

INSTITUTIONAL PRESSURE AND THE ADOPTION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGs) IN MINING COMPANIES IN INDONESIA

Sammy R N Korua^{1*}, Olivia S. Nelwan², Victor P.K. Lengkong³, Rita N. Taroreh⁴, Genita G. Lumintang⁵

¹ Faculty of Economics and Business, Christian University of Indonesia in Tomohon

^{2,3,4,5} Faculty of Economics and Business, Sam Ratulangi University

¹ novieko@gmail.com

² olivianelwan@gmail.com

³ vpk.lengkong@unsrat.ac.id

⁴ rita.taroreh@unsrat.ac.id

⁵ genitagracia73@gmail.com

(*) Corresponding Author

novieko@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 19-06-2025

Revised : 18-08-2025

Accepted : 29-10-2025

KEYWORDS

Capital markets;
Institutional theory;
Mining industry;
Normative pressure;
SDGs; Sustainability
reporting

ABSTRACT

This study uses institutional theory as the analytical framework to examine how institutional pressures affect the institutional adoption of sustainable development goals (SDGs) among mining companies in Indonesia. Through a qualitative content analysis of sustainability reports from 11 firms in three categories of ownership (state-owned enterprises, multinational corporations, and domestic private firms), this study examines different patterns of SDG integration due to coercive normative and mimetic pressures. The findings reveal that multinationals pursue the widest array of SDGs 15-16, motivated by global ESG expectations and investor demands. State-owned enterprises show moderate adoption of 10-12 goals mainly due to national regulations and the legitimacy of the public. Domestic private firms have high variability in 6-11 goals, with listed or parent-affiliated firms showing more substantive engagement than their smaller non-listed counterparts. Crucially, the research concludes that capital market affiliation, directly or indirectly, serves as a consistent normative force that increases the adoption of SDGs for all ownership types. This research contributes theoretically to the literature, showing that normative pressure from financial markets could outweigh coercive regulatory pressure in driving meaningful sustainability practices in developing economies. Practically, it provides practical insights for regulators, investors, and corporate leaders to enhance the implementation of SDGs beyond mere symbolic disclosure.

INTRODUCTION

The mining sector is essential to Indonesia's national economic development because of its significant contribution to foreign exchange, employment, and infrastructure development. However, this sector presents substantial environmental and social challenges in the form of deforestation, water pollution, and conflicts with local communities. These twin pressures constantly contradict economic pressure and sustainable development ideals. In

response to increasing global awareness of ecological and societal well-being, the United Nations launched the Sustainable Development Goals SDGs in 2015 as a universal framework for the sustainable integration of economic, social, and environmental dimensions into development strategies. The SDGs have since become a benchmark for corporate sustainability, encouraging businesses to pinpoint their operations as global priorities (Ike et al., 2019; Khaled et al., 2021; Küçükgül et al., 2022). In Indonesia, regulatory mandates such as Otoritas Jasa Keuangan OJK Regulation No. 51/POJK.03/2017 have institutionalized sustainability reporting for public companies, thus strengthening the relevance of SDGs in corporate practice (Adhariani & Du Toit, 2020; Putri et al., 2025). Against this dynamic background, it is necessary to study the understanding and application of the Sustainable Development Goals [SDGs] by mining companies in Indonesia at strategic and operational levels.

Corporate adoption of SDGs is less often a matter of internal motivation and more often a matter of external pressure to which organizations are subject in their institutional environments. Institutional theory is a robust framework for understanding this process (Rageth et al., 2021; Risi et al., 2023). It emphasizes the role of coercive normative and mimetic pressures that lead firms to conform to extant practices to gain or retain legitimacy. Coercive pressure is also a result of legal and regulatory requirements, which may include national laws and stock exchange listing rules requiring sustainability disclosures. Historically, the most stringent environmental regulations are those set by authorities. Normative pressure comes from professional standards, global expectations, and stakeholder demands, particularly international investors and civil society organizations advocating for environmental, social, and governance ESG compliance. Mimetic pressure arises when firms imitate industry leaders or peers to lower their level of uncertainty and build their reputational position. In Indonesia, these institutional forces interact in complex ways, affecting the depth and breadth of SDG integration across different types of mining companies. This is important for understanding SDG adoption dynamics and determining whether it is a sincere commitment or symbolic compliance.

