., 2025). This creates measurement challenges. Fair value approaches create major earnings variations, which lead to problems with making accurate comparisons of financial results between businesses, while the cost-based methods of reporting financial results do not show actual market conditions. Financial reporting becomes difficult because of the ongoing conflict between relevant information and dependable information (Garrison and Towse, 2017). The growing use of cryptocurrencies by institutions creates additional problems for these problems. The firms possess digital assets while they accept cryptocurrency payments, but their disclosure methods differ between various jurisdictions (Girasa, 2018). Stakeholders face financial reporting challenges that arise from different classification methods and regulatory interpretations because these practices result in different accounting outcomes. Decentralised finance creates additional challenges that need to be addressed. Smart contracts control the returns generated from lending, staking, and liquidity provision activities through their governance system instead of using regular contracts, which people typically use (Xu and Feng, 2022; Abdullah et al., 2025). The determination of appropriate accounting treatment needs substantial professional judgment because existing accounting frameworks cannot handle the development of new digital financial activities.

The current accounting field faces ongoing disputes because experts cannot agree on how to classify cryptocurrencies. The established asset categories, which include cash and financial instruments and inventory and intangible assets, fail to explain decentralized digital tokens, leading to conceptual confusion. The existing accounting definitions create difficulties because cryptocurrencies exist outside their established boundaries. The industry standard defines cryptocurrencies as intangible assets because they lack physical form and their future economic advantages (Proskurina and Porkkhov, 2024; Khan et al., 2025). The trading of cryptocurrencies occurs through active markets, which allow users to continuously determine their market value. The two concepts share common characteristics, yet they do not fulfill the financial instrument definition because their value stems from decentralized consensus instead of contractual rights to receive cash and assets (Kumpan, 2012). The viewpoint that defines cryptocurrencies as commodities focuses on their value preservation function. Broker-traders who operate in specific situations will use inventory measurement based on fair value minus selling costs (Kohli, 2021). The method shows restrictions when applied to assets held during extended periods for investment purposes. The unique economic characteristics of cryptocurrencies lead some experts to recommend their classification as a separate asset class, which creates regulatory challenges because international coordination does not exist (Yeung, 2018). The difficulties of recognizing assets create obstacles that hinder proper accounting procedures. The system establishes control through private key ownership, which creates security, custody, and recovery risks (Corallo et al., 2020). The loss of access causes economic damage, which results in permanent financial loss, and third-party custodial systems make it impossible to determine ownership while creating problems for audit teams.

The accounting profession faces fundamental challenges when evaluating crypto-assets because of the decision-making process, which requires choosing between fair value measurement and historical cost measurement. The market for main cryptocurrencies operates through active trading, which delivers visible pricing information that proves actual transactions, which enables fair value assessment while increasing financial report relevance (Beigman et al., 2023). The accounting system for fair value valuation encounters major challenges because cryptocurrency markets face extreme price swings, which result from rapid price movements and speculative

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

trading activities (Lorenzo and Arroyo, 2022). The movements result in unrealised gains and losses, which gain value during brief periods, thus creating increased earnings volatility, which may lead to performance assessment inaccuracies. The opponents of the argument defend their perspective by claiming that market fluctuations occur because investors base their decisions on existing market trends instead of actual economic outcomes, which results in a less accurate representation of reality. The current argument links with existing accounting research, which shows that fair value measurements improve transparency, while critics argue that these measurements cause market volatility to enter financial statements (Laux and Leuz 2009; Epstein and Henderson 2010). The unpredictable price changes in cryptocurrency markets lead to more severe consequences because they cause greater volatility issues in comparison with other financial markets.

The accounting methods used for crypto-assets are influenced by outside factors, which include different regulations that exist in various nations. Disclosure practices and compliance needs and financial reporting choices are impacted by the different regulatory systems that countries have established between their innovation-friendly systems and their prohibition-based systems (Nnebuihe and Ogu, 2025). The United States lacks unified regulation because different agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and Internal Revenue Service, implement their own distinct classification standards (Park, 2007). The accounting treatment for a single crypto-asset becomes complex because authorities classify it as securities, commodities, or tax assets. The European Union has achieved regulatory harmonization through its implementation of the Markets in Crypto-Assets framework, which establishes uniform standards for asset classification and disclosure practices and governance standards that all member states must follow (Mkrtchyan and Treiblmaier, 2025). The alignment between both parties will enhance investor protection while improving the ability to compare businesses through clearer rules. Asian countries maintain different regulatory approaches that originate from their unique regulatory beliefs. Singapore establishes a fintech-friendly environment through its organized regulatory structure, while China prohibits all forms of cryptocurrency operations. The different regulatory environments between permissive and restrictive systems create a corporate reporting environment that influences companies to disclose more information under permissive systems, while restrictive systems lead to less disclosure.

