Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

A REGULATORY VIEW OF FINANCIAL STABILITY: THE ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING EFFECT

[1]Dr. Farah Nasreen, [2]Dr. Ahsan Mukhtar, [3]Eman Zahra, [4]Muhammad Talha

[1]Department of Commerce, University of Gujrat.
[2]Department of Commerce, University of Gujrat.
[3]Scholar , Department of Commerce, University of Gujrat.
[4]Scholar , Department of Architecture, University of Gujrat.
[1]Farah.nasreen@uog.edu.pk, [2]Ahsan.Mukhtar@uog.edu.pk
[4]muhammad.talha@uog.edu.pk

Abstract

Regulatory bodies are the first line of defence against systemic risk in a financial world that is connected to the rest of the world. This study looks at how the enforcement of anti-money laundering rules, backed by the quality of institutions, affects credit risk in developed countries. Anti-money laundering standards are meant to stop illegal money from flowing, but little is known about how they affect the performance of the financial system in the real world. The fixed and random effects regression models were used on panel data from 37 developed countries from 2014 to 2023 to look into the link between the quality of regulation, the control of corruption, the adequacy of capital, and the risk in the banking sector, which were measured by non-performing loans. The governance indicators were taken from the World Bank's Indicators database and used important macroeconomic factors as controls. The results show that regulatory quality has a statistically significant and consistent negative relationship with non-performing loans. This means that stronger institutional frameworks encourage safer lending practices. However, controlling corruption and having enough cash does not seem to have much of an effect on credit risk. These results go against what people usually think and show how complicated governance is in advanced financial systems. The study shows that policymakers need to do more than just formally establish policies; they also need to invest in building up the institutions that will make sure they are followed.

Keywords: Anti-Money Laundering, Financial System Stability, Regulatory Quality, Bank Non-performing Loans, Econometric Analysis, Panel Data Analysis

Article Details:

Received on 18 May 2025
Accepted on 08 June 2025
Published on 11 June 2025

Corresponding Authors*:

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

INTRODUCTION

As global finance changes and connects more, national financial systems become more vulnerable, especially to illegal operations like money laundering. These illegal actions not only hurt the reputation of banks and other financial organizations and change the flow of money, but they also make people less trusting of the financial system as a whole. Governments all across the world have put in place tighter anti-money laundering (AML) procedures to make sure that financial operations are honest, accountable, and safe *(International Monetary Fund, 2023)*. There is much agreement that money laundering is a systemic concern, especially because it hides illegal profits and encourages irresponsible lending. However, researchers are still looking into how it affects financial indicators.

Non-performing loans (NPLs) are a key sign of the health of the banking sector. They show loans that are unlikely to be paid back. High non-performing loan rates are generally a sign of problems with risk assessment, regulatory enforcement, or vulnerabilities in the institution as a whole. It is hoped that properly enforcing anti-money laundering rules will lead to better credit procedures, which will minimize the number of non-performing loans and provide clear proof of better risk management *(Durguti et al., 2025)*. It is well known that there is a theoretical link between the quality of institutions and the stability of the economy. Acknowledged, but how this link works under anti-money laundering regimes is still not well understood and Looked into. People often say that things like the quality of regulations, the fight against corruption, and the amount of money available are important for financial resilience. However, based on real data, there is not much study that looks at these factors in the context of enforcing anti-money laundering.

Recent research shows that just having anti-money laundering laws on paper is not enough; they need to have a genuine effect. Requires operational capabilities to enforce them through strong compliance systems, competent staff, and working along with other agencies *(Basel Institute on Governance, 2024)*. In addition, it has been shown that some countries adopt anti-money laundering policies more to fit in with global expectations than to make real improvements in domestic risk control aspirations than to make real progress in controlling domestic risks *(Clifford Chance, 2024)*.