The heterogeneity of mining firms in Indonesia further adds to the complexity of the country's SDG implementation. State-owned entities SOEs have dual mandates to deliver commercial success while also delivering public policy goals, which often means responsiveness to public policy and regulatory mandates from the government and public accountability requirements. On the other hand, multinational corporations (MNCs) are embedded in global value chains and subject to stringent ESG expectations from international investors' stock exchanges and sustainability rating agencies (Bantekas, 2024; Das, 2024). Domestic private firms display a great deal of variance depending on their size, market orientation, and ownership structure, with larger listed companies generally showing more proactive sustainability practices than their smaller non-listed counterparts. This diversity indicates that institutional pressures do not operate similarly for all firms, and are mediated by organizational features and positioning. Consequently, a comparative analysis between ownership types is needed to reveal patterns in SDG adoption and the underlying institutional drivers. This approach transcends the monolithic approach to corporate sustainability and instead sees the complex dialectic between external demands and internal capacity, which is essential for developing specific policy interventions and investor approaches aimed at building substantive as opposed to performative sustainability.

Despite the growing prevalence of sustainability reporting in Indonesia, most studies in this area have examined the quality of such disclosures or the role of corporate governance mechanisms. Few studies systematically investigated how institutional pressures affect the adoption of SDGs in high-impact sectors such as mining (Berrone et al., 2023; Gold et al., 2022). Existing literature tends to approach sustainability reporting as an end in and of itself without exploring strategic motivation and the institutional context to understand reporting content and scope (Andrades et al., 2025; Mahmood & Uddin, 2021). Moreover, limited empirical work compares SDG integration across SOEs, domestic private firms, and MNCs using primary data from sustainability reports (Fourati et al., 2025). This gap is significant because the environmental footprint and social implications of the mining sector make this sector a critical place to test the efficacy of institutional pressures to get the industry to show meaningful sustainability outcomes. Without this granular analysis, policymakers, investors, and civil society can easily be misled into thinking that symbolic gestures are progressing towards the 2030 Agenda. Therefore, this research aims to address this gap by examining the structures of different institutional logics in how Indonesian mining companies have adopted SDGs. The findings intend to contribute theoretically by enhancing institutional theory in emerging market contexts and providing information for more effective sustainability governance.

The global sustainability agenda has increasingly focused on SDGs as a common language for corporate responsibility and impact measurement. Herein, extractive industries, such as mining integration with SDGs, provide a way to bring together resource exploitation with long-term ecological balance and community well-being. The release of international frameworks, such as the Global Reporting Initiative GRI and the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), has led to the inclusion of SDG indicators so that companies can map their activities against global goals (Abhayawansa & Adams, 2022; Ngo et al., 2023). In the meantime, international investors are incorporating ESG criteria into capital allocation decisions, which is increasing normative pressure on companies to show that they are SDG-aligned. This trend is especially true for MNCs that rely on their sustainability credentials to access international capital markets. Even in emerging economies such as Indonesia, the knock-on effects of global ESG expectations are apparent as domestic companies with foreign ties or publicly listed companies adjust their practices in response to investor demands. Thus, the SDGs provide a moral compass and a strategic tool for ensuring competitiveness and legitimacy in a world economy where sustainability is becoming very important.

In Indonesia, the regulatory environment has changed to strengthen corporate accountability regarding environmental and social performance. The turning point was the enactment of the OJK Regulation No. 51/2017, which states that public companies and financial institutions must publish annual sustainability reports based on international standards (Adhariani & Du Toit, 2020; Nastiti & Bayangkara, 2024). This regulatory change is a clear example of coercive institutional pressure that induces firms to formalize their sustainability commitments. Furthermore, the Mineral and Coal Mining Law UU Minerba stipulates mining post-effects and community development, which ties sustainability into laws. While these regulations have increased the area of sustainability reporting, they do not necessarily guarantee the depth and authenticity of SDG integration. Some firms may achieve the bare minimum by producing narrative reports without measurable targets or strategic alignment. Others may use the regulatory baseline as a springboard for more ambitious sustainability efforts brought on by normative or mimetic pressures. The diversity of responses points to the need to look beyond mere reporting of the SDGs and companies' efforts to embed these goals into their core business strategies.

