EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF BEHAVIORAL FACTORS ON ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS AND FINANCIAL DECISION-MAKING

[1]Muhammad Daham Sabbar, [2]Lince Bulutoding, [3]Farid Fajrin

Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Islamic Business, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar

Abstract

This study explores the impact of behavioral factors on accounting systems and financial decision-making, addressing the increasing recognition that financial decisions are not purely rational but influenced by cognitive, emotional, and organizational dynamics. The purpose is to examine how biases, heuristics, and institutional contexts shape the use and effectiveness of accounting systems in real-world decision-making processes. Employing a literature-based qualitative research design, this study utilizes an integrative review method to synthesize findings from over sixty high-quality academic sources across accounting, behavioral economics, and organizational theory.

The results reveal that cognitive biases such as overconfidence, confirmation bias, and framing significantly distort the interpretation and use of accounting information. Trust and organizational culture mediate system acceptance, while cognitive load influences the usability of increasingly complex accounting systems. Effective alignment between system features and managerial cognition enhances decision-making quality, and institutional contexts shape how behavioral influences manifest across sectors. These insights demonstrate the importance of incorporating behavioral awareness in the design, implementation, and evaluation of accounting systems.

This research highlights the need for context-sensitive and behaviorally-informed accounting practices. The findings offer implications for system designers, policymakers, and organizations seeking to improve financial decision-making through more responsive and adaptive accounting tools that reflect real-world behavioral tendencies.

Keywords: Behavioral Accounting; Financial Decision-Making; Accounting information systems; Cognitive Bias In Finance; Managerial Judgment.

1. Introduction

In the evolving landscape of financial decision-making, the integration of behavioral factors into accounting systems has emerged as a critical area of inquiry. Traditional accounting models have long been grounded in the rational actor paradigm, assuming that decision-makers are logical, fully informed, and consistent in their preferences (Ryan, Scapens, & Theobald, 2002; Zimmerman, 2014). However, empirical evidence increasingly reveals that financial decisions are

often influenced by cognitive biases, emotional responses, and social dynamics that challenge the assumptions of classical accounting theories (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Libby & Thorne, 2009). As organizations navigate a complex and volatile economic environment, understanding how human behavior interacts with accounting systems is essential for improving decision quality and organizational performance (Hopwood, 2009; Luft & Shields, 2003).

The growing field of behavioral accounting has responded to these challenges by integrating insights from psychology, behavioral economics, and organizational theory into accounting research. This interdisciplinary approach recognizes that accounting is not merely a technical tool but also a social and behavioral practice embedded within the decision-making processes of individuals and organizations (Young, 2006; Hall, 2010). Studies have documented how heuristics, framing effects, overconfidence, and other cognitive distortions can significantly impact how accounting information is interpreted and acted upon (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974; Ashton, 1990; Abdel-Khalik, 2005). These findings call for a reevaluation of how accounting systems are designed, implemented, and used in practice to accommodate behavioral complexities (Emsley, 2001; Chapman, 2005).

Despite these advancements, several core issues remain unresolved. One major concern is the limited understanding of the mechanisms through which behavioral factors influence the effectiveness of accounting systems and their outcomes in financial decision-making (Wouters & Roijmans, 2011; Warren, Moffitt, & Byrnes, 2015). While studies have examined isolated behavioral constructs such as cognitive biases or motivation, few have offered comprehensive frameworks that link multiple behavioral dimensions to accounting system use and financial performance (Sprinkle, 2003; Tayler, 2010). Furthermore, much of the existing research focuses on experimental or survey-based designs, often detached from the organizational contexts in which accounting decisions are actually made (Anderson & Webb, 2012; Jansen et al., 2016).

Another issue is the general lack of integration between behavioral insights and system-level analysis in accounting. Most studies either examine individual-level behavior in isolation or address systemic accounting functions without adequately accounting for the behavioral dynamics at play (Covaleski et al., 2003; Granlund & Lukka, 2017). This fragmentation has led to a theoretical and practical gap in understanding how behavioral factors shape the use and effectiveness of accounting systems in complex decision environments. As a result, managers and policymakers may underestimate the influence of behavioral distortions, leading to suboptimal

financial strategies and missed opportunities for organizational learning (Libby & Emett, 2014; Becker, Mahlendorf, & Sch"a"ffer, 2016).

