Journal of Theoretical Accounting Research
ISSN: 1556-5106
Volume 22 Issue 1s Year 2026 Page 35-48

The Algorithmic Auditor: Navigating the Socio-Technical Transformation of Assurance in the Era of Artificial Intelligence

Thai-Thinh Dang[1*], Phuoc-Hai To[2]

[1*]University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City thinhdt@ueh.edu.vn ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5835-4114
[2]University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City haitp@ueh.edu.vn ORCID ID: 0009-0007-7328-7179

Abstract
The auditing profession is undergoing a fundamental structural metamorphosis driven by the Fourth Industrial Revolution. This research investigates the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI)—including Machine Learning, Natural Language Processing, and Robotic Process Automation—into the audit lifecycle. Moving beyond traditional manual sampling, the paper analyzes how AI facilitates a paradigm shift toward continuous, full-population testing and real-time anomaly detection, significantly enhancing audit quality and operational efficiency. However, this digital evolution introduces complex socio-technical challenges, including the "black-box" opacity of deep learning models, the "responsibility gap" in legal accountability, and the risk of cognitive deskilling among junior auditors. Drawing on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Institutional Theory, the study argues that AI does not render human auditors obsolete but rather elevates their role. It proposes an "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" framework, where practitioners transition from data gatherers to strategic advisors and algorithmic overseers. The findings emphasize that maintaining professional legitimacy requires urgent educational reforms, interdisciplinary collaboration, and the adoption of Explainable AI (XAI) to ensure human judgment remains the final arbiter of trust. Ultimately, the paper concludes that the successful integration of AI depends on balancing computational power with unwavering professional skepticism to safeguard the public interest in an increasingly automated financial landscape.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Continuous Auditing, Audit Quality, Human-in-the-Loop, Professional Skepticism.*

1. Introduction

The auditing profession is currently navigating a profound structural transformation catalyzed by the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the unprecedented proliferation of digital data. Historically, financial statement auditing has relied heavily on manual processes, periodic evaluations, and the retrospective sampling of financial transactions. However, these traditional methodologies are increasingly inadequate for navigating the high-velocity, complex data environments characteristic of modern enterprises. To meet escalating stakeholder expectations and fulfill the mandate of providing reasonable assurance, the profession is transitioning toward continuous, proactive, and data-driven methodologies. At the vanguard of this digital evolution is the integration of artificial intelligence (AI)—a broad spectrum of advanced computational systems including machine learning (ML), deep learning, natural language processing (NLP), and robotic process automation (RPA) (Ahmi & Smidt, 2026). As major global public accounting firms invest billions of dollars into these systems, AI has transitioned from an experimental tool into a disruptive force capable of fundamentally redefining the assurance landscape (Fedyk et al., 2022).

Viewed through theoretical lenses such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Institutional Theory, the adoption of AI in auditing is propelled by normative pressures to enhance operational efficiency, increase audit quality, and maintain competitive market positioning (Ahmi & Smidt, 2026). Despite widespread enthusiasm and capital investment, the scholarly understanding of AI's broader sociotechnical consequences remains fragmented. Integrating autonomous and semi-autonomous algorithms into a highly regulated, judgment-intensive profession creates complex challenges concerning ethical governance, cognitive reliance, and professional accountability (Munoko et al., 2020). To address these gaps in the literature, it is imperative to systematically investigate how these intelligent systems alter both the mechanics of the audit process and the professionals executing it. Accordingly, this paper is guided by two primary research questions (RQ).

RQ1: How does the integration of artificial intelligence impact the auditing process? The integration of AI fundamentally restructures the audit process by shifting methodologies from constrained random sampling to full-population testing. By leveraging advanced ML algorithms and NLP, AI systems can rapidly ingest, classify, and analyze 100% of a client's structured and unstructured data—including complex contracts, emails, and global transaction logs (Kokina & Davenport, 2017). This capacity enables auditors to continuously monitor financial activities in real time, identify hidden non-linear

anomalies, and vastly improve the detection of fraudulent patterns that would otherwise elude manual inspection (Ahmi & Smidt, 2026). Recent empirical studies confirm that firm-level investments in AI yield measurable enhancements in audit quality, significantly reducing the likelihood of material restatements while simultaneously increasing efficiency and reducing audit fees (Fedyk et al., 2022). However, the application of complex, "black-box" algorithms also introduces formidable challenges. The inherent opacity of deep learning models severely limits explainability, making it difficult for auditors to transparently justify AI-driven decisions or comply with strict regulatory standards for audit evidence (Lehner et al., 2022). Furthermore, models trained on unrepresentative or flawed historical data risk perpetuating algorithmic biases that compromise the objectivity and reliability of the audit (Munoko et al., 2020).

RQ2: In the AI era, what are the implications for individual auditors and auditing firms? For individual professionals, AI functions primarily as an augmenting force that automates mundane data extraction and reconciliation, liberating auditors to focus on higher-order, strategic risk assessments and complex advisory functions (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021). Consequently, the traditional skill set of the auditor must evolve; future practitioners must cultivate interdisciplinary competencies, combining accounting expertise with data science, IT auditability, and algorithmic literacy (Li & Goel, 2025). Furthermore, the human-algorithm interaction introduces critical behavioral tensions. Auditors must consciously navigate the psychological pitfalls of "automation bias"—the tendency to unquestioningly trust machine outputs—as well as "algorithm aversion," wherein professionals discount highly accurate computer-generated advice due to a lack of interpretability or trust (Commerford et al., 2022). There are also pressing societal concerns regarding the potential displacement of entry-level accounting positions and the "deskilling" of junior auditors who miss out on foundational learning traditionally gained through routine manual tasks (Fedyk et al., 2022).

At the organizational level, auditing firms face significant implementation hurdles and must establish robust IT governance frameworks to seamlessly align AI technologies with business strategies and regulatory requirements (Almaqtari, 2024). Firms are increasingly grappling with a "responsibility gap"—the ethical and legal ambiguity surrounding culpability when autonomous systems commit errors or overlook material misstatements (Munoko et al., 2020). Interestingly, emerging experimental evidence suggests that the deployment of AI can also serve as a strategic shield; when independence conflicts or close auditor-client relationships raise concerns, the use of objective AI tools can successfully mitigate juror negligence assessments and lower the audit firm's legal liability (Libby & Witz, 2024). Ultimately, to safeguard the profession's societal legitimacy, firms must champion Explainable AI (XAI) and "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" paradigms, ensuring that human judgment remains the ultimate arbiter of trust and accountability in the digital age (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021).

2. The Transformative Impact of AI on the Audit Process

The auditing profession is currently undergoing a profound structural and methodological evolution, transitioning from an era of manual, retrospective verification into a dynamic period of continuous, proactive, and data-driven assurance. Historically, auditors have relied on statistical sampling, rigid rule-based systems, and labor-intensive procedures to form opinions on the fairness of financial statements. However, the unprecedented proliferation of digital data and the increasing complexity of the global financial ecosystem have rendered these traditional approaches inadequate. At the vanguard of modernizing the assurance function is the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI)—a broad spectrum of advanced computational systems that includes Machine Learning (ML), Deep Learning (DL), Natural Language Processing (NLP), and Robotic Process Automation (RPA) (Ahmi & Smidt, 2026). By automating mundane tasks, fundamentally altering evidence-gathering methodologies, and augmenting human cognitive capacities, AI is driving a paradigm shift that offers unprecedented improvements in operational efficiency, testing comprehensiveness, and the detection of sophisticated fraud (Fotoh & Lorentzon, 2023).

