Vol. 3 No. 1 Edisi Januari 2026 E. ISSN. 3032-2472
Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW ON ENHANCING ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE FOR FUTURE GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISES

BUDAYA KELINCAHAN BERKELANJUTAN DALAM MANAJEMEN SUMBER DAYA MANUSIA: KERANGKA PRIDE UNTUK ORGANISASI YANG SIAP MASA DEPAN

Yonghwa Han[1*], Andini Nurwulandari[2], Hasanudin[3], Aghnia Wulandari[4]

[1*]National University, Email: yonghwahan2024@student.unas.ac.id
[2]National University, Email: andini.nurwulandari@civitas.unas.ac.id
[3]National University, Email: hasanudin64@civitas.unas.ac.id
[4]National University, Email: wulandariaghnia@gmail.com

*email koresponden: yonghwahan2024@student.unas.ac.id

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62567/micjo.v3i1.1572

Abstract

This study explores how incorporating artificial intelligence improves institutional resilience and overcomes the rigidity of conventional, data-based methods to alter financial risk management. To find patterns in AI applications, resilience theory, and integration pathways, a qualitative systematic literature review was carried out utilizing theme synthesis in accordance with PRISMA peer-reviewed protocols. Findings show that AI techniques, machine learning for tail-risk detection, deep learning for high-frequency forecasting, and explainable AI for transparent decisions, yield up to 28% reductions in forecasting errors and halve recovery times during crises. The hybrid CNN Transformer architectures and transformer-based NLP models significantly enhance predictive accuracy and forward-looking insights. The study suggests financial institutions adopt integrated AI frameworks, invest in data quality and human–AI collaboration, and implement principle-based governance to balance innovation with fairness and stability. Limitations include reliance on published literature and limited representation of emerging AI models, warranting future longitudinal and context-specific empirical research.

Keywords : Artificial Intelligence, Financial Risk Management, Global Financial Crises, Machine Learning, Organizational Resilience.

Abstrak

Studi ini mengeksplorasi bagaimana penggabungan kecerdasan buatan meningkatkan ketahanan institusional dan mengatasi kekakuan metode konvensional berbasis data untuk mengubah manajemen risiko keuangan. Untuk menemukan pola dalam aplikasi AI, teori ketahanan, dan jalur integrasi, tinjauan literatur sistematis kualitatif dilakukan dengan memanfaatkan sintesis tema sesuai dengan protokol tinjauan sejawat PRISMA. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa teknik AI, pembelajaran mesin untuk deteksi risiko ekor, pembelajaran mendalam untuk peramalan frekuensi tinggi, dan AI yang dapat dijelaskan untuk keputusan transparan, menghasilkan pengurangan kesalahan peramalan hingga 28%

dan memangkas waktu pemulihan selama krisis hingga setengahnya. Arsitektur CNN Transformer hibrida dan model NLP berbasis transformer secara signifikan meningkatkan akurasi prediktif dan wawasan berwawasan ke depan. Studi ini menyarankan lembaga keuangan untuk mengadopsi kerangka kerja AI terintegrasi, berinvestasi dalam kualitas data dan kolaborasi manusia-AI, serta menerapkan tata kelola berbasis prinsip untuk menyeimbangkan inovasi dengan keadilan dan stabilitas. Keterbatasan meliputi ketergantungan pada literatur yang dipublikasikan dan keterwakilan model AI yang muncul yang terbatas, sehingga memerlukan penelitian empiris longitudinal dan spesifik konteks di masa depan.

Kata Kunci : Kecerdasan Buatan, Manajemen Risiko Keuangan, Krisis Keuangan Global, Pembelajaran Mesin, Ketahanan Organisasi.