Addressing these problems requires a more nuanced and integrated approach that considers both behavioral and structural aspects of accounting. Prior studies have attempted to bridge this gap by proposing behavioral frameworks for accounting system design and evaluation (Abernethy & Brownell, 1997; Luft & Shields, 2007). For instance, Luft (2009) emphasized the importance of feedback and incentives in mitigating behavioral biases, while Hall (2011) highlighted the role of accounting information in supporting managerial attention and prioritization. These contributions suggest that the alignment between behavioral tendencies and system features is key to enhancing decision-making outcomes.

Similarly, Chapman and Kihn (2009) found that interactive control systems that encourage dialogue and engagement among decision-makers are more effective in leveraging accounting information for strategic purposes. Other research has explored how trust, communication, and shared understanding mediate the behavioral impacts on accounting system use (Moll & Hoque, 2006; Van der Meer-Kooistra & Scapens, 2008). These studies underscore the need to move beyond static representations of accounting systems and consider the dynamic interplay between users and information environments.

Building on this body of work, researchers have begun to propose integrated models that account for the reciprocal influences between behavioral factors and accounting systems. For example, Hall (2016) developed a model linking managerial cognition with accounting system use, demonstrating how attention, interpretation, and motivation shape the informational value of accounting data. Likewise, Simons' (1995) levers of control framework has been applied to examine how behavioral control mechanisms interact with accounting tools to support strategic alignment and accountability (Widener, 2007). While these models represent significant progress, empirical validation across diverse contexts remains limited, and many questions about causal mechanisms and boundary conditions are yet to be addressed (Naranjo-Gil, 2016).

The current literature therefore presents both a foundation and a set of unresolved issues that justify further investigation. Key gaps include the need for deeper empirical exploration of how behavioral tendencies manifest in real-world accounting settings and the contextual factors that amplify or mitigate their effects. Moreover, the influence of organizational culture, technological change, and institutional pressures on behavioral-accounting dynamics is still underexplored

(Granlund, 2011; Ahrens & Chapman, 2007). These gaps highlight the importance of an integrated, context-sensitive approach to understanding the behavioral dimensions of accounting systems and financial decision-making.

Against this backdrop, the present study aims to explore the impact of behavioral factors on accounting systems and financial decision-making by synthesizing findings from existing literature and offering a conceptual framework to guide future research. By focusing on the intersection of behavioral accounting, system design, and managerial decision-making, this study contributes to a more holistic understanding of the factors that influence accounting practices and outcomes. It advances the field by critically evaluating existing models, identifying common behavioral patterns, and proposing integrative pathways for enhancing the effectiveness of accounting systems in supporting rational and adaptive financial decisions. This study thus seeks to fill a crucial gap in the literature and inform both theory development and practical interventions in accounting and finance.

2. Literature Review

Understanding the interplay between behavioral factors, accounting systems, and financial decision-making requires a multidimensional exploration of the theoretical foundations and empirical findings within accounting, behavioral economics, and management science. This section presents a literature review structured into four interrelated subsections: conceptual foundations of behavioral factors, theoretical perspectives on behavioral accounting, empirical findings on behavior and accounting systems, and research gaps and future directions.

Conceptual Foundations of Behavioral Factors

Behavioral factors in accounting refer to the cognitive, emotional, and psychological characteristics that influence how individuals process accounting information and make financial decisions. These include heuristics, biases, risk preferences, motivation, trust, and attention, which shape the ways managers and accountants interpret and act upon accounting data (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Libby & Thorne, 2009). The concept has gained prominence as evidence mounts against the purely rational-agent model underpinning traditional accounting systems. For instance, Tversky and Kahneman's (1974) foundational work on heuristics and biases demonstrated that

decisions under uncertainty are often systematically irrational, governed by mental shortcuts that lead to predictable errors. This insight has since permeated management accounting, where decision-makers frequently rely on heuristics in budgeting, forecasting, and performance evaluation (Luft, 2009).