2.1. Operational Efficiency and Cost Reduction

The pursuit of operational efficiency remains one of the most significant institutional drivers for the adoption of AI technologies within the auditing and accounting sectors. At the core of this efficiency revolution is Robotic Process Automation (RPA), a technology that utilizes software bots to automate repetitive, rule-based, and highly structured business tasks that traditionally consumed vast amounts of human labor (Deloitte, 2017). RPA applications excel in executing deterministic procedures without the need for complex cognitive judgment. Across the audit lifecycle, RPA bots are increasingly deployed to automate routine bookkeeping activities, invoice processing, manual data entry, multi-system reconciliations, and the preparation of standardized audit workpapers (Shaffer et al., 2020; Vărzaru, 2022).

Through the orchestration of these software bots, audit firms can seamlessly import and export data across fragmented legacy enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems, validate inputs, and execute pre-planned audit checks, thereby substantially reducing the time allocated to the testing phase (Kokina & Davenport, 2017). Empirical case studies highlight the dramatic efficiency

gains achieved through such automation. For instance, the implementation of a specialized Data Extraction Bot for the revenue transaction cycle was found to be 4.25 times faster than a human operator, functioning with a microscopic error rate of less than 0.1% while saving thousands of hours annually for payment and direct debit runs (A. Eulerich & Eulerich, 2020). By effectively eliminating the inherent risk of human error in these routine administrative and data-gathering processes, RPA improves the consistency, precision, and accuracy of audit procedures while simultaneously minimizing associated operational costs (CPAB, 2024).

This rapid automation translates directly into accelerated audit cycles and a systemic reduction in audit fees. Because audit fees serve as a proxy for the level of effort exerted by the audit team and the client's underlying risk, the deployment of highly efficient AI and RPA tools allows firms to pass on cost savings or improve their own profit margins (Fedyk et al., 2022). In a large-scale empirical analysis of the U.S. auditing sector, firm-level investments in AI workforces predicted subsequent reductions in per-audit fees of 0.9% after one year, compounding to an economically significant 2.1% reduction after three years (Fedyk et al., 2022). The monetary benefits generated by this efficiency are multifaceted: audit firms can confidently take on more fixed-fee projects, increase profitability by bringing previously outsourced repetitive tasks back in-house, and strategically leverage lowered fees and enhanced service quality to gain a competitive market share (Zhang et al., 2022).

Crucially, the operational efficiencies introduced by AI do not merely cut costs—they fundamentally restructure the allocation of human capital and the socio-technical dynamics within the audit firm. By transferring the heavy lifting of data aggregation, extraction, and reconciliation to machines, AI liberates highly skilled human auditors to divert their cognitive energy toward tasks demanding complex professional judgment, strategic risk assessment, and proactive business advisory (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021). This reallocation elevates the intrinsic value of the auditor, transforming their role from a retrospective data checker to a forward-looking assurance provider. While this shift necessitates a paradigm change in accounting education and requires auditors to upskill in data science and algorithmic literacy, it ultimately elevates job satisfaction and equips the profession to navigate the increasing complexities of the modern digital economy (Saengsith & Suntraruk, 2023).

2.2. Transition from Sampling to Full-Population Testing

Perhaps the most revolutionary methodological shift catalyzed by the integration of artificial intelligence is the transition from traditional statistical sampling to the continuous testing of full data populations. Historically, due to the prohibitive financial costs and time constraints associated with manual document inspection, auditors were forced to rely on random or stratified sampling to evaluate the effectiveness of internal controls and the accuracy of financial balances. While statistically accepted under traditional standards (such as ISA 530), this approach inherently carries sampling risk—the very real possibility that the selected sample fails to represent the true state of the population, thereby allowing material misstatements or rare, sophisticated anomalies to go undetected (Xing et al., 2020).

AI technologies empower auditors to transcend these historical limitations by rapidly ingesting, classifying, and analyzing 100% of a client's transactions in real-time, effectively eliminating sampling risk and providing a much more rigorous evidentiary foundation (Murikah et al., 2024). By establishing robust audit data warehouses and leveraging the immense computational and storage power of Cloud-Based Artificial Intelligence (CBAI) infrastructure, auditors can process massive volumes of financial and operational data seamlessly (Abu Huson et al., 2025). Global audit firms and regulatory bodies recognize this capacity as the cornerstone of the "data-driven audit," an approach defined by the consistent, transaction-level analysis of entire ledgers to pinpoint areas of the highest inherent risk (Bradley & Stöckle, 2024). For instance, rather than manually examining a limited sample of 400 revenue transactions using substantive procedures, an AI-enabled General Ledger Analytics Tool (GLAT) can automatically evaluate an entire population of millions of journal entries against dozens of risk indicators, ultimately isolating only the few highest-risk outliers for human investigation (O'Leary et al., 2024).

This capability to process entire datasets facilitates the realization of Continuous Auditing (CA), where financial activities and internal controls are monitored dynamically as transactions occur, rather than exclusively at the end of the fiscal reporting period (Abdullah & Almaqtari, 2024). Continuous Auditing of AI systems (CAAI) allows auditors to proactively identify anomalous patterns, behavioral deviations, and compliance breaches nearly instantaneously, fundamentally shifting the audit from a reactive, backward-looking inspection into a proactive, continuous assurance mechanism (Minkkinen et al., 2022). By constantly comparing real-time operational data against established benchmarks and historical patterns, AI ensures that financial irregularities are flagged and addressed before they metastasize into material misstatements.

However, the paradigm shift to full-population testing also challenges traditional epistemological frameworks and expectation management within the auditing profession. If an algorithm tests every single transaction that occurred during a financial year, the traditional statutory concept of providing merely "reasonable assurance" may eventually be viewed as obsolete or insufficient by the public and shareholders (Colthart, 2019). While testing 100% of a population provides a significantly higher level of assurance regarding the

completeness and accuracy of financial statements, it does not equate to absolute certainty (Manita et al., 2020). Furthermore, analyzing full datasets often yields thousands of flagged anomalies or false positives. Therefore, this transition requires auditors to develop and rely on intelligent machine learning scoring systems to prioritize high-risk exceptions, ensuring that human auditors are not overwhelmed by data and can effectively apply professional skepticism to the anomalies that truly matter (Issa & Kogan, 2014).

2.3. Enhanced Fraud Detection and Audit Quality

The ultimate objective of integrating artificial intelligence into the audit process is the enhancement of overall audit quality, achieved specifically through the superior detection of fraud, anomalies, and material misstatements. Traditional audit procedures and simple rule-based automation are often ill-equipped to uncover the sophisticated, highly concealed, and complex methodologies employed in modern financial statement fraud. In contrast, advanced AI systems—particularly those utilizing Machine Learning (ML), Deep Learning (DL), and Natural Language Processing (NLP)—possess the unique computational capacity to model highly nonlinear relationships and extract abstract features from massive lakes of unstructured data (Fedyk et al., 2022; Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018).

Machine learning algorithms excel as sophisticated "prediction machines," learning iteratively from historical datasets to forecast outcomes, classify transactions, and identify hidden, multi-dimensional correlations that would easily elude even the most experienced human auditors (Agrawal et al., 2018). In the context of fraud detection, these algorithms continuously process inputs to detect subtle anomalies that deviate from established organizational baselines—such as unusual payment timings, suspicious vendor relationships, or abnormal billing frequencies (Murikah et al., 2024). Deep learning neural networks, which mimic the hierarchical architecture of the human brain, push this analytical capability even further by automatically extracting complex features from raw data without the need for manual, human-guided feature engineering (Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018). In scenarios characterized by imbalanced data—where fraudulent transactions are exceedingly rare compared to legitimate ones—deep learning models utilizing cost-sensitive learning consistently outperform traditional statistical models like logistic regression or naive Bayes in accurately identifying corporate misconduct (Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018).