1. INTRODUCTION

Critical flaws in traditional risk management systems at financial institutions around the world were made clear by the 2008 Global Financial Crisis. According to DesJardine et al. (2019), there were significant systemic breakdowns as a result of old models that were focused on patterns in historical data failing to predict complex, non-linear processes. Many financial institutions continue to use rigid, rule-based models that are unable to quickly adjust to unstable market circumstances or unheard-of shocks, even in the wake of regulatory changes like Basel III, which increased capital requirements and stress testing procedures. Acemoglu et al. (2015) demonstrated that interconnected financial networks amplify contagion effects, yet legacy approaches do not capture these network-driven tail risks. Stulz (2023) showed that Value-at-Risk and similar methodologies systematically underestimate extreme losses during systemic crises because they cannot model regime shifts or feedback loops across institutions. These persistent gaps underscore the need for fundamentally new analytical tools.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies present transformative solutions by delivering adaptive learning mechanisms and pattern recognition capabilities far beyond traditional methods. Gu et al. (2020) reported 0.5–1.8% improvements in out-of-sample predictive R^2 for asset pricing models using machine learning, while Berg et al. (2020) found that AI credit scoring using digital footprints boosts predictive accuracy for thin-file borrowers. Gambacorta et al. (2019) further showed that incorporating alternative data streams such as mobile phone usage and social network metrics expands financial inclusion and enhances risk assessment significantly. Advanced neural network architectures and natural language processing expand AI's impact across financial forecasting and sentiment analysis domains. Giantsidi and Claudia (2025) reviewed deep learning studies and found 12–28% lower forecast errors using CNN-Transformer hybrids in market prediction tasks. Du et al. (2024) highlighted how transformer-based language models extract forward-looking signals from unstructured text to anticipate market movements. Explainable AI techniques bridge the gap between performance and transparency, with Mohsin et al. (2025) demonstrating that SHAP and LIME methods increase stakeholder trust and regulatory acceptance without compromising accuracy..

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This systematic literature review employs a qualitative research design focused on conceptual development and theoretical synthesis rather than quantitative hypothesis testing. The research model is organized around the mind map framework presented above, which serves as our conceptual roadmap for literature analysis and synthesis. The central focus of our investigation examines the relationship between AI implementation in financial risk management and organizational resilience outcomes, with particular attention to the mechanisms through which these technologies enhance institutional capacity for crisis preparedness, response, and recovery (Berg et al., 2020; Gambacorta et al., 2024). Our analytical approach follows established systematic literature review protocols, incorporating PRISMA guidelines for transparent and reproducible research synthesis (Page et al., 2021; Mengist et al., 2020).

The research model emphasizes identification of emergent themes, theoretical patterns, and conceptual relationships that become visible through systematic analysis of collective literature. Gibson and Tarrant (2010) proposed that organizational resilience depends on strategic vision, organizational culture, change readiness, and innovation capacity, suggesting that AI adoption effectiveness depends critically on organizational context and implementation quality. Rather than testing predetermined hypotheses, this qualitative approach allows for inductive theory development and discovery of unexpected relationships. Caccioli et al. (2018) revealed that AI-powered network reconstruction algorithms and machine learning-based centrality measures enable identification of hidden vulnerabilities and contagion pathways that traditional analysis overlooks.

The research model incorporates consideration of contextual factors influencing effectiveness of AI-driven resilience strategies, including organizational characteristics, regulatory environments, crisis types, and implementation approaches that moderate the connection between technological embrace and resilience results, such as organizational characteristics, regulatory environments, crisis types, and implementation approaches. Chen et al. (2023) found that digital transformation generates heterogeneous effects depending on bank characteristics, with larger institutions experiencing greater risk reduction benefits. Anang et al. (2024) identified that AI deployment effectiveness depends critically on organizational governance structures, risk management frameworks, and compliance monitoring systems ensuring responsible implementation aligned with regulatory expectations. This comprehensive analytical framework enables nuanced understanding of how AI technologies contribute to financial institutions' capacity to navigate uncertain environments while maintaining operational continuity and stakeholder confidence (Vashishth et al., 2025).

a. Conceptual Framework

The study adopts mind mapping instead of traditional hypothesis testing to explore how AI integration enhances resilience in financial risk management. The conceptual mind map centers on the core research question of how AI integration enhances organizational resilience

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

in financial risk management contexts, with five primary branches extending from this central concept.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

Traditional risk management constraints, such as static models that are unable to adjust to changing market conditions, are examined in the initial segment. Historical data bias causes poor capture of unprecedented events and structural breaks. Conventional approaches systematically underestimate tail risks by 3–10× during systemic crises (Stulz, 2023). Default prediction models relying solely on historical financial ratios degrade 15–25 percentage points in accuracy during crisis periods (Alvi & Arif, 2024).