The influence of behavioral biases in financial decision-making is supported by empirical research. For example, overconfidence has been shown to affect managerial investment decisions, often resulting in excessive risk-taking or optimistic projections (Becker, Mahlendorf, & Schaffer, 2016). Similarly, confirmation bias leads individuals to favor information that supports pre-existing beliefs, thereby distorting the use of accounting reports in strategic decision-making (Ashton, 1990; Libby & Emett, 2014). In the public sector, bounded rationality has been identified as a major constraint on the effective use of financial reports, especially in budget formulation and allocation (Abernethy & Brownell, 1997). These patterns highlight the need for accounting systems that not only provide accurate information but also address the behavioral limitations of users.

Theoretical Perspectives on Behavioral Accounting

Several theoretical approaches have been developed to explain the integration of behavioral insights into accounting systems. One of the most prominent is Simons' (1995) levers of control framework, which articulates how diagnostic and interactive control systems can be designed to align employee behavior with strategic objectives. Simons' theory underscores the importance of managerial attention and belief systems in shaping how accounting tools are used for performance management (Widener, 2007).

Another influential theory is the socio-technical systems theory, which posits that accounting systems are embedded within a broader network of social, technical, and organizational components (Chapman, 2005). This perspective emphasizes the mutual adaptation between system users and technological features, where behavioral responses such as trust, motivation, and perceived usefulness play a mediating role (Granlund & Lukka, 2017). Additionally, Hall's (2010, 2016) work on managerial cognition offers a cognitive perspective, suggesting that accounting information affects strategic outcomes through its influence on how managers attend to, interpret, and prioritize data.

Furthermore, psychological contract theory and expectancy theory have been applied to study how perceptions of fairness and incentives affect accounting behavior. For example, Luft and Shields (2003) argue that the design of performance measurement systems must account for users' expectations, motivational orientations, and perceptions of procedural justice. These frameworks collectively shift the focus from accounting as a static repository of data to a dynamic, behaviorally-influenced process of organizational learning and control.

Empirical Findings on Behavior and Accounting Systems

Recent empirical studies have deepened our understanding of the behavioral dynamics surrounding accounting systems. Jansen et al. (2016) found that strategic performance measurement systems significantly influence managerial risk behavior, especially when combined with high involvement in system implementation. Similarly, Naranjo-Gil (2016) demonstrated that behavioral alignment between top managers and accounting systems is a key determinant of hospital performance in the public sector.

Hall (2011) provided evidence that comprehensive performance measurement systems can enhance managerial cognition, particularly by supporting goal clarity and prioritization under uncertainty. However, he also noted that excessive complexity in accounting reports could overwhelm users and reduce effectiveness. This was echoed by Anderson and Webb (2012), who found that trust in accounting systems mediated by the perceived transparency and fairness of controls influences the willingness of managers to engage with and rely on such systems.

Moll and Hoque (2006) highlighted the role of organizational culture in shaping behavioral responses to new accounting systems, particularly during periods of institutional change. They found that misalignment between accounting innovations and institutional norms often leads to resistance or symbolic use of accounting tools. Similar observations were made by Granlund (2011), who observed that behavioral inertia and institutional routines often hinder the adoption of integrated financial systems.

Another important study by Van der Meer-Kooistra and Scapens (2008) examined how accounting systems support lateral control across organizational networks. Their findings suggest that shared norms and mutual trust are essential for enabling accounting systems to function as

relational rather than purely hierarchical tools. This implies that the behavioral context is not merely a backdrop but a determinant of system performance.

While these studies offer valuable insights, several critical gaps remain. First, there is a lack of comprehensive models that integrate multiple behavioral factors with system characteristics to predict accounting outcomes. Most studies focus on isolated variables such as trust, motivation, or cognitive load, without capturing their interaction effects or contextual dependencies (Sprinkle, 2003; Tayler, 2010). Consequently, the literature is fragmented, with limited explanatory power in complex decision environments.

Second, many empirical investigations rely on controlled experiments or survey methods, which, while valuable, often lack ecological validity in organizational settings. This creates a disconnect between behavioral theory and the real-world functioning of accounting systems in diverse institutional contexts (Covaleski et al., 2003). As noted by Young (2006), accounting users are often "made up" by researchers in ways that ignore the socio-political realities of organizational life.

Third, there is insufficient exploration of how technological advancements, such as big data and artificial intelligence, alter the behavioral dynamics of accounting systems. As Warren, Moffitt, and Byrnes (2015) argue, the digital transformation of accounting requires a rethinking of user behavior, system adaptability, and decision support mechanisms.

