WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Demystifying Earnings Management

Dr. B. Mohan Kumar[1], Veena Malkhed[2], Mitesh Kadakia[3]

[1] Principal & Associate Professor, Badruka College of Commerce and Arts, Kachiguda, Hyderabad
bmk_sap@hotmail.com 8121809419
[2] Associate Professor Badruka College of Commerce and Arts, Kachiguda, Hyderabad
[3] Associate Professor Badruka College of Commerce and Arts, Kachiguda, Hyderabad
(M) – 8919339490 E-Mail: mkadakia7@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Earnings Management (EM) is a critical space in accounting and finance, involving an intentional manipulation of financial statements to achieve the specific corporate objectives. This paper explores the motives, mechanism and the implications of Earnings Management, highlighting its ethical and financial consequences. It examines how firms manipulate earnings using various strategies – such as "Big Bath", "Cookie Jar" reserves, and accrual adjustments – often under the guise of managerial discretion within accepted accounting standards. The study also explores both quantitative and qualitative methods of detecting Earnings Management including the use of Jones Model for identifying discretionary accruals. Furthermore, it evaluates the role of regulatory framework. Forensic accounting and corporate governance in mitigating such practices. By offering a comprehensive analysis of Earnings Management. The paper aims to enhance stakeholder's ability to detect and understand manipulative financial reporting, thereby contributing to more transparent and accountable corporate environments.

Keywords: Earnings Management, Financial Reporting, Accrual Accounting, Corporate Governance, Forensic Accounting.

Introduction:

Earnings management is a perilous topic in the fields of accounts and finance, as it reconnoiters the intentional alteration of financial statements by accounting team with the support and instructions from the management to achieve specific intentions. This practice of manipulating the data, this can include everything ranging from unethical financial misrepresentation to reasonable accounting judgement, it has momentous insinuations for stakeholders, including government offices, creditors, investors, and analysts. Understanding earnings management is indispensable for judging the quality of reported earnings, ensuring transparency in financial reporting, and maintaining trust in capital markets. Researchers wants to offer insights that help improve corporate governance and guide regulatory frameworks by examining the reasons behind, strategies used, and outcomes of profits management. This study contributes to the expanding literature by investigating the root causes and a broader affects of EM.

Earnings management involves deliberately influencing financial data to shape percepptions of company's financial health. For decades together this practice has been an area of interest for accounting and research community. This is considered as a critical issue in corporate world. According to Healy and Wahlen (1999, p.368) Earning's Management occurs when managers exploit judgement in financial reporting or structure transactions to mislead stakeholders or influence outcomes tied to reported results. Extensive studies (Dechow et al., 1995; DeFond and Subramanyan, 1998; have explored the issues in detail to understand and curb this concerning practice. Examples of Earnings Management include stock offerings (Teoh et al., 1998), management buy-outs (Wu, 1997), mergers and acquisitions (Eastwood, 1997), auditors changes (DeFond and Subramanyan, 1998), and selection of auditors (Becker et al., 1998).

The Earnings Management Landscape

Earnings Management refers to deliberate changes in financial reporting intended to present a more favorable picture of the firms' performance then what might be accurate. Companies may employ various accounting techniques – such as altering revenue recognition, adjusting expense accruals, or manipulating reserves – to achieve this. Over the past few decades Earnings Management has emerged as a significant topic in both accounting and corporate governance discussions, and corporate governance, particularly following notorious corporate scandals like from Enron, WorldCom, and Satyam in 2000s. These cases demonstrated have aggressive EM practices could lead to severe financial collapses, eroding investors wealth & trust and prompting stricter regulatory scrutiny.

The presence and enforcement of financial regulations greatly impact the extent and form of EM practices. Accounting Standards such as the GAAP and the IFRS establish guidelines for financial reporting. However, these standards often allow for some degree of managerial judgement, creating opportunities for companies to engage in EM. Motivations for such behavior vary – firms may manipulate earnings to meet analyst forecast, boost stock prices, avoid breaching loan covenants, or enhance their position in mergers and acquisitions.

The consequences of EM can be far-reaching. When investors detect signs of earnings manipulation, they may loose confidence in company's financial disclosure, leading to stock price declines, increased financing cost and in extreme cases legal repercussions for executives. To fight against these risks, strong external audits and stringent regulatory enforcement all contribute to ensuring the true and fair financial reporting.