The second branch looks at AI technologies in the financial industry, such as explainable AI methods for transparent decision-making, deep learning architectures for complex feature extraction, machine learning algorithms with supervision for classification and regression tasks, and natural language processing for textual data analysis. Du et al. (2024) provided a comprehensive survey of natural language processing applications in finance, documenting how transformer-based language models including BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers), RoBERTa (A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach), and FinBERT (Financial BERT) enable extraction of sentiment signals, event detection, entity recognition, and relation extraction from financial news, earnings call transcripts, analyst reports, and social media content that significantly improve forecasting accuracy by capturing forward-looking information and market psychology dynamics invisible to purely quantitative models. Kothandapani, N.H.P. (2024) explains that BERT is a cutting-edge language representation approach that makes use of the Transformer architecture.

Stakeholder relationship management, crisis recovery techniques, adaptive capacity, and strategic flexibility are all included in the third branch's focus on organizational resilience theory. Banks with strong adaptive leadership and digital agility recover in 4.2 months versus 8.7 months for peers, maintaining over 92% customer retention during COVID-19 disruptions (Juliana et al., 2023). Reactive capabilities such as operational adaptability and resource mobility enable rapid strategic pivots and business model innovation during crises (Damayanti & Suryani, 2024).

The fourth branch investigates AI-resilience integration pathways: early warning systems, predictive analytics, automated monitoring, and dynamic risk assessment. An XGBoost-SHAP early warning model identifies credit defaults 8–12 weeks in advance with

95.8% accuracy and explains feature importance transparently (Tan & Lin, 2023). Hybrid neural networks optimized with Adam algorithms predict banking crises 6–9 months ahead with 97.2% accuracy by processing multiple macroeconomic and sectoral indicators (Li, 2025). Future research should develop responsible AI frameworks, real-time adaptation capabilities, and empirical validation methods to assess resilience outcomes.

The fifth branch outlines future research directions, including responsible AI framework development for ethical deployment, real-time system adaptation capabilities for dynamic environments, cross-institutional learning mechanisms for knowledge sharing, and empirical validation methodologies for assessing resilience outcomes. Papagiannidis et al. (2024) conducted a comprehensive review of responsible artificial intelligence governance frameworks, organizational practices, and regulatory approaches across multiple jurisdictions, proposing an integrative ethical framework specifying five core principles beneficence (promoting stakeholder welfare), nonmaleficence (avoiding harm), autonomy (respecting human agency), justice (ensuring fairness), and explicability (providing transparency) that provide structured guidance for financial institutions developing AI systems aligned with stakeholder interests, societal values, and regulatory expectations while balancing innovation imperatives with risk management obligations. This conceptual framework serves as the foundation for our systematic literature analysis and synthesis, guiding the identification of relevant studies, organization of empirical findings, and development of theoretical insights regarding AI contributions to financial risk management and organizational resilience enhancement.

b. Methodology

In order to guarantee an open, thorough, and repeatable research synthesis, this systematic review of the literature adheres to the PRISMA 2020 principles. In order to capture the most up-to-date and rigorous research in this quickly developing subject, our data collection method focuses on peer-reviewed publications published in high-impact journals that are indexed in major academic information sources and other prominent repositories. To find pertinent research spanning several academic borders, the search technique uses Boolean operators to combine terms associated with deep learning, machine learning, AI, financial risk management, organizational resilience, and crisis management. Inclusion criteria specify that studies must appear in Q1-Q4 ranked journals according to recognized citation reports, present empirical analysis or substantial theoretical contributions, focus on AI applications in financial contexts, address risk management or organizational performance outcomes, and be published in English language. Our sampling frame prioritizes premier finance and management journals to ensure comprehensive coverage of both technical and strategic perspectives. Quality assessment procedures evaluate study methodology, sample sizes, analytical rigor, citation impact, and journal reputation using established assessment frameworks to ensure that only the highest quality research informs our synthesis and conclusions. The final sample comprises studies that demonstrate clear connections between AI technology implementation and organizational resilience outcomes, with particular emphasis on empirical evidence from crisis

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

periods or longitudinal analyses that capture dynamic relationships between variables.

c. Data Analysis

Our data analysis employs systematic content analysis and thematic synthesis techniques appropriate for qualitative systematic literature reviews. Page et al. (2021) established comprehensive PRISMA 2020 guidelines that inform transparent and reproducible research synthesis processes across diverse research domains. The analytical process begins with systematic extraction of key findings, methodological approaches, theoretical frameworks, and empirical evidence from each included study using standardized data extraction forms. Mengist et al. (2020) developed systematic methodological guidance for conducting literature reviews emphasizing structured approaches to data extraction that minimize bias and maximize comprehensiveness. Braun and Clarke (2006) provided foundational methodological guidance for thematic analysis emphasizing reflexivity and systematic approaches to pattern identification across qualitative datasets.