This study fills in these important gaps by looking at how the quality of institutions that support anti-money laundering enforcement affects credit risk in banks. The study looks at panel data from 37 developed countries spanning over the course of 10 years, using panel regression to see how these institutional characteristics are related to non-performing loan results. The idea is that countries with better and more strictly enforced anti-money laundering Governance systems are more likely to keep credit risk low *(Nugrohowati & Shidiqie, 2025)*. This study connects institutional governance with financial performance, which is useful right now. Insights for people who make decisions who want to improve the banking sector and make anti-money laundering systems stronger, being able to bounce back from global financial risks.

The objective of the studies are, firstly, In order to analyze the connection between regulatory quality and non-performing loans (NPLs). This aim aims to determine whether more effective regulatory systems help to promote better credit discipline and reduce credit risk in banking systems. Secondly, To analyze the effectiveness of loan portfolio performance as influenced by corruption control. This entails examining whether a nation's capacity to curb abuse of public power results in increased financial sector stability and lower non-performing loans. Lastly, To identify the contribution to bank capital

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

adequacy towards curbing credit risk. This aim is aimed at investigating whether higher capital-to-assets ratios are linked with improved loan performance and as effective buffers for credit shocks.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Any country that wants to have a healthy economy needs to keep its financial system stable. Trust from investors and prosperity in the economy. Developed economies, with their advanced financial systems that are linked to each other, are more prone to systemic instability that can cascade all around the world. One of the many strategies that policymakers use to keep the economy stable is that Anti-money laundering (AML) rules have become more important as soundness has grown. Anti-money laundering rules were first seen as just ways to stop illegal financial transactions, but now most people understand that they have a much bigger role to play in improving the integrity of the financial system the robustness of the system *(Zdanovic, 2021).* Money laundering activities affect asset markets by introducing unlawful cash, increasing risk levels, and lowering the trustworthiness of banks and other financial institutions. Therefore, the existence or absence of strong anti-money laundering frameworks can have a big impact on the general health and stability of the banking sector. Part. This part looks at current empirical and theoretical research that shows how important anti-money laundering rules and institutional governance mechanisms are for keeping the economy and the financial sector stable.

Institutional economic theory explains why robust regulatory systems are necessary. This theory stresses the relevance of formal rules and enforcement mechanisms in determining behaviour and results in the financial market *(Rodrik, 2020).* Anti-money laundering policies are official rules that make institutions more open, lower the possibility of moral hazard, and stop people from taking risks or unlawful money activities by making sure that people are more accountable and watched. At the same time, the financial intermediation perspective shows how important it is to have reliable intermediaries, mostly banks, to help the economy use its capital more efficiently. This job of acting as an intermediary depends a lot on good regulation and oversight. *Kose, Ohnsorge, and Sugawara (2022)* say that banks can successfully screen borrowers, manage portfolios wisely, and avoid taking on too much risk if they have clear, consistent, and trustworthy rules. This is essential for keeping the system stable. So, good institutions and good regulatory processes work together to make an environment where financial intermediaries can do their jobs safely and well.

Much real-world research shows that there is a favourable link between the quality of regulations and bank performance measures. Anti-money laundering rules usually require banks to do customer due diligence, check identities, and report suspicious transactions. This lowers their risk of being involved in financial crimes and makes monitoring easier. By doing due diligence, checking IDs, and reporting questionable transactions, they lower their risk of being victims of financial crimes and make monitoring easier. The percentage of non-performing loans (NPLs) is a frequent sign of a bank's health. Non-performing loans are the loans that are most likely to go bad. High non-performing loan rates are frequently an indicator of vulnerabilities in institutions, bad lending decisions, or mistakes made by regulators. *Adegbite, Aremu, and Olowookere (2021)* discovered that banks with tougher rules and more openness are likely to have stronger loan portfolios, as shown by lower non-performing loan levels. The link between following anti-money laundering rules and better loan quality makes it possible to use non-

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

performing loans as a primary dependent variable in this study. This makes it easier to see how regulatory quality affects the financial health of countries in many ways.

