

CREATIVE ACCOUNTING AS A MANAGERIAL TOOL: STRATEGIC USE, RISKS, AND REGULATORY CHALLENGES

Maria Mitsou

Department of finance and accountability, SWU “Neofit Rilski” Bulgaria, mary_mit@hotmail.com

Abstract: This paper examines how digital transformation reshapes creative accounting practices by simultaneously strengthening monitoring capacity and creating new opportunities for manipulation within increasingly automated financial reporting environments. The purpose is to synthesize contemporary academic and professional literature on the interaction between advanced data analytics, continuous auditing, enterprise information systems, and emerging “fraud windows” that arise from complexity, speed, and interconnectivity in digital accounting infrastructures. Methodologically, the study adopts a structured literature review approach. The reviewed evidence indicates three main results: first, the diffusion of integrated enterprise resource planning systems, electronic invoicing, and platform-based workflows expands transaction traceability, thereby improving anomaly detection and strengthening the evidentiary base for assurance; second, organizations increasingly deploy audit analytics and continuous auditing techniques that shift assurance from periodic sampling to more frequent, risk-oriented testing, which can reduce traditional accrual-based manipulation that depends on low visibility and limited verification; third, despite these advances, digital transformation generates new risk channels, including manipulation of master data, exploitation of access controls and privileged accounts, automated posting rules that embed biased assumptions, intentional segmentation of transactions across systems, and governance gaps in algorithmic decision processes. In combination, these mechanisms suggest that creative accounting is not eliminated but rather reconfigured, with opportunistic actors moving from overt journal entry adjustments toward subtler forms of data and process manipulation that may evade conventional audit routines if information technology governance is weak. The conclusions emphasize that technology is an ambiguous control instrument: it enhances transparency when well governed, yet heightens vulnerability when accountability, segregation of duties, and model oversight lag behind system sophistication. Recommendations propose strengthening information technology general controls, instituting robust data governance and audit trails for master data changes, expanding auditor competencies in information systems and analytics, and aligning continuous auditing with clear escalation protocols and human review to mitigate automation bias.

Keywords: creative accounting, digital transformation, continuous auditing, audit analytics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation is reshaping the architecture of financial reporting by embedding accounting processes within integrated enterprise resource planning platforms, automated workflows, and increasingly data-rich ecosystems. In this environment, managerial discretion does not disappear; rather, it is exercised through new levers that sit “upstream” of the general ledger, such as master data governance, automated posting logic, access rights, and the configuration of system interfaces. This shift is central to contemporary debates on creative accounting, understood here as the strategic shaping of accounting outputs (and the underlying processes that produce them) to influence stakeholders’ perceptions while remaining within, or close to, formal compliance boundaries. As organizations accelerate automation, the conditions that historically enabled earnings management and concealment, as limited transparency, periodic controls, and sampling-based assurance, are partially replaced by continuous digital traceability. At the same time, complexity and speed create fresh vulnerabilities: a single misconfigured rule, a privileged account, or a compromised data pipeline can have scalable effects across transactions and reporting periods (Lee et al., 2022; Wang & Vasarhelyi, 2024).

The audit profession is responding by expanding the use of audit data analytics and moving toward continuous or near-continuous assurance models. Continuous auditing is commonly framed as providing assurance “virtually simultaneously with, or shortly after” the underlying events, thereby narrowing the temporal gap between economic activity and verification (Chiu et al., 2014). This orientation aligns with the broader transition from periodic, sample-based approaches toward technology-enabled procedures that can interrogate large volumes of structured data, identify anomalies, and support more granular risk assessment. Research highlights that big data and analytics can transform the modern audit engagement by enabling broader testing coverage and new forms of evidence, while also raising questions about data reliability, relevance, and the auditor’s ability to interpret complex analytic outputs (Appelbaum et al., 2017). Standard setters and professional bodies similarly recognize both the opportunities and implementation challenges associated with using data analytics in financial statement audits, including issues of

expectations-setting, documentation, and professional judgment in technologically advanced engagements (IAASB, 2016; AUASB, 2020).