Ownership structure emerges as a crucial moderator in translating institutional pressures into adopting SDGs. SOEs such as ANTAM, PTBA, and Timah are naturally susceptible to government direction and public scrutiny, increasing the power of coercive pressures. Their reporting tends to focus on national development priorities such as energy transition, job creation, and environmental rehabilitation, reflecting their role as an instrument of state policy. In contrast, the MNCs such as Freeport Indonesia and Vale Indonesia are more sensitive to global ESG benchmarks and investor expectations, which increases normative pressure and causes broader and more systematic SDG integration. Domestic private firms are in the middle, where the power of institutional pressures varies with their connections with capital markets and international networks. Listed companies such as Adaro and ITM have higher responsiveness to investor demand. In contrast, smaller non-listed firms such as CITA and Berau limit their efforts to local community programs and regulatory compliance. This range of responses demonstrates how institutional isomorphism works differently in each type of organization, depending on each organization's strategic dependence and stakeholder configuration. Understanding these differences is critical in developing policies that promote greater involvement in sustainability's deep work in the entire sector.

Given its cross-cutting influence, the role of capital markets as an avenue for normative pressure deserves special attention. Even companies not publicly traded on stock exchanges often operate under the umbrella of parent companies that are publicly traded or major shareholders subject to ESG scrutiny. This indirect connection causes a ripple effect in filtering sustainability requirements through corporate and supply chains. For instance, Archi Indonesia's ownership of MSM and TTN means that the latter has been able to implement progressive practices, such as gender equality SDG 5 and multi-stakeholder partnerships SDG 17, which are uncommon among domestic miners. Similarly, KPC's affiliation with Bumi Resources makes it open to investor expectations beyond simply complying with regulations. This dynamic implies that affiliation in the capital market is a potent institutional filter that amplifies global sustainability norms even in non-listed subsidiaries. Consequently, the border between coercive and normative pressures becomes blurred because regulatory mandates and market expectations contribute to corporate behavior. Understanding this interplay is essential to anticipate how sustainability practices will change as Indonesia's financial markets deepen and become more integrated with the systems in the rest of the world.

METHOD

The methodological approach centers on a systematic content analysis of publicly available sustainability and annual reports issued between 2021 and 2023. This timeframe ensures relevance to current regulatory and market expectations, while capturing post-pandemic sustainability priorities. The sample comprises 11 mining firms purposively selected to represent three distinct ownership categories: state-owned enterprises (SOEs), multinational corporations (MNCs), and domestic private firms. Inclusion criteria required consistent publication of sustainability disclosures accessible via official corporate websites and active operational status during the study period. Data collection follows a documentation technique in which primary documents are downloaded and cross-verified for completeness and authenticity.

The analytical framework operationalizes the 17 SDGs as a priori categories, enabling the systematic mapping of disclosed initiatives to specific goals. Institutional pressure was concurrently identified and classified according to DiMaggio and Powell's typology. Coercive pressures are linked to national regulations, such as OJK Regulation No. 51/POJK-03/2017, and the Mineral and Coal Mining Law, inferred from references to global standards, including GRI ISO 26000. ESG investor expectations and mimetic pressures are deduced from the evidence of benchmarking or alignment with industry peers. A comparative analysis is conducted across ownership types to discern patterns in the SDG coverage depth of integration and dominant institutional drivers. To ensure methodological rigor, triangulation is applied by cross-referencing findings with secondary sources, including academic literature, regulatory texts, and international sustainability guidelines. Although this study relies exclusively on secondary documentary data, this approach is well established in institutional and sustainability research, where corporate disclosures serve as legitimate proxies for organizational behavior and strategic orientation. The limitations inherent to document-based analysis, such as potential reporting bias, are acknowledged yet mitigated through systematic coding and contextual interpretation within Indonesia's institutional landscape.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

The data reflect the scope of adoption of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) and the dominant forms of institutional pressure, coercive, normative, and mimetic, that shape sustainability disclosure practices across ownership types. This tabular synthesis is grounded in systematic content analysis of publicly available corporate reports and aligned with established theoretical frameworks from high-quality academic sources.