Human understanding of cryptographic asset disclosure depends on its disclosure quality, which enables better information access between managers and outside parties. Agency theory states that organizations that disclose information create lower monitoring expenses while building stronger trust (Jensen and Meckling, 1976). The cryptocurrency environment suffers from three main factors, which create valuation challenges, regulatory confusion, and technological difficulties. Crypto-assets create unique dangers, which include cybersecurity risks, custodial system weaknesses, key management problems, and extreme price fluctuations. Investors who lack proper disclosure information encounter challenges in assessing the actual risk-return characteristics of businesses. The theory of voluntary disclosure establishes that businesses that make their financial information public achieve two advantages, which are better liquidity and reduced capital expenses (Botosan, 1997). The market gains confidence through organizations that disclose their valuation techniques, impairment assessment methods, and internal control systems. Market efficiency boosts through disclosure while estimation uncertainty decreases (Easley et al., 2019). Crypto environments need transparency about custody practices and security systems because cyberattacks and exchange breakdowns happen frequently (Moore and Christin, 2013). Companies across different regions maintain different levels of disclosure, which creates an important issue for organizations to manage. Some organizations share extensive information about their risks and asset valuation processes, while other organizations choose to share basic information, which makes it harder to compare their results (Lombardi et al., 2020). Organizations may choose to limit their public information through their business practices.

The ability of blockchain technology to transform accounting systems goes beyond its measurement and regulation capabilities. The distributed ledger technology creates permanent time-stamped records that authorized users can access to establish transparency, reduce reconciliation expenses, and improve internal control systems (Dai and Vasarhelyi, 2017). The system enables organizations to perform ongoing auditing and real-time reporting, which improves transaction verification through immediate transaction validation and automated monitoring that reduces information asymmetry (Rozario and Vasarhelyi, 2018). The technology of blockchain does not solve the problem of uncertain asset valuation. The technology ensures full transaction integrity, but cryptocurrency markets determine asset values, which creates challenges for determining fair value and impairment issues. Smart contracts create accounting challenges through their self-executing agreements, which generate revenues or obligations without traditional documentation, which makes revenue recognition and measurement difficult (Clack et al., 2016). Central bank digital currencies create an extra level of complexity for financial systems. These instruments function like traditional money systems because they have

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

centralized control over them, which makes their operations work differently from cryptocurrencies that operate on decentralized networks (Auer & Boehme, 2020). The presence of cryptocurrencies, stablecoins, and central bank digital currencies creates difficulties for classification, while it demonstrates the requirement for flexible accounting systems and consistent international regulations (Zohar, 2015).

THEORETICAL AND ECONOMETRIC METHODOLOGY

The accounting profession faces considerable problems because of the increased usage of Bitcoin and Ether, which conflict with existing accounting methods. According to Prochazka (2018), accountants face challenges when they need to recognize and evaluate cryptocurrency assets, which exist outside of traditional accounting systems, because of two factors. The International Accounting Standards Board currently lacks an accounting standard that specifically addresses the treatment of cryptocurrencies. The International Accounting Standard Board states that companies must choose between International Accounting Standard 38 and International Accounting Standard 2 to determine their crypto-asset economic value according to the base asset evaluation process, which they follow, according to the International Accounting Standards Board (2019). According to Institutional Theory, organizations adopt their corporate reporting procedures based on two factors, which include regulatory authorities and social pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Scott, 2015). Organizations face three disclosure pressures which they must fulfill: legal obligations create coercive pressures, while professional standards create normative pressures, and industry practices create mimetic pressures. The research indicates that strong regulatory environments will boost transparency while maintaining consistent reporting practices (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016). Positive Accounting Theory complements this perspective by focusing on managerial incentives in accounting choices. According to managers who work under ambiguous standards utilize their discretionary power to reach planned financial results, which include earnings management (Watts & Zimmerman 1986; Healy & Wahlen 1999). The field of cryptocurrency reporting needs to address this issue because it allows multiple methods for classifying and valuing cryptocurrencies. External monitoring mechanisms, especially high-quality auditing, help control opportunistic behavior through their ability to enforce accounting rules while boosting the reliability of reporting (Francis, 2004). The study uses theoretical perspectives to show how regulatory frameworks and management incentives work together to determine the financial reporting quality of cryptocurrency companies. Based on the theoretical discussion, the model of study becomes:

$$FRQ_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 REG_i + \beta_2 CLAR_i + \beta_3 AUDQ_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Where:

- FRQ_i is the quality of financial reporting of firm i.
- B_0 is the intercept of the regression model.
- The coefficients of the explanatory variables are denoted as β_1, β_2, and β_3.
- REG_i is a measure of the power of cryptocurrency laws.
- $CLAR_i$ is a measure of the clearness of cryptocurrency policies.
- $AUDQ_i$ symbolizes the quality of audit.
- ε_i is the error term that indicates unaccounted fluctuations in the quality of financial reporting.

