

Financial Reporting, Corporate Governance, and Fraud Prevention: A Contemporary Review

by Jana Publication & Research

Submission date: 13-Sep-2025 12:42PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 2690366929

File name: IJAR-53786.pdf (422.3K)

Word count: 2130

Character count: 12897

6 1 Financial Reporting, Corporate Governance, 2 and Fraud Prevention: A Contemporary Review

3 Abstract

4 Financial reports are fundamental to corporate governance, investor decision-making, and
5 market stability. High-profile accounting scandals over the last two decades have exposed
6 vulnerabilities in financial reporting, undermining stakeholder trust and prompting
7 regulatory reform. This paper reviews the importance of financial reports, analyzes the
8 causes and consequences of financial statement fraud, and examines reforms and tools
9 aimed at improving reporting quality. It incorporates recent developments — including
10 the Wirecard and Luckin Coffee scandals, the Hindenburg–Adani episode, the issuance
11 of ISSB sustainability standards (2023), the EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting
12 Directive (CSRD), and the effective adoption of IFRS 17 — to highlight the evolving risk
13 landscape. The paper concludes with policy recommendations on auditor independence,
14 technology adoption (AI, data analytics, blockchain), and enhanced stakeholder
15 engagement to restore confidence in financial reporting.

16 **Keywords:** Financial reporting, corporate governance, financial statement fraud, audit
17 quality, IFRS, ISSB, CSRD

18 1. Introduction

19
20 Financial reports — including balance sheets, income statements, statements of cash
21 flows, and accompanying notes — provide a structured means of communicating a firm's

22 financial position and performance to stakeholders (Zack, 2012). They underpin capital
23 allocation decisions, inform credit assessments, and serve as inputs for regulatory
24 oversight. However, deliberate misstatements and omissions in financial reports have
25 periodically resulted in catastrophic corporate failures, eroding investor confidence and
26 inflicting broad economic harm.

27 This paper synthesizes academic and practitioner literature on ¹²the role of financial
28 reporting in corporate governance, identifies recurring drivers of accounting fraud
29 (pressure, opportunity, rationalization), and evaluates recent reforms and technological
30 approaches that aim to strengthen reporting reliability. Particular emphasis is given to
31 developments since 2020, when the interplay of pandemic-era pressures, digitalization,
32 and high-profile scandals reshaped the reporting landscape.

33 2. Literature Review

34 2.1 Theoretical foundations

35 The literature on financial reporting and fraud is anchored in a few enduring theoretical
36 frameworks. The Fraud Triangle (Cressey, 1953) posits that fraud is likely when pressure
37 (financial or performance-related), opportunity (weak controls), and rationalization
38 (ethical lapse) co-exist. ⁵Agency Theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) explains how
39 conflicts of interest between managers and shareholders create incentives for earnings
40 manipulation. Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984) expands the accountability lens
41 beyond shareholders to employees, creditors, regulators, and broader society.

42 2.2 Empirical studies on fraud and detection

43 Empirical research has examined predictors of financial statement fraud and the
44 effectiveness of detection models. Models such as the Beneish M-Score, along with
45 newer machine-learning approaches, have been used to flag manipulative earnings
46 behaviour (Erdogan & Erdogan, 2020; Mongwe & Malan, 2020). Studies also highlight
47 the importance of robust corporate governance — board composition, independent audit
48 committees, and external oversight — in reducing fraud risk (Md Nasir & Hashim, 2020).

49 3. Evolution of the Regulatory and Institutional Landscape

50 In response to recurring scandals, jurisdictions worldwide have strengthened legal and
51 institutional frameworks. The United States enacted ¹ the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002),
52 enhancing auditor independence and establishing the Public Company Accounting
53 Oversight Board (PCAOB) for audit oversight. The PCAOB's mandate includes
54 inspections, standard-setting, and enforcement to protect investors (PCAOB, n.d.).