Table SDG Adoption Patterns and Institutional Pressures among Indonesian Mining Companies

Company Category	Sampel Companies	No of SDGs	Dominant SDGs	Dominant Institutional	Notable Characteristics
Multinational	PT Freeport Indonesia, PT Vale Indonesia Tbk	15–16	3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17	Normative (global ESG standards, Paris Agreement, international investor expectations)	Strongest and most strategic SDG integration; emphasis on community development and climate action
State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs)	ANTAM, PTBA, Timah	10–12	7, 8, 12, 13, 15	Coercive (national regulations, OJK reporting mandate), Normative (public legitimacy)	Moderate adoption driven by compliance and public accountability; emerging focus on energy transition

Large Domestic Private Firms	Adaro, ITM	9–11	3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15	Coercive (investor pressure, capital market affiliation)	+	Progressive compared to peers; beginning to integrate global sustainability issues
Mid-Sized Domestic Private Firms	KPC, Berau, CITA	–9	3, 4, 8, 12, 15	Coercive (regulatory compliance), Mimetic (benchmarking SOEs)		CSR-oriented; limited strategic integration; risk of symbolic disclosure
Special Case (Archi Subsidiaries)	MSM/TTN (Archi Indonesia)	–10	3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 15, 17	Coercive (listed parent company)	+	Standout focus onSDG 5(gender equality) andSDG 17(partnerships), uncommon among coal miners

This is derived from a systematic content analysis of sustainability and annual reports (2021–2023) issued by 11 Indonesian mining companies categorized into three ownership types: state-owned enterprises (SOEs), multinational corporations (MNCs), and domestic private firms. The number of SDGs adopted reflects explicit references to the United Nations' 17 Sustainable Development Goals in official corporate disclosures. Institutional pressure is classified according to DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) typology:

- Coercive pressure stems from binding national regulations, notably OJK Regulation No. 51/POJK.03/2017 and the Mineral and Coal Mining Law (UU Minerba).
- Normative pressure arises from global ESG expectations, adherence to international standards (e.g., GRI, ISO 26000), and investor demands, particularly pronounced among firms linked to capital markets (Ding & Wang, 2025).
- Mimetic pressure is observed when firms emulate industry leaders to manage uncertainty and enhance legitimacy.

The data reveal a clear hierarchy in SDG adoption depth: MNCs demonstrate the broadest and most substantive integration, SOEs exhibit moderate and regulation-driven adoption, while domestic private firms show wide variation, ranging from selective CSR-based disclosures to more strategic engagement, primarily when affiliated with publicly listed parents. Notably, even non-listed subsidiaries (e.g., MSM/TTN and KPC) are influenced by normative pressures transmitted through their listed parent companies, underscoring the pervasive role of capital markets as a cross-cutting institutional force.

DISCUSSION

. The results of this study show a nuanced and structured pattern in Indonesian mining companies' adoption of sustainable development goals (SDGs), which comprises decision-making processes in response to institutional pressures and the moderate role of ownership structures. Drawing on institutional theory, the present analysis shows that coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures function differently in three types of firms: multinational corporations, state-owned enterprises, and domestic private firms. These pressures are not independent of one another; instead, they interact in such a way as to shape both the scope and intensity of the SDG integration.