Crucially, the integration of AI allows auditors to drastically expand their evidentiary base beyond traditional structured financial ledgers to incorporate massive volumes of unstructured data, which currently constitutes the vast majority of modern enterprise information. Leveraging Natural Language Processing (NLP), AI systems can rapidly parse, interpret, and generate deep insights from textual data such as emails, complex legal contracts, board meeting minutes, social media sentiment, and the Management Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) sections of 10-K filings (Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018). Advanced NLP techniques, including Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) and topic modeling, can automatically synthesize millions of documents to detect misleading disclosures or compliance violations (Munoko et al., 2020). For example, deep learning models can meticulously evaluate the semantic sentiment, emotional tone, and linguistic clues embedded in a CEO's earnings conference call. If an executive utilizes linguistic patterns indicative of deception (e.g., avoiding first-person pronouns) or if the positive joy and sentiment scores expressed in unstructured public statements sharply contradict the deteriorating financial metrics in the structured ledger, the AI system immediately flags this inconsistency as a high-risk indicator for potential management fraud or internal control weaknesses (Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018).

Furthermore, Deep Learning extends the audit's reach into the physical world through Computer Vision and Speech Recognition, enabling entirely new forms of autonomous substantive testing. Auditors can now employ deep convolutional neural networks (CNNs) paired with drone technology to autonomously conduct physical inventory counts in expansive warehouses, or use image analytics to evaluate the structural integrity and valuation of commercial real estate by analyzing video footage for damage or wear (Appelbaum & Nehmer, 2017; Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018). These multi-modal, unstructured data capabilities ensure that the audit triangulates the truth from every available data dimension, leaving far fewer blind spots for material misstatements to hide.

The empirical evidence substantiating AI's profound impact on audit quality is highly compelling. Research utilizing comprehensive longitudinal datasets of public accounting firms clearly demonstrates that sustained investments in AI specialists and technologies yield measurable, significant improvements in the reliability of financial reporting. Specifically, a one-standard-deviation increase in an audit firm's AI investments over a three-year period is associated with a 5.0% reduction in the likelihood of a future financial restatement, a 1.4% reduction in material restatements, and a 1.9% drop in restatements specifically linked to complex accruals and revenue recognition manipulation (Fedyk et al., 2022). Furthermore, instances of severe audit failures leading to SEC investigations also decline measurably in correlation with AI adoption. These statistics robustly confirm that AI-driven anomaly detection and predictive risk modeling successfully preempt errors and fraudulent reporting before an erroneous audit opinion is finalized and issued to the public.

However, the deployment of such advanced ML and DL models introduces critical epistemological and regulatory challenges regarding "black box" opacity. Because sophisticated deep neural networks do not rely on

explicit, human-programmed logic rules, tracing the exact reasoning behind their algorithmic predictions can be exceptionally difficult. This opacity poses a direct conflict with strict professional standards for audit documentation and audit evidence (e.g., PCAOB AS 1105 and AS 1215), which require auditors to fully understand and justify the procedures and evidence underlying their conclusions (Zhang et al., 2022). To ensure that enhanced fraud detection does not compromise transparency or accountability, the auditing profession is increasingly pioneering the integration of Explainable AI (XAI) techniques.

By implementing XAI frameworks such as LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations) and SHAP (Shapley Additive exPlanations), auditors can transparently visualize and quantify exactly which specific financial variables, ratios, or textual features drove a complex algorithm's fraud prediction for a specific client (Zhong & Goel, 2024). These XAI layers translate opaque algorithmic math into interpretable insights, empowering the human "Auditor-in-the-Loop" to apply appropriate professional skepticism, validate the machine's logic against their domain expertise, and fully justify their audit conclusions in compliance with regulatory mandates. Ultimately, the synthesis of advanced, full-population AI analytics with transparent, explainable governance frameworks ensures that the auditing profession can successfully navigate the digital age, achieving unprecedented levels of operational efficiency, diagnostic quality, and unwavering public trust.

3. The Evolving Role of the Auditor

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) and its rapid integration into the financial sector represents one of the most profound technological disruptions in the history of the auditing profession. Historically characterized by retrospective, sample-based testing and manual data verification, the audit function is currently undergoing a radical metamorphosis. Far from rendering the human auditor obsolete, the proliferation of AI technologies—ranging from robotic process automation (RPA) and machine learning (ML) to natural language processing (NLP) and generative AI—is fundamentally redefining the auditor's identity. As intelligent algorithms assume responsibility for voluminous data processing and complex pattern recognition, the auditor is transitioning from a traditional data gatherer into a strategic advisor, an orchestrator of human-machine collaboration, and a guardian of algorithmic integrity (Kokina & Davenport, 2017). This paper explores the evolving role of the auditor through three critical dimensions: the shift toward strategic and advisory functions, the emergence of the "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" paradigm, and the urgent necessity for advanced upskilling and new competency requirements.

3.1. Shift to Strategic and Advisory Functions

For decades, the auditing profession has been heavily burdened by labor-intensive, repetitive, and rule-based tasks. The manual extraction of data, the cross-referencing of invoices and shipping documents, and the execution of traditional sampling methods consumed the vast majority of an audit engagement's time and resources (Moffitt et al., 2018). However, the integration of AI liberates auditors from this mundane, backward-looking manual data collection. Technologies such as RPA combined with cognitive automation can autonomously scrape unstructured documents, perform continuous general ledger reconciliations, and execute full-population transaction testing with microscopic error rates (A. Eulerich & Eulerich, 2020).

This liberation of human capital serves as the primary catalyst for the auditor's shift toward strategic and advisory functions. By delegating the "heavy lifting" of data aggregation to machines, auditors are empowered to refocus their cognitive efforts on complex problem-solving, strategic decision-making, and proactive risk monitoring (Greenman, 2017). Instead of merely verifying historical data, the auditor's role is elevated to interpreting AI-generated insights and predicting future vulnerabilities. For example, when deep learning models flag anomalous payment patterns or natural language processors detect deceptive sentiment in management disclosures, the human auditor steps in to contextualize these findings within the broader macroeconomic and industry-specific environment (Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018).

Furthermore, this technological shift fundamentally alters the temporal nature of the audit. Traditional audits have historically been retrospective, providing reasonable assurance on financial statements months after the fiscal year has ended. In contrast, AI facilitates Continuous Auditing (CA), a paradigm where financial activities and internal controls are monitored dynamically and in real-time (Abdullah & Almaqtari, 2024). This transition enables auditors to shift from a backward-looking, reactive stance to a forward-looking, proactive advisory role. Armed with predictive analytics, auditors can now offer clients real-time insights into emerging risks, operational inefficiencies, and strategic opportunities, thereby significantly enhancing the value-add of the audit engagement (Yigitbasioglu et al., 2023). Ultimately, as routine bookkeeping and compliance checks become fully automated, the intellectual authority of the auditor will rest entirely on their capacity to provide high-level, strategic business counsel that machines cannot replicate.

3.2. The "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" Paradigm

A pervasive initial fear surrounding the digitalization of the accounting profession was the complete technological displacement of human labor (Frey & Osborne, 2017). However, contemporary empirical evidence and professional consensus vehemently reject this deterministic view. Rather than entirely replacing humans, the future of auditing points unequivocally to a

"Human-in-the-Loop" (HITL) collaboration model (Grønsund & Aanestad, 2020). Within this framework, AI systems and human auditors form a symbiotic, intelligent team where cognitive strengths are complementary: AI provides unparalleled computational scale, speed, and pattern recognition, while humans provide contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, and professional skepticism (Malone, 2020).