Cross-case comparison analyzes similarities and differences across institutional contexts including bank size variations, geographic regions with varying regulatory frameworks, crisis types from idiosyncratic shocks to systemic disruptions, and AI implementation approaches. Bitetto et al. (2023) demonstrated through empirical evidence that machine learning credit risk models require careful calibration to specific organizational contexts to achieve sustainable performance improvements. Theoretical synthesis integrates findings to develop comprehensive understanding of mechanisms through which AI technologies enhance organizational resilience including improved early warning capabilities, enhanced decision-making speed, and strengthened adaptive capacity. Caccioli et al. (2018) provided systematic review of network models for financial systemic risk revealing that AI-powered analysis enables identification of hidden vulnerabilities that traditional approaches overlook. Quality assessment and bias evaluation procedures systematically examine potential limitations including small sample sizes, short observation windows, and publication biases favoring positive findings. Stulz (2023) examined crisis risk management demonstrating that systematic evaluation of methodological rigor remains essential for drawing valid conclusions from empirical evidence. Meta-narrative analysis tracks evolution from early rule-based systems through machine learning adoption to current deep learning and explainable AI developments. Mohsin et al. (2025) systematically reviewed explainable AI applications demonstrating how transparency techniques have evolved to address regulatory compliance while maintaining predictive performance.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Our synthesis reveals that traditional risk management approaches suffer from fundamental limitations that AI technologies effectively address. Stulz (2023) demonstrated that conventional risk models systematically underestimate tail risk probabilities during systemic crises due to their inability to capture regime shifts and nonlinear contagion dynamics. Machine learning algorithms overcome these limitations through superior pattern recognition

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

capabilities. Gu et al. (2020) provided empirical evidence that machine learning algorithms achieve out-of-sample R^2 improvements ranging from 0.5% to 1.8% monthly in empirical asset pricing by capturing complex interactions invisible to traditional factor models. Berg et al. (2020) documented that FinTech credit scoring models incorporating digital footprints achieve significantly higher predictive accuracy compared to conventional methodologies, particularly for borrowers with limited credit histories. Deep learning architectures revolutionize financial forecasting by extracting hierarchical patterns from high-frequency data. Zeng et al. (2023) showed that integrated CNN-Transformer frameworks enable superior S&P 500 index prediction by simultaneously capturing short-term technical patterns and long-term macroeconomic trends. Du et al. (2024) documented that transformer-based language models including FinBERT significantly improve forecasting accuracy by incorporating sentiment dynamics from financial news and social media content.

The literature consistently demonstrates that AI integration enhances organizational resilience across multiple dimensions. Halbusi et al. (2025) demonstrated that AI adoption moderates organizational resilience effectiveness through enhanced change capability and dynamic resource reallocation mechanisms. Juliana et al. (2023) analyzed Indonesian banks during pandemic, revealing that institutions with robust AI-enabled adaptive capacity returned to pre-crisis profitability levels in 4.2 months versus 8.7 months for less technologically sophisticated peers, while maintaining customer retention rates exceeding 92% compared to 78% industry average. Early warning systems powered by machine learning enable proactive threat detection. Tan and Lin (2023) developed XGBoost-SHAP models achieving 95.8% accuracy in credit risk assessment, identifying emerging defaults 8-12 weeks before traditional indicators signal distress. Li (2025) demonstrated that hybrid multilayer perceptron architectures achieve 97.2% accuracy in predicting banking crises 6-9 months in advance by processing macroeconomic indicators. Vashishth et al. (2025) documented that adaptive AI fraud detection systems reduce false positive rates below 5% while maintaining detection sensitivity above 95%.

A critical finding concerns the essential role of explainable AI techniques in reconciling predictive performance with transparency requirements. Mohsin et al. (2025) systematically reviewed explainable AI applications demonstrating that SHAP values and LIME methodologies enhance model interpretability without sacrificing predictive accuracy, with financial institutions reporting 30-40% improvement in model acceptance rates among compliance officers following XAI implementation. Andrae (2024) developed comprehensive frameworks showing that explainable AI architectures satisfy regulatory transparency standards while maintaining state-of-the-art performance. Wang et al. (2025) documented that effective explainable AI implementation requires balancing predictive accuracy maximization, computational efficiency, interpretability, and regulatory compliance.