A. Multinational Corporations: Normative Pressure as the Source of Substantive Integration

Multinational corporations, including PT Freeport Indonesia and PT Vale Indonesia Tbk, have the most complete adoption of the SDGs, with 15 to 16 out of 17 goals. This massive integration is driven mainly by normative pressure from global capital markets, international environmental agreements, and the transnational standards for sustainability. As subsidiaries of international mining conglomerates Freeport McMoRan and Vale S.A., respectively, these companies are part of international value chains in which ESG performance is a precondition for business access to markets, investor trust, and reputational legitimacy. The Paris Agreement, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards, and ISO 26000 are not only reporting frameworks but also institutionalized expectations that influence corporate strategy. As a result, their sustainability reporting is more than just compliance with reporting, and expresses strategic roadmaps, such as Vale's net zero emission target by 2050 or Freeport's community development programs

in Papua, which are directly linked to SDGs 3, 4, 6, 9, and 17. The alignment is substantive rather than symbolic, as it is actively measured against global standards, and civil society organizations and investors closely monitor performance. Such expectations have potential consequences in divestment, legal investigation, and reputational damage. Thus, normative pressure has emerged as a potent force that forces SDGs to be central business imperatives that must be internalized by multinational companies rather than as marginal CSR activities.

In contrast, state-owned firms (BUMN), such as ANTAM, PTBA, and Timah, show average SDG uptake with five to 12 goals. Their main institutional driver is coercive pressure from national regulations, including OJK Regulation No. 51/POJK.03/2017 and the Mineral and Coal Mining Law (UU Minerba). These requirements include sustainability reports and post-mining land reclamation by public companies and mining operators. Compliance with these rules is non-negotiable since BUMNs are state policy tools subject to high public and political scrutiny. As a result, their SDG disclosures reflect national priorities, including energy transition (SDG 7), climate action (SDG 13), and terrestrial ecosystem rehabilitation (SDG 15). They result from regulatory requirements and the state's developmental priorities. However, in contrast to multinationals, BUMNs exhibit low-level interactions with goals of global relevance, such as gender equality (SDG 5) or life below water (SDG 14), indicating that the sustainability agenda of the latter is still rooted in domestic legitimacy, as opposed to global norm diffusion. The dual mandate of BUMN (as a commercial entity and public service provider) generates a hybrid motivation. SDG adoption is both a matter of regulatory compliance and a source of political legitimacy. This results in fairly uniform but strategic integration, focusing on operational and environmental goals rather than social equity or global partnership dimensions (Donnini & Sacco, 2024; Schriger et al., 2021; Whitelock, 2019).

B. Domestic Private Firms: Piecemeal responses and the ghost of symbolic adoption

Domestic private firms show the most extensive range in selecting SDGs, with six to 11 goals. This heterogeneity can best be explained regarding market affiliations and investor exposure. Large listed companies, such as Adaro and ITM, implement nine to eleven SDGs due to coercive pressure from OJK regulations and normative pressure from capital market expectations. Public companies are exposed to investor pressure to be transparent in their ESG policy, which motivates them to invest in renewable energy and make climate-related commitments. However, this is more often about operational efficiency than systemic change. Their reports increasingly refer to SDGs 7 and 13, indicating a shift toward strategic sustainability and away from a focus on CSR in specific locations. In contrast, mid-sized firms, such as CITA and Berau Coal, have only adopted six to eight SDGs, and they are mainly focused on community-based programs, such as education (SDG 4), health (SDG 3), and local economic empowerment (SDG 8). These efforts are more like traditional CSR than the strategic integration of SDGs. They are driven to a large degree by coercive regulation requirements and mimesis to follow industry leaders. Their announcements are not standards-based, long-term, or accompanied by measurable targets but represent a symbolic rather than substantive effort. This pattern is consistent with the institutional theory's prediction that firms with high uncertainty levels and low resource capacity levels are likely to adopt isomorphic practices superficially for legitimacy purposes without modifying core operations.

An example that stands out in the domestic private sector is MSM and TTN (owned by Archi Indonesia Tbk), which adopts nine to ten SDGs, with a unique focus on gender equality (SDG 5) and partnerships (SDG 17). This anomaly can be explained by the fact that Archi is a publicly listed gold producer with ESG-conscious institutional shareholders. The normative pressure channeled through this ownership structure leads subsidiaries to consider the social dimensions of sustainability that are usually not present in coal-focused firms. This case highlights how indirect market affiliation can also affect non-listed operating subsidiaries, resulting in the multiplication of normative pressure, broadening the scope of SDG adoption beyond sectoral or size-based expectations. It also highlights that institutional pressures are complexly transmitted through ownership structures and corporate hierarchies.