To understand this dynamic, it is necessary to examine the spectrum of human-algorithm interaction. At the foundational level is the Auditor-in-the-Loop (Assisted AI), where machines perform predefined, repetitive tasks, but humans retain immediate control and must validate steps before the system proceeds (Munoko et al., 2020). The intermediate level is the Auditor-on-the-Loop (Augmented AI), where machines possess the analytical intelligence to process data and recommend solutions for complex tasks—such as fraud detection or going-concern evaluations—while the human acts in a supervisory capacity, co-deciding and overriding the system if necessary (PwC, 2017). The most extreme and ethically fraught level is the Auditor-out-of-the-Loop (Autonomous AI), where systems make and execute decisions entirely independently (Malone, 2020).

Given the highly regulated and judgment-intensive nature of financial assurance, the autonomous extreme is largely rejected by the profession. Instead, the optimal future state is conceptualized as the "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" paradigm (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021). Under this paradigm, AI handles the heavy data lifting, models complex nonlinear relationships, and surfaces risk-prioritized suggestions. However, human auditors retain absolute ultimate oversight, utilizing their professional skepticism to confirm, reject, or label AI outputs (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021). The auditor governs the parameters of the algorithm, evaluates the training data for bias, and acts as the final arbiter of truth.

This governance role requires auditors to consciously navigate the psychological pitfalls inherent in human-machine interaction. One of the most significant threats to audit quality in the AI era is automation bias—the human tendency to unquestioningly trust machine outputs and scale back independent critical thinking, effectively turning a human supervisory role into a mere "rubber-stamping" exercise (Parasuraman & Manzey, 2010). If an auditor blindly accepts an algorithm's classification of a complex lease agreement without understanding the underlying logic, they abdicate their professional responsibility (Munoko et al., 2020). Conversely, auditors must also avoid algorithm aversion, where they discount highly accurate AI advice due to a lack of trust or an inability to interpret the "black box" nature of deep learning models (Commerford et al., 2022). Therefore, governing the loop means the auditor must actively interrogate AI suggestions, applying rigorous professional skepticism to ensure that the AI is not hallucinating, perpetuating historical biases from its training data, or missing context-specific anomalies (Nelson, 2009).

3.3. Upskilling and New Competency Requirements

The transformation of the auditor into a strategic advisor and a governor of algorithms cannot occur within the confines of traditional accounting education. The integration of artificial intelligence necessitates that auditors radically expand their skill sets beyond conventional Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and traditional manual auditing standards. The modern auditor must become a hybrid professional—a "bilingual" expert who is fluent in both the language of business finance and the language of data science (Pemer & Werr, 2025).

First and foremost, the profession demands a foundational competency in data science and algorithmic literacy (Li & Goel, 2025). While auditors are not expected to become full-fledged software engineers or write complex neural network code from scratch, they must possess a robust conceptual understanding of how machine learning models are trained, how data is ingested and weighted, and how algorithmic predictions are generated (Appelbaum et al., 2017). Without this algorithmic literacy, an auditor cannot effectively exercise professional skepticism over a machine's output. They must be capable of identifying potential sources of algorithmic bias—such as imbalanced training datasets that might skew fraud detection models—and they must understand the statistical limitations of the predictive analytics they deploy (Chawla et al., 2004).

Secondly, the rise of AI necessitates a profound enhancement of IT auditability skills. As client organizations increasingly automate their own financial reporting environments using AI, external auditors must be capable of auditing through the computer, not just around it. IT auditors are now required to evaluate the governance structures, data pipelines, and security protocols of the AI-driven processes implemented by their clients (Li & Goel, 2025). This involves assessing whether a client's AI system complies with ethical standards, data privacy regulations (such as the GDPR), and internal control frameworks (Baviskar et al., 2021). Furthermore, auditors must become proficient in utilizing Explainable AI (XAI) tools—such as LIME or SHAP—which translate the opaque, non-linear logic of "black box" deep learning models into interpretable, human-readable insights (Zhong & Goel, 2024). Mastering XAI is critical for auditors to document sufficient and appropriate audit evidence and to justify AI-assisted conclusions to regulatory bodies (PCAOB AS 1105).

Thirdly, as repetitive tasks are automated, higher-order cognitive and interpersonal skills become the primary differentiator of human value. Auditors must cultivate advanced critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and complex judgment capabilities (Samiolo et al., 2024). Furthermore, as they transition into advisory roles,

excellent communication and stakeholder management skills are imperative. Auditors must be able to translate highly technical AI findings and complex data visualizations into plain, actionable language for corporate boards, audit committees, and external stakeholders (Li & Goel, 2025).

This seismic shift in competency requirements poses a significant challenge to both higher education institutions and accounting firms. Academic programs are under immense pressure to modernize their curricula, moving away from rote memorization of accounting rules toward integrated STEM-designated coursework that blends accounting theory with data analytics, statistics, and information systems design (Andiola et al., 2020). Rooted in the principles of the Diffusion of Innovation theory and Constructivist pedagogy, educational institutions must provide hands-on, experiential learning environments where students actively interact with AI tools, critically evaluating their outputs to build technological readiness before entering the workforce (Rawashdeh, 2025).

Simultaneously, audit firms must commit to massive, ongoing professional development initiatives. Organizations must establish internal "centers of excellence," providing modular learning pathways and continuous on-the-job training to upskill their existing workforce (Saad et al., 2024). Because AI technology evolves at a blistering pace, an auditor's education is no longer confined to university study and CPA certification; it is a lifelong requirement to adapt to an ever-shifting socio-technical landscape.

The integration of artificial intelligence is not a death knell for the auditing profession; rather, it is a powerful catalyst for its intellectual evolution. By automating the mechanical, repetitive tasks that have historically constrained the profession, AI acts as a liberating force, allowing human auditors to ascend the value chain. In this new era, the auditor's role is fundamentally redefined from a retrospective checker of historical figures to a forward-looking, strategic business advisor who provides deep, proactive insights.

However, the realization of this potential relies entirely on the successful implementation of the "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" paradigm. Human oversight, grounded in unwavering professional skepticism, remains the ultimate safeguard against algorithmic bias, automation complacency, and the ethical risks of autonomous systems. To assume this elevated role, the profession must aggressively pursue upskilling, demanding that future auditors master a hybrid competency profile that bridges traditional accounting with data science, algorithmic literacy, and advanced IT auditability. Ultimately, the future of auditing belongs not to the machines, but to the professionals who can seamlessly integrate human judgment with artificial intelligence to deliver unprecedented levels of assurance, transparency, and strategic value.

4. Professional Implications

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the auditing and accounting ecosystem is not merely an operational or technological upgrade; it represents a profound socio-technical disruption that strikes at the core of the profession's identity, ethics, and structure. While early discourse predominantly focused on the efficiency gains and expanded analytical capabilities offered by AI, a critical examination of the literature reveals severe sociotechnical tensions. As intelligent algorithms assume responsibilities that historically required human cognition, the auditing profession faces a triad of existential and ethical challenges: the paradoxical risks of job displacement and cognitive deskilling, the legal and ethical ambiguities encapsulated in the "responsibility gap," and the overarching threat of deprofessionalization.