However, the same technological infrastructure that strengthens detection can open what may be described as “new fraud windows”: opportunities to manipulate reporting indirectly by influencing the systems that generate accounting records rather than merely adjusting end-of-period journal entries. Empirical and practice-oriented literature suggests that continuous auditing and monitoring can improve timeliness and responsiveness, yet successful implementation depends on robust control environments and organizational readiness, including clear governance over data, processes, and exception handling (Hardy & Artinger, 2015). From a fraud-risk perspective, contemporary evidence also indicates that occupational fraud remains widespread and increasingly confronted through technology and analytics, reinforcing the strategic importance of integrating analytic capabilities with strong prevention and oversight mechanisms (ACFE, 2024). These developments motivate a careful re-examination of creative accounting in the digital era: not only whether analytics and continuous auditing reduce manipulation, but also how manipulation adapts to the digital control landscape (Cao et al., 2022).

Accordingly, the objective of this paper is to provide focused background for a literature review that investigates the intersection of creative accounting and digital transformation, emphasizing three linked problem areas: (1) how audit analytics and continuous auditing alter the detectability and costs of traditional manipulation; (2) how automation, system integration, and data governance weaknesses enable new forms of process- and data-level manipulation; and (3) what control and assurance implications follow for auditors, managers, and regulators. By clarifying these issues, the introduction sets the foundation for evaluating how digitalization reconfigures the mechanisms of creative accounting and the capabilities required to mitigate technology-enabled misstatement and fraud risk in contemporary organizations.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study used a structured literature review design to synthesize contemporary knowledge on how digital transformation influences creative accounting through audit analytics, continuous auditing, and technology-enabled “fraud windows.” (Snyder, 2019). Although the paper is not positioned as a full systematic review, core elements of systematic review logic (planning, searching, screening, and synthesis) were adopted to strengthen rigor and reduce selection bias (Tranfield et al., 2003; Petticrew & Roberts, 2006). The materials consisted of peer-reviewed journal articles and authoritative practitioner or standard-setting documents relevant to: (a) creative accounting and earnings management mechanisms; (b) audit data analytics and continuous auditing; (c) digital transformation in accounting information systems; and (d) fraud risk and internal control implications in automated environments. Searches were conducted in multidisciplinary and business-focused databases (for example, Scopus and Web of Science) and supplemented with targeted searches in publisher platforms for accounting and information systems journals. A keyword-based search protocol was implemented using combinations of terms across four concept clusters: (1) “creative accounting” OR “financial statement manipulation”; (2) “digital transformation” OR “enterprise resource planning” OR “accounting information systems” (3) “audit analytics” OR “continuous auditing” OR and (4) “fraud risk” OR “internal control”.

Inclusion criteria were: (a) English-language publications; (b) substantive focus on at least two of the following intersections: creative accounting/earnings management, digital accounting infrastructures, audit analytics/continuous auditing, or fraud/control implications; (c) peer-reviewed articles, or high-authority practitioner/standard-setting outputs; and (d) primarily contemporary evidence, with priority given to work published from 2014 onward to reflect rapid technological change, while allowing older foundational sources for continuous auditing concepts where necessary. Exclusion criteria included: studies focused solely on technical computer science topics without clear accounting/audit relevance; opinion pieces without clear methodological grounding; and duplicates across databases. (Tranfield et al., 2003). Themes were then consolidated into a conceptual map showing how digital transformation can both constrain and reconfigure creative accounting depending on control maturity and analytic capability. This method supports reproducibility by making the logic of categorization explicit and allowing a competent reviewer to reapply the same coding scheme to an equivalent body of literature (Snyder, 2019; Petticrew & Roberts, 2006).

3. RESULTS

Across studies on audit technology and continuous assurance, financial reporting was increasingly portrayed as the output of configured information infrastructures rather than isolated accounting decisions, meaning that manipulation opportunities often shifted to data definitions, automated rules, and interface controls. In this context, the evidence suggested that the traditional boundary between accounting choices and information technology

governance became less distinct, because reporting outcomes depended heavily on system configuration and data integrity.

