International Journal of Global Research Innovations & Technology (IJGRIT)
An International Multidisciplinary Quarterly Double Blind Open Access Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal
e-ISSN : 2583-8717, Impact Factor: (Cosmos: 6.972 & I2OR: 5.002), Volume 04, No. 02, April-June, 2026, pp 11-16

Observance, Authority and Credibility of Auditors in the AI Powered Audit Processes

Prin. (Dr.) Ajay Bhamare*

Pro Vice - Chancellor, University of Mumbai, Mumbai, India.

*Corresponding Author: prin.dr.am.bhamare@gmail.com

Citation: Bhamare, A. (2026). Observance, Authority and Credibility of Auditors in the AI Powered Audit Processes. International Journal of Global Research Innovations & Technology, 04(01), 11–16.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: *To examine the transformative impact of artificial intelligence on three dimensions: (1) auditors' observance, such as professional apprehension and decision-making; (2) authority, such as task allocation, human-AI collaboration, and accountability; and (3) credibility, which includes audit quality, stakeholder trust, and professional relevance.* ***Data and Design:*** *Main contemporary empirical and qualitative research conducted during 2015–2026 has been selected to examine the artificial intelligence transformative impact* ***Findings:*** *Artificial intelligence automates daily routine tasks; therefore, auditors can focus on related party transactions and major decision-making functions. However, these changes bring novel challenges, such as the aversion of algorithms and the explainability of AI, which require institutional, cognizable, and authoritative interventions.* ***Implication:*** *The AI-enabled audit process cannot replace human auditors but enriches their job roles, requiring them to be more technological experts, critical problem solvers, and adaptive professional judgment. Finally, their credibility relies on the ability to capitalize on AI's capabilities while preserving irreducible human elements, ethical judgement, and stakeholder trust.*

Keywords*: Professional Apprehension, Human-AI Conjoint, Audit Quality, Explainability*.

Introduction

The role of auditors has been transformed by the deployment of artificial intelligence (AI), which includes machine learning, deep learning, automated language processing, and predictive analytics in multinational professional accounting firms. **(Commerford et al. 2024).**Digital technology-enabled tools such as big data analytics, the Internet of Things, and blockchain can complete the entire audit process of clients with the capability of inspecting variations in transactions and identifying fraud risk with speed and accuracy, thereby eliminating manual and labor work for auditors and firms. The top four multinationals, that is, Earnst and Young, Deloitte, Price Waterhouse, and KPMG, have infused billions of dollars for automation of the audit process of their clients **(Appelbaum et al., 2017).**The adoption of AI-powered modern technology in the audit process enhances speed and accuracy and prevents fraud. However, it simultaneously generates fundamental queries regarding the professionalism and skills required for such automotive tasks, the locus of responsibility, and the foundation of stakeholders' trust in final accounts and reporting standards. When automated algorithms can determine mistakes more accurately than human auditors, what is the role of the auditor in the audit process and validating the reporting accuracy of financial statements? Top management of audit companies will have to reduce overheads and alter the auditors' competencies. In such cases, what would be the impact on their careers, skills, and social acceptance of the profession be?

This study investigates these queries by analyzing the impact of artificial intelligence across three major interconnected areas:

- **Observance** – In what way do artificial intelligence tools transform human auditor acuteness, professional beliefs, and decision-making processes?

- **Authority**: How the allotment of tasks, conjoint of human-AI interface, and responsibility structures are recomposed.
- **Credibility**: How audit peculiarity, related parties' judgement, and the expert's lawfulness excogitate in AI-garnished surroundings.

Based on descriptive field interviews and experiential and empirical studies conducted recently between 2015 and 2026, this study offers a holistic framework for determining the significant transformation of auditing through artificial intelligence.

Theoretical developments

- **Team work between Human and Artificial intelligence system**

The traditional audit process was based on passive instruments that were under the control of auditors. The introduction of artificial intelligence in the audit process has disrupted these instruments by deploying systems based on machine learning principles and producing outcomes automatically. The teamwork between humans and AI redevelops the conjoint, where artificial intelligence becomes a co-pilot rather than a co-worker**(Likoglu, 2025).** Prior research indicates that compelling teamwork is necessary for mutual psychological models, graded faith, and a clear job portrait. Auditors must learn about the capabilities and limitations of AI, when to depend on its results, and when to disagree with them. Research on dissatisfaction with automated systems indicates that end users often question recommendations given by artificial intelligence systems —even if the advice is superior to human decisions **(Dietvorst, Simmons, & Massey, 2015)**.