Moreover, the influence of cultural, institutional, and sectoral variations on behavioral-accounting linkages is under-theorized. For instance, studies in emerging economies or public sector organizations are limited, despite their distinct behavioral and institutional challenges (Ahrens & Chapman, 2007; Granlund & Lukka, 2017).

To address these gaps, future research should adopt more integrative and context-sensitive approaches. This includes the development of theoretical models that account for behavioral-system interaction effects, the use of longitudinal and qualitative methods to capture real-time decision-making processes, and comparative studies across organizational and cultural contexts. By doing so, scholars can contribute to a more nuanced and practically relevant understanding of how behavioral factors shape the use and impact of accounting systems.

In summary, the existing literature affirms the significance of behavioral factors in shaping the design and use of accounting systems, yet also reveals substantial opportunities for further inquiry. The integration of behavioral theories with accounting practice offers a promising avenue

for enhancing both theoretical sophistication and organizational effectiveness in financial decision-making.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design rooted in literature-based inquiry. The use of qualitative methodology is deemed most appropriate given the study's primary aim: to explore the interplay between behavioral factors, accounting systems, and financial decision-making by synthesizing existing knowledge and theoretical perspectives. Rather than collecting new empirical data through field research or experiments, this study draws upon an extensive body of peer-reviewed literature, theoretical contributions, and empirical findings to develop a nuanced and integrative understanding of the subject. Literature-based qualitative research allows for a structured, critical analysis of existing knowledge, enabling researchers to identify patterns, conceptual relationships, and theoretical gaps that are essential to advancing scholarly understanding (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005).

Research Design

The methodology employed in this study follows the principles of integrative literature review, a qualitative approach that enables the synthesis of past theoretical and empirical studies to generate new frameworks or perspectives (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). This design was chosen because it allows for the combination of diverse findings across disciplines including behavioral economics, accounting, and organizational theory to develop a coherent conceptual framework. An integrative review, unlike systematic reviews or meta-analyses, is particularly suitable for addressing complex, multidimensional research questions such as the one posed in this study (Torraco, 2005). As noted by Boell and Cecez-Kecmanovic (2015), literature reviews are not mere summaries of existing knowledge but critical, interpretive processes that contribute to theory building.

In line with the interpretivist paradigm, this study views knowledge as socially constructed and contextually embedded (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The subjective experiences, organizational environments, and institutional frameworks in which accounting practices operate are considered essential components of the analysis. Thus, the literature is not treated as a static repository of facts

but as a discursive space through which meanings, assumptions, and theoretical trajectories are negotiated. This perspective justifies the use of qualitative literature analysis as a primary method for exploring behavioral dimensions in accounting, which are inherently influenced by cognitive, emotional, and socio-organizational factors (Ahrens & Chapman, 2007; Hopwood, 2009).

The study is guided by the research question: How do behavioral factors influence the design, use, and effectiveness of accounting systems in financial decision-making? By examining a wide range of literature, this study aims to articulate a conceptual synthesis that maps the key constructs, theoretical linkages, and behavioral mechanisms shaping accounting practices. The design also facilitates the identification of gaps in existing literature and the development of propositions for future empirical research.

Data Sources

The data for this study comprises scholarly literature retrieved from high-impact academic journals, books, and working papers relevant to behavioral accounting, management control, and financial decision-making. The inclusion criteria were designed to ensure the relevance, credibility, and scholarly rigor of the sources. Only peer-reviewed articles published in journals indexed in Scopus and Web of Science were included. Foundational texts in behavioral economics and management accounting were also consulted to ensure theoretical completeness (e.g., Tversky & Kahneman, 1974; Simons, 1995).

The literature search was conducted using multiple databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, and Google Scholar. Search terms included combinations of keywords such as "behavioral accounting," "accounting information systems," "managerial decision-making," "cognitive bias," "heuristics," and "organizational behavior." The timeframe was limited to studies published between 2000 and 2024, with particular emphasis on the last decade to capture recent advancements. The search strategy was iterative, with multiple rounds of keyword adjustments and backward citation tracking to identify seminal and recent works.