4.1. Job Displacement vs. Deskilling Risks

The narrative surrounding AI in professional services frequently emphasizes an "augmentation" paradigm, wherein machines handle mundane data processing, thereby liberating human auditors to focus on high-value, strategic advisory functions (Moffitt et al., 2018). While AI undoubtedly creates new high-skilled opportunities—particularly for professionals possessing hybrid competencies in data science and accounting (Li & Goel, 2025)—it simultaneously poses a significant threat of job displacement, particularly for entry-level roles. In a seminal analysis of occupational susceptibility to computerization, researchers estimated a 94% probability that accounting and auditing roles could eventually be automated (Frey & Osborne, 2017). Recent empirical evidence confirms that this theoretical vulnerability is already manifesting in practice. Longitudinal analyses of the largest U.S. public accounting firms demonstrate that sustained investments in AI result in measurable workforce reductions that are disproportionately concentrated at the junior level; specifically, a one-standard-deviation increase in a firm's AI workforce is associated with an 11.8% decrease in junior accounting employees four years post-investment (Fedyk et al., 2022).

Beyond the immediate economic consequences of job displacement, the automation of entry-level tasks introduces a severe pedagogical and cognitive threat known as "deskilling" (Sutton et al., 2016). Historically, the traditional audit apprenticeship model relied on junior auditors performing manual, routine, and repetitive tasks—such as vouching, tracing, and data reconciliation—to build their foundational understanding of client operations, internal controls, and accounting anomalies (Samiolo et al., 2024). By removing these routine, manual tasks from the professional's experiential learning trajectory, AI strips away the fundamental training ground where professional judgment and skepticism are forged (Munoko et al., 2020).

If junior auditors are deprived of the opportunity to develop mental representations of financial data through hands-on practice, their ability to perform higher-order cognitive tasks in the future is severely compromised (Plumlee et al., 2015). This phenomenon can be examined through the theory of technology dominance, which suggests that novice professionals who rely heavily on intelligent decision aids fail to develop the requisite domain expertise and eventually default to habitual, uncritical reliance on the technology (Sutton et al., 2016). Consequently, the profession faces a looming crisis: as the current generation of junior auditors ascends to leadership roles, they may lack the deep-seated professional judgment necessary to critically evaluate complex management estimates or effectively supervise the very AI systems they rely upon. This reliance engenders "automation bias" and complacency, whereby human auditors unquestioningly accept algorithmic outputs, fundamentally undermining the investigative skepticism that is the bedrock of audit quality (Parasuraman & Manzey, 2010).

4.2. Accountability and the "Responsibility Gap"

As AI technologies evolve from assistive tools into augmented and autonomous decision-making agents, they introduce profound ambiguities surrounding legal culpability and moral accountability. Under current statutory frameworks and professional standards (e.g., PCAOB AS 1105 and AS 1215), the human auditor and the audit firm bear ultimate responsibility for the audit opinion and the sufficiency of the underlying audit evidence (Zhang et al., 2022). However, the deployment of highly complex, self-learning algorithms inherently conflicts with this traditional liability model, creating what ethicists and legal scholars term a "responsibility gap" (Gunz & Thorne, 2020; Matthias, 2004).

The responsibility gap describes the ethical and legal void that occurs when an autonomous system produces a critical error—such as issuing a false negative that allows material financial fraud to go undetected—and it becomes conceptually and practically impossible to assign blame (Munoko et al., 2020). If an AI system acts autonomously and unpredictably, adapting its logic dynamically through machine learning without direct human intervention, who is liable for its failures? Does culpability fall on the engagement partner who signed the audit report, the audit firm's centralized IT governance committee that approved the tool, or the external software developer who designed the proprietary neural network?

This ambiguity is severely exacerbated by the "black box" nature of deep learning algorithms (Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018). Because these models process massive volumes of unstructured data through opaque, non-linear neural layers, their internal decision-making logic is often inscrutable even to the data scientists who programmed them (Buhmann et al., 2020). If an algorithm is designed in a way that precludes users from understanding how a conclusion was reached, it forces an abdication of ethical responsibility; auditors cannot apply due professional care or justify their conclusions if they cannot trace the algorithmic reasoning (Martin, 2019).

Furthermore, developers of AI systems often utilize proprietary algorithms protected by trade secrets, thereby restricting external review and legally distancing themselves from the outcomes of the AI's application in the field (Li & Goel, 2025). While explainable AI (XAI) techniques like LIME and SHAP are being explored to pierce this opacity and provide post-hoc interpretability, they frequently offer approximations of logic rather than absolute causal truths, leaving residual vulnerabilities (Zhong & Goel, 2024). Ultimately, if the legal system and professional regulatory bodies (such as the PCAOB or IAASB) do not update their frameworks to explicitly delineate liability across developers, firms, and individual practitioners, auditors may find themselves bearing the entirety of the legal risk for technological failures over which they exercise no meaningful cognitive control (Kellogg et al., 2020).

4.3. Threats of Deprofessionalization

The culmination of cognitive deskilling, the displacement of human labor, and the delegation of judgment to autonomous algorithms poses an existential threat to the institutional legitimacy of auditing: deprofessionalization. Sociological theories of professionalization posit that a profession derives its status, societal authority, and exclusive market jurisdiction from its mastery over a body of esoteric, complex knowledge that requires extensive training and independent human judgment (Abbott, 1988). For over a century, the auditing profession has justified its statutory monopoly and high societal status by asserting that financial assurance requires bespoke, intellectual professional skepticism that cannot be commodified or mechanized (Power, 1997).

However, as AI systems become increasingly proficient at absorbing massive datasets, modeling complex non-linear financial relationships, and independently identifying anomalies, the boundaries of this exclusive jurisdiction are threatened. If autonomous AI can execute judgment-heavy tasks—such as evaluating going-concern status, assessing complex fair-value estimates, or identifying highly concealed fraud—with greater accuracy and efficiency than human practitioners, the intellectual core of the audit is effectively transformed into a mechanical, standardized technique (Montagna, 1968). When esoteric knowledge is successfully codified into an algorithm, the profession's claim to exclusive expertise is fundamentally weakened.

This technological encroachment risks undermining the intellectual authority traditionally held by Certified Public Accountants (CPAs). If the essence of the audit shifts from human-driven skepticism to the mere configuration and maintenance of algorithmic software, the profession may see its cultural authority siphoned away by method experts, such as computer scientists, data

engineers, and AI developers, who do not adhere to the traditional ethical codes of the accounting profession (Brown-Liburd & Vasarhelyi, 2015; Faulconbridge, 2025). As these non-accounting professionals take on increasingly prominent roles in designing the parameters of assurance, the traditional auditor risks being relegated to the role of an administrative bystander who merely "rubber-stamps" machine outputs (Commerford et al., 2022).

Furthermore, the legitimacy of the auditing profession is intrinsically tied to social trust and public accountability (Power, 1997). The public relies on the independent, ethical conscience of the human auditor to act as a guardian of capital markets. If stakeholders—including investors, regulators, and the public—perceive that the audit opinion is generated by a black-box algorithm devoid of moral reasoning or professional conscience, the societal trust placed in the audit mechanism could rapidly erode (Lombardi et al., 2022). An audit driven entirely by algorithmic efficiency, without the transparent, ethical oversight of a human professional, may satisfy commercial desires for speed and cost-reduction but will ultimately fail the profession's mandate to serve the public interest.

To prevent deprofessionalization, the auditing sector must actively reshape the boundaries of its expertise. It is imperative that the profession does not passively accept technological determinism but instead insists on an "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" paradigm (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021). By aggressively upskilling the workforce in AI auditability and algorithmic governance, and by reasserting that human ethical judgment is the irreplaceable final arbiter of financial truth, the profession can protect its jurisdictional authority, maintain its high status, and continue to command public trust in the artificial intelligence era.