Technological advancements and growing complexities of financial transactions have introduced new challenges in detecting and preventing EM. Sophisticated financial instruments, fair value accounting and the valuation of intangible assets have extended the scope for possible manipulation, making financial reporting even more intricate. These highlights the ethical dilemmas surrounding EM – corporate leaders must balance transparency and accountability with the pressure to meet market expectations.

In response to past financial scams, regulators have introduced stricter accounting rules, enhanced auditing requirements, and harsher penalties for fraudulent reporting. These measures aims to deter unethical EM practices and restore trust in financial markets. For investors, creditors, regulators, and corporate managers understanding the importance and the dynamics of EM is critical. Transparency, ethical leadership and effective governance remains basics to maintain the credibility of financial statements.

The above discussion stresses the need for continuous vigilance in financial reporting. Keeping up with shifts in financial reporting standards and regulatory updates is crucial for the stakeholders to understand the complexities of EM efficiently. In the end, reducing the risk connected to profits manipulation requires developing a business culture that places a high value on truthfulness and responsibility.

The Motivations behind Earnings Management

There are multiple causes for the manager managing the earnings. At its core, earnings management stems from the company's need to meet key performance benchmarks. These targets may include past results (to show growth), analyst forecast (to exceed expectations), profitability thresholds (to avoid losses), or bonus related metrics in executive contracts. Not meeting these benchmarks may have severe effects as stock prices and executive compensation often react sharply when earnings narrowly miss the critical targets. This creates strong motivation for the managers to manipulate reported figures near these pivotal points. A corporate that misses the earnings target even by a small margin may see a precipitously decline in its share prices and the reverse is also true that a corporate that beats its target even by a smallest margin may see a good boost in its stock prices.

Its hardly surprising that companies rarely miss earning targets by just 1 rupee, while significantly more often meet or exceed them by the same narrow margin (DeGeorge, Patel and Zeckhauser, 1999; Burgstahler & Dichev, 1997). When results move around critical thresholds, pressure to push earnings past the finish line becomes intense. In such cases organizations resort to upward earning management techniques – adjusting estimates, deferring expenses, or increasing revenue – to artificially "nudge" their reported figures.

However, in the reversal of the situation, if the firms are much below their expected targets it is beneficial for them to make things look more worse than what they actually are. This is because any amount of manipulations in the financial statements would not help them meet the target. Secondly, if the firm is below the target in that scene the cost of being worse i.e. much below the expectations is actually less or minimal. This type of intentional earning reduction is termed as "Big Bath" in financial reporting terminology. Usually in these situations the companies would take a huge restructuring cost, increase in its provisions and decrease their other incomes to reduce the overall incomes. Understanding the concept of accounting, these changes will actually led to increase in Speech Entitled "The Numbers Game" by Arthur Levitt – Chairman SEC at the NYU Center for Law and Business, Sept 28 th, 1998. States that such incomes in future in expenses which would not need to be recognized. .Also, any increase in performance will appear considerably more impressive. Although a significant amount of the turnaround may be an accounting magic, managers will receive more credit for turning around the company. This concept was emphasized by Arthur Levitt in one of his speeches, he noted that companies often use large restructuring charges to present a cleaner balance sheet – a tactic referred to as "Big Bath." He pointed out that such one-time losses are sometimes overstated, as investors tend to overlook them and focus on future performance. These conservative estimates may later be reversed, conveniently boosting income when needed.

Another case of EM is when companies significantly exceed targets, they often have incentives to under-report earnings. As substantially outperforming benchmarks offers diminishing returns, firms may smartly and in a well planned manner lower results. This process of showing lower results is known as "Cookie Jar" accounting. This serves dual purpose: it preserves excess earnings for future periods when targets might be missed, while avoiding the rachet effect where strong performance raises future expectations. In all there are 3 common approaches to EM – Big-Bath, Bump-Up and Cookie Jar.

Various researches and academic studies have revealed additional motivations for EM, mainly related to ESOP. Research shows that managers strategically time information disclosure and manipulate earnings to maximize option value. Aboody and Kasznick (2000) found managers tend to delay positive news and hasten negative disclosure before option grants, securing lower grant prices since options are normally granted "at the money". Similarly, Bartov and Mohanram (2003) documented earnings management patterns around options exercises – firm employ income boosting techniques before large exercises to inflate stock prices, then switch to income reducing methods afterward. This findings highlight how complementation structures can result in motivated EM.