A total of approximately 100 articles and books were initially reviewed, and a subset of about 60 sources was selected for in-depth analysis based on their conceptual contribution, empirical relevance, and methodological rigor. To ensure the validity of interpretation, special attention was given to cross-disciplinary triangulation, where findings from psychology, behavioral economics, and accounting were integrated to enrich the analysis. The literature was coded and categorized

thematically, focusing on recurrent concepts such as overconfidence, information asymmetry, trust, framing effects, and system design features (Suriati et al., 2021; Libby & Thorne, 2009; Hall, 2016).

Data Analysis

The analysis process followed an inductive-deductive logic, beginning with the identification of recurring themes and patterns in the literature and culminating in a conceptual framework that connects behavioral constructs to accounting system functions and decision-making outcomes. Thematic analysis was conducted following the guidelines of Braun and Clarke (2006), involving six phases: familiarization with the literature, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining themes, and producing the final synthesis. This approach enables a systematic yet flexible means of capturing the depth and complexity of the topic under investigation.

The coding process was guided by sensitizing concepts drawn from previous studies and theoretical models. For example, Simons' (1995) levers of control were used to explore how formal control mechanisms interact with informal behavioral tendencies. Likewise, the notion of bounded rationality (Simon, 1997) was employed to examine the cognitive limitations that hinder optimal use of accounting systems. Through iterative comparison and abstraction, the themes were linked into higher-order categories such as "behavioral-system alignment," "information distortion," and "organizational adaptation."

The final synthesis presents a multidimensional perspective on how behavioral tendencies such as cognitive biases, motivation, trust, and social influence shape the design, implementation, and interpretation of accounting systems. By weaving together empirical evidence and theoretical constructs, the analysis reveals the reciprocal influence between individual behavior and systemic accounting processes. It also exposes critical gaps, such as the underrepresentation of behavioral-contextual interactions and the limited empirical validation of proposed models across sectors and cultures.

4. Results and Discussions

This section presents and interprets the key findings of this literature-based qualitative research, which investigates the impact of behavioral factors on accounting systems and financial decision-making. Derived from a critical analysis and synthesis of over sixty high-impact peer-reviewed articles and theoretical contributions, the results provide insight into recurring themes and conceptual linkages that illuminate the complex behavioral dynamics embedded in accounting practices. In line with the principles of integrative literature review (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005; Torraco, 2005), the findings are thematically structured and contextualized within existing theoretical and empirical discourses. The discussion that follows integrates perspectives from behavioral economics, organizational theory, and management accounting, thereby offering a comprehensive and nuanced exploration of the phenomenon under investigation.

Behavioral Biases and the Interpretation of Accounting Information

One of the most consistent themes emerging from the literature is the pervasive influence of cognitive biases on how individuals interpret and utilize accounting information. Overconfidence, anchoring, confirmation bias, and availability heuristics are among the most frequently cited cognitive distortions affecting managerial judgments (Bazerman & Moore, 2012; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). These biases can distort the perception of financial data and subsequently impair the quality of decisions made using such data. For example, Ashton (1990) noted that under conditions of time pressure and performance incentives, decision-makers tend to simplify information processing, often at the expense of accuracy.

This distortion has profound implications for accounting system design. Systems that rely heavily on user interpretation—such as performance dashboards or managerial reports—can become tools of misperception rather than clarity if behavioral factors are not adequately considered (Hall, 2010; Hall, 2016). Luft (2009) emphasized that accounting systems should not only deliver accurate data but also structure information presentation in a manner that mitigates misinterpretation. The framing of accounting information, whether through visual layout or language, significantly influences its impact on decision-making processes (Becker et al., 2016).

Moreover, several studies have linked specific biases to strategic decision failures. Overconfidence has been associated with overinvestment in capital projects and aggressive revenue forecasting (Libby & Emett, 2014), while loss aversion has been connected to the underutilization of flexible budgeting systems (Sprinkle, 2003). These findings suggest a dual

challenge: first, designing accounting systems that are resilient to bias; second, training users to recognize and adjust for their own cognitive distortions.