The results indicated that audit data analytics and continuous auditing expanded the potential scope and timeliness of assurance. Conceptual and review work reported that analytics-enabled engagements increasingly moved beyond small samples and periodic testing, enabling broader coverage of transaction populations and more frequent exception identification (Appelbaum et al., 2017; IAASB, 2016). The continuous auditing literature also described a long-term transition toward more automated, near-real-time assurance cycles, with research mapping the field's development and identifying core streams focused on continuous controls monitoring, continuous data assurance, and exception management (Chiu et al., 2014; Chan & Vasarhelyi, 2011). Overall, the literature converged on the finding that digital traceability and analytics strengthened detection capacity, particularly for patterned anomalies and rule-based irregularities that could be flagged repeatedly as data refreshed (IAASB, 2016; Chiu et al., 2014).

Additionally, the synthesis showed that technology did not remove creative accounting pressures but frequently displaced them into less visible channels. Rather than relying solely on discretionary accrual estimates or late journal entries, manipulation was often conceptualized as operating through (a) master data changes (for example, vendor or customer records, pricing conditions, tax codes), (b) access control abuse (privileged accounts, weak segregation of duties), and (c) automated posting logic that embedded biased assumptions or selectively triggered classifications. Continuous auditing research emphasized that automated tests and exception workflows could detect many irregularities, but effectiveness depended on the quality of the underlying data and on governance structures that ensured exceptions were investigated rather than normalized (Chan & Vasarhelyi, 2011; Chiu et al., 2014). In practice-oriented accounts of continuous auditing implementation, results highlighted that organizations achieved high-frequency automated testing and operational value, yet they also faced challenges around data standardization, rule maintenance, and organizational responsiveness to alerts, which could become failure points if escalation protocols were weak (Hardy & Laslett, 2015).

Also, the literature consistently reported “new fraud windows” associated with digital scale and interconnectivity. These windows were characterized less by isolated accounting decisions and more by systemic vulnerabilities: weak information technology general controls, insufficient monitoring of configuration changes, and limited oversight of complex data pipelines. The broader fraud evidence base reinforced the practical relevance of these risks, given the continuing global prevalence and material impacts of occupational fraud and the importance of detection mechanisms and control maturity (ACFE, 2024).

Finally, moderators repeatedly emerged as decisive for whether digital transformation constrained or amplified creative accounting. The strongest moderating factors were internal control maturity (especially access management and change control), data governance (ownership, quality controls, and auditability of master data), and the capability of auditors and internal assurance teams to interpret analytics outputs and translate exceptions into investigative action (Appelbaum et al., 2017; IAASB, 2016). These results collectively indicated that the main empirical “gain” from digitalization lay not in eliminating creative accounting, but in altering its techniques and redistributing risk toward system-level vulnerabilities that required integrated accounting, auditing, and information technology controls.

4. DISCUSSIONS

This review indicated that digital transformation did not neutralize creative accounting; it reallocated it. The central interpretive implication was that manipulation opportunities migrated from visible, end-stage financial statement adjustments toward earlier and more technical intervention points embedded in digital processes. In traditional settings, creative accounting could be conceptualized as a set of discretionary choices concentrated around estimates, classifications, and closing entries. In digitally integrated environments, the same strategic intent could be operationalized through configuration choices, data governance decisions, and control circumvention within transaction systems. This shift mattered because it altered both detectability and accountability: when reporting outcomes were shaped by system logic and data structures, the “where” and “who” of manipulation became harder to isolate unless governance responsibilities were clearly assigned.

The findings were significant for assurance because they suggested a dual effect of analytics and continuous auditing. On the one hand, these approaches appeared to tighten the time window in which irregularities could persist undetected and to expand coverage beyond traditional sampling. This strengthened the deterrence capacity of auditing and increased the probability that patterned anomalies would be surfaced. On the other hand, the review implied that analytics-based detection could create a false sense of security if organizations treated technology as a substitute for core control discipline. Continuous testing could flag exceptions, but it could not guarantee integrity when the underlying data were biased, incomplete, or strategically engineered. In that sense, the review supported a

“socio-technical” interpretation: audit technology produced value only when embedded in governance routines that ensured alerts were investigated, responsibilities were enforced, and configuration changes were controlled.

A further implication concerned the nature of the “new fraud windows.” The review suggested that modern fraud risk increasingly reflected scale and interconnectivity. Manipulation could be amplified through privileged access, through subtle changes to master data, or through automation rules that systematically misclassified transactions. These pathways were consequential because they could operate continuously rather than episodically, producing cumulative distortions that looked operationally “normal” in a highly automated environment. This reframed creative accounting as partly a data and process integrity problem rather than only an accounting-policy problem, indicating that effective prevention required tighter integration between accounting expertise, information technology controls, and cybersecurity-aware governance.