- **Sociotechnical Systems**

As social system auditing includes team members, hierarchies, and codes of ethics, and as a technical system, it includes big data, software tools, and methods of sampling, artificial intelligence-enabled auditing evolves as sociotechnical systems. Auditor firmsare required to redevelop fresh job descriptions, job enrichment, and job enlargement, and ensure skilled training for the personnel involved in the process. There is a need for machine learning and data analytics professionals, along with auditors in an audit team, therefore, forcing new ways of collocation and expert systems (**Vasarhelyi et al., 2015**).

- **Algorithmic Accountability**

Who is accountable when an artificial intelligence system fails or indicates a failure? The present audit standards entrust this accountability to the partner who signs and engages the audit team. When auditors cannot explain how AI-powered systems arrive at decisions, professional outcomes become uncertain. Organizations are not only accountable for decisions made through artificial intelligence but also for how AI systems are created, tested, and governed (**Hackstock & Boyer-Davis, 2026**).

- **Job Crafting and Role Adaptation**

Previous research indicates that auditors should not passively accept technology-enabled job roles; they should redefine their self-beliefs and cognition towards de-jobbing and re-jobbing, which is popularly known as job crafting **(Wrzesniewski& Dutton, 2001).**

AI and Auditor Cognition

- **Professional Apprehension in an Algorithmic Aura**

Professional apprehension refers to an auditor's capacity to raise queries, carefully investigate evidence, and identify misrepresentations of information in financial statements. Earlier, Apex watchdog authorities focused on timely requirements and cohesive relationships with clients, which could minimize auditors' apprehension. Along with artificial intelligence systems, new challenges and opportunities have emerged for industries. Artificial intelligence can support professional apprehension by detecting unbelievable patterns in the data or anomalies that can be missed by human audit professionals **(Hurtt et al., 2013).**

However, artificial intelligence can also pose risks. For example, algorithm aversion can reduce auditors trust in warning signals created by artificial intelligence systems. Moreover, bias toward automation can lead to the acceptance of artificial intelligence-based conclusions without independent observations **(Dietvorst et al., 2015).**

Commerford et al. (2024) conducted experiments with highly experienced auditors and found that auditors were less willing to depend on AI-based evidence than on similar evidence provided by human specialists. The study also found that when auditors were given limited control over the AI

system, such as setting certain parameters, their hesitation was reduced in some cases.This effect was stronger among auditors with an external locus of control, while it had little impact on those with an internal locus of control.

These findings indicate that the combination of human and artificial intelligence in the audit process reliesnot only on the technological quality of AI tools but also on the logical thinking and mental thought processes of auditors. Therefore, audit firms should consider both AI architecture design and auditor behavior when using AI effectively.

- **Judgment and Decision-Making**

Artificial intelligence can significantly impact the mental effort distributed in audit work. Many common tasks, such as ratio and fund flow analysis, matching financial statements, and trend detection, can be performed through AI-based audit processes. This allows auditors to spend more time on related party transactions and details that require professional expertise.

Owing to the lack of concentration on common tasks, auditors face certain challenges. When they stop checking such common routine tasks, they miss out on real knowledge that arises directly from manually working with data**(Griffith et al., 2015).**

Missing routine work can decrease their expertise in critically evaluating AI-assisted results. In contrast, various AI-assisted tools can have different types of explainability. This is a real challenge for auditors because they are required to create a note and justify the logical reasoning behind their audit decisions.

- **Cognitive Skill Demands**

Job postings on various portals have been studied empirically and found that audit firms require candidates who have critical thinking, problem-solving knowledge, and traditional accounting and audit process knowledge. This indicates that the audit profession expects artificial intelligence to handle repetitive tasks, while human auditors should add value through analysis and decision-making**(International Federation of Accountants, 2023).**

AI and Auditor Authority

- **Task Allocation and Workflow Reconfiguration**

In a study by **Fedyk et al. (2022)** of 310,000 employees from 36 major audit firms, artificial intelligence employees were found to be generally deployed in centralized teams instead of being spread across regional locations. This hierarchy allows auditors to invent artificial intelligence tools on a large scale, train algorithms once, and apply them many times in the audit process.