However, tensions persist between complete interpretability and maximal predictive performance. Anang et al. (2024) identified that while XAI techniques substantially improve transparency, fundamental trade-offs remain between model complexity and human comprehension. Papagiannidis et al. (2024) analyzed evolving governance structures including the EU AI Act and OECD AI Principles, revealing that financial institutions must navigate fragmented regulatory landscapes while maintaining competitive advantages.

Our analysis reveals that AI effectiveness varies substantially across institutional contexts and regulatory environments. Chen et al. (2023) demonstrated that digital transformation generates heterogeneous effects depending on organizational characteristics, with larger institutions experiencing greater risk reduction benefits while smaller banks face implementation challenges. Bitetto et al. (2023) provided evidence that machine learning credit models require careful calibration to specific borrower characteristics and regional economic conditions, with effectiveness varying by 15-25 percentage points across contexts. Vuković et al. (2025) revealed that permissive regulatory frameworks encourage innovation but may inadequately address fairness concerns, while restrictive approaches ensure consumer protection but potentially stifle beneficial innovations.

Despite substantial promise, significant implementation challenges constrain widespread AI adoption. Mestiri (2024) emphasized that machine learning performance critically depends on data quality, with model accuracy degrading by 20-35% when training data contains significant quality issues. Simón et al. (2024) identified that effective AI integration requires developing dynamic capabilities spanning technical infrastructure, human capital development, and organizational culture transformation. Theodorakopoulos et al. (2025) identified persistent gaps in understanding how big data analytics translate into actionable resilience strategies during rapidly evolving crisis conditions. Camilleri (2024) highlighted that ethical AI governance requires embedding fairness constraints and accountability mechanisms throughout system lifecycles.

4. CONCLUSION

This systematic literature review synthesizes empirical evidence demonstrating that artificial intelligence integration substantially enhances organizational resilience in financial risk management by addressing fundamental limitations of traditional approaches. Machine learning algorithms consistently outperform conventional econometric methods through superior pattern recognition capabilities and adaptive learning mechanisms (Gu et al., 2020). Deep learning architectures revolutionize financial forecasting by extracting complex hierarchical patterns (Giantsidi & Claudia, 2025), while natural language processing enables incorporation of forward-looking information from textual sources (Du et al., 2024).

Organizational resilience emerges as a multidimensional construct encompassing crisis preparedness, adaptive capacity, stakeholder relationship management, and strategic flexibility. Empirical evidence validates that AI-enabled institutions demonstrate significantly faster recovery trajectories and maintain superior customer retention rates compared to less technologically sophisticated peers (Juliana et al., 2023). However, realizing these benefits requires addressing critical implementation challenges spanning data quality assurance, organizational capability development, regulatory compliance navigation, and ethical governance framework establishment (Simón et al., 2024).

Future research should prioritize longitudinal studies tracking organizations through complete crisis cycles, enabling rigorous assessment of how AI capabilities translate into actual resilience outcomes. Comparative analyses examining AI effectiveness across different crisis types would illuminate boundary conditions determining when AI technologies deliver greatest resilience benefits. Investigation of potential unintended consequences including new forms of systemic risk emerging from widespread AI adoption represents critical priority (Acemoglu et al., 2015). Research examining implementation processes and sociotechnical factors influencing AI adoption success would provide valuable practical guidance.

5. REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D., Ozdaglar, A., & Tahbaz-Salehi, A. (2015). Systemic risk and stability in financial networks. American Economic Review, 105(2), 564–608. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20130456.

Akinjole, A., Shobayo, O., Popoola, J., Okoyeigbo, O., & Ogunleye, B. (2024). Ensemble-Based Machine Learning Algorithm for Loan Default Risk Prediction. Mathematics, 12(21), 3423. https://doi.org/10.3390/math12213423.

Alvi, J., & Arif, I. (2024). Advancing financial resilience: A systematic review of default prediction models and future directions in credit risk management. Heliyon, 10(21), e39770. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39770.

Anang, A.N. et al. (2024). Explainable AI in financial technologies: Balancing innovation with regulatory compliance. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 13(1), pp. 1793–1806. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.13.1.1870.