Strong, capable institutions must support anti-money laundering policies if they are to work. *The World Bank (2023)* came up with the regulatory quality index to measure how well public institutions design, carry out and enforce rules that help the private sector grow and manage risks wisely. Even the best-designed anti-money laundering (AML) policies will not function in places where the rules are not clear or enforcement is not consistent. *Chang, Liu, and Lin (2022)* show that strong regulatory institutions are linked to fewer financial problems and better loan portfolio performance. In the same way, *Gul, Qureshi, and Anwar (2021)* show that Regulatory strength makes financial firms take fewer risks, which lowers the number of loan defaults. These results show that the link between regulatory efficacy and financial outcomes is not always straightforward: the benefits of policy only happen when institutions are able to follow through significant ability to enforce. Adding regulatory quality as an explanatory variable helps us get a better picture of how well the banking sector can use anti-money laundering regimes.

Corruption can make even the best anti-money laundering standards useless by making it harder to police them and allowing unlawful financial transactions to continue. Not checked. The control of corruption indicator measures how well a country stops people from using public power for personal gain, which is necessary for good government. When there is much corruption, it is harder for regulators to do their jobs, and institutions lose their validity. *Youssef and Salim (2020)* say that corruption messes up how capital is distributed, with People typically getting loans based on favouritism or bribes instead of a good credit check. These biases make non-performing loans go up, and capital adequacy go down, which makes the financial system less stable. Without accountability, anti-money laundering initiatives are only skin-deep because law enforcement may not look into questionable activity or punish those who break the law. Therefore, keeping corruption in check is still an important factor in figuring out how anti-money laundering affects the health of the financial system.

Capital adequacy is the first line of defence for banks against financial shocks. The capital-to-assets ratio shows how much money a bank can lose before it goes bankrupt becoming unable to pay its debts. Anti-money laundering rules do not directly set capital levels, but they do affect practices that affect the long-term health of capital. For instance, cultures that strongly follow the rules reduce fraud, encourage responsible lending, and limit high-risk transactions, all of which help keep balance sheets healthy. *Sarkar, Roy, and Basu (2022)* suggest that banks with higher capital ratios are better able to handle financial crises and are more likely to follow the rules set by regulators. Therefore, looking at capital adequacy coupled with governance and risk indicators gives a better overall view of how stable the financial system is.

METHODOLOGY

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study used a quantitative method with an explanatory focus to look into how anti-money laundering (AML) enforcement, as shown by governance and financial indicators, influences credit risk in the banking sectors of advanced economies. The concept was based on the idea that a country's regulatory strength and institutional quality have a big impact on how strong its financial system is.

Two theoretical frameworks guide the design. Institutional Theory shows how well functioning formal institutions, such rules and enforcement processes, affect how

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

organizations and economies act. Financial Intermediation Theory, on the other hand, stresses how important it is to have good monitoring to make sure that banks lend money responsibly and handle risk well. These points of view all support the study of how anti-money laundering enforcement affects the financial stability of banks.

DATA AND SAMPLE

For the analysis, panel data from 37 developed countries from 2014 to 2023 was used. The World Bank's categories and the fact that the necessary indicators were always available over the chosen period were used to choose the countries. The World Development Indicators (WDI) database provided all of the variables used in the study. This source is well known for its complete and standardized international data, which makes it possible to compare data from different countries and years. The study's analysis is stronger since it uses data from ten years to show both temporal trends and differences between countries.

THE VARIABLES USED

The key factor was Non-performing Loans (NPLs), which is shown as a percentage of all gross loans. This statistic revealed how much credit risk there is in a country's banking system by showing how many loans are likely to go overdue. The study employed the following explanatory variables to look at the factors that affect credit performance in institutions and finances:

No.	Variable	Proxy/Definition	Source	Linked Theory/Model
1	Non-performing Loans (NPLs)	Loans that are in default or close to being in default, indicating banking risk	World Development Indicators (WDI)	Financial Stability Framework
2	Regulatory Quality	Government's ability to make and enforce rules that support economic growth	World Development Indicators (WDI)	Institutional Theory
3	Control of Corruption	Ability to prevent misuse of public power for personal gain	World Development Indicators (WDI)	Good Governance Framework
4	Bank Capital to Assets Ratio	Share of bank assets financed by its own capital (acts as a buffer for losses)	World Development Indicators (WDI)	Basel Accords (Basel III)

Besides these, the model also took into account three important macroeconomic factors: The GDP growth rate, which showed how the economy is doing overall;

- The inflation rate, which can affect how people borrow money and how much they can pay back;
- The unemployment rate, which is a sign of financial trouble at the household and business levels;

These variables were included to separate the effects of anti-money laundering related governance aspects from those of the economy as a whole.