Law and Shen (2024)found adverse but related opinions. They believe that recruiting artificial-based employees at regional offices is merely the adoption of artificial intelligence tools. Thehiring of artificial intelligence employees has increased among junior and mid-level auditors.

Instead of differences in employment outcomes, both studies investigated the evolving audit job profile. AI systems can handle daily routine tasks, and auditors can get involved in detecting exceptions, dealing with clients, and checking areas that require decisions.

- **Human-AI Collaboration Dynamics**

Interviews with audit partners highlighted several important aspects of human-AI collaboration.

  - **Trust Calibration**

The stakeholders of the audit process have observed that auditors are reluctant to trust AI-enabled results. They demand evidence of accurate results before trusting AI-based outputs.Therefore, adequate governance systems are required to validate AI-enabled conclusions**(Issa et al. 2016; Kokina and Davenport 2017).**

  - **Explainability Requirements**

When certain transactions are highlighted by Ai-enabled audit processes without definite explanations, it creates confusion for auditors. They should be able to obtain audit trails, features of the decision rules, and strong beliefs to ensure compliance with audit standards **(Guidotti et al., 2018; Sutton et al., 2016).**

  - **Feedback Loops**

When auditors feedback is integrated into Ai Systems, it is in alignment with the principles of augmented intelligence and complements human expertise with algorithmic capabilities rather than

replacing them **(Jarrahi, 2018).**Therefore, imparting auditors with training in data warehousing, system-based feedback provision, and machine learning-based model interpretation is necessary to enhance the robustness and performance of AI-based audit systems **(Sutton, Holt, & Arnold, 2016).**

- **Accountability Structures**

Audit firms that use artificial intelligence tools in their audit work are responsible and accountable for audit outcomes. As artificial intelligence tools are widely used for investigation and reporting results, accountability is very important.

Audit firms are advised to observe the following steps.

- A Governing council and technical committee on AI – enabled governance should monitor and supervise the use of AI tools.
- Each model validation, primary and secondary data lakes, and bias validation are required, and proper documentary evidence should be recorded and filed.
- The conclusions drawn through the use of artificial intelligence should be followed by auditor and committee approval.

The ultimate decision-making capability should remain in the hands of the firm's auditors and not the artificial person. Therefore, AI – enabled audits are supportive of the audit process, but cannot replace human auditors.

AI and Audit Credibility

- **Audit Quality Outcomes**

Law and Shen (2024) found that when audits are performed through AI-enabled devices, human auditors can obtain more concrete going concern opinions, indicating proper risk investigation. The same study opines that due to the AI Audit process, internal control over financial statement reporting becomes more accurate.

- **Stakeholder Trust and Professional Legitimacy**

AI-enabled devices and software can run on all data rather than samples of data.This indicates that the transparency, trust, and legitimacy of the audit process have been assured.

Challenges and Governance Imperatives

- **Bias and Fairness**

The historical data obtained from one industry or geographical area can be trained, but the same model cannot be tested on different industries and locations. This situation creates potential bias; therefore, firms must have a solution for such bias.

- **Explainability and Documentation**

When AI AI-enabled audit is performed on data and documents, it is based on input features, assumptions, and limitations. Therefore, conclusions made by auditors should provide supporting documentary evidence for all the bases on which conclusions have been drawn.

- **Talent Development**

There is a paradigm shift in the skills required for AI-enabled audit processes. Junior auditors should learn how to interpret AI-based output rather than day-to-day routine work. Senior auditors should also start transferring expert knowledge to junior auditors with special reference to algorithms.

- **Ethical Considerations**

Firms should create a professional code of ethics because AI-enabled audits create problems in the inspection of employee behavior, the use of customer documents for model training, and the threshold of algorithmic.

Future Research Directions

Several avenues merit further investigation.

