

**DETERMINANTS OF THE QUALITY OF FINANCIAL AUDITS:  
EVIDENCE FROM A FRONTIER MARKET****Rasanjali, K.M.<sup>1</sup>, Wijesinghe, B.A.C.H.<sup>2</sup>**<sup>1,2</sup>*Department of Accountancy, Faculty of Business Studies and Finance, Wayamba  
University of Sri Lanka*<sup>1</sup>*madhujalee@gmail.com*, <sup>2</sup>*harshani@wyb.ac.lk***ABSTRACT**

This study investigated the determinants of the quality of financial audits of listed companies in Sri Lanka, a frontier market. Among the 282 publicly traded firms on the Colombo Stock Exchange, a sample of 50 companies covering a wide range of industries was selected for data collection from 2016 to 2020 (250 observations). Referring to previous literature, audit firm size, audit fee, audit rotation, and audit tenure were selected as the independent proxies, while the dependent variable was audit opinion. Correlation analysis revealed no evidence of multicollinearity between variables. Due to the dichotomous nature of the audit opinion, binary logistic regression was used to evaluate the data. The results revealed that audit firm size and audit fee significantly affect the audit opinion, whereas audit rotation and tenure have an insignificant effect. According to the findings, the involvement of the Big Four in financial audits was a key component in improving audit quality. In addition, increasing audit costs improved the quality of financial audits. In certain cases, this may be attributable to the fact that the more fees an audit firm charges, the more time and effort its partners and other skilled senior auditors devote to it. Furthermore, this study established that the mandated practice of rotating the auditor every five years and the auditor rotation in the current year have no impact on the audit quality. Future studies into audit quality were urged to consider the characteristics of the business and the role of management in enhancing the literature.

**Keywords:** *Audit Fees, Audit Quality, Auditor Rotation, Audit Firm Size, Audit Tenure*

**1. INTRODUCTION**

Economic decisions in the modern global economy are based on financial information. Therefore, financial audit processes have the primary role of enhancing the credibility of financial statements by providing stakeholders with credible information for their decision-making needs. Auditing is critical to the development and advancement of the global economy and commercial organizations and the creation of investor trust regarding corporations. The complexity of transactions that occur with globalization, economic growth, geographical changes, technological advancements, and perception changes of management, shareholders, and prospective investors have made auditors and the entire auditing process a vital requirement of the economy (Sulanjaku and Shingjergji, 2015). Therefore, auditors should express their opinions based on the fairness and accuracy of firms' financial statements. This is essential for the users of financial statements to ensure that the

financial statements are prepared in accordance with the relevant financial reporting framework. Accordingly, auditing would increase the credibility of financial statements, ensuring those are free of material misstatements.

Diverse perspectives of different stakeholders on what constitutes audit quality may impact the indicators used to measure audit quality. Financial report users may think that high audit quality equates to the absence of substantial misstatements. The auditor may define high audit quality as satisfactorily accomplishing all audit tasks needed by the firm's audit methodology. The audit company may define a high-quality audit as one for which the work may be justified in an inspection or court of law. In the eyes of regulators, a high-quality audit may adhere to professional standards. Finally, society may see a high-quality audit as one that averts economic difficulties for a business or market. Accordingly, diverse perspectives offer divergent measurements (Knechel et al., 2013).

Even though numerous research has been conducted on the quality of financial audits, there is no general definition or conclusion because audit quality is a complex and multifaceted concept. According to De Angelo (1981), audit quality means the auditor detects breaches in the client's accounting system and reports those breaches. Accordingly, two aspects are highlighted by De Angelo (1981): the likelihood that an auditor identifies existing misstatements and takes appropriate action in response to the finding. The auditor's expertise and effort are linked to the first component, while the auditor's objectivity, professional skepticism, and independence are linked to the second. These two components also imply that various parts of the audit might impact overall audit quality (Knechel et al., 2013).