MODEL STRUCTURE

The study looked at how governance and financial health affect banking performance and uses a model for panel regression. This model allows understanding changes in the data that happen at the same time or across time:

$$NPL\_it = \alpha + \beta 1 * RQ\_it + \beta 2 * CC\_it + \beta 3 * CAR\_it + \delta * X\_it + \mu\_i + \varepsilon\_it$$

Where:

- NPL_it: The ratio of non-performing loans for nation i at time t

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

- RQ_it: The quality of regulations
- CC_it: The control of corruption
- CAR_it: The ratio of capital to assets
- X_it: Control variables (GDP growth, inflation, unemployment)
- μ_i: Unobserved effects that are distinctive to each country
- ε_it: A random error term

This framework made it possible to figure out how much each explanatory variable affected the risk in the banking sector, while taking into account other macroeconomic factors and the fixed traits of each country.

ESTIMATION STRATEGY

The investigation started with a descriptive analysis to figure out how things are spread out and what the main patterns are in the data set. Next analysis was correlation analysis, which is used for multicollinearity. The main study used panel regression approaches, such as Fixed Effects (FE) and Random Effects (RE) models. The Hausman test was used to choose between the two effects. If the test shows a significant result, it would mean that the fixed effect model is better because it means that unobserved country specific effects are linked to the explanatory variables. The RE model is used for its speed, though. Robust standard errors are utilized in all estimates to deal with problems like heteroskedasticity and serial correlation. In addition, diagnostic tests like the Wooldridge test (for autocorrelation), the Breusch-Pagan test (for variance concerns), and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) analysis (for multicollinearity) were performed to make sure the model's assumptions are correct. Stata software was used to do all the statistical testing, as it is known for handling huge panel datasets and has powerful statistical features.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

The descriptive statistics are a good place to start when trying to understand the data used in this study. The main thing to focus at was, non-performing loans (NPLs), changed a lot over the ten years in the 37 wealthy countries. The average non-performing loans value is about 5.44%, but the median is lower at 3.09%. This means that many countries have relatively low levels of bad loans, but some have much higher numbers. The high standard deviation of 9.37% backs this up, and the right-skewed distribution (skewness = 4.09) with a kurtosis of 20.27, which suggests heavy tails, makes it even clearer. These data show that most countries have average credit quality, but others have had very high loan defaults.

TABLE 4.1: DISCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Var	NPL	RQ	CC	CAR
n	370	370	370	370
Avg	5.4375	1.228	1.262	7.826
Med	3.0874	1.33	1.392	7.826
Mod	5.4375	-0.41	1.151	7.826
Min	0.2333	-0.41	-0.36	4.018
Max	61.116	2.308	2.402	20.46
Rang	60.8827	2.727	2.7627	16.447
SD	9.3655	0.588	0.737	2.6
Var	87.7125	0.3466	0.5439	6.7616
Skew	4.0898	-0.72	-0.5	1.761

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

Kurt	17.2694	-0.051	-0.873	4.2809

The first explanatory variable, regulatory quality has a mean score of 1.23 and a median of 1.33. This shows that, overall, the sample countries have quite robust policy frameworks. The variable has a slight left skew and a distribution that is almost normal, as shown by a kurtosis value close to three. The control of corruption variable has a similar pattern, with mean and median values that are close to each other (1.26 and 1.39, respectively). Its distribution is also almost symmetrical and centered around the middle. The capital-to-assets ratio, on the other hand, is used to measure a bank's solvency. It averages about 7.83% and is righter skewed. Its kurtosis of 7.28 shows that there are more extreme values, which is because there are a few institutions in the dataset that have a lot of capital. The descriptive analysis of the data is presented in Figures 1-5, and 7-8, including various type of plots.