Andrae, S. (2024). Explainable Artificial Intelligence in Risk Management: A Framework. Transformations in Banking, Finance and Regulation, pp. 149–206. https://doi.org/10.1142/9781800615212_0004.

Berg, T., Burg, V., Gombović, A., & Puri, M. (2020). On the rise of FinTechs: Credit scoring using digital footprints. The Review of Financial Studies, 33(7), 2845–2897. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz099.

Bitetto, A. et al. (2023). Machine learning and credit risk: Empirical evidence from small and mid-sized businesses. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 90, 101764. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2023.101746.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Camilleri, M. A. (2024). Artificial intelligence governance: Ethical considerations and regulatory structures. Expert Systems with Applications, 238, 121899. https://doi.org/10.1111/exsy.13406.

Caccioli, F., Barucca, P. and Kobayashi, T. (2018) 'Network models of financial systemic risk: a review,' Journal of Computational Social Science, 1(1), pp. 81–114.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-017-0008-3.

Chen, Z., Li, H., Wang, T., Wu, J. (2023). How digital transformation affects bank risk: Evidence from listed Chinese banks. Finance Research Letters, 58, p. 104319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104319.

Damayanti, I. and Suryani, I.P. (2024) 'Supplementary Strategies for Organizational Resilience in the Times of Crises: A Literature review, 1(2), pp. 70–78. https://doi.org/10.31603/itej.12063.

DesJardine, M., Bansal, P., & Yang, Y. (2019). Bouncing back: Building resilience through social and environmental practices in the context of the 2008 global financial crisis. Journal of Management, 45(4), 1434–1460. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317708854.

Du, K. et al. (2024). Natural language processing in finance: A survey. Information Fusion, 115, p. 102755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2024.102755.

Durairaj, M., & Mohan, B. G. K. (2022). A convolutional neural network-based approach to financial time series prediction. Neural Computing and Applications, 34(16), 13319–13337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-022-06922-9.

Gambacorta, L., Huang, Y., Qiu, H., & Wang, J. (2019). How Do Machine Learning and Non-Traditional Data Affect Credit Scoring? New Evidence from a Chinese Fintech Firm. Risk Management eJournal. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2024.101284.

Giantsidi, S., & Claudia, T. (2025). Deep learning for financial forecasting: A review of recent advancements. Computational Economics, 65(4), 1123–1168. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-024-10563-2.

Gibson C. A., Tarrant M. (2010). A 'conceptual models' approach to organisational resilience. Australian Journal of Emergency Management 25(2): 6–12.

Gu, S., Kelly, B., & Xiu, D. (2020). Empirical asset pricing via machine learning. The Review of Financial Studies, 33(5), 2223–2273. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhaa009.

Halbusi, H.A. et al. (2025). The nexus of managerial and technical AI knoweldge, disruptive innovation and the circular economy: The role of organizational change capability and financial resilience. Technology in Society, p. 102937. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.102937.

Heß, V. L., & Damásio, B. (2025). Machine learning in banking risk management: Mapping a decade of evolution. Annals of Operations Research, 334(1-3), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjimei.2025.100324.

Juliana, B.M. et al. (2023). The analysis effect of adaptive leadership, digital adoption, and organization agility on the resilience of Indonesian banks. Proceeding Medan International Conference on Economic and Business. https://doi.org/10.30596/miceb.v1i0.300.

Karanikola A, Davrazos G, Liapis CM, Kotsiantis S. Financial sentiment analysis: Classic methods vs. deep learning models. Intelligent Decision Technologies. https://doi.org/10.3233/IDT-230478.

Kothandapani, N.H.P. (2024). Automating financial compliance with AI: A New Era in regulatory technology (RegTech). International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 11(1), pp. 2646–2659. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2024.11.1.0040.

Kou, G., Chao, X., Peng, Y., Alsaadi, F. E., & Herrera-Viedma, E. (2019). Machine learning methods for systemic risk analysis in financial sectors. Technological and Economic Development of Economy, 25(5), 716-742. https://doi.org/10.3846/tede.2019.8740.

Li, B. and Zhang, X. (2024). Systemic risk and financial networks. The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 94, pp. 25–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.qref.2023.12.012.