For management and audit committees, the discussion implied that oversight needed to expand beyond financial statement review toward monitoring the digital conditions that generated reporting numbers. Strong segregation of duties, disciplined change management, and transparent ownership of master data emerged as foundational. For auditors, the review implied that professional judgment increasingly depended on the ability to evaluate system configurations, interpret analytics outputs, and challenge management’s assumptions embedded in automation. Capacity gaps in these areas likely increased risk, especially in organizations undergoing rapid system changes or adopting new analytic tools without commensurate training and protocols.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This literature-based study concluded that digital transformation has not removed creative accounting behavior but has materially changed its operational form. The most important conclusion is that manipulation risks increasingly arise upstream of the financial statements, within the digital infrastructures that generate and validate accounting data. In integrated and automated environments, discretion is frequently exercised through system configuration choices, master data management, automated posting rules, and the control of access rights, rather than only through late-period accrual adjustments or manual journal entries. As a result, creative accounting in the digital era is more closely linked to data integrity and process governance than to isolated accounting-policy decisions.

A second conclusion is that audit analytics and continuous auditing strengthen the potential for timely detection and broader testing coverage, but their effectiveness is conditional. Where organizations maintain strong information technology general controls, disciplined change management, and clear accountability for data ownership, analytics-supported assurance can narrow detection gaps and increase deterrence. Where these foundations are weak, analytics may identify anomalies without preventing systematic distortions, especially when manipulation is embedded in automated routines that appear operationally legitimate. Thus, technology should be interpreted as an enabling control mechanism rather than a standalone solution.

Third, the study concluded that digitalization creates “new fraud windows” that can scale misstatement risks. These windows are associated with privileged access, weak segregation of duties, poor monitoring of configuration changes, and limited oversight of data pipelines connecting multiple systems. The implication is that the risk profile of creative accounting becomes more complex and potentially more persistent, because system-level manipulations can operate continuously across high transaction volumes and may be difficult to attribute without detailed audit trails and governance documentation.

Overall, the findings imply that modern accounting and auditing practice must integrate financial expertise with information systems oversight. Effective mitigation depends on aligning continuous assurance tools with robust governance routines, investing in analytic competencies, and treating data governance as a core component of financial reporting reliability.

REFERENCES

- Appelbaum, D., Kogan, A., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2017). Big Data and Analytics in the Modern Audit Engagement: Research Needs. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 36, 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-51684>
- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2024). *Occupational fraud 2024: A report to the nations*. ACFE.
- Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2020). *Technology—Audit documentation (Non-authoritative support material)*. AUASB.
- Chan, D. Y., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2011). Innovation and practice of continuous auditing. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 12(2), 152–160.
- Cao, T.; Duh, R.R.; Tan, H.T.; Xu, T. Enhancing Auditors’ Reliance on Data Analytics Under Inspection Risk Using Fixed and Growth Mindsets. *Account. Rev.* **2022**, 97, 131–153
- Chiu, V., Liu, Q., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2014). The development and intellectual structure of continuous auditing research. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 33(1), 37–57. 10.1016/j.acclit.2014.08.001.

-
- Hardy, C. A., & Laslett, G. (2015). Continuous auditing and monitoring in practice: Lessons from Metcash's Business Assurance Group. *Journal of Information Systems*, 29 (2): 183–194. <https://doi.org/10.2308/isy-50969>
- International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2016). *Exploring the growing use of technology in the audit, with a focus on data analytics*. IAASB.
- Lee, H., Zhang, L., Liu, Q., & Vasarhelyi, M. (2022). Text Visual Analysis in Auditing: Data Analytics for Journal Entries Testing. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 46, Article 100571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2022.100571>.
- Sanoran, K., & Ruangprapun, J. (2023). Initial Implementation of Data Analytics and Audit Process Management. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 1766. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15031766>
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470754887>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222.
- Wang, W., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2024). The application of continuous audit and monitoring methodology: A government medication procurement case. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 55, 100713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2024.100713>.