CORRELATION

The correlation matrix shows how these factors are connected to each other. It is interesting to note that non-performing loans are linked to both regulatory quality (r = –0.2976) and control of corruption (r = –0.1985), and both of these links are statistically significant (Figure 6).

TABLE 4.2: CORRELATION

Variables	**Non-performing Loans (NPLs)**	**Non-performing Loans (NPLs)**	**Non-performing Loans (NPLs)**	**Non-performing Loans (NPLs)**
Non-performing Loans (NPLs)	1.0	-0.2976	-0.1985	-0.0053
Regulatory Quality	-0.2976	1.0	0.8981	-0.2618
Control of Corruption	-0.1985	0.8981	1.0	-0.2077
Bank Capital to Assets Ratio	-0.0053	-0.2618	-0.2077	1.0

These results back with the idea that countries with superior governance tend to have less problems with lending. Both metrics show that institutional strength affects credit performance, although the association with regulatory quality is higher. The capital ratio does not seem to have much of an effect on non-performing loans (r = –0.0053), which means that higher capitalization levels alone do not seem to lead to fewer bad loans in this dataset. This could mean that there are institutional or risk management issues that capital ratios do not show. The strength of regulations and the ability to manage corruption are highly associated (r = 0.8981), highly expected based on theory. Countries with strong policy settings tend to have stronger control over corrupt practices. There is a lot of correlation between these two variables, which makes people worry about multicollinearity. However, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) study shows that this is not a big problem, since all VIF values are well below the conventional criteria.

PANEL REGRESSION

To look at changes over time and between countries, panel data approaches were utilized. The fixed effects model shows that the amount of variation explained within countries

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

across time is relatively small, with an R-squared value of only 1.87%. The difference between countries is explained by a higher percentage, 7.65%. The model's overall F-statistic, on the other hand, does not attain statistical significance, which means that it does not fit very well overall. In the fixed effects model, the coefficient for regulatory quality is still negative (–3.35). It is not significant at the 5% level, but it is close to being significant with a p-value of 0.067. This means that there may be a link, but it gets weaker against unique elements to each country and do not change over time. The other two variables, corruption control and capital ratio, are not statistically significant, which means they do not explain anything about what is going on in the country.

However, the random effects model gives results that are more convincing. This model shows both the unique traits of each country and how things change over time. The Wald chi-square test shows that the model is important overall, and the R-squared values, while still low, suggest that it explains things better than the fixed effects version. In this model, regulatory quality again has a strong negative relationship with NPLs (coefficient = –3.88, p = 0.021), which supports the idea that effective policy environments lower credit risk. On the other hand, corruption control does not have a strong effect (p = 0.910), and the capital ratio does not have a strong effect either (p = 0.413). These findings are in line with the fixed effects model and support the idea that, while the quality of regulation is important, other indices of institutions may not have a direct, independent effect on loan performance in this sample.

TABLE 4.3: REGRESSION RESULT

Variable	Coef	STD err	t	P>|t|	[0.025	0.975]
Const	15.148	2.014	7.52	0	11.187	19.109
Regulatory Quality: Estimate	-10.4307	1.799	-5.797	0	-13.969	-6.892
Control of Corruption: Estimate	4.6928	1.417	3.311	0.001	1.906	7.48
Bank capital to assets ratio (%)	-0.3608	0.183	-1.97	0.05	-0.721	-0.001

The Hausman test was used to find out which panel model gives better accurate estimations. The result (p = 0.3316) does not demonstrate a big difference between fixed and random effects models. This means that the random effects model can be utilized without worrying about endogeneity produced by the connection between predictors and country-level variables. Traits that cannot be seen. The Breusch-Pagan test also supports using panel modeling instead of pooled ordinary least square, with a significant result (p < 0.01) showing that there is difference between countries. These tests all show that the random effects model is the best way to understand the data because it is more efficient and fits the structure of the dataset better.