5. Recommendations and Future Research Directions

5.1. Educational Reforms

The rapid penetration of artificial intelligence into the assurance domain mandates a systemic overhaul of accounting education and continuous professional training. As the profession shifts from backward-looking manual verification to forward-looking predictive analytics, academic institutions must urgently update university curricula to equip future auditors with essential competencies in data science, machine learning, and AI ethics (Stancheva-Todorova, 2018). While future financial auditors are not expected to become computer scientists or software engineers, they require a foundational algorithmic literacy to critically evaluate machine outputs, identify biased training datasets, and exercise appropriate professional skepticism (Appelbaum et al., 2017; PwC, 2017). Recognizing this imperative, accrediting bodies such as the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) now mandate technological proficiency, pressuring accounting departments to integrate IT auditability, statistical analysis, and information systems design directly into their programs (Andiola et al., 2020). Furthermore, professional service firms must commit to massive, ongoing professional development initiatives. Establishing continuous, modular training programs is necessary to upskill the existing workforce, mitigating behavioral risks like automation bias and ensuring practitioners can responsibly govern the AI tools they deploy (Manita et al., 2020; Seethamraju & Hecimovic, 2023).

5.2. Interdisciplinary Collaboration

The ethical, legal, and technical complexities inherent in auditing sophisticated, autonomous algorithms cannot be resolved through the isolated efforts of accounting professionals. Constructing and governing trustworthy AI systems requires robust, interdisciplinary collaboration that transcends traditional professional silos (Landers & Behrend, 2024). Future AI audit frameworks must be developed through active partnerships between computer scientists, legal experts, organizational ethicists, and accountants (Borgesius, 2025; Hasan, 2022). Within these collaborative structures, data scientists and engineers can ensure the technical robustness, accuracy, and optimal design of machine learning models. Concurrently, legal experts are necessary to navigate complex algorithmic compliance and data privacy regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) or the EU Artificial Intelligence Act. Ethicists play a critical role in evaluating societal impacts, ensuring that the algorithms do not perpetuate systemic biases, discriminatory outcomes, or threaten human autonomy (Smith et al., 2023). Finally, accountants and IT auditors must synthesize these insights to ensure the AI systems align with rigorous financial audit evidence standards (e.g., PCAOB AS 1105) and broader societal values (Williams et al., 2013). Only through this synergistic, multi-stakeholder approach can the auditing profession establish transparent, fair, and legally compliant AI governance ecosystems that protect the public interest (Falco et al., 2021; Li & Goel, 2025).

5.3. Future Research

As the integration of artificial intelligence into auditing remains in an emergent and highly dynamic phase, several critical avenues for future research must be prioritized to advance the literature and inform practice. First, there is a pressing need to conduct longitudinal studies on the impact of AI on audit quality. While current cross-sectional surveys have documented early adoption intentions and perceived usefulness, longitudinal empirical research is required to track how sustained AI investments dynamically influence actual audit outcomes, error rates, financial restatements, and fee structures over extended periods of time, moving beyond anecdotal claims of improvement (Ahmi & Smidt, 2026; Fedyk et al., 2022)

Second, scholars should systematically explore the integration of AI with other emerging technologies, particularly blockchain. Blockchain's immutable, decentralized, and consensus-driven ledger can provide highly secure, real-time data provenance, creating a verified source of truth that enhances the reliability of the data fed into AI systems (Cong et al., 2019; Han et al., 2023). Investigating this technological convergence could pioneer new frameworks for fully automated, tamper-proof continuous auditing environments.

Finally, the explosive proliferation of generative AI and Large Language Models (LLMs) demands urgent scholarly attention. Researchers must develop standardized methodologies for auditing generative AI, addressing severe inherent limitations such as algorithmic "hallucinations," knowledge cutoffs, prompt injection vulnerabilities, and the lack of domain-specific financial expertise (Huang & Wang, 2023; Ling et al., 2023). Developing layered auditing frameworks specifically calibrated for LLMs—encompassing governance audits of model providers, pre-deployment evaluations, and continuous downstream application monitoring—will be paramount to safely harnessing generative AI within the highly regulated auditing profession (M. Eulerich et al., 2024; Mökander et al., 2024).

6. Conclusion

The integration of artificial intelligence into the auditing domain represents a profound structural evolution rather than a terminal threat to human practitioners. As the preceding analysis demonstrates, AI is not replacing the audit profession; rather, it is fundamentally shifting its foundation from manual, retrospective, and sample-based verification toward a paradigm of continuous, automated, and highly analytical assurance (Dai & Vasarhelyi, 2017). By deploying advanced technologies such as machine learning (ML), deep learning, and natural language processing (NLP), audit firms can now evaluate 100% of a client's transactions in real time, uncovering complex, non-linear anomalies that traditional methods would easily overlook (Sun & Vasarhelyi, 2018). However, the automation of these routine, data-intensive tasks does not render the human auditor obsolete. Instead, AI acts as a powerful augmenting force that liberates accounting professionals to focus on higher-order, strategic problem-solving and complex risk assessment (Kokina & Davenport, 2017). The core identity of the auditor is being elevated, transforming the practitioner from a retrospective data gatherer into a forward-looking strategic advisor and a governor of algorithmic outputs (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021).

Despite these unprecedented capabilities, the full realization of AI's transformative power in auditing is completely contingent upon overcoming significant sociotechnical and ethical hurdles. The scholarly literature extensively cautions against the "black box" nature of complex algorithms, which inherently threatens the transparency, explainability, and reliability required by strict audit evidence standards (Zhong & Goel, 2024). To safely harness AI's analytical power, the profession must mandate rigorous, transparent IT governance and robust ethical safeguards (Almaqtari, 2024). These governance frameworks must proactively address data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the assignment of accountability when autonomous systems commit errors—closing the widely debated "responsibility gap" (Lehner et al., 2022). Without a coordinated regulatory infrastructure—potentially guided by dedicated AI audit standards boards—the unchecked deployment of AI risks safety-washing and could severely undermine the profession's societal legitimacy and public trust (Manheim et al., 2025).

Ultimately, the successful integration of AI rests entirely on the irreplaceable primacy of human judgment. Artificial intelligence, despite its immense computational scale, lacks the contextual awareness, moral reasoning, and professional skepticism that form the bedrock of the audit opinion (Eisikovits et al., 2025). As AI systems assume greater responsibility for generating predictive insights and identifying fraud, the auditor's role as the final, ethical arbiter of truth becomes even more critical (Sidhu, 2019). An audit driven solely by algorithmic efficiency, devoid of human conscience and critical oversight, cannot fulfill the profession's mandate to protect the public interest (Munoko et al., 2020). Therefore, the future of the auditing profession requires the steadfast adoption of an "Auditor-Governing-the-Loop" paradigm (Tiron-Tudor & Deliu, 2021). By seamlessly blending machine intelligence with unwavering human intuition and ethical stewardship, the auditing profession can successfully navigate the digital age, delivering unparalleled assurance quality while safeguarding its indispensable role in global financial markets.

Acknowledgment

This research is funded by the University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City (UEH) - Vietnam.