Li, H. (2025). Hybrid Multilayer Perceptron-Adam Optimization based Early Warning System for Financial Crisis Prediction. IEEE Xplore. https://doi.org/10.1109/icdsis65355.2025.11070600.

Lin, W. Y., Hu, Y. H., and Tsai, C.F. (2011). Machine Learning in Financial Crisis Prediction: A Survey. IEEE Transactions on Systems Man and Cybernetics Part C (Applications and Reviews), 42(4), pp. 421–436. https://doi.org/10.1109/tsmcc.2011.2170420.

McCarthy, J. (2023). Cyber-risks in modern finance: Building operational and digital resilience. Journal of International Banking Law and Regulation, 38(7), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4881572.

Mengist, W., Soromessa, T., & Legese, G. (2020). Method for conducting systematic literature review and meta-analysis for environmental science research. MethodsX, 7, 100777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2019.100777.

Mestiri, S. (2024). Credit scoring using machine learning and deep learning-based models. Data Science in Finance and Economics, 4(2), 236–248. https://doi.org/10.3934/DSFE.2024009.

Mohsin, M. T. & Nasim, N. B., & Ahmed, S. (2025). Explaining the unexplainable: A systematic review of explainable AI in finance. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 16(03), 476–497. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.16.3.2581.

Mokheleli, T., & Museba, T. (2023). Machine Learning Approach for Credit Score Predictions. Journal of Information Systems and Informatics, 5(2), 497-517. https://doi.org/10.51519/journalisi.v5i2.487.

Olawale, N.O. et al. (2024). RegTech innovations streamlining compliance, reducing costs in the financial sector. GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 19(1), pp. 114–131. https://doi.org/10.30574/gscarr.2024.19.1.0146.

Ortiz-de-Mandojana, N., & Bansal, P. (2016). The long-term benefits of organizational resilience through sustainable business practices. Strategic Management Journal, 37(8), 1615–1631. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2410.

Page, M. J., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. The BMJ, 372, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71.

Papagiannidis, E., Enholm, I. M., Dremel, C., Mikalef, P., & Krogstie, J. (2024). Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review of regulatory frameworks and organizational practices. Information Systems Frontiers, 27(1), 245–272. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-024-10498-2.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Simón, C., Ferreras-Méndez, J. L., Neumann, W. P., & Arias-Aranda, D. (2024). Integrating AI in organizations for value creation through human–AI interactions: A dynamic capabilities-based framework. International Journal of Information Management, 79, 102839. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114783.

Stulz, R. M. (2023). Crisis risk and risk management. European Financial Management, 29(4), 1097–1126. https://doi.org/10.1111/eufm.12441.

Sudra, R. (2024). Regulatory compliance with AI and risks involved in finance and banking sectors. Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research, 11(1), 276–285. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12772054.

Tan, B. & Lin, Y. (2023). Early Warning of Companies' Credit Risk Based on Machine Learning. International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach (IJITSA), 16(3), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJITSA.324067.

Theodorakopoulos, L., Theodoropoulou, A., & Bakalis, A. (2025). Big data in financial risk management: Evidence, advances, and open questions: A systematic review. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 8, 1658375. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1658375.

Tian, X., Tian, Z., Khatib, S. F. A., & Wang, Y. (2024). Machine learning in internet financial risk management: A systematic literature review. PLOS ONE, 19(4), e0300195. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0300195.

Vashishth, T. K., Chaudhary, A., Sharma, V., Chaudhary, S., Sharma, N., Sharma, R., Kaushik, V., & Sharma, S. (2025). Adaptive AI Systems for Financial Fraud Detection and Risk Management. In A. Derbali (Ed.), Artificial Intelligence for Financial Risk Management and Analysis (pp. 431-454). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1200-2.ch021.

Vuković, D.B., Dekpo-Adza, S. & Matović, S. (2025). AI integration in financial services: a systematic review of trends and regulatory challenges. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12(1), 84. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04850-8.

Wang, M. et al. (2025). Explainable Machine learning in Risk Management: Balancing accuracy and interpretability. Journal of Financial Risk Management, 14(03), pp. 185–198. https://doi.org/10.4236/jfrm.2025.143011.

Zeng, Z., Kaur, R., Siddagangappa, S., Rahimi, S., Balch, T., & Veloso, M. (2023). Financial time series forecasting using CNN and Transformer. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence - AI for Financial Services Bridge Program, 37, 15897–15903. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.04912.