DISCUSSION

This study looks at how the quality of institutions, specifically the quality of regulations, the ability to fight corruption, and the amount of capital available, affects credit risk in the banking sectors of industrialized countries. The results show that strong institutional frameworks are very important for reducing credit risk. They also show that there are complicated, context-dependent linkages that need to be looked into more.

The study shows that there is a substantial negative link between the quality of regulations and the number of non-performing loans (NPLs). This means that stronger regulatory bodies are linked to reduced credit risk. This is in line with recent research that shows that good regulatory frameworks make banks more open and accountable, which lowers the risk of loan defaults. This finding is in line with recent studies that suggest that banks are more open and responsible when there are excellent rules in place, which lowers

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

the chance of loan defaults *(Chang, Liu, & Lin, 2022; Gul, Qureshi, & Anwar, 2021).* For instance, *Rasheed et al. (2023)* observed that stronger regulation in developed economies leads to safer lending and better risk management, which lowers the number of non-performing loans (NPLs).

Egbendewe and Oloufade (2020) also said that good rules help investors feel safe. Trust and encourage financial stability, which supports the idea that the quality of regulation on credit risk. These results are in line with Institutional Theory, which says that well-established Institutions create the right conditions for economic activities to grow. According to Institutional Theory, strong institutions make it easier for businesses to operate *(Rodrik, 2020).* These results support this idea. Strong rules make ensuring that banks work within a clear set of rules that help them lend money wisely and manage risk well *(Kose, Ohnsorge, & Sugawara, 2022).*

A research study by *Silva et al. (2024)* found that non-performing loan ratios were higher in countries that had recently made changes to fight corruption. At first went up as risks that had been hidden before became clearer. This means that the consequences the effects of corruption control on credit risk are complex and may change over time. *Youssef and Salim (2020)* also said that while stopping corruption is important, its effects on credit risk might be lessened in places where institutional frameworks are already strong, like in most developed countries.

The study shows that capital adequacy does not have a statistically significant effect on the ratios of non-performing loans. This observation goes against the common belief that more capital buffers directly lower the risk of credit. One probable reason is that capital adequacy acts more like a safety net to protect against possible losses instead of a proactive step to stop loan defaults. A research paper by *Lu et al. (2022)* backs this up by saying that capital buffers are necessary for they can handle shocks, but it does not mean they stop non-performing loans from building up.

In addition, in industrialized countries with banks that have a lot of money, the capital adequacy ratios might change. Might not be enough to have a big effect on credit risk. In addition, the link between capital adequacy and credit risk may be affected by other things like the quality of the loan, the state of the economy, and the banks own traits. Therefore, capital adequacy alone might not be a good enough sign of credit risk. This shows that the necessity for a broader approach that takes into account many factors. Other factors, such the quality of the loan, the state of the economy as a whole, and the specific characteristics of the bank, can be more important than capital sufficiency *(Sarkar, Roy, & Basu, 2022).*

The models used in this study, on the other hand, do not show very strong results. Low R-squared values show that they do not explain much. This means that there may be factors that affect credit risk, thus more research is needed. Next Research should try to include more detailed, bank-level data to get a better picture of what is going on inside the bank. Governance procedures, techniques for managing risk, and other small-scale elements that add to the danger of credit. Using dynamic panel models may also help capture time-varying effects and better illustrate how institutional quality interacts with credit risk over time *(Adegbite et al., 2021).* In addition, adding sector-specific institutional variables to the mix would help.

Finally, expanding the geographic scope to include emerging markets or nations at different stages of institutional development could give us a better idea of how the test works and how it compares to others. Stages of institutional growth could provide us a

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

better idea of how things work and test the ability to apply present discoveries to other situations. Such comparative analysis could improve our understanding of how institutional quality affects financial stability globally *(Zdanovic, 2021)*. The analysis confirms that making regulatory bodies stronger is important for improving credit quality. Policymakers should work on making supervision more independent and staff more knowledgeable. Enforcement skills and technology infrastructure to make sure those things are done on time and well supervision. Because the results on controlling corruption are unclear, anti-corruption reforms need be combined with financial-sector-specific actions like improving credit registries, making it harder to get a loan and pushing for more openness in how banks do business. These kinds of focused actions may help lower credit risk more quickly.