References

1. Abbott, A. (1988). *The System of Professions*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226189666.001.0001
2. Abdullah, A. A. H., & Almaqtari, F. A. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence and Industry 4.0 on transforming accounting and auditing practices. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *10*(1), 100218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100218
3. Abu Huson, Y., Sierra García, L., García Benau, M. A., & Mohammad Aljawarneh, N. (2025). Cloud-based artificial intelligence and audit report: the mediating role of the auditor. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*,

55(6), 1553–1574. https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-03-2024-0089

4. Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). *Prediction machines : the simple economics of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.
5. Ahmi, A., & Smidt, L. (2026). AI-driven auditing: trends, themes, and research trajectories. *EDPACS*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/07366981.2026.2637772
6. Almaqtari, F. A. (2024). The Role of IT Governance in the Integration of AI in Accounting and Auditing Operations. *Economies*, *12*(8), 199. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies12080199
7. Andiola, L. M., Masters, E., & Norman, C. (2020). Integrating technology and data analytic skills into the accounting curriculum: Accounting department leaders' experiences and insights. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *50*, 100655. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccedu.2020.100655
8. 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*(4), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-51684
9. Appelbaum, D., & Nehmer, R. A. (2017). Using Drones in Internal and External Audits: An Exploratory Framework. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, *14*(1), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.2308/jeta-51704
10. Baviskar, D., Ahirrao, S., Potdar, V., & Kotecha, K. (2021). Efficient Automated Processing of the Unstructured Documents Using Artificial Intelligence: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Directions. *IEEE Access*, *9*, 72894–72936. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3072900
11. Borgesius, Z. (2025). *UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository) Discrimination, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic decision-making*. https://rm.coe.int/discrimination-artificial-intelligence-and-algorithmic-decision-
12. Bradley, L., & Stöckle, S. (2024). *KPMG. Make the Difference. Financial reporting leaders' AI expectations for their companies and external auditors AI in financial reporting and audit: Navigating the new era KPMG International kpmg.com/NavigatingAIinAudit*.
13. Brown-Liburd, H., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2015). Big Data and Audit Evidence. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, *12*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.2308/jeta-10468
14. Buhmann, A., Paßmann, J., & Fieseler, C. (2020). Managing Algorithmic Accountability: Balancing Reputational Concerns, Engagement Strategies, and the Potential of Rational Discourse. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *163*(2), 265–280. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04226-4
15. Chawla, N. V., Japkowicz, N., & Kotcz, A. (2004). Editorial. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, *6*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1145/1007730.1007733
16. Colthart, J. (2019). *Demystifying artificial intelligence for audit*. https://www.accountingweb.co.uk/tech/tech-pulse/demystifying-artificial-intelligence-for-audit
17. Commerford, B. P., Dennis, S. A., Joe, J. R., & Ulla, J. W. (2022). Man Versus Machine: Complex Estimates and Auditor Reliance on Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Accounting Research*, *60*(1), 171–201. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679X.12407
18. Cong, R., Lei, J., Fu, H., Cheng, M.-M., Lin, W., & Huang, Q. (2019). Review of Visual Saliency Detection With Comprehensive Information. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, *29*(10), 2941–2959. https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSVT.2018.2870832
19. CPAB. (2024). *Potential benefits of AI-enabled audit tools*.
20. Dai, J., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2017). Toward Blockchain-Based Accounting and Assurance. *Journal of Information Systems*, *31*(3), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.2308/isys-51804
21. Deloitte. (2017). *Automate this The business leader's guide to robotic and intelligent automation Service Delivery Transformation*.
22. Eisikovits, N., Johnson, W. C., & Markelevich, A. (2025). Should Accountants Be Afraid of AI? Risks and Opportunities of Incorporating Artificial Intelligence into Accounting and Auditing. *Accounting Horizons*, *39*(2), 117–123. https://doi.org/10.2308/HORIZONS-2023-042
23. Eulerich, A., & Eulerich, M. (2020). What is the value of internal auditing? – A literature review on qualitative and quantitative perspectives. *Maandblad Voor Accountancy En Bedrijfseconomie*, *94*(3/4), 83–92. https://doi.org/10.5117/mab.94.50375
24. Eulerich, M., Sanatizadeh, A., Vakilzadeh, H., & Wood, D. A. (2024). Is it all hype? ChatGPT's performance and disruptive potential in the accounting and auditing industries. *Review of Accounting Studies*, *29*(3), 2318–2349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-024-09833-9
25. Falco, G., Shneiderman, B., Badger, J., Carrier, R., Dahbura, A., Danks, D., Eling, M., Goodloe, A., Gupta, J., Hart, C., Jirotka, M., Johnson, H., LaPointe, C., Llorens, A. J., Mackworth, A. K., Maple, C., Pálsson, S. E., Pasquale, F., Winfield, A., & Yeong, Z. K. (2021). Governing AI safety through independent audits. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, *3*(7), 566–571. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00370-7
26. Faulconbridge, J. (2025). Trajectories of legal work in the context of machine learning AI: conceptualising mediated evolution. *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, *32*(1), 97–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2025.2458039

27. Fedyk, A., Hodson, J., Khimich, N., & Fedyk, T. (2022). Is artificial intelligence improving the audit process? *Review of Accounting Studies*, *27*(3), 938–985. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-022-09697-x
28. Fotoh, L. E., & Lorentzon, J. I. (2023). Audit Digitalization and Its Consequences on the Audit Expectation Gap: A Critical Perspective. *Accounting Horizons*, *37*(1), 43–69. https://doi.org/10.2308/HORIZONS-2021-027
29. Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *114*, 254–280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019
30. Greenman, C. (2017). Exploring the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Accounting Profession. *Journal of Research in Business, Economics and Management*. www.scitecresearch.com
31. Grønsund, T., & Aanestad, M. (2020). Augmenting the algorithm: Emerging human-in-the-loop work configurations. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *29*(2), 101614. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101614
32. Gunz, S., & Thorne, L. (2020). Thematic Symposium: The Impact of Technology on Ethics, Professionalism and Judgement in Accounting. In *Journal of Business Ethics* (Vol. 167, Number 2, pp. 153–155). Springer Science and Business Media B.V. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04404-4
33. Han, H., Shiwakoti, R. K., Jarvis, R., Mordi, C., & Botchie, D. (2023). Accounting and auditing with blockchain technology and artificial Intelligence: A literature review. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, *48*, 100598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2022.100598
34. Hasan, A. R. (2022). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Accounting & Auditing: A Literature Review. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, *10*(01), 440–465. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2022.101026
35. Huang, F., & Wang, Y. (2023). Introducing Machine Learning in Auditing Courses. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, *20*(1), 195–211. https://doi.org/10.2308/JETA-2022-017
36. Issa, H., & Kogan, A. (2014). A Predictive Ordered Logistic Regression Model as a Tool for Quality Review of Control Risk Assessments. *Journal of Information Systems*, *28*(2), 209–229. https://doi.org/10.2308/isys-50808
37. Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control. *Academy of Management Annals*, *14*(1), 366–410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174
38. Kokina, J., & Davenport, T. H. (2017). The Emergence of Artificial Intelligence: How Automation is Changing Auditing. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, *14*(1), 115–122. https://doi.org/10.2308/jeta-51730
39. Landers, R. N., & Behrend, T. S. (2024). *Research Methods for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315167473
40. Lehner, O. M., Ittonen, K., Silvola, H., Ström, E., & Wührleitner, A. (2022). Artificial intelligence based decision-making in accounting and auditing: ethical challenges and normative thinking. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *35*(9), 109–135. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-09-2020-4934
41. Li, Y., & Goel, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence auditability and auditor readiness for auditing artificial intelligence systems. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, *56*, 100739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2025.100739
42. Libby, R., & Witz, P. D. (2024). Can artificial intelligence reduce the effect of independence conflicts on audit firm liability? *Contemporary Accounting Research*, *41*(2), 1346–1375. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12941
43. Ling, Z., Fang, Y., Li, X., Huang, Z., Lee, M., Memisevic, R., & Su, H. (2023). Deductive Verification of Chain-of-Thought Reasoning. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, & S. Levine (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vol. 36, pp. 36407–36433). Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/72393bd47a35f5b3bee4c609e7bba733-Paper-Conference.pdf
44. Lombardi, R., de Villiers, C., Moscariello, N., & Pizzo, M. (2022). The disruption of blockchain in auditing – a systematic literature review and an agenda for future research. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *35*(7), 1534–1565. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-10-2020-4992
45. Malone, T. W. (2020). How Can Human-Computer "Superminds" Develop Business Strategies? In *The Future of Management in an AI World* (pp. 165–183). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20680-2_9
46. Manheim, D., Martin, S., Bailey, M., Samin, M., & Greutzmacher, R. (2025). The necessity of AI audit standards boards. *AI & SOCIETY*, *40*(8), 6609–6624. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02320-y
47. Manita, R., Elommal, N., Baudier, P., & Hikkerova, L. (2020). The digital transformation of external audit and its impact on corporate governance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *150*, 119751. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119751
48. Martin, K. (2019). Ethical Implications and Accountability of Algorithms. *Journal of Business*