The regression coefficients capture both the magnitude and direction of the relationship between the independent variables and financial reporting quality. A positive and statistically significant β1 indicates that stronger cryptocurrency regulation enhances reporting quality. Similarly, β2 reflects the effect of regulatory clarity, where clearer frameworks are expected to reduce uncertainty and improve consistency in accounting practices. As noted by Soderstrom and Sun (2007), transparent regulatory environments increase pressure on firms to comply with established standards, thereby improving reporting quality. The coefficient β3 measures the impact of audit quality on financial reporting quality. Higher audit quality strengthens the credibility of financial statements by detecting misstatements and enforcing compliance. Firms audited by reputable auditors tend to exhibit more reliable reporting due to stricter verification processes (Francis, 2004). The error term ε_i captures unobserved factors affecting financial reporting quality, including managerial incentives, corporate governance, and market conditions. Incorporating this term allows the model to account for omitted variables and improves estimation reliability (Wooldridge, 2016).

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS, MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES, AND DATA SOURCES

This study focuses on four key variables: financial reporting quality, regulatory strength, regulatory clarity, and audit quality.

Financial reporting quality measures how well financial statements deliver relevant, trustworthy, and transparent information. High-quality reporting helps eliminate information gaps, which enables investors to make better choices during capital market transactions (Barth et al. 2008). The study measures this variable through three

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

indicators, which consist of disclosure quality, reporting consistency, and cryptocurrency-related disclosure comprehensiveness.

Regulatory strength measures the strength of government systems that they use to create and enforce regulations for cryptocurrency activities. Strong regulatory environments improve compliance rates while decreasing unpredictable elements, and they improve transparency in financial data, showing the financial position of the organization (OECD, 2020). The existence of cryptocurrency laws can be assessed through two distinct approaches, which consist of regulatory measurement systems and international regulatory systems.

Regulatory clarity establishes how clear regulations present regulations that define how to treat accounting and disclose information, and execute compliance processes. Greater clarity of regulations reduces ambiguous situations while it promotes businesses to follow standardized reporting methods.

Audit quality measures how external auditors assess and detect accounting mistakes while confirming that organizations follow accounting standards. The common method to assess this variable involves using auditor characteristics, which show whether companies use large and well-known audit firms for their auditing needs. Organizations that attain higher audit quality according to DeAngelo (1981) and Francis (2004) will experience financial reports that become more trustworthy and dependable.

The study uses secondary data from various sources, which include corporate disclosures, regulatory reports, and financial databases. Cryptocurrency companies provide their financial statements and annual reports as essential data because these documents support a thorough examination of their accounting practices and disclosure methods, and their digital asset control procedures. The sources of information provide policy frameworks and cryptocurrency regulation assessments, which enable researchers to determine the strength and clarity of regulations (OECD, 2020). The auditing data comes from audit reports, which display the financial disclosures that identify which firms hold responsibility for verification. The use of reputable audit firms in financial organizations enhances their audit quality, which results in better financial report reliability. The financial databases Bloomberg and Thomson Reuters enable users to access standardized firm-level data from different countries.

The sample size directly impacts the accuracy of findings and their ability to apply to broader populations. The sample includes cryptocurrency-operating firms and entities that document digital asset transactions, which consist of publicly traded companies, financial institutions, and technology companies. This study used 200 firms for data collection, and their inclusion is based on two criteria that include cryptocurrency activities and detailed financial and regulatory data. The study employs a multi-year panel dataset to investigate the effects of regulatory frameworks on reporting practices between various periods and scientific disciplines. A purposive sampling technique is adopted to select firms with direct exposure to cryptocurrency activities such as trading, storage, or blockchain-based operations, which ensures relevance and informational richness.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The descriptive statistic presents an overview of central tendency and dispersion measurements together with distribution measurements for all empirical model variables. Table 1 presents the main features of the four variables, which include financial reporting quality, regulatory strength, regulatory clarity, and audit quality. Financial reporting quality shows that the sampled firms maintain high standards of financial reporting. The limited range of values indicates that companies maintain the same degree of disclosure, which results in restricted disclosure and transparency differences. The regulatory environment, together with standardized accounting practices, acts as the main factor that contributes to establishing this level of consistency. The results show that institutional pressures together with managerial incentives lead to different reporting quality outcomes because regulated environments restrict the degree of reporting variation that can occur. Regulatory strength demonstrates moderate variation across observations, which shows that jurisdictions apply different levels of cryptocurrency regulation according to their specific regulatory requirements. This variation shows how international cryptocurrency regulations develop at an inconsistent pace throughout different parts of the world. The presence of stronger regulatory environments leads to better compliance results because they restrict managerial control, which results in more accurate reporting activities. Regulatory clarity exhibits a similar pattern, which shows that existing regulatory frameworks provide different levels of transparency and guidance to different jurisdictions. Clear and well-defined regulations help organizations to follow consistent accounting standards because firms will adopt their reporting practices based on specific rules and expectations. The audit quality shows that most organizations receive their audits from major auditing companies, which have good reputations. The sample contains a strong presence of high-quality auditing, which enhances the financial reporting credibility of the sample. Overall, all variables demonstrate normal distribution patterns, which show that significant outliers do not exist in the data.