Mechanism of Earnings Management

As far as managing or manipulating the earnings are concerned the firms have multiple options based on their needs and the company strategy. One of the common option used by many firms is changing or self-interpreting the accounting standards of changing its assumptions. This option is mainly used as GAAP or the AS gives flexibility for interpretation of many standards. From an outsiders perspective it is difficult to identify any manipulation as it looks like proper application of the management discretion. This helps individuals – accountants and managers – who engage in manipulation to avoid detection, as it is difficult to definitively link such practices to deceptive or manipulative practices. For example managers may change the useful life of a depreciable asset to make the necessary change in its depreciation and justify the same by claiming alignment with industry standard. This is the practice used by Southwest Airlines in 1999. Other tactics companies may use include capitalizing cost that were previously expensed, expanding the scope of capitalization, delaying the amortization of already capitalized expense. This was the tactic used by WorldCom.

Companies may also intentionally lower their income by recording huge one-time cost as revenue expense. This may serve as means to take "Big-Bath" during unfavorable periods to establish "Cookie Jar" reserves. Microsoft is blamed of using the Cookie Jar accounting by intentionally delaying the revenue recognition – and thus profits – during strong financial years, allowing it to draw from these reserves during weaker periods, A similar practice was also practiced by AOL had its restructuring charges related to acquisitions made.

Firms may also affect their reported earnings by manipulating the timings of transactions. For instance, managers may choose to recognize revenue earlier, particularly near the end of the reporting period. While some of these end -of -the period sales may be valid. Others may involve prematurely recording revenue by moving inventory off the books – even without the buyers confirmation to purchase the goods. This practice is known as "Channel Loading". Firms involved in such practice often show warning signs, such as a significant spike in receivables in relation to sales. In some rare cases companies have been found committing frauds, such as hiding inventories, moving it to undisclosed godowns and falsely recording it as revenue. This practice was used by Sunbeam Inc.

Basically, most Earnings management revolves around accruals – the difference between reported earnings and actual cash flows. Accruals arise from many accounting decisions. For example, when a company makes a credit sale, it records revenue and a corresponding receivable even though no cash has yet been received. Such accruals are normal part of routine business operations and usually reverse over the period of time when the cash is received for the receivables. Accruals exists mainly due to accounting concepts like – Matching Concept, which aims to provide a more accurate representation of company's performance of over a period of time then a company's stand-alone cash flow statement would give. The major challenge lies in the ability to differentiate between the discretionary accruals (Subject to Management Judgement) and non-discretionary accruals (naturally from company's operations).

EM can be viewed as "inter-temporal" shifting of income across accounting periods. When a firm employs aggressive accounting practices, it is effectively pulling income from future periods. On the other hand a conservative approach defers income, mainly saving it for the future. In a stable economic environment, this balancing act has minimal long term impact due to the normal reversal of accruals over time. However, during the periods of growth, firms may use aggressive accounting without immediate results – much like countries managing moderate budget deficits. The real issue comes up when the growth slows or reverses, showing the effects of previous aggressive accounting decisions. It is no surprise that few accounting scandals came to light during the tech boom, whereas multiple such scandals were exposed during the recession that followed the boom.

Forensic Accounting: Identifying Earnings Management

Here, we will look at the two approaches that help in detecting the EM. The two methods are – Qualitative Method and the Analytical Method.

5a. Qualitative Method: Accounting Analysis.

Identifying earnings management from a qualitative perspective involves a detailed review of a firm's accounting practices. The process begins by recognizing the key accounting policies that are most critical to the company's industry. For example in banking credit and interest rate risk management are crucial, while for airlines, depreciation policy often plays a major role.

Once these key policies are identified, the next step is to examine the level of discretion available in applying them, some firms operate under strict accounting rules with limited flexibility – such as those concerning research and development or marketing expenses – while others have more leeway, specially in areas like credit risk estimation. Evaluating how aggressively or conservatively a firm uses this flexibility provides insights into its financial reporting behavior. Companies that have historically reported conservatively might have more room to boost earnings when needed, whereas those already using aggressive methods may be more prone to manipulations.

The firms overall accounting approach should also be compared with industry peers. It's important to assess whether their accounting estimates and policies have been reasonable over time. Any significant policy shifts should be checked for their impact, and one should consider whether managers have personal or contractual incentives that could encourage opportunistic behavior.

Disclosure quality is another crucial factor. Transparent companies typically provide enough information to help users understand their strategies and financial performance. This includes thorough explanations of accounting policies, detailed breakdowns of performance and compressive disclosures by segment or geography. Strong investor relations and consistent communication of both good and bad news signals high quality reporting.