Nowadays, many accounting firms are accused of conducting substandard audits that fail to recognize the major risk involved. Therefore, the audit of financial statements raises the question of whether the audit is capable enough to ensure the accountability of shareholders' fund management. Accordingly, the need for the quality of audit has become increasingly important nowadays, and there is a need to study the determinants of audit quality. Moreover, numerous researchers have studied the determinants that affect the quality of financial audits in different contexts and found different results (Hai, 2016; Salehi et al., 2019; Mawutor et al., 2019; Hetagan, 2019; Sulanjaku and Shingjergji, 2015; Feng, 2020). Much of this research has been conducted in Western and American countries, while some research is available in African and Asian countries. However, in Sri Lanka, not much focus is given to the determinants of the quality of financial audits. Therefore, it is imperative to study what determinants affect the quality of audits in the Sri Lankan context to fill this gap.

Our study will be conducted with the objectives of identifying the determinants of financial audit quality and investigating the extent to which those determinants affect the quality of financial audits of listed companies in the Colombo Stock Exchange (CSE) of Sri Lanka, a frontier market. The study's findings are vital since audit quality causes achieve efficient and effective resources management while improving corporate performance. It is more important than ever for shareholders to know if their investments are in a secure or risky scenario. Moreover, accurate, reliable, and

quality information is essential for a well-functioning financial market. Accordingly, this study serves different stakeholders in different aspects.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows; section two discusses the literature related to audit quality, section three describes the methodology, and section four presents the results and analysis. Finally, section five offers the conclusion of the study.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Theoretical Review**

The auditing process can be defined as a monitoring mechanism that gives an assurance to stakeholders of the company by certifying that the company's financial statements provide a true and fair view of financial information. Agency theory, policeman theory, and credibility theory justify the audit quality cause to reduce information asymmetry among related parties.

#### ***Agency theory***

Jensen and Meckling (1976) put forward the agency theory of corporate governance. Agency theory revolves around information asymmetry between the principal (shareholder) of a company and the agent (management) of the company. As a result of the separation of ownership from control in modern business organizations, the agent misuses the economic resources assigned to him by the principal. Then there is an information asymmetry between the principal and the agent, resulting in the agency problem. This problem affects the decisions of both parties resulting in the owners and managers needing some mechanism to solve this problem to make effective and correct decisions. To minimize information asymmetry related to agency relations, shareholders seek the services of high-quality external auditors to protect their interests. Jones (1991) explained that potential conflicts between managers and owners raise the need for audit service monitoring methods, which are crucial for different securities holders. Sometimes agents (whether they are directors or auditors) can be trusted without the need for auditing or other regulatory or oversight mechanisms. But as a whole, the audit and its quality can help reduce misstatements and reduce the problem of information asymmetry between the principal agents. And also, high quality can reduce the cost of misstatements of financial statements and is vital to restore confidence in the quality of a company's financial reporting and increasing the company's market valuation.

#### ***Policeman Theory***

Limperg (1985) identifies the auditor as a police officer who focuses on mathematical accuracy and fraud prevention as well as identification. Until the 1940s, police theory was extensively reviewed by researchers as the guarded theory for auditing. In the early 20th century, according to the policeman theory, the duty of an auditor was to investigate, detect and prevent fraud in a company. Therefore, an auditor's ability to detect and prevent fraud depends solely on the mathematical accuracy of the financial data provided by the company's management. If the auditor finds that the audit client's financial statement is materially misstated or fraudulent, they should issue a

disclaimer financial statement, enhancing the auditor's independence and quality. In addition, police theory could argue that there is a need for more robust monitoring, auditing, and exchange of information in an independent and responsive role, as citizens and stakeholders demand better services and more information.

### ***Credibility Theory***

This theory describes the primary function of auditing as adding credibility to financial statements. The theory of reliability is considered by auditors to be a fundamental theory used in auditing and contributes to improving audit performance, the credibility of financial statements, and the quality of audits. Therefore, according to this theory, audited financial statements are intended to improve the attitude of financial statement makers as well as increase the credibility of financial publishers to reduce the information asymmetry between users.

### **Empirical Review**

Numerous research has been conducted on the factors that influence the quality of audits. However, due to the difficulties of explicitly evaluating audit quality, much research focuses on the perceived audit quality. Furthermore, there is no generally accepted definition because the