C. Capital Markets as a Normative Cross-Cutting Force

Cross-cutting all ownership categories is the pervasiveness of capital markets as a source of normative pressure. Firms not directly listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI), such as KPC, Freeport Indonesia, and MSM/TTN, are embedded in ownership structures that link them to public markets. KPC is a subsidiary of Bumi Resources Tbk, a listed holding company. In contrast, Freeport Indonesia is a joint venture between MIND ID (a state holding) and Freeport McMoRan (listed on the NYSE). This indirect affiliation ensures that the normative

expectations of global and domestic investors trickle down corporate hierarchies, affecting how sustainability practices are practiced at the operational level. The data corroborate that no sampled firm operates in isolation from the logic of capital markets. This finding, which contradicts the traditional dichotomy between listed and non-listed firms, conceives market affiliation (directly or indirectly) as a key institutional filter. This contributes to the view that normative pressure from financial markets can cut across national regulatory boundaries and bring about more significant sustainability impacts than repressive mandates in shaping the policies of emerging economies.

SDG adoption has a more explicit thematic focus, which sheds light on the logic of institutionality (Breitmeier et al., 2021; Carmagnac et al., 2024). The embeddedness of transnational networks manifests in the centrality of globally resonant issues such as clean energy, climate action, biodiversity, and multi-stakeholder partnerships in multinational companies. BUMNs focus on country-defined priorities, such as energy transition, responsible consumption, and post-mining rehabilitation, which align with Indonesia's decarbonization agenda and legal commitments. Domestic private organizations, particularly smaller ones, focus on local issues such as village schools, health clinics, and micro-enterprise support. These are important to immediate community relations but have little strategic connection to larger sustainability frameworks. This divergence spatializes institutional pressures that direct corporate attention to different spatial scales (global, national, or local), depending on where the firm has its primary sources of legitimacy.

The threat of greenwashing is also not evenly distributed among the ownership types. Multinationals are held to the most significant accountability because of their exposure to the scrutiny of the global media, non-governmental organizations, and investor due diligence; therefore, symbolic disclosure is costly and unsustainable. Therefore, their integration of SDGs is more likely to be substantive with quantifiable targets, third-party verification, and long-term commitments (Lashitew, 2021; Lyytimäki et al., 2023). BUMNs operate in a gray zone where a certain level of regulation compliance is a starting point for legitimacy, but this may be weakened by political considerations around implementation. Their reports are detailed, but sometimes vague at the outcome level, which suggests that they are a mixture of substantive and symbolic elements. Domestic private companies (especially non-listed, mid-sized companies) are most vulnerable to greenwashing: companies that are often not required to produce disclosures that are not subject to external validation, and only the disclosures are made to meet the minimum requirements of the regulations. Their CSR-style narratives often do not have a measurable impact or strategic realignment.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings develop an institutional theory in the context of emerging economies. While DiMaggio and Powell's original framework holds that isomorphism brings about uniformity, this study reveals that institutional pressures bring about structured variation rather than homogeneity. The nature and level of pressure vary depending on ownership, leading to different adoption patterns. Moreover, the study shows that normative pressure from capital markets can be more potent than coercive pressure from the state for driving substantive sustainability, a less apparent dynamic in more developed institutional environments. This questions the presumption that regulatory mandates are the major drivers of corporate sustainability in developing countries, and points out the emerging role of financial markets as transnational norm entrepreneurs.

These findings have several important practical implications. The findings also imply that while coercive pressure is required in situations of SDG deep integration, it is not sufficient. In the future, regulatory measures should go beyond voluntary reporting to mandatory performance standards, science-based targets, and third-party verification to prevent token compliance. In addition, aligning national standards to global standards such as the ISSB or TCFD would minimize reporting fragmentation and maximize comparability. The data confirm domestic and international investors' positions as essential agents of normative pressure. By asking for granular, ESG-related data and penalizing meaningless disclosure, firms can incentivize them to shift from CSR to strategic sustainability. Focused capital investment in companies making real progress in SDGs 7 and 13 could help accelerate Indonesia's energy transition. The message for companies is clear: SDG integration must go beyond narrative disclosure and be integrated into the core strategy, governance, and performance metrics. Firms that proactively align with global norms will benefit from their competitive advantage in attracting investment, securing social licenses, and providing future proof of their operations.

