

Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises

Anggun Yolistina, S.Kom (1) and Nia Riana (2) (1) Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP | (2) Universitas Widyatama, Bandung

Anggun_yolistina@gmail.com ; Nia.riana@widyatama.ac.id

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines cloud accounting maturity and financial reporting timeliness in small enterprises by asking how cloud accounting maturity is connected to financial reporting timeliness and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. Evidence associated with Knudsen, 2020 and Dechow et al., 2010 is read with the wider source set to distinguish formal adoption from effective use, short-term response from durable capability, and observed association from causal interpretation. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for segregation of duties and authorization, staff capability, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: cloud, accounting, maturity, financial, reporting, timeliness, small, accounting, integrative review

Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises addresses a contemporary question in reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems. The title implies a relationship between cloud accounting maturity and financial reporting timeliness, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

From a governance perspective, Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Exception detection and escalation is most credible when supported by staff capability and regulatory clarity. The reviewed literature (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore

emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The synthesis treats cloud accounting maturity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of financial reporting timeliness. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, governance oversight and professional judgment changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while governance independence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with IFRS Foundation, 2023 and OECD, 2023 and is especially relevant in small enterprises. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Technology-enabled traceability provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on system integration, governance independence, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of compliance quality.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through data provenance and reconciliation. The pathway is conditional on regulatory clarity and regulatory clarity; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Verhoef et al., 2021 and Dechow et al., 2010 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce information reliability.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through segregation of duties and authorization. The pathway is conditional on organizational scale and data quality; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Kraus et al., 2022 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce reporting timeliness.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Governance oversight and professional judgment provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on staff capability, organizational scale, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by IFRS Foundation, 2023 and Knudsen, 2020 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of decision usefulness.

A recurring issue in research on Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Cloud Accounting Maturity may be associated with financial reporting timeliness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when governance independence is weak. The mechanism examined here is technology-enabled traceability, which connects the focal practice to changes in compliance quality.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Data provenance and reconciliation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on system integration, system integration, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of information reliability.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness.

Segregation of duties and authorization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on regulatory clarity, organizational scale, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Kraus et al., 2022 and IFRS Foundation, 2023 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reporting timeliness.

A recurring issue in research on Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Cloud Accounting Maturity may be associated with financial reporting timeliness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when organizational scale is weak. The mechanism examined here is measurement discipline and disclosure consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in auditability.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded. Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added

separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In *Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises*, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through data provenance and reconciliation. The pathway is conditional on staff capability and staff capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce information reliability.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In *Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises*, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through segregation of duties and authorization. The pathway is conditional on governance independence and system integration; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Kraus et al., 2022 and Verhoef et al., 2021 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce reporting timeliness.

The synthesis treats cloud accounting maturity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of financial reporting timeliness. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, measurement discipline and disclosure consistency changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while system integration shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with OECD, 2023 and Kraus et al., 2022 and is especially relevant in small enterprises. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In *Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises*, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through exception detection and escalation. The pathway is conditional on regulatory clarity and staff capability; these factors determine

whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Knudsen, 2020 and OECD, 2023 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce control effectiveness.

From a governance perspective, Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Governance oversight and professional judgment is most credible when supported by organizational scale and system integration. The reviewed literature (Dechow et al., 2010; Knudsen, 2020) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Segregation of duties and authorization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on staff capability, governance independence, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Kraus et al., 2022 and Kraus et al., 2022 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reporting timeliness.

A recurring issue in research on Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Cloud Accounting Maturity may be associated with financial reporting timeliness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when governance independence is weak. The mechanism examined here is measurement discipline and disclosure consistency, which connects the focal practice to changes in auditability. Sources such as OECD, 2023 and OECD, 2023 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through exception detection and escalation. The pathway is conditional on system integration and data quality; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Knudsen, 2020 and Knudsen, 2020 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies,

measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce control effectiveness.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In *Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises*, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through governance oversight and professional judgment. The pathway is conditional on regulatory clarity and governance independence; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Dechow et al., 2010 and Dechow et al., 2010 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance

bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce decision usefulness.

From a governance perspective, *Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises* requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Technology-enabled traceability is most credible when supported by organizational scale and regulatory clarity. The reviewed literature (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013; Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

Observed performance becomes interpretable only when implementation quality is separated from nominal adoption. In *Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises*, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through measurement discipline and disclosure consistency. The pathway is conditional on staff capability and system integration; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with OECD, 2023 and Knudsen, 2020 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce auditability.