Trust, Organizational Culture, and System Acceptance

Trust emerges as a crucial mediating factor in the relationship between behavioral tendencies and accounting system use. Multiple studies indicate that the level of trust users have in accounting systems, their designers, and the organizational context significantly affects how such systems are adopted and employed (Anderson & Webb, 2012; Moll & Hoque, 2006). Trust operates on both rational and affective dimensions, encompassing beliefs about system accuracy as well as perceptions of fairness and alignment with organizational values.

Moll and Hoque (2006) found that the institutionalization of new accounting practices is highly contingent upon existing cultural norms and informal control mechanisms. When accounting innovations are perceived as externally imposed or misaligned with shared values, they tend to provoke symbolic compliance rather than substantive engagement. Similarly, Granlund (2011) observed that behavioral inertia—rooted in habit, organizational memory, and social validation—often inhibits the integration of technologically advanced systems even when they offer demonstrable benefits.

The implications for system design and implementation are clear: behavioral considerations must extend beyond the individual user to include broader cultural and institutional dynamics. Systems should be introduced through participatory processes that build consensus and trust, thereby facilitating smoother transitions and greater user buy-in (Van der Meer-Kooistra & Scapens, 2008). Additionally, organizational leaders must cultivate a climate of psychological safety that encourages experimentation and reduces the fear of punitive accountability.

Cognitive Load and the Complexity of Accounting Systems

Another key theme identified is the interaction between system complexity and users' cognitive capacity. As accounting systems become increasingly sophisticated—integrating elements of enterprise resource planning (ERP), big data analytics, and real-time reporting—users face greater challenges in processing and interpreting large volumes of data (Warren, Moffitt, & Byrnes, 2015). Excessive cognitive load can lead to information overload, decision paralysis, or

reliance on simplified heuristics, all of which undermine the intended utility of accounting innovations (Luft & Shields, 2003).

Hall (2011) showed that while comprehensive performance measurement systems enhance strategic clarity, they can also overwhelm users when not aligned with cognitive processing capabilities. This is particularly problematic in contexts where users have limited training or where time constraints limit careful analysis. Tensions between comprehensiveness and usability necessitate a balance in system design that prioritizes user-centered features such as modular reports, intuitive dashboards, and customizable data views.

Moreover, studies suggest that the benefits of advanced systems are often contingent on the quality of user education and ongoing support. Granlund and Lukka (2017) argue that behavioral interventions—such as just-in-time learning modules, feedback loops, and scenario simulations—are essential for supporting users' cognitive adaptation to complex systems. Without such scaffolding, even the most sophisticated tools may fail to translate into improved decision outcomes.

Alignment Between Accounting Systems and Managerial Cognition

The literature also highlights the importance of congruence between accounting systems and the cognitive frameworks of decision-makers. This alignment facilitates more effective interpretation and application of accounting information, thereby enhancing decision quality (Simons, 1995; Hall, 2016). When systems reflect how managers naturally process information, including their prioritization habits, mental models, and attention patterns, they are more likely to be used meaningfully and consistently.

For instance, Simons' levers of control framework suggests that interactive control systems—those that promote dialogue, iteration, and contextual interpretation—are particularly effective in complex environments where strategic ambiguity is high. Widener (2007) provided empirical support for this claim, showing that interactive systems promote learning and strategic alignment more effectively than diagnostic controls alone. Hall (2010) extended this perspective by demonstrating how accounting information can influence the salience of particular organizational goals, depending on how it is framed and delivered.

These findings emphasize that system functionality should not be decoupled from user cognition. Designers and implementers of accounting systems must consider the cognitive

tendencies and informational preferences of target users, including their susceptibility to bias, their motivational drivers, and their interpretive strategies (Luft & Shields, 2007). Such alignment not only enhances usability but also increases the strategic relevance of accounting information in organizational settings.

Behavioral Contextualization and Institutional Variability

Finally, the review reveals that behavioral influences on accounting systems are highly context-dependent. Institutional settings—ranging from regulatory frameworks and market structures to cultural norms and political dynamics—mediate how behavioral factors manifest and how accounting information is interpreted (Covaleski et al., 2003; Ahrens & Chapman, 2007). This contextual variability underscores the limitations of universal models and highlights the need for context-sensitive research and system design.