The fact that capital adequacy does not have much of an effect means that regulators should look at more than just that. Include qualitative evaluations of how well the bank is run, how much risk it is willing to take, and how well it can handle problems. Putting together quantitative capital requirements with effective internal controls and risk management frameworks will help protect against loan defaults. Management frameworks will help protect against loan defaults better. In the end, a comprehensive solution that unifies regulatory policy is needed to keep credit stable. The way institutions act, the quality of enforcement, and the incentives in the market. Small improvements in one sector, without other reforms, may not be enough to promote long-term financial robustness of the system.

CONCLUSION

This study wanted to find out if the quality of institutions, especially the strength of regulations, and controlling corruption, coupled with bank capitalization, affects the stability and efficiency The financial systems measured through non-performing loans (NPLs) across 37 developed during a ten-year span. The results always show that regulatory quality is a big part of better credit outcomes, but the results for corruption control and Capital adequacy was less clear. These results give us useful and theoretical information. Insights into the factors that affect how well the financial system works. The strongest finding from this study is that there is a consistent negative link between the quality of regulations and the number of bad loans. This back up the main idea of Institutional Theory says that institutions that work well help people get what they want. Change behavior and lower uncertainty. When it comes to banking, stricter rules Frameworks probably help with improved risk management, spotting credit problems early, and following strict lending rules. These impacts seem to be statistically significant and can be seen in both pooled and panel regression models.

This shows how important good governance is for making institutions financially strong. On the other hand, the expected impact of controlling corruption and the bank's capital to assets ratio on the evidence from the real world did not strongly support non-performing loans. In the panel data models, corruption control had no statistically significant effect, and in one case, it even revealed an unanticipated positive link with non-performing loans. This unexpected finding could be due to changes in governance reforms, measurement problems, or indirect effects that the model does not show right away. The capital ratio variable's poor performance also goes against what people usually think, which suggests that capital buffers are important for keeping the financial system safe but may not be a direct or good way to measure the quality of a loan portfolio. In a bigger picture, the study's very low R-squared values across all models show that many things affect the

Policy Journal of Social Science Review
Online ISSN 3006-4635
Print ISSN 3006-4627
Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

efficiency and stability of the financial system, and many of these things are not included in the institutional variables that were looked at here. These could be things like the law, the culture of credit, how consistently the law is enforced, and big changes in the economy. These are all important for understanding financial outcomes, but they were not part of our study. However, finding regulatory quality as a constant aspect helps to ground continuing talks about what institutions need to do to have a healthy banking system.

In real life, the results give policymakers and regulatory bodies a good reason to spend money on building up the capacity of institutions. Not only should financial supervision be well planned on paper, but it should also work well in real life. This means making sure that regulatory bodies are autonomous, have enough resources, and can make sure that people follow the rules. This study shows that stronger structures are connected to better credit risk profiles in national banking systems. The report also says that anti-corruption policies and capital adequacy standards are crucial, but they should not be looked at on their own. To work best, these parts need to be part of larger regulatory structures that include things like honest supervision, quick courts, and open finances. The results also add to the body of academic work by filling a gap in cross-country studies that look at industrialized economies. A lot of the work that has come before this has been about emerging countries or situations that happened after a crisis.

This study adds to that by showing that even in well-developed financial systems, the quality of regulation is still a crucial factor in determining credit outcomes. Using a balanced panel dataset across 10 years makes these insights much more credible because they give a time-sensitive and internationally relevant view. The study further improves its scientific rigor by using both pooled and panel data approaches. Random and fixed effects models can be used to look at differences across countries and within countries, which makes the results easier to understand. This two-pronged approach reveals that the link between regulatory strength and credit risk is strong, no matter how the model is set up. The research has several good points, but it also has certain problems that future studies may be able to fix. One big problem is that governance measures based on views are not always objective, even though they are commonly used. These measures could not show the complete picture of how well institutions can execute the law or how they work on a daily basis.