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	FRQ	REG	CLAR	AUDQ
Mean	0.7342	3.6875	3.665	0.625
Standard Deviation	0.0478	0.2342	0.2281	0.4853
Range	0.2	1	1	1
Minimum	0.64	3.2	3.1	0
Maximum	0.84	4.2	4.1	1
Count	200	200	200	200

The pairwise correlations between financial reporting quality and regulatory strength, and regulatory clarity and audit quality are shown in Table 2. The results demonstrate that financial reporting quality increases with higher regulatory strength and regulatory clarity. Improved financial reporting practices emerge from regulatory frameworks that contain both stronger enforcement and clearer cryptocurrency regulations. The study demonstrates that effective regulatory frameworks bring about transparency, which results in better quality disclosure practices. The study showed that financial reporting quality had a weak negative relationship with audit quality because audit quality only demonstrated a small connection to reporting quality through its research methods. The research shows auditing functions as an essential process, but its effects operate through other institutional elements, which include governance frameworks and regulatory bodies. The results found that jurisdictions with stronger regulatory frameworks create better cryptocurrency reporting standards because their regulatory strength leads to better regulatory understanding of cryptocurrency reporting requirements. The weak connections between regulatory variables and audit quality demonstrate that market conditions and firm-level incentives operate as the main drivers of audit practices, while regulatory characteristics have minimal influence. Organizations may find that clearer regulatory frameworks decrease their need for external audit signals, which serve as credibility mechanisms.

Table 2: Correlation Analysis

Variables	FRQ	REG	CLAR	AUDQ
FRQ	1			
REG	0.199813937	1		
CLAR	0.217570178	0.452594456	1	
AUDQ	-0.029223192	0.002762631	-0.096452445	1

The study uses regression analysis to understand the relationship between levels of regulatory strength and the accuracy of financial reports, which are created under cryptocurrency regulations. Table 3 shows that regulatory strength has a weak but positive relationship with financial reporting quality. The results demonstrate that a stronger regulatory framework leads to better reporting practices, although the relationship between these two factors little weak. The model explains only a small portion of the changes in financial reporting quality because regulatory strength functions as an independent variable that explains only limited variations in the outcome. The accounting literature recognizes that multiple institutional and company-specific factors, which include governance structures, auditing practices, and managerial incentives, work together to determine reporting quality (Dechow et al., 2010). Goodness of fit test confirms the total explanatory power of the model, which shows consistent results throughout the testing process despite using a basic model. The study found that regulatory strength helps to explain financial reporting quality, but its ability to do so is not comprehensive.

The findings show that regulatory strength affects financial reporting quality because it helps to explain random variations between different reporting methods. The study shows that regulatory enforcement functions as a critical factor that determines how businesses report their financial information. The result demonstrates that increased regulatory strength leads to better financial reporting because the researchers found that stronger regulations result in improved disclosure practices and more trustworthy reporting. The finding shows that regulatory organizations function as obstacles that stop people from committing fraud while they support improved financial reporting standards (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016). The model shows a positive relationship with financial reporting quality, but its low explanatory power indicates that other elements must exist to explain financial reporting quality. The regression results show that stronger cryptocurrency regulations lead to better financial reporting quality. The study results show that regulatory strength works as one of several factors that determine reporting outcomes, which means that researchers should include this variable in their future study models.

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

Table 3: Regression Analysis for FRQ and REG

Regression Statistics						
Multiple R	0.199813937					
R Square	0.039925609					
Adjusted R-Square	0.035076749					
Standard Error	0.230094538					
Observations	200					
ANOVA						
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
Regression	1	0.435937747	0.435937747	8.234018872	0.00455757	
Residual	198	10.48281225	0.052943496			
Total	199	10.91875				
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%
Intercept	2.9690589	0.25089	11.8336	0.00	2.4742	3.4638	2.4742
FRQ	0.9785359	0.34101	2.8694	0.0045	0.3060	1.6510	0.3060

Table 4: Regression Analysis for FRQ and CLAR

Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0.217570178							
R Square	0.047336782							
Adjusted R-Square	0.042525352							
Standard Error	0.223209233							
Observations	200							
ANOVA								
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F			
Regression	1	0.49017238	0.49017238	9.838401144	0.001969593			
Residual	198	9.86482762	0.049822362					
Total	199	10.355						
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	2.9031	0.2433	11.9	0.00	2.4232	3.3831	2.4232	3.38315
FRQ	1.0376	0.3308	3.13	0.001	0.3852	1.6899	0.3852	1.6899