55 In the European Union, recent policy developments have emphasized sustainability and
56 broader stakeholder disclosures. ² The Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive
57 (CSRD) expands the scope of non-financial reporting and aims to standardize ESG
58 disclosures across large companies and listed entities (European Commission, n.d.). ³ The
59 International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), established under the IFRS
60 Foundation, issued initial sustainability disclosure standards in 2023 (IFRS Foundation,
61 2023), marking a step toward globally consistent sustainability-related financial
62 disclosures.

⁷
63 India's Companies Act 2013, and the establishment of the National Financial Reporting
64 Authority (NFRA) reflect similar efforts to bolster audit quality and enforcement. NFRA

65 has been positioned to align Indian auditing oversight with international best practices
66 (Taxmann/NFRA overview, 2025).

67 **4. Case Studies: Recent High-Profile Scandals**

68 **4.1 Wirecard (Germany, 2020)**

69 Wirecard AG, once a darling of the German fintech scene and a DAX-listed firm,
70 collapsed in June 2020 after auditors could not verify €1.9 billion in cash balances. The
71 missing funds were reported as having been ⁴ held in trustee accounts in the Philippines
72 and elsewhere but were later found to be non-existent. Wirecard's failure revealed
73 weaknesses in external audit procedures, regulatory oversight by BaFin, and the risks
74 posed by aggressive growth strategies combined with opaque corporate structures (BBC;
75 Wikipedia; Financial Times investigations).

76 Key lessons from Wirecard include the need for more effective auditor skepticism,
77 multinational audit cooperation, and improved regulatory mechanisms to inspect and
78 challenge complex fintech arrangements (Financial Times; Transparently.ai).

79 **4.2 Luckin Coffee (China/US-listed, 2020)**

80 Luckin Coffee, a China-based coffee chain listed in the US, admitted in 2020 that its
81 management had fabricated significant sales transactions, resulting in an overstatement of
82 revenue of approximately \$190 million. Independent forensic investigations (e.g., FTI
83 Consulting) found that fabricated transactions were initiated in 2019. The scandal
84 highlighted challenges in auditing US-listed foreign firms, including access to audit
85 working papers and limitations faced by the PCAOB in inspecting audits of firms

86 headquartered in jurisdictions restricting such inspections (Wharton/AI-Analytics; FTI
87 Consulting).

88 The Luckin episode underscored the importance of cross-border regulatory cooperation,
89 transparent disclosure practices for ADR-listed firms, and enhanced due diligence by
90 investors in fast-scaling firms with aggressive growth narratives.

91 **4.3 Adani Group and Hindenburg Research (India, 2023–2024)**

92 In January 2023, Hindenburg Research published a report alleging various governance
93 and accounting concerns regarding the Adani Group, including the use of offshore
94 entities, related-party transactions, and debt opacity. The allegations triggered intense
95 market volatility and regulatory scrutiny. The Adani Group denied the allegations and
96 engaged in legal and PR responses. Regulators in India, including SEBI, initiated
97 inquiries into market conduct and disclosures; the episode highlighted the interplay
98 between short-seller reports, market confidence, and regulatory investigations
99 (Hindenburg Research; Reuters coverage).

100 The Adani–Hindenburg episode demonstrates the reputational and market impact of
101 public allegations, the role of external market monitors, and the need for timely,
102 transparent corporate responses and effective regulator communication to maintain
103 market stability.

104 **5. Technology, Audit Quality, and Fraud Detection**

105

106 Advances in data analytics, machine learning, and forensic accounting techniques have
107 improved the ability to detect anomalies and potential fraud. Automated models can scan

108 entire ledgers, flagging unusual transactions, revenue recognition patterns, or
109 relationships suggestive of related-party manipulation (Mongwe & Malan, 2020; Sorkun,
110 2017).

111 Blockchain technology has been proposed as a mechanism to enhance the audit trail and
112 reduce opportunities for tampering with financial records. While promising, blockchain
113 adoption faces hurdles including legacy system integration, privacy concerns, and
114 standards for data immutability in accounting contexts.

115 Despite technological gains, audit quality still hinges on professional skepticism, auditor
116 independence, and rigorous inspection regimes. Oversight bodies such as the PCAOB
117 and NFRA play essential roles in monitoring audit firms and enforcing standards
118 (PCAOB, n.d.; NFRA commentary, 2025).