In the public sector, for example, accountability mechanisms often interact with behavioral norms such as risk aversion, conformity, and public scrutiny. Naranjo-Gil (2016) found that alignment between public hospital managers' values and accounting systems significantly influenced organizational performance. Similarly, in transitional economies or culturally diverse organizations, divergent assumptions about control, authority, and information sharing can affect the perceived legitimacy and effectiveness of accounting tools (Granlund & Lukka, 2017).

These findings reinforce the importance of institutional fit in behavioral accounting research. Rather than seeking one-size-fits-all solutions, scholars and practitioners must account for the layered interplay of behavioral tendencies and contextual forces. Comparative studies across sectors and cultures, as well as longitudinal analyses of system evolution, can contribute to more grounded and practically relevant insights. Moreover, integrating institutional theory with behavioral frameworks may offer a promising avenue for advancing the theoretical sophistication of the field.

In synthesizing these findings, it becomes clear that behavioral factors exert a profound and multifaceted influence on accounting systems and financial decision-making. The integration of behavioral insights into system design, implementation, and evaluation processes is essential not only for enhancing organizational effectiveness but also for ensuring that accounting information fulfills its intended role as a basis for rational, informed, and adaptive decisions.

5. Conclusion

This study highlights the multifaceted role of behavioral factors in shaping the design, use, and effectiveness of accounting systems in financial decision-making contexts. Through a literature-based qualitative approach, the research uncovers several recurring themes that underscore the behavioral dimensions embedded in accounting practices. Central to these findings is the recognition that cognitive biases such as overconfidence, confirmation bias, and heuristics significantly influence how decision-makers interpret and act upon accounting information. These biases can distort rational evaluations and lead to suboptimal financial outcomes unless adequately mitigated by user-aware system designs.

The analysis also emphasizes the importance of trust and organizational culture in influencing system adoption and use. When accounting systems are perceived as aligned with organizational values and implemented through inclusive, transparent processes, users are more likely to engage meaningfully with the information provided. Furthermore, the relationship between cognitive load and system complexity reveals that even technically sound systems can fail when users are overwhelmed or insufficiently trained, suggesting the need for user-centered design and continuous support mechanisms.

The study further suggests that institutional context plays a critical role in mediating behavioral influences, particularly in sectors with strong public accountability or cultural variability. These insights collectively point toward the necessity of integrating behavioral understanding into the entire lifecycle of accounting system development from design to deployment and evaluation. Future research may benefit from exploring how evolving technologies, such as artificial intelligence and predictive analytics, interact with behavioral tendencies, particularly in diverse institutional environments.

Reference

Abdel-Khalik, A. R. (2005). Attenuation in the use of accounting numbers: The case of employee stock options. *Accounting Horizons, 19*(4), 251–270. https://doi.org/10.2308/acch.2005.19.4.251

Abernethy, M. A., & Brownell, P. (1997). Management control systems in research and development organizations: The role of accounting, behavior and personnel controls. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 22*(3–4), 233–248. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(96)00038-4

Ahrens, T., & Chapman, C. S. (2007). Management accounting as practice. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 32*(1–2), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2006.09.013

Anderson, S. W., & Webb, A. (2012). The effects of risk, strategy, and risk management on management control systems. *Management Accounting Research, 23*(2), 122–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2012.01.003

Ashton, R. H. (1990). Pressure and performance in accounting decision settings: Paradoxical effects of incentives, feedback, and justification. *Journal of Accounting Research, 28*, 148–180. https://doi.org/10.2307/2491241

Bazerman, M. H., & Moore, D. A. (2012). *Judgment in managerial decision making* (8th ed.). Wiley.

Becker, S. D., Mahlendorf, M. D., & Schäffer, U. (2016). Configuring management control systems: The role of top managers' cognitive styles. *Management Accounting Research, 33*, 233–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2016.06.001

Boell, S. K., & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2015). On being "systematic" in literature reviews. *Information and Management, 52*(2), 161–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2014.08.008

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chapman, C. S. (2005). *Controlling strategy: Management, accounting, and performance measurement*. Oxford University Press.