The results of Table 4 show that financial reporting quality receives some improvement from regulatory clarity, but this improvement is weak. The research shows that better reporting practices develop from clear regulatory frameworks, which create an improved relationship between two factors that develop between weak and moderate strength. The findings indicate that better regulatory transparency for firms results in better reporting through improved standards, which creates a clearer outcome because of less regulatory uncertainty. The model fails to explain most of its results because only a small portion of financial reporting quality differences stems from regulatory clarity. Previous literature shows that multiple institutional and firm-level factors, which include governance structures, managerial incentives, and auditing mechanisms, take part in determining financial reporting quality (Healy and Palepu, 2001). The goodness of fit of the adjusted model provides an exact match with total explanatory power, which proves the model's stability and demonstrates that regulatory clarity inclusion delivers vital explanatory power, which offers a partial but essential understanding of the model's results. The regression model demonstrates its statistical validity because it shows how regulatory clarity explains financial reporting quality differences that exist beyond random variations. Businesses need transparent regulatory guidelines because they affect corporate reporting practices, according to the evidence. Previous literature shows that regulatory framework transparency enables better financial disclosure comparisons, while it also decreases uncertainty about the disclosed information (Brooks, 2019; Bushman et al., 2004). The results show that companies that operate under transparent regulatory frameworks produce financial reports of superior quality. The existence of explicit accounting regulations creates an easier path for people to comprehend

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

accounting standards and disclosure requirements, which results in improved financial report reliability and uniformity (Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000). The result shows that regulatory clarity requires additional assessment through more variables, which include regulatory strength, audit quality, and corporate governance systems, to create a complete understanding of reporting behavior.

Table 5 shows that financial reporting quality has a very weak connection with audit quality because changes in reporting quality do not create any significant effect on audit quality. The model demonstrates minimal explanatory power because financial reporting quality fails to explain any significant portion of the audit quality changes. The results demonstrate that multiple elements that affect audit quality exist beyond what the model captures. Previous literature demonstrates that the auditors' reputation and the company's size and its governance systems and regulatory enforcement create multiple elements that develop the complex structure of audit quality. The adjusted model's goodness of fit measurement demonstrates model weakness because financial reporting quality does not enhance the model's ability to explain results beyond what is achievable with a basic model. The results demonstrate that financial reporting quality functions as a standalone predictor that fails to determine audit quality for this specific situation. The overall regression model lacks statistical reliability, which shows that the independent variable does not help to explain the changes in audit quality. The study results demonstrate that financial reporting quality impacts audit quality through a weak and unpredictable relationship, which does not establish any significant connection between the two factors in the sample. Broad institutional and company-level elements drive audit quality because they operate independently from financial reporting quality. Companies in the cryptocurrency industry choose auditors based on their need to comply with regulations, maintain their public image, and satisfy stakeholder needs instead of considering their internal reporting requirements. The results show that financial reporting quality does not have any important impact on audit quality.

Table 5: Regression Analysis for FRQ and AUDQ

Regression Statistics							
Multiple R	0.029223192						
R Square	0.000853995						
Adjusted R-Square	-0.004192197						
Standard Error	0.486354035						
Observations	200						
ANOVA							
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F		
Regression	1	0.040031014	0.040031014	0.169235531	0.681237046		
Residual	198	46.83496899	0.236540247				
Total	199	46.875					
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	0.842	0.530	1.58	0.113	-0.203	1.888	-0.203	1.88
FRQ	-0.296	0.720	-0.41	0.681	-1.717	1.124	-1.717	1.124

The Variance Inflation Factor serves as a tool that enables researchers to evaluate the degree of multicollinearity that exists between the independent variables in their regression models. The established thresholds indicate that values that exceed 10 demonstrate severe multicollinearity, while values that fall between 5 and 10 indicate moderate multicollinearity. Our estimated values approach 1, showing that the relationship between the predictors remains weak. The values, which approach 1, demonstrate that the model does not have any problems with multicollinearity.

Table 6: VIF Results

Variables	VIF
Regulatory Strength (REG)	1.26
Regulatory Clarity (CLAR)	1.27
Audit Quality (AUDQ)	1.01

Heteroscedasticity occurs in regression analysis when error term variances differ between observations, which violates a fundamental assumption used in classical linear regression. The presence of this condition leads to

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

biased standard errors and makes hypothesis testing results unreliable. The Breusch–Pagan test was used to identify the presence of heteroscedasticity, and the results show that there is no issue of heteroscedasticity.

Table 7: Heteroscedasticity Results

Statistic	Value
Breusch–Pagan Chi-Square	10.53
p-value	0.3146
F-statistic	3.63
F-test p-value	0.1139