A vital part of this qualitative review involves identifying red flags that may indicate manipulation. This include sudden accounting changes without clear justification, one-off gains from asset sales, unusually high receivable compared to sales, persistent gaps between net income and cash flows from operations, last-minute adjustments in final quarter, and frequent auditor changes or qualified audit opinions. Large related party-transactions can also be a cause of concern.

The final step is to adjust financial data where possible to correct for distortions. For instance, if a company extends useful life of an asset in a questionable manner, restating it to its original estimate helps provide a more accurate view. This adjusted data should be used for further analysis and evaluation.

5b. Detecting Earnings Management Analytically:

The gap between a company's net income and its cash flow from operation (CFO) is often referred to as discretionary accruals. At first glance, firms with high accruals may seem to be overstating their earnings. However, relying solely on total accruals to detect earnings manipulation can be misleading, as these figures can legitimately increase due to factors like business expansion – leading to higher receivables and payables or capital expenditures (additional depreciation). To better assess earnings manipulation, financial accounting researchers have sort to separate accruals in 2 parts based on their nature – the accruals which are manageable are termed as discretionary and the ones which are from genuine operations are termed as non-discretionary.

The Jones model based on the paper by Jones (1991) is an example of one of the most commonly used models. The model uses a multiple regression framework, treating total accrual as the dependent variable while incorporating factors such as revenue changes, variations in receivables and fluctuations in plant, property and equipment (PPE) as independent variables. Additional controls may be incorporated for actual firm performance as recent studies indicate that economically strong firms naturally exhibit higher accrual even without earnings management.

The Jones Model can be applied in 2 ways –

1. Time Series – Using historical data for a single firm
2. Cross – Sectional – Analyzing industry peers at a particular moment in time.

The cross – sectional approach is generally preferred as it requires less historical data while still providing reliable estimates.

The basic estimation equation is as follows.

$$\frac{TA_{it}}{Assets_{i,t-1}} = k_{1t}\frac{1}{Assets_{i,t-1}} + k_2\frac{(\Delta REV_{it} - \Delta AR_{it})}{Assets_{i,t-1}} + k_3\frac{PPE_{it}}{Assets_{i,t-1}} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

In this model the total accruals for the year t are calculated as the difference between income before extraordinary items and cash flow from operations. Revenue for the year t, total assets at the end of the year t-1, and gross property, plant, and equipment at the end of the year t are included as explanatory variables. The coefficients β1, β2, β3 represent parameters that are specific to the industry and the time period being analyzed.

The regression analysis yields two key outputs:

1. The fitted values estimate the Non-discretionary earnings component.
2. The residue represents discretionary accruals.

We can interpret these results as –

- Significant positive residuals – Potential upward earnings manipulation.
- Small or negative residuals – Potential downward earnings manipulation.

The methodology for estimating discretionary accruals is inherently imprecise, as it imposes theoretical structure that may not always hold in practice. For example –

- **Time Series Analysis** assumes a firm's accruals should remain stable over time, conditional on growth adjustments.
- **Cross Sectional Analysis** assumes uniformity in accruals across firms within same industry.

While these assumptions are strong, empirical evidence supports their general validity. Notably, studies such as Dechow, Solan, and Sweeney (1995) and Barton, Gul, and Tusi (2000) have demonstrated that discretionary accruals serve as reliable proxy for detecting earnings management.

Consequences and Stakeholder Implications:

EM remains as entrenched feature of modern capital markets. This article has explored its mechanism and detection methods – a critical toolkit for investors, analysts, regulators, and auditors. While the manipulation of earnings is undeniable, dismissing accrual accounting in favour of cash flows would be misguided. Empirical evidences, including Dechow (1995), confirms that net income – despite its imperfectins – outperforms cash flows in predicting future performance, even further cash flows themselves. The adage "Cash is King" oversimplifies reality; earnings with strong cash correlation (i.e. low accruals) signal higher quality, but earnings overall remain superior for valuation, performance assessment, and forecasting. The goal, therefore, is not to discard earnings but to refine them by adjusting for potential distortions.

Understanding managerial tactics is very important for stakeholders to decode financial statements effectively. Awareness of common manipulative techniques empowers market participants to nullify their effects, ultimately reducing the effectiveness of such practices. This highlights the responsibilities of the academicians and practitioners to prioritize forensic accounting literacy – analyzing a firms accounting choices is as vital as checking its financial outcomes.

Critics often blame accounting scandals on the flexibility inherent in accounting standards. However, the basic issues lies not in this flexibility but in the market participants tendency to neglect accounting rigor during bullish periods. Flexible standards help firms to communicate nuanced financial narratives; the solution is to pair this flexibility with vigilant oversight. When stakeholders improve their ability to detect manipulation, standards can remain adaptable without compromising transparency.