119 **6. Comparative Analysis of Governance Frameworks**

120
121 Different legal and market systems shape corporate governance practices. ¹¹Common-law
122 jurisdictions (e.g., UK, US) often emphasize shareholder protections and litigative
123 enforcement, while civil-law jurisdictions (e.g., many European countries) rely more on
124 regulatory oversight and codes. Emerging markets, including India, have adopted hybrid
125 approaches, introducing statutory audit oversight (NFRA), stricter audit committee
126 requirements, and enhanced disclosure mandates (Companies Act 2013; SEBI LODR).

127 Cross-border listings and global capital flows have made alignment of accounting and
128 audit standards important; the ISSB and IFRS initiatives seek to reduce fragmentation

129 and create more comparable, decision-useful information for global investors (IFRS
130 Foundation, 2023).

131 **7. Policy Implications and Recommendations**

132

133 Based on the preceding analysis, the following policy and practice recommendations are
134 proposed:

135 **7.1 Strengthen auditor independence and oversight**

136 Regulators should consider measures such as mandatory audit partner rotation for key
137 clients, tighter restrictions on non-audit services, and enhanced inspection powers for
138 national oversight bodies. Transparent reporting of audit firm tenure and fees can assist
139 stakeholders in assessing audit independence.

140 **7.2 Promote technology-enabled audit and continuous monitoring**

141 Audit firms and companies should invest in data analytics, continuous audit tools, and
142 AI-assisted anomaly detection. Regulators can support pilot programs and develop
143 guidance on acceptable use of AI in audit processes.

144 **7.3 Improve cross-border regulatory cooperation**

145 International cooperation between audit oversight bodies (e.g., PCAOB, ESMA, NFRA)
146 is crucial to inspect multinational audits and address jurisdictional barriers that impede
147 access to audit evidence.

148 **7.4 Enhance sustainability-related and non-financial disclosures**

149 Standardizing ESG disclosures under frameworks such as the ISSB and CSRD will
150 improve comparability and help investors incorporate sustainability-related risks into
151 financial analysis.

152 **7.5 Strengthen corporate governance and board accountability**

153 Boards should ensure robust internal controls, active audit committees with financial
154 expertise, and transparent related-party transaction reporting. Regulators should enforce
155 penalties for failures in governance that enable fraud.

156 **8. Conclusion**

157
158 Financial reporting remains a cornerstone of market discipline, enabling effective capital
159 allocation and accountability. While historic and recent scandals expose persistent
160 vulnerabilities, coordinated reforms — legal, technological, and institutional — provide
161 avenues to restore trust. A multi-pronged approach that includes stronger oversight,
162 technology adoption, international cooperation, and enhanced board accountability is
163 necessary to mitigate fraud risk and improve the reliability of financial reports.

164 **References**

- 165
- 166 1. Awolowo, I. F., Garrow, N., Clark, M., & Chan, D. (2018). Accounting scandals:
167 Beyond corporate governance. *Journal of Modern Accounting and Auditing*,
168 14(8). <https://doi.org/10.17265/1548-6583/2018.08.001>
 - 169 2. Beneish, M. (1999). The detection of earnings manipulation. *Financial Analysts*
170 *Journal*, 55(5), 24–36.