The adoption of SDGs in the mining sector in Indonesia is not random and homogenous, but rather a well-structured process of institutional forces filtered through ownership and market position. Multinationals are in the

vanguard by global norm alignment, middle BUMNs are in the middle ground because of regulation compliance, and at the bottom, domestic firms differ depending on investor exposure and mimetic behavior. The capital market is revealed as the binding factor - a crosscutting normative influence that increasingly determines the legitimacy of sustainability. The dynamic reveals how global agendas about sustainability are being localized through institutional processes that are coercive, normative, and mimetic simultaneously. This leads to a graded and layered landscape of SDG adoption, in which the depth and authenticity of adoption are strongly related to exposure to the international structures of capital and accountability. This institutional architecture will likely strengthen as Indonesia continues to deepen its sustainability commitments. SDG integration will stop being a voluntary organizational choice, but a strategic imperative for all companies seeking to be sustainable in an increasingly changing global economy.

CONCLUSION

Multinational corporations, such as PT Freeport Indonesia and PT Vale Indonesia Tbk, show the best and most substantive integration of SDGs related to goals 15 to 16 of 17. This pattern is driven mainly by normative pressure from global ESG standards, investor expectations, and international sustainability frameworks. In comparison, SOEs like ANTAM, PTBA, and Timah have been found to have moderate adoption (an average of ten to 12 SDGs), where coercive pressure was provided by institutional instruments such as OJK Regulation No. 51/POJK-03/2017 and the Mineral and Coal Mining Law as the primary institutional drivers. Domestic private firms show the broadest play of between six and eleven SDGs, with larger listed entities, such as Adaro and ITM, demonstrating progressive tendencies, given that the scrutiny of investors and mid-sized firms, such as CITA and Berau, is selective and often symbolic in their approach. A critical cross-cutting finding is that affiliation with capital markets, directly or indirectly through parent companies, always acts as a source of normative pressure. SDG adoption is pushed beyond compliance with regulations. This dynamic makes the capital market a unifying institutional mechanism above the ownership categories. The research confirms that, in emerging economies, normative pressure from financial markets can overcome coercive regulatory mandates to encourage substantive sustainability integration. As a result, the mining sector in Indonesia shows a stratified situation in which depth, authenticity, and strategic congruence are significantly related to exposure to accountability structures globally. This insight touches on the fact that sustainability is increasingly becoming a strategic imperative and not a discretionary choice for firms seeking long-term legitimacy and competitiveness in a globalized economy.

REFERENCE

- Abhayawansa, S., & Adams, C. (2022). Towards a conceptual framework for non-financial reporting inclusive of pandemic and climate risk reporting. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 30(3), 710–738.
- Adhariani, D., & Du Toit, E. (2020). Readability of sustainability reports: evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 10(4), 621–636.
- Andrades, J., Martinez-Martinez, D., & Larrán, M. (2025). Sustainability reporting, institutional pressures and universities: evidence from the Spanish setting. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 16(4), 1045–1071.
- Bantekas, I. (2024). Multinational Business Entities and their Role in the Global Environmental, Social, and Governance Architecture. *Minn. J. Int'l L.*, 33, 49.
- Berrone, P., Rousseau, H. E., Ricart, J. E., Brito, E., & Giuliadori, A. (2023). How can research contribute to the implementation of sustainable development goals? An interpretive review of SDG literature in management. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(2), 318–339.
- Breitmeier, H., Schwindenhammer, S., Checa, A., Manderbach, J., & Tanzer, M. (2021). Aligned sustainability understandings? Global inter-institutional arrangements and the implementation of SDG 2. *Politics and Governance*, 9(1), 141–151.
- Carmagnac, L., Silva, M. E., & Fritz, M. M. C. (2024). Exploring sustainable development goals adoption in supply chain management: A typology of coexisting institutional logics. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 33(4), 3463–3479.