The recent increase in accounting scrutiny, supported by high profile cases like Satyam, Enron, etc. is encouraging. Yet, history suggest this focus may diminish when markets rebound. Sustaining this momentum is essential to avoid future frauds. The lesson is clear – Robust Accounting Vigilance, Not Reactive Outrage – must become a permanent fixture of market culture.

REFERENCES:

1. Healy, P. M., & Wahlen, J. M. (1999). A review of the earnings management literature and its implications for standard setting. *Accounting horizons*, *13*(4), 365-383.
2. Dechow, P. M., Sloan, R. G., & Sweeney, A. P. (1995). Detecting earnings management. *Accounting review*, 193-225.
3. DeFond, M.L., Subramanyan, K.R. (1998). Auditor changes and discretionary accruals. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 25, pp: 35-67.
4. Becker, C.L., DeFond, M. L., Jiambalvo, J., Subramanyan, K.R. (1998). The effects of audit quality on earnings management. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 15: 1-24.
5. Dechow, P. M., & Dichev, I. D. (2002). The quality of accruals and earnings: The role of accrual estimation errors. *The accounting review*, *77*(s-1), 35-59.
6. Francis, J., LaFond, R., Olsson, P. M., & Schipper, K. (2004). Costs of equity and earnings attributes. *The accounting review*, *79*(4), 967-1010.
7. Roychowdbury, S. (2006). Earnings management through real activities manipulation. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 42(3), pp. 335-370.
8. Gunny, K. (2010). The relation between earnings management using real activities manipulation and future performance: Evidence from meeting earnings benchmarks. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 27(3), pp. 855-888.
9. Roy, T.; Alfan, E. (2022). Does Gender Diversity Moderate the Nexus Between Board Characteristics and Earnings Management? *Asian Journal of Business and Accounting*, Vol. 15(2), pp. 3177.
10. Teoh, S. H., Welch, I., & Wong, T. J. (1998). Earnings management and the long-run market performance of initial public offerings. *The journal of finance*, *53*(6), 1935-1974.
11. Wu, Y. W. (1997). Management buyouts and earnings management. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, *12*(4), 373-389.
12. Eastwood, C. (1997). Takeovers, and incentives for earnings management: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 14, pp: 29-48.
13. Burgstahler, David, and Ilia Dichev. 1997. Earnings Management to Avoid Earnings Decreases and Losses. Journal of Accounting and Economics 24, 99-126
14. Degeorge, Francois, Jayendu Patel, and Richard Zeckhauser. 1999. Earnings Management to Exceed Thresholds. Journal of Business 72, 1-33
15. Aboody, D., and R. Kasznick. 2000. CEO stock option awards and the timing of corporate voluntary disclosures. Journal of Accounting and Economics 29, 73-100.

16. Bartov, E. and P. Mohanram 2003. Private Information, Earnings Manipulations, Executive Stock Option Exercises. Working Paper – Columbia University/New York University.
17. Dechow, Patricia, Richard Sloan and Amy Sweeney. 1995. Detecting Earnings Management. The Accounting Review 70, 193-225.
18. Bartov, E., F.A. Gul, and J.S.L. Tsui. 2000. Discretionary accruals models and audit qualifications. Journal of Accounting and Economics 30, 421-452.
19. Ramanna, K., & Watts, R. L. (2012). Evidence on the use of unverifiable estimates in required goodwill impairment. *Review of accounting studies*, *17*, 749-780.
20. Nubaiti, A.; Salilla, R. (2022). A*udit Quality: Client importance, Audit capacity stress, and Audit fee*. Proceedings of the 5th European International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management. Rome (Italy), July 26-28.
21. Maleki, D.; Sarfi, E. (2017). Comparison of the social responsibility effect on accrual-based earnings management in companies with or without financial crisis: case study of companies accepted in Tehran Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 4 (8), pp. 811-820.
22. Irani, R.M. ; D. Oesch (2016). Analyst coverage and real earnings management: Quasi-experimental Evidence. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 51 (2), pp. 589-627.
23. Guo, Y ; S. Lu ; J. Ronen ; J. Ye (2019). Equity Financial Assets: a tool for earnings management – a case study of a Chinese corporation. *Abacus Journal of Accounting, Finance, and Business Studies*, Vol. 55 (1), pp: 180-204.
24. Mohanram, Partha. (2003). How to Manage Earnings Management?.