Future studies could look at more detailed, process-based governance metrics or focus on sector-specific variables like the quality of banking supervision or the standards for classifying loans. The focus on macro-level data is another problem. National indicators are useful for putting things in context, but they may hide differences between nations or between different types of financial institutions. Adding data from individual banks could assist find behaviors that are unique to each bank and affect credit performance. Using longitudinal case studies or mixed-method techniques could also help us learn more about how changes in regulation or governance led to measurable financial results over time.

In conclusion, our study shows once again that the quality of regulations is very important for making the financial system work better and lowering credit risk. It was not as clear how corruption control and bank capitalization worked, but the fact that regulatory strength was always important shows the need to develop regulatory institutions that are capable, open, and responsive. Is necessary for a stable financial industry. This information is useful not only for wealthy economies but also for countries who want to improve their financial systems in a world that is becoming more interconnected and complicated.

Policy Journal of Social Science Review

Online ISSN 3006-4635

Print ISSN 3006-4627

Vol. 3 No. 6 (2025)

REFERENCES

Adegbite, E., Aremu, M. A., & Olowookere, J. K. (2021). Impact of anti-money laundering regulations on banking performance: Evidence from emerging markets. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 28(1), 234–248. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-01-2021-0005

Basel Institute on Governance. (2024). *Global fight against money laundering: Progress on paper, success elusive*. Retrieved from https://baselgovernance.org/news/global-fight-against-money-laundering-progress-paper-success-elusive

Chang, H., Liu, F., & Lin, X. (2022). Regulatory quality and banking stability: Evidence from developed economies. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 135, 106371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2021.106371

Clifford Chance. (2024). *Anti-money laundering: Global developments and their impact on business*.

Durguti, E., Arifi, E., Gashi, E., & Spahiu, M. (2025). *Anti-money laundering regulations' effectiveness in ensuring banking sector stability: Evidence from Western Balkan countries*. Cogent Economics & Finance.

Egbendewe, M., & Oloufade, P. (2020). Institutional quality and financial stability: A cross-country analysis. *International Journal of Banking and Finance*.

Gul, S., Qureshi, M. A., & Anwar, S. (2021). Institutional quality and financial stability: The role of regulatory enforcement. *Finance Research Letters*, 43, 101946. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2021.101946

International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Anti-Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism*. Retrieved from https://www.imf.org/en/Topics/Financial-Integrity/amlcft

Kose, M. A., Ohnsorge, F., & Sugawara, N. (2022). Financial intermediation and risk management under strong regulation. *Economic Modelling*, 104, 105667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2021.105667

Lu, J., Chen, X., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Capital adequacy and credit risk: Evidence from developed markets. *European Financial Management*.

Nugrohowati, R. N. I., & Shidiqie, J. S. A. (2025). *Impact of financial inclusion and institutional quality on banking stability: Lessons from the Asia region*. Retrieved from

Rasheed, A., Khan, M. A., & Mahmood, H. (2023). Regulatory quality and bank performance: Evidence from developed economies. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*.

Rodrik, D. (2020). Institutions for economic growth: A conceptual overview. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(3), 123–146. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.34.3.123

Sarkar, S., Roy, A., & Basu, S. (2022). Capital adequacy and bank resilience: A study during financial crises. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 59, 100945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2022.100945

Silva, R., de Oliveira, L., & Santos, M. (2024). Anti-corruption reforms and non-performing loans: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Banking & Finance*.

World Bank. (2023). Worldwide Governance Indicators. *World Bank Group*.

Youssef, H., & Salim, R. (2020). Corruption, governance, and financial sector stability: Cross-country evidence. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 66, 101207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intfin.2020.101207

Zdanovic, N. (2021). Anti-money laundering policies and financial system integrity. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance*, 29(2), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRC-07-2020-0074