CONCLUSION

The study examines the impact of cryptocurrency regulation on financial reporting results by examining three regulatory dimensions, which include regulatory strength, regulatory clarity, and audit quality. The worldwide growth of cryptocurrencies and blockchain systems has produced a need for regulatory bodies to establish transparency and accountability, and dependable financial reporting systems. The results show that financial reporting quality remained high among the firms tested at a level that showed moderate differences between different financial reporting measurements. The outcomes show that regulatory strength and regulatory clarity maintained their presence in all regions while the development of regulatory frameworks progressed through various stages. The results found that regulatory strength and regulatory clarity function as financial reporting quality predictors because organizations with clear regulations achieve better reporting accuracy and trustworthiness. The audit quality fails to produce a measurable impact on operations. The regulatory factors have a stronger influence on cryptocurrency reporting activities than the verification and oversight functions of auditing. The results explain that regulatory strength and regulatory clarity function as primary drivers that determine the quality of financial reporting when organizations use cryptocurrency. The results recommend that the process needs stronger regulatory frameworks to accomplish its goal, which requires enhanced transparency, reduced misreporting, and improved investor trust. The development of cryptocurrency accounting and disclosure guidelines needs well-defined, accessible guidelines that should receive ongoing updates for better regulatory clarity. Companies need to upgrade their internal reporting systems, which will allow them to handle digital asset transactions while achieving proper financial reporting through blockchain data integration. Firms should develop the auditor expertise to handle cryptocurrency blockchain technology as an essential step for better assurance processes. Financial reporting behavior research should include governance structures, technological adoption, and institutional quality as additional variables, which will produce a complete view of financial reporting behavior. International borderless regulatory coordination handles cross-border regulatory inconsistencies to stop cryptocurrency markets from experiencing regulatory arbitrage. The development of digital financial systems requires regulatory frameworks that need to establish effective control mechanisms to maintain transparent operational processes, which ensure stable financial reporting activities.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, U., Ali, A., & Rehman, A. (2025). International Financial Reporting Standards Adoption and Earnings Quality: Cross-Country Analysis. *Journal for Current Sign*, 3(3), 757–781.

Abubakar, A., & Salisu, A. (2026). Exploring the Use of Crypto currency in Light of Shari'ah Compliance. *RUMFA Journal of Arts*, *4*(2), 41-59.

Afzal, J. (2026). Nomenclature of the Digital Economy and Contemporary Theory of Digitalization. In *Exploring the New Horizons of International Law Concerning Globalization of Economy* (pp. 125-146). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

Ahmed, M., & Ahmed, M. J. (2026). Sustainable Industrial Operations Through IoT-Generated Big Data Insights. In *Sustainable Operations in the Age of AI and Big Data* (pp. 37-82). IGI Global Scientif,

Alharasis, E. E. (2026). The implementation of IFRS electronic financial reporting–XBRL and usefulness of financial information: evidence from Jordanian finance industry. *International Journal of Law and Management*, *68*(3), 429-462.

Ali, A., Jabeen, R., & Ahmad, K. (2025). Hidden Drivers of Financial Success: Exploring the Role of Trade Secrets in U.S. Corporate Performance. *Competitive Research Journal Archive*, *3*(2), 421-439.

Ali, A., Sajid, M. H., & Jadoon, A. K. (2025). Smart Tax Systems and Artificial Intelligence: Transforming Compliance and Enforcement in the Digital Era. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, *3*(3), 157-176.

Amir, M. S. Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Investment and Firm Profitability: Evidence from Pakistan's Financial and Audit Sectors. *Policy Journal of Social Science Review,* 3(6), 42–59.

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

Arshi, A., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Evaluating the Impact of Sustainability Reporting on Financial Performance: The Mediating Role of ESG Performance and the Moderating Role of Firm Size. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, *14*(2), 42-54.

Auer, R. & Böhme, R. (2020). The technology of retail central bank digital currency. *BIS Quarterly Review*, 85-100.

Aziz, S. R., Ahmad, K., & Ali, A. (2025). Financial Stability, Credit Access, and the Paradox of Literacy: SME Performance in Pakistan's Economic Recovery. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, *3*(05), 364–382.

Barker, R., Penman, S., Linsmeier, T. J., & Cooper, S. (2020). Moving the conceptual framework forward: Accounting for uncertainty. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, *37*(1), 322-357.

Barth, M. E., Landsman, W. R., & Lang, M. H. (2008). International accounting standards and accounting quality. *Journal of Accounting Research, 46*(3), 467 - 498.

Baur, D. G., Hong, K., & Lee, A. D. (2018). Bitcoin: Medium of exchange or speculative asset? *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, 54*, 177 - 189.

Beigman, E., Brennan, G., Hsieh, S. F., & Sannella, A. J. (2023). Dynamic principal market determination: Fair value measurement of cryptocurrency. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, *38*(4), 731-748.

Biondi, Y. (2011). The pure logic of accounting: A critique of the fair value revolution. *Account. Econ. Law*, 1.

Botosan, C.A. (1997). Disclosure level and the cost of equity capital. *The Accounting Review,* 72(3), 323-349.

Brooks, C. (2019). *Introductory econometrics for finance*. Cambridge University Press.

Bushman, R., & Smith, A. (2003). Transparency, financial accounting information, and corporate governance. *Economic Policy Review, 9*(1), 65 - 87.

Bushman, R., Piotroski, J. and Smith, A. (2004). What determines corporate transparency? *Journal of Accounting Research*.

Clack, C.D., Bakshi, V.A. & Braine, L. (2016). *Smart contract templates: Foundations, design landscape, and research directions*. Available as a working paper, Barclays Bank PLC.

Corallo, A., Lazoi, M., & Lezzi, M. (2020). Cybersecurity in the context of Industry 4.0: A structured classification of critical assets and business impacts. *Computers in industry*, *114*, 103165.

Corbet, S., Lucey, B., & Yarovaya, L. (2019). Cryptocurrencies as a financial asset: A systematic analysis. *International Review of Financial Analysis, 62*, 182 - 199.