- Das, A. (2024). Predictive value of supply chain sustainability initiatives for ESG performance: a study of large multinationals. *Multinational Business Review*, 32(1), 20–40.
- Ding, H., & Wang, Z. (2025). The Influence of Institutional Pressures on Environmental, Social, and Governance Responsibility Fulfillment: Insights from Chinese Listed Firms. *Sustainability*, 17(9), 3982.
- Donnini, C., & Sacco, A. (2024). Social equity in international environmental agreements. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 90(1), 261–291.
- Fourati, A., Zenaidi, A., & Jeriji, M. (2025). Like Parent, Like Subsidiary? On the Diffusion of Sustainability Reporting in Multinational Companies. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 32(3), 3210–3226.
- Gold, N. O., Taib, F. M., & Ma, Y. (2022). Firm-level attributes, industry-specific factors, stakeholder pressure, and country-level attributes: global evidence of what inspires corporate sustainability practices and performance. *Sustainability*, 14(20), 13222.
- Ike, M., Donovan, J. D., Topple, C., & Masli, E. K. (2019). The process of selecting and prioritising corporate sustainability issues: Insights for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 236, 117661.
- Khaled, R., Ali, H., & Mohamed, E. K. A. (2021). The Sustainable Development Goals and corporate sustainability performance: Mapping, extent and determinants. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 311, 127599.
- Küçükgül, E., Cerin, P., & Liu, Y. (2022). Enhancing the value of corporate sustainability: An approach for aligning multiple SDGs guides on reporting. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 333, 130005.
- Lashitew, A. A. (2021). Corporate uptake of the Sustainable Development Goals: Mere greenwashing or an advent of institutional change? *Journal of International Business Policy*, 4(1), 184–200.
- Lyytimäki, J., Eckert, N., Lepenies, R., Mosoni, C., Mustajoki, J., & Pedersen, A. B. (2023). Assuming accuracy, pretending influence? Risks of measuring, monitoring and reporting sustainable development goals. *Ambio*, 52(4), 702–710.
- Mahmood, Z., & Uddin, S. (2021). Institutional logics and practice variations in sustainability reporting: evidence from an emerging field. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 34(5), 1163–1189.
- Nastiti, K., & Bayangkara, I. B. K. (2024). PENYUSUNAN LAPORAN KEBERLANJUTAN BERDASARKAN PERATURAN OTORITAS JASA KEUANGAN NO. 51 TAHUN 2017 PADA PT. BPR SURYA ARTHA UTAMA PERSERODA SURABAYA. *GOVERNANCE: Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Politik Lokal Dan Pembangunan*, 11(1).
- Ngo, T., Le, T., Ullah, S., & Trinh, H. H. (2023). Climate risk disclosures and global sustainability initiatives: A conceptual analysis and agenda for future research. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 32(6), 3705–3720.
- Putri, I. G. A. M. A. D., Sari, K., Hasibuan, H. T., Ardiana, P. A., Yanthi, K. D. L., Pradnyani, N. W. A., & Sujana, N. W. K. J. P. (2025). Institutional dynamics and environmental disclosures: insights from Indonesia's energy sector. *Pacific Accounting Review*.
- Rageth, L., Caves, K. M., & Renold, U. (2021). Operationalizing institutions: a theoretical framework and methodological approach for assessing the robustness of social institutions. *International Review of Sociology*, 31(3), 507–535.
- Risi, D., Vigneau, L., Bohn, S., & Wickert, C. (2023). Institutional theory-based research on corporate social responsibility: Bringing values back in. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(1), 3–23.
- Schriger, S. H., Binagwaho, A., Keetile, M., Kerry, V., Mubiligi, J. M., Ramogola-Masire, D., Roland, M., Barg, F. K., & Cancedda, C. (2021). Hierarchy of qualities in global health partnerships: a path towards equity and sustainability. *BMJ Global Health*, 6(12).
- Whitelock, V. G. (2019). Multidimensional environmental social governance sustainability framework: Integration, using a purchasing, operations, and supply chain management context. *Sustainable Development*, 27(5), 923–931.