- 171 3. Cressey, D. R. (1953). Other people's money: A study in the social psychology of
172 embezzlement. Free Press.
- 173 4. Erdogan, M., & Erdogan, E. O. (2020). Financial statement manipulation: A
174 Beneish model application. In *Advances in Forensic Accounting* (pp. 173–188).
- 175 5. Financial Reporting Council (FRC). (2019). Financial reporting: Who does what?
176 ICAEW.
- 177 6. FTI Consulting. (2020). Forensic investigation: Luckin Coffee. FTI Consulting
178 report.
- 179 7. Hindenburg Research. (2023). Adani Group — report. Hindenburg Research.
180 <https://hindenburgresearch.com/adani/>
- 181 8. IFRS Foundation. (2023). General sustainability-related disclosures.
182 [https://www.ifrs.org/projects/completed-projects/2023/general-sustainability-](https://www.ifrs.org/projects/completed-projects/2023/general-sustainability-related-disclosures/)
183 [related-disclosures/](https://www.ifrs.org/projects/completed-projects/2023/general-sustainability-related-disclosures/) (ISSB Standards)
- 184 9. IFRS Foundation. (n.d.). IFRS 17 Insurance Contracts.
185 [https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/list-of-standards/ifrs-17-insurance-](https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/list-of-standards/ifrs-17-insurance-contracts/)
186 [contracts/](https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/list-of-standards/ifrs-17-insurance-contracts/)
- 187 10. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial
188 behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*,
189 3(4), 305–360.
- 190 11. Md Nasir, N. A., & Hashim, H. A. (2020). Corporate governance performance
191 and financial statement fraud: Evidence from Malaysia. *Journal of Financial*
192 *Crime*, 28(3), 797–809.
- 193 12. Mongwe, W. T., & Malan, K. M. (2020). A survey of automated financial
194 statement fraud detection with relevance to the South African context. *South*
195 *African Computer Journal*, 32(1), 74–112.
- 196 13. PCAOB. (n.d.). Oversight. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board.
197 <https://pcaobus.org/oversight>
- 198 14. Rezaee, Z., & Riley, R. (2012). Financial statement fraud: Prevention and
199 detection. John Wiley & Sons.
- 200 15. Reuters. (2024). Adani vs Hindenburg: What you need to know.
201 [https://www.reuters.com/world/india/adani-vs-hindenburg-research-what-you-](https://www.reuters.com/world/india/adani-vs-hindenburg-research-what-you-need-know-2024-01-03/)
202 [need-know-2024-01-03/](https://www.reuters.com/world/india/adani-vs-hindenburg-research-what-you-need-know-2024-01-03/)
- 203 16. Sorkun, M. C. (2017). Fraud detection on financial statements using data mining
204 techniques. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications in*
205 *Engineering*, 3(5), 132–134.
- 206 17. Transparently.ai. (2024). How the Wirecard scandal happened: Case study.
207 <https://www.transparently.ai/blog/how-the-wirecard-scandal-happened>
- 208 18. Wharton AI-Analytics. (2022). Luckin Coffee case study. [https://ai-](https://ai-analytics.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Luckin_Case_Study.pdf)
209 [analytics.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-](https://ai-analytics.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Luckin_Case_Study.pdf)
210 [content/uploads/2022/02/Luckin_Case_Study.pdf](https://ai-analytics.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Luckin_Case_Study.pdf)

- 211 19. Youngblood, J. R. (2016). Business theft and fraud: Detection and prevention.
212 Taylor & Francis.

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR

Financial Reporting, Corporate Governance, and Fraud Prevention: A Contemporary Review

ORIGINALITY REPORT

8%

SIMILARITY INDEX

4%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

Submitted to Texas A&M University, College Station

Student Paper

1%

2

bankingblog.accenture.com

Internet Source

1%

3

www.lw.com

Internet Source

1%

4

Submitted to Glasgow Caledonian University

Student Paper

1%

5

Submitted to HELP UNIVERSITY

Student Paper

1%

6

Submitted to University of Stellenbosch, South Africa

Student Paper

1%

7

blog.ipleaders.in

Internet Source

1%

8

portal.santarosa.edu

Internet Source

1%

9

Submitted to Baker College of Flint

Student Paper

1%

10

Jian Chen. "Climate Finance", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2025

Publication

<1%

11

Vicki Huang. "An Australian study comparing the use of multiple-choice questionnaires with assignments as interim, summative law school assessment", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 2016

Publication

<1 %

12

Maria Aluchna, Grażyna Aniszewska-Banaś, Rafał Mrówka, Mikołaj Pindelski, Tomasz Serwański, Justyna Szumniak-Samolej. "Sustainability Disclosure - Evidence from Mandatory Reporting Regulation in the European Union", *Routledge*, 2025

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On