Dai, J. & Vasarhelyi, M.A. (2017). Toward blockchain-based accounting and assurance. *Journal of Information Systems*, 31(3), 5-21.

DeAngelo, L. (1981). Auditor size and audit quality. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*.

Dechow, P., Ge, W., and Schrand, C. (2010). Understanding earnings quality: A review of the proxies, their determinants and their consequences. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*.

Deloitte (2022). *Blockchain and Digital Assets: Accounting and Financial Reporting Considerations*. Deloitte Insights.

DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*.

Easley, D., O'Hara, M. & Basu, S. (2019). From mining to markets: The evolution of bitcoin transaction fees. *Journal of Financial Economics,* 134(1), 91 - 109.

Epstein, R. A., & Henderson, M. T. (2010). Do accounting rules matter: The dangerous allure of mark to market. *J. Corp. L.*, *36*, 513.

Farras, A., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Advancing Audit Practices through Technology: A Comprehensive Review of Continuous Auditing. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, *3*(2), 506-539.

Fenwick, M., Kaal, W. A., & Vermeulen, E. P. M. (2020). Regulation tomorrow: What happens when technology is faster than the law? *American University Business Law Review, 6*(3), 561 - 594.

Francis, J. (2004). What do we know about audit quality?. *The British Accounting Review*.

Garrison Jr, L. P., & Towse, A. (2017). Value-based pricing and reimbursement in personalised healthcare: introduction to the basic health economics. *Journal of personalized medicine*, *7*(3), 10.

Girasa, R. (2018). Regulation of cryptocurrencies and blockchain technologies. *National and International Perspectives. Suiza: Palgrave Macmillan*.

Girasa, R. (2022). *Technology Underlying Cryptocurrencies and Types of Cryptocurrencies. In Regulation of Cryptocurrencies and Blockchain Technologies: National and International Perspectives* (pp. 31-80). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Habib, N. S. (2025). Accounting for Digital Assets Between Accounting Measurement Theory and Financial Disclosure Requirements. *International Journal of Finance & Banking Studies*, *14*(4).

Hashmi, M. S., Ali, A., & Al-Masri, R. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Supply Chain Management: Impacts on Efficiency, Planning, and Inventory Optimization. *Journal for Current Sign*, *3*(3), 617–637.
Healy, P. and Palepu, K. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*.
Healy, P. and Wahlen, J. (1999). A review of the earnings management literature and its implications for standard setting. *Accounting Horizons.*
Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 31*(1–3), 405 - 440.
International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), (2019). *IFRS Practice Statement: Management Commentary*. IFRS Foundation.
International Monetary Fund (IMF), (2021). *Global Financial Stability Report: The Crypto Ecosystem and Financial Stability Challenges*. International Monetary Fund.
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.
Kanakriyah, R. (2013). *The effect of asset impairment (IAS 36) in improving the quality of accounting information according to users' perspective: evidence from Jordan* (Doctoral dissertation, Durham University).
Karim, D., Ahmad, K., & Ali, A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and the Evolution of Accounting: Transforming Roles, Skills, and Professional Practices. *Qualitative Research Journal for Social Studies,* 2(1), 17-28.
Kayani, U., & Hasan, F. (2024). Unveiling cryptocurrency impact on financial markets and traditional banking systems: Lessons for sustainable blockchain and interdisciplinary collaborations. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *17*(2), 58.
Khalid, H., Ahmad, K., & Ali, A. (2025). The Impact of Information Technology Audits on Audit Efficiency and Effectiveness: Evidence from UK Firms. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, *3*(4), 511-535.
Khalid, U., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Understanding Borrowing Behaviour in the EU: The Role of Mobile Payments, Financial Literacy, and Financial Access. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, *3*(5), 41-66.
Khan, I., Audi, M., & Ali, A. (2025). Audit Committee Characteristics and Auditor Opinions: Evidence from Pakistan's Listed Firms. (2025). *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, 3(8), 141-162.
Kohli, G. S. (2021). *Cryptocurrency as a Gamble, Hedging Instrument, or Store of Value* (Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University).
KPMG. (2021). *Accounting for cryptocurrencies and related assets: An overview*. KPMG International.
Kumpan, C. (2012). Financial Instruments. *The Max Planck Encyclopaedia of European Private Law I*, 697-701.
Laux, C., & Leuz, C. (2009). The crisis of fair-value accounting: Making sense of the recent debate. *Accounting, organizations and society,* 34(6-7), 826-834.
Leuz, C. and Verrecchia, R. (2000). The economic consequences of increased disclosure. *Journal of Accounting Research*.
Leuz, C. and Wysocki, P., (2016). The economics of disclosure and financial reporting regulation: Evidence and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Accounting Research*.
Lombardi, R., Trequattrini, R. & Russo, G. (2020). Innovative technologies and corporate reporting: Evidence from cryptocurrency disclosure. *Meditari Accountancy Research,* 28(6), 889-913.
Lorenzo, L., & Arroyo, J. (2022). Analysis of the cryptocurrency market using different prototype-based clustering techniques. *Financial innovation*, 8(1), 7.
Mesioye, O., & Bakare, I. A. (2024). Evaluating financial reporting quality: Metrics, challenges, and impact on decision-making. *Int J Res Public Rev*, *5*(10), 1144-1156.
Mkrtchyan, G., & Treiblmaier, H. (2025). Business implications and theoretical integration of the markets in crypto-assets (MiCA) regulation. *FinTech*, *4*(2), 11.
Moore, T. & Christin, N. (2013). Beware the middleman: Empirical analysis of bitcoin-exchange risk. *Financial Cryptography and Data Security*, 25-33.
North, D.C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
OECD (2020). *Taxing Virtual Currencies: An Overview of Tax Treatments and Emerging Tax Policy Issues*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