Ethics, *160*(4), 835–850. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3921-3

49. Matthias, A. (2004). *The responsibility gap: Ascribing responsibility for the actions of learning automata*.
50. Minkkinen, M., Laine, J., & Mäntymäki, M. (2022). Continuous Auditing of Artificial Intelligence: a Conceptualization and Assessment of Tools and Frameworks. *Digital Society*, *1*(3), 21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44206-022-00022-2
51. Moffitt, K. C., Rozario, A. M., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2018). Robotic Process Automation for Auditing. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, *15*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.2308/jeta-10589
52. Mökander, J., Schuett, J., Kirk, H. R., & Floridi, L. (2024). Auditing large language models: a three-layered approach. *AI and Ethics*, *4*(4), 1085–1115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00289-2
53. Montagna, P. D. (1968). Professionalization and Bureaucratization in Large Professional Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, *74*(2), 138–145. https://doi.org/10.1086/224616
54. Munoko, I., Brown-Liburd, H. L., & Vasarhelyi, M. (2020). The Ethical Implications of Using Artificial Intelligence in Auditing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *167*(2), 209–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04407-1
55. Murikah, W., Nthenge, J. K., & Musyoka, F. M. (2024). Bias and ethics of AI systems applied in auditing - A systematic review. *Scientific African*, *25*, e02281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2024.e02281
56. Nelson, B. (2009). Empty archives: most researchers agree that open access to data is the scientific ideal, so what is stopping it happening? Bryn Nelson investigates why many researchers choose not to share. *Nature*, *461*, 160+. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A208276379/
57. O'Leary, N. A., Cox, E., Holmes, J. B., Anderson, W. R., Falk, R., Hem, V., Tsuchiya, M. T. N., Schuler, G. D., Zhang, X., Torcivia, J., Ketter, A., Breen, L., Cothran, J., Bajwa, H., Tinne, J., Meric, P. A., Hlavina, W., & Schneider, V. A. (2024). Exploring and retrieving sequence and metadata for species across the tree of life with NCBI Datasets. *Scientific Data*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-024-03571-y
58. Parasuraman, R., & Manzey, D. H. (2010). Complacency and Bias in Human Use of Automation: An Attentional Integration. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, *52*(3), 381–410. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720810376055
59. Pemer, F., & Werr, A. (2025). Defusing Digital Disruption Through Creative Accumulation: Technology-Induced Innovation in Professional Service Firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, *62*(5), 1945–1990. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12972
60. Plumlee, M., Brown, D., Hayes, R. M., & Marshall, R. S. (2015). Voluntary environmental disclosure quality and firm value: Further evidence. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, *34*(4), 336–361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2015.04.004
61. Power, Michael. (1997). *The Audit Society*.
62. PwC. (2017). *A practical guide to Responsible Artificial Intelligence (AI)*.
63. Rawashdeh, A. (2025). The consequences of artificial intelligence: an investigation into the impact of AI on job displacement in accounting. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, *16*(3), 506–535. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTPM-02-2023-0030
64. Saad, G., Honey, A., Schaecken, P., & Scanlan, J. N. (2024). Strategies and supports used by mental health peer workers to facilitate role performance and satisfaction. *Advances in Mental Health*, *22*(2), 179–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/18387357.2023.2237135
65. Saengsith, N., & Suntraruk, P. (2023). Assessing the internal auditors' readiness for digital transformation. *Global Business and Economics Review*, *28*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1504/GBER.2023.127552
66. Samiolo, R., Spence, C., & Toh, D. (2024). Auditor judgment in the fourth industrial revolution. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, *41*(1), 498–528. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12901
67. Seethamraju, R., & Hecimovic, A. (2023). Adoption of artificial intelligence in auditing: An exploratory study. *Australian Journal of Management*, *48*(4), 780–800. https://doi.org/10.1177/03128962221108440
68. Shaffer, K. J., Gaumer, C. J., & Bradley, K. P. (2020). Artificial intelligence products reshape accounting: time to re-train. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, *34*(6), 41–43. https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-10-2019-0242
69. Sidhu, S. M. (2019). Human Ethics in the age of Robots and Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of Peace Education and Development*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.30954/2454-9525.01.2019.15
70. Smith, A. E., Zlatevska, N., Chowdhury, R. M. M. I., & Belli, A. (2023). A Meta-Analytical Assessment of the Effect of Deontological Evaluations and Teleological Evaluations on Ethical Judgments/Intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *188*(3), 553–588. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05311-x
71. Stancheva-Todorova, E. P. (2018). How artificial intelligence is challenging accouting profession. *Economy & Business ISSN*, *12*. www.scientific-publications.net
72. Sun, T., & Vasarhelyi, M. (2018). Embracing Textual Data Analytics in Auditing with Deep Learning. *The International Journal of Digital*

Accounting Research, 49–67. https://doi.org/10.4192/1577-8517-v18_3

73. Sutton, S. G., Holt, M., & Arnold, V. (2016). "The reports of my death are greatly exaggerated"—Artificial intelligence research in accounting. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, *22*, 60–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2016.07.005
74. Tiron-Tudor, A., & Deliu, D. (2021). Reflections on the human-algorithm complex duality perspectives in the auditing process. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, *19*(3), 255–285. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRAM-04-2021-0059
75. Vărzaru, A. A. (2022). Assessing Artificial Intelligence Technology Acceptance in Managerial Accounting. *Electronics*, *11*(14), 2256. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11142256
76. Williams, J. A., Weakley, A., Cook, D. J., & Schmitter-Edgecombe, M. (2013). *Machine Learning Techniques for Diagnostic Differentiation of Mild Cognitive Impairment and Dementia*. www.aaai.org
77. Xing, X., Zhong, B., Luo, H., Zhou, Q., Li, H., Rose, T., & Fang, W. (2020). Deep learning-based extraction of construction procedural constraints from construction regulations. *Advanced Engineering Informatics*, *43*, 101003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2019.101003
78. Yigitbasioglu, O., Green, P., & Cheung, M.-Y. D. (2023). Digital transformation and accountants as advisors. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *36*(1), 209–237. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-02-2019-3894
79. Zhang, C., Thomas, C., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2022). Attended Process Automation in Audit: A Framework and A Demonstration. *Journal of Information Systems*, *36*(2), 101–124. https://doi.org/10.2308/ISYS-2020-073
80. Zhong, C., & Goel, S. (2024). Transparent AI in Auditing through Explainable AI. *Current Issues in Auditing*, *18*(2), A1–A14. https://doi.org/10.2308/CIIA-2023-009