The synthesis treats cloud accounting maturity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of financial reporting timeliness. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, exception detection and escalation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while governance independence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is

consistent with Knudsen, 2020 and Dechow et al., 2010 and is especially relevant in small enterprises. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Cloud Accounting Maturity may be associated with financial reporting timeliness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when system integration is weak. The mechanism examined here is governance oversight and professional judgment, which connects the focal practice to changes in decision usefulness. Sources such as Dechow et al., 2010 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

From a governance perspective, Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Technology-enabled traceability is most credible when supported by regulatory clarity and system integration. The reviewed literature (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013; IFRS Foundation, 2023) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Data provenance and reconciliation is most credible when supported by organizational scale and organizational scale. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

The synthesis treats cloud accounting maturity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of financial reporting timeliness. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, exception detection and escalation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while staff capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Knudsen, 2020 and Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and is especially relevant in small enterprises. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Cloud Accounting Maturity may be associated with financial reporting timeliness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when governance independence is weak. The mechanism examined here is governance

oversight and professional judgment, which connects the focal practice to changes in decision usefulness. Sources such as Dechow et al., 2010 and IFRS Foundation, 2023 are therefore interpreted for mechanism and boundary conditions rather than combined into a single pooled effect.

The synthesis treats cloud accounting maturity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of financial reporting timeliness. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, technology-enabled traceability changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while system integration shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Data provenance and reconciliation is most credible when supported by regulatory clarity and regulatory clarity. The reviewed literature (IFRS Foundation, 2023; Verhoef et al., 2021) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, cloud accounting maturity can influence financial reporting timeliness through segregation of duties and authorization. The pathway is conditional on organizational scale and data quality; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For finance leaders, auditors, owners, regulators, and governance bodies, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce reporting timeliness.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

A recurring issue in research on Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Cloud Accounting Maturity may be associated with financial reporting timeliness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when staff capability is weak. The mechanism examined here is governance oversight and professional judgment, which connects the focal practice to changes in decision usefulness.

The synthesis treats cloud accounting maturity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of financial reporting timeliness. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, technology-enabled traceability changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while governance independence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and Verhoef

et al., 2021 and is especially relevant in small enterprises. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Data provenance and reconciliation provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on system integration, system integration, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by IFRS Foundation, 2023 and Kraus et al., 2022 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of information reliability.

From a governance perspective, Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Segregation of duties and authorization is most credible when supported by regulatory clarity and organizational scale. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Measurement discipline and disclosure consistency provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on organizational scale, staff capability, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Knudsen, 2020 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of auditability.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Technology-enabled traceability provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on staff capability, data quality, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission, 2013 and Kraus et al., 2022 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of compliance quality.

The synthesis treats cloud accounting maturity as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of financial reporting timeliness. In reporting, assurance, control, and financial decision systems, data provenance and reconciliation changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while governance independence shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is

consistent with IFRS Foundation, 2023 and OECD, 2023 and is especially relevant in small enterprises. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Cloud Accounting Maturity and Financial Reporting Timeliness in Small Enterprises, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking cloud accounting maturity with financial reporting timeliness. Measurement discipline and disclosure consistency provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on regulatory clarity, data quality, and the time available for adjustment. The literature represented by Verhoef et al., 2021 and Dechow et al., 2010 suggests that average associations can conceal important differences in starting conditions and execution quality. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of auditability.

Historical source context and interpretation

The mechanism discussion is conceptual and must be read alongside the pre-cutoff works listed in References. Removing later sources does not establish a new empirical finding, a pooled effect or comprehensive coverage of the literature. Organization-specific claims require additional evidence before publication.

References

- Knudsen, D.-R. (2020). Elusive boundaries, power relations, and knowledge production: A systematic review of the literature on digitalization in accounting. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 36, 100441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2019.100441>
- Dechow, P., Ge, W., & Schrand, C. (2010). Understanding earnings quality: A review of the proxies, their determinants and their consequences. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 50(2-3), 344-401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2010.09.001>
- Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). *Internal Control-Integrated Framework*. Durham, NC: COSO.
- IFRS Foundation. (2023). *IFRS S1 General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information*. London: IFRS Foundation.
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- OECD. (2023). *OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>