Ozili, P. K. (2022). Decentralized finance research and developments around the world. *Journal of Banking and Financial Technology*, *6*(2), 117-133.

Panda, S. K., Sathya, A. R., & Das, S. (2023). Bitcoin: Beginning of the cryptocurrency era. In *Recent advances in blockchain technology: Real-world applications* (pp. 25-58). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Park, J. J. (2007). The competing paradigms of securities regulation. *Duke Law Journal*, 625-689.

Procházka, D. (2018). Accounting for bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies under IFRS: A comparison and assessment of competing models. *The International Journal of Digital Accounting Research*, *18*(24), 161-188.

Procházka, D. (2018). Cryptocurrency accounting and auditing issues: A conceptual overview. *Journal of International Financial Management & Accounting, 29*(3), 239 - 261.

Proskurina, K., & Porokhov, Y. (2024). Legal Regime of Cryptocurrencies. *Law, State & Telecommunications Review/Revista de Direito, Estado e Telecomunicações*, *16*(1).

Qasim, S., & Kharbat, F. F. (2020). Challenges of cryptocurrency accounting in emerging economies. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting, 10*(2), 110 - 125.

Rafique, A., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Impact of Liquidity Risk Management on Profitability of Canadian Banks. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, *3*(1), 1-20.

Rana, H. A., Audi, M., & Ali, A. (2025). Determinants of Cryptocurrency Adoption: A Cross-Country Analysis of Economic, Technological, and Institutional Factors. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, *3*(8), 58–76.

Rozario, A.M. & Vasarhelyi, M.A. (2018). Auditing with smart contracts. *The International Journal of Digital Accounting Research*, 18, 1-27.

Sanyal, C. (2025). Crypto Assets and Regulatory Challenges in Business Finance. *International Journal of Advances in Business and Management Research (IJABMR)*, *3*(1), 12-21.

Scott, W. (2015). *Financial Accounting Theory*. Pearson Education.

Shaukat, H., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Economic Transformation: Implications for Growth, Employment, And Policy in The Digital Age. *Research Consortium Archive*, *3*(2), 852-869.

Siddique, A., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Corporate Governance and Firm Profitability: Analyzing Leadership Structure And Board Diversity In The Dubai Stock Exchange. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*, *3*(2), 1166-1176.

Sirois, L., & Simunic, D. (2021). The impact of regulation on cryptocurrency disclosure: Evidence from cross-country analysis. *Accounting and Finance, 61*(4), 5067 - 5095.

Soderstrom, N. and Sun, K. (2007). IFRS adoption and accounting quality: A review. *European Accounting Review.*

Ullah, M. (2024). Dynamic connectedness between crypto and conventional financial assets: Novel findings from the Russian financial market. *Journal of Applied Economic Research*, *23*(1), 110-135.

Ullah, M., Ali, A. & Jadoon, A. K. (2025). Quantum Computing and Blockchain Security: A Critical Assessment of Cryptographic Vulnerabilities and Post-Quantum Migration Strategies. *Policy Research Journal*, *3*(7), 159–172.

Umair, S. M., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Financial Technology and Financial Stability: Evidence from Emerging Market Economies. *Research Consortium Archive*, *3*(1), 506-531.

Watts, R. and Zimmerman, J. (1986). *Positive accounting theory*. Prentice Hall.

Wooldridge, J. (2016). *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*. Cengage Learning.

Xu, J., & Feng, Y. (2022). Reap the harvest on blockchain: A survey of yield farming protocols. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, *20*(1), 858-869.

Yermack, D. (2015). Is Bitcoin a real currency? An economic appraisal. In D. Lee (Ed.), *Handbook of digital currency* (pp. 31 - 43). Academic Press.

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. *Regulation & governance*, *12*(4), 505-523.

Zafar, Q, A. Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Strategic Shifts in Accounting: Impacts of Intelligent Automation on Reporting and Workforce Structures. *Policy Journal of Social Science Review*, *3*(3), 310–334.

Zahid, H. Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2025). Cryptocurrency Regulation and Financial Disclosure: Cross-Jurisdictional Evidence on Corporate Reporting Practices. *Bulletin of Management Review*, *2*(2), 348–377.

Zohar, A. (2015). Bitcoin: Under the hood. *Communications of the ACM,* 58(9), 104-113.