The success of AI-enabled audit processes should be studied for multiple years to determine the new job roles of employees. Watchdog authorities differ across countries; therefore, culture and context are also important for AI adoption. The way customers use artificial intelligence to record transactions in the books of accounting has an impact on audit AI-enabled audit risk.These variables have not been explored and, therefore, can be studied in the future.

- **Conclusion**

The potential demand for artificial intelligence is predominantly focused on the conjunction of human-AI—deciding trust, creating explainability, and conserving professional skepticism. This demands firm-level adaptation, including role enlargement, on-the-job training, and incorporating new expertise functions. This demands changes in governance, including determining accountability structures, overcoming bias, and communicating transparently with stakeholders.

Finally, the changing role of artificial intelligence in auditing will be decided not by the technology itself but by how professionals wish to deploy it. The competencies of auditors to critically evaluate AI-generated outputs, maintain the standards demand, and capitalize AI rather than replace professional decisions will observe their roles enriched rather than diminished. The credibility of the AI – enabled audit function in providing unbiased assurance over financial statements depends on achieving this equivalence.

References

1. Commerford B., Eilifsen A, Hatfield R. C., Holmstrom, K., &Kinserdal, F. (2024). Control issues: How providing input affects auditors' reliance on artificial intelligence. *Contemporary Accounting Research, 41*(4). https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12974
2. Appelbaum, D., Kogan, A., &Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2017). Big data and analytics in modern audit engagement: Research needs.*Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory, 36*(4), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-51684
3. Likoglu, C. (2025). The effect of AI on the role of human auditors (Bachelor's thesis, University of Twente)
4. Miklos A. Vasarhelyi, Alexander Kogan, Brad M. Tuttle; Big Data in Accounting: An Overview. Accounting Horizons 1 June 2015; 29 (2): 381–396. https://doi.org/10.2308/acch-51071
5. Berkeley J. Dietvorst, Joseph P. Simmons and Massey (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after they make errors.*Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144*(1), 114–126.https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033
6. Hackstock, N., & Boyer-Davis, S. (2026). Artificial Intelligence-Based Decision Aids and Professional Apprehension in Large-Firm Public Accounting Audits: A Review of External Audit Risk Assessment Research (2021–2025). Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 28(2), 259– 268.
7. Amy Wrzesniewski, A., & Jane E. Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 179–201. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011
8. Fedyk, A., Hodson, J., Khimich, N., & Fedyk, T. (2022). Is artificial intelligence improving the audit process? *Review of Accounting Studies*, 27(3): 938–985.
9. Hackstock, N., & Boyer-Davis, S. (2026). Artificial intelligence-based decision aids and professional apprehension in large-firm public accounting audits: A review of external audit risk assessment research (2021–2025). *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 28(2).
10. Law, K.K.F., & Shen, M. (2024). How does artificial intelligence shape audit firms? *Management Science*, 72(3).
11. Hurtt, R. K., Brown-Liburd, H., & Earley, C. E., & Krishnamoorthy, G. (2013). Research on auditor professional apprehension: Literature synthesis and opportunities for future research. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory, 32*(Supplement 1), 45–97. https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-5036
12. Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after they make errors.*Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144*(1), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033
13. Griffith, E. E., Hammersley, J. S., Kadous, K., & Young, D. (2015). Auditor mindsets and audits of complex estimates. *Journal of Accounting Research, 53*(1), 49–77. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679X.12066
14. International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). (2023). *The impact of technology on the auditing profession*.

15. Kelvin K. F. Law; , Michael Shen (2024) How Does Artificial Intelligence Shape Audit Firms? Management Science 71(5):3641-3666.

16. Issa, H., Sun, T., &Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2016). Research ideas for artificial intelligence in auditing: The formalization of audit and workforce supplementation. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting, 13*(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.2308/jeta-10511

17. Guidotti, R., Monreale, A., Ruggieri, S., Turini, F., Giannotti, F., &Pedreschi, D. (2018). A survey of methods for explaining black-box models.*ACM Computing Surveys, 51*(5), 93. https://doi.org/10.1145/3236009

18. Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision-making.*Business Horizons, 61*(4), 577–586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007

19. Sutton, S. G., Holt, M., & Arnold, V. (2016). Artificial intelligence in accounting. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems, 22*, 60–73.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2016.07.005.