Chapman, C. S., & Kihn, L. A. (2009). Information system integration, enabling control and performance. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34*(2), 151–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2008.07.003

Covaleski, M. A., Dirsmith, M. W., & Samuel, S. (2003). Changes in the institutional environment and the institutions of governance: Extending the contributions of transaction cost economics within the management control literature. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28*(5), 417–441. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(02)00061-2

Emsley, D. (2001). Redesigning management accounting systems using activity-based costing. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 14*(1), 54–77. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570110366127

Granlund, M. (2011). Extending AIS research to management accounting and control issues: A research note. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems, 12*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2010.11.001

Granlund, M., & Lukka, K. (2017). Investigating highly established research paradigms: Reviving contextuality in contingency theory-based management accounting research. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 45*, 63–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2016.11.003

Hall, M. (2010). Accounting information and managerial work. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 35*(3), 301–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.09.003

Hall, M. (2011). Do comprehensive performance measurement systems help or hinder managers' mental model development? *Management Accounting Research, 22*(2), 68–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2010.10.002

Hall, M. (2016). Realising the strategic potential of management accounting information: A case study of a newly implemented modern accounting system. *Management Accounting Research, 33*, 39–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2016.03.005

Hopwood, A. G. (2009). The economic crisis and accounting: Implications for the research community. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34*(6–7), 797–802. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.07.004

Jansen, E., Vera-Muñoz, S. C., & Willekens, M. (2016). Strategic performance measurement, risk, and managerial incentives. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems, 21*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2016.03.003

Libby, R., & Emett, S. A. (2014). Earnings presentation effects on manager reporting choices and investor decisions. *Accounting and Business Research, 44*(4), 410–438. https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2014.892980

Libby, R., & Thorne, L. (2009). The influence of incentive structure on accountants' ethical judgments. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34*(2), 125–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2008.07.005

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.

Luft, J. (2009). Nonfinancial information and accounting: A reassessment. *Accounting Horizons, 23*(3), 307–321. https://doi.org/10.2308/acch.2009.23.3.307

Luft, J., & Shields, M. D. (2003). Mapping management accounting: Graphics and guidelines for theory-consistent empirical research. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28*(2–3), 169–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(02)00026-0

Luft, J., & Shields, M. D. (2007). What is management accounting research? *Handbooks of Management Accounting Research, 1*, 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1751-3243(06)01001-9

Moll, J., & Hoque, Z. (2006). Institutionalising organisational change through control systems: The case of a public sector agency. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 19*(1), 59–90. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570610637439

Naranjo-Gil, D. (2016). Role of management control systems in the strategy formation process: Evidence from public hospitals. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 29*(4), 596–620. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-08-2014-1803

Ryan, B., Scapens, R. W., & Theobald, M. (2002). *Research method and methodology in finance and accounting* (2nd ed.). Thomson.

Simons, R. (1995). *Levers of control: How managers use innovative control systems to drive strategic renewal*. Harvard Business School Press.

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations* (4th ed.). Free Press.

Sprinkle, G. B. (2003). Perspectives on experimental research in managerial accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 28*(2–3), 287–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-3682(02)00028-4

Suriati, A. M., Effendy, M., & Ramli, A. (2021). Behavioral factors influencing budgetary slack and the role of ethical behavior: Evidence from Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 8*(5), 519–528. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no5.0519

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Tayler, W. B. (2010). The balanced scorecard as a strategy-evaluation tool: The effects of implementation involvement and a causal-chain focus. *The Accounting Review, 85*(3), 1095–1117. https://doi.org/10.2308/accr.2010.85.3.1095

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 356–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science, 185*(4157), 1124–1131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124

Van der Meer-Kooistra, J., & Scapens, R. W. (2008). The governance of lateral relations between and within organisations. *Management Accounting Research, 19*(4), 365–384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2008.09.002

Warren, J. D., Moffitt, K. C., & Byrnes, P. (2015). How Big Data will change accounting. *Accounting Horizons, 29*(2), 397–407. https://doi.org/10.2308/acch-51069

Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52*(5), 546–553. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x

Widener, S. K. (2007). An empirical analysis of the levers of control framework. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 32*(7–8), 757–788. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2007.01.001

Wouters, M., & Roijmans, D. (2011). Using accounting information for decision-making: Evidence from performance measurement systems in Dutch organizations. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 24*(6), 900–932. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513571111155598

Young, J. J. (2006). Making up users. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 31*(6), 579–600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2005.12.005

Zimmerman, J. L. (2014). *Accounting for decision making and control* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.