

INTERNAL CONTROL SYSTEMS AND FRAUD PREVENTION IN PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING

Ir. Nida Garnida Fitrianti, MSI, Anggun Yolistina, S.Kom

1 Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas

2 Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP

NidaFitrianti@gmail.com, Anggun_yolistina@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Fraud prevention is strongest when controls are embedded in ordinary work rather than added after a scandal. Public organizations face a difficult balance: controls must be strong enough to deter and detect abuse, but not so cumbersome that employees create informal workarounds to get basic services delivered. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including OECD (2024b); ACFE (2024). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. No checklist eliminates fraud. The effectiveness of a control depends on the incentives, authority and information surrounding it, and collusion can bypass procedures that appear sound on paper. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for public organizations and finance units that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Internal Control, Fraud Prevention, Public Sector Accounting, Governance, Whistleblowing, Audit*

Introduction

Fraud prevention is strongest when controls are embedded in ordinary work rather than added after a scandal. Public organizations face a difficult balance: controls must be strong enough to deter and detect abuse, but not so cumbersome that employees create informal workarounds to get basic services delivered. This question is timely for public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability. Recent institutional and research sources such as OECD (2024c); OECD (2024b) provide the broader context for the discussion.

No checklist eliminates fraud. The effectiveness of a control depends on the incentives, authority and information surrounding it, and collusion can bypass procedures that appear sound on paper. For public organizations and finance units, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. BPS (2026); United Nations (2024) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Public organizations and finance units do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial for one organization

and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for public organizations and finance units. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. OECD (2021); OECD (2024c); Knudsen (2020) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for public organizations and finance units because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. Knudsen (2020); OECD (2024b) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Control environment and ethical tone	leadership behavior shapes whether employees treat controls as real obligations or ceremonial documentation	formal codes lose force when exceptions are routinely granted to senior staff
Risk assessment and fraud scenarios	controls should respond to specific opportunities in procurement, payroll, grants, assets and revenue	generic risk registers can become disconnected from actual transaction flows
Segregation and compensating controls	separating authorization, custody and recording reduces the power of a single actor	small units may not have enough staff for textbook segregation
Whistleblowing and speak-up systems	tips remain an important detection channel when reporters trust the process	retaliation fears and unclear case handling suppress reporting
Digital controls and analytics	continuous monitoring can flag duplicate vendors, unusual timing, split purchases and anomalous transactions	poor data quality creates false alerts and weakens investigator confidence
Audit follow-up and organizational learning	control improvements depend on whether findings are corrected and repeated failures are examined	closing an audit recommendation administratively does not guarantee behavior has changed

Research Method

The method is a thematic synthesis of scholarly and institutional evidence. The synthesis is deliberately transparent about differences in context, since studies conducted in different sectors or countries should not be treated as if they estimated the same underlying relationship.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
COSO (2013)	internal-control principles and components	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
ACFE (2024)	occupational fraud patterns and control implications	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2021)	public governance and institutional capacity	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024c)	institutional trust and public-governance drivers	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024b)	digital technology, policy, skills and trust	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
Knudsen (2020)	digitalization of accounting and information boundaries	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Control environment and ethical tone

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Leadership behavior shapes whether employees treat controls as real obligations or ceremonial documentation. That distinction matters because formal codes lose force when exceptions are routinely granted to senior staff. In public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including United Nations (2024); BPS (2026), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For public organizations and finance units, the practical response is to make accountability visible in everyday decisions and exception handling. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Leadership behavior shapes whether employees treat controls as real obligations or ceremonial documentation, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Formal codes lose force when exceptions are routinely granted to senior staff. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024c) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A

more credible approach is therefore to make accountability visible in everyday decisions and exception handling, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Leadership behavior shapes whether employees treat controls as real obligations or ceremonial documentation should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, formal codes lose force when exceptions are routinely granted to senior staff. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by COSO (2013); BPS (2026) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: make accountability visible in everyday decisions and exception handling. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Risk assessment and fraud scenarios

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Controls should respond to specific opportunities in procurement, payroll, grants, assets and revenue. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: generic risk registers can become disconnected from actual transaction flows. In public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); OECD (2021), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For public organizations and finance units, the practical response is to map high-risk processes and test plausible fraud paths. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Controls should respond to specific opportunities in procurement, payroll, grants, assets and revenue, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Generic risk registers can become disconnected from actual transaction flows. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. ACFE (2024) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to map high-risk processes and test plausible fraud paths, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Controls should respond to specific opportunities in procurement, payroll, grants, assets and revenue should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, generic risk registers can become disconnected from actual transaction flows. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2024c); COSO (2013) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: map high-risk processes and test plausible fraud paths. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Segregation and compensating controls

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Separating authorization, custody and recording reduces the power of a single actor. The point is especially relevant where small units may not have enough staff for textbook segregation. In public-sector

accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024c); Knudsen (2020), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For public organizations and finance units, the practical response is to use independent review, rotation, system logs and post-transaction analytics where separation is limited. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Separating authorization, custody and recording reduces the power of a single actor, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Small units may not have enough staff for textbook segregation. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. ACFE (2024) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to use independent review, rotation, system logs and post-transaction analytics where separation is limited, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Separating authorization, custody and recording reduces the power of a single actor should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, small units may not have enough staff for textbook segregation. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by ACFE (2024); Knudsen (2020) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: use independent review, rotation, system logs and post-transaction analytics where separation is limited. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Whistleblowing and speak-up systems

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Tips remain an important detection channel when reporters trust the process. The reason is practical: retaliation fears and unclear case handling suppress reporting. In public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024c); OECD (2021), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For public organizations and finance units, the practical response is to protect confidentiality, define triage rules and report outcomes at an aggregate level. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Tips remain an important detection channel when reporters trust the process, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Retaliation fears and unclear case handling suppress reporting. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2021) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to protect confidentiality, define triage rules and report outcomes at an aggregate level, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Tips remain an important detection channel when reporters trust the process should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, retaliation fears and unclear case handling suppress reporting. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by United Nations (2024); OECD (2021) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: protect confidentiality, define triage rules and report outcomes at an aggregate level. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Digital controls and analytics

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Continuous monitoring can flag duplicate vendors, unusual timing, split purchases and anomalous transactions. For managers, the consequence is immediate: poor data quality creates false alerts and weakens investigator confidence. In public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); COSO (2013), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For public organizations and finance units, the practical response is to combine analytics with data governance and human review. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Continuous monitoring can flag duplicate vendors, unusual timing, split purchases and anomalous transactions, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Poor data quality creates false alerts and weakens investigator confidence. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to combine analytics with data governance and human review, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Continuous monitoring can flag duplicate vendors, unusual timing, split purchases and anomalous transactions should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, poor data quality creates false alerts and weakens investigator confidence. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2021); OECD (2024c) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: combine analytics with data governance and human review. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Audit follow-up and organizational learning

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Control improvements depend on whether findings are corrected and repeated failures are examined. In operational terms, closing an audit recommendation administratively does not guarantee behavior has changed. In public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or

technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including United Nations (2024); OECD (2021), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For public organizations and finance units, the practical response is to verify remediation in subsequent transactions and track recurring root causes. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Control improvements depend on whether findings are corrected and repeated failures are examined, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Closing an audit recommendation administratively does not guarantee behavior has changed. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. BPS (2026) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to verify remediation in subsequent transactions and track recurring root causes, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Control improvements depend on whether findings are corrected and repeated failures are examined should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, closing an audit recommendation administratively does not guarantee behavior has changed. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by ACFE (2024); COSO (2013) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: verify remediation in subsequent transactions and track recurring root causes. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that internal control systems and fraud prevention in public sector accounting cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by Knudsen (2020); BPS (2026); ACFE (2024).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Public organizations and finance units with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For public organizations and finance units, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including OECD (2021); Knudsen (2020), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Make accountability visible in everyday decisions and exception handling	Formal codes lose force when exceptions are routinely granted to senior staff
2	Map high-risk processes and test plausible fraud paths	Generic risk registers can become disconnected from actual transaction flows
3	Use independent review, rotation, system logs and post-transaction analytics where separation is limited	Small units may not have enough staff for textbook segregation
4	Protect confidentiality, define triage rules and report outcomes at an aggregate level	Retaliation fears and unclear case handling suppress reporting
5	Combine analytics with data governance and human review	Poor data quality creates false alerts and weakens investigator confidence
6	Verify remediation in subsequent transactions and track recurring root causes	Closing an audit recommendation administratively does not guarantee behavior has changed

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to public-sector accounting environments where managers must protect public resources while maintaining service delivery, procurement speed and accountability.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how

long capability building tool, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for internal control systems and fraud prevention in public sector accounting would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish control environment and ethical tone from risk assessment and fraud scenarios and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with segregation and compensating controls may not transfer directly to settings dominated by whistleblowing and speak-up systems, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of internal control systems and fraud prevention in public sector accounting, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of internal control systems and fraud prevention in public sector accounting should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined internal control systems and fraud prevention in public sector accounting through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: no checklist eliminates fraud. The effectiveness of a control depends on the incentives, authority and information surrounding it, and collusion can bypass procedures that appear sound on paper. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by public organizations and finance units.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). Internal Control - Integrated Framework. Durham, NC: COSO.
- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2024). Occupational Fraud 2024: A Report to the Nations. Austin, TX: ACFE.
- OECD. (2021). Government at a Glance 2021. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2024). OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions - 2024 Results. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2024). OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024 (Volume 1): Embracing the Technology Frontier. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a1689dc5-en>
- 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>
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2024). UN E-Government Survey 2024. New York: United Nations.
- BPS-Statistics Indonesia. (2026). Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia 2026. Jakarta: BPS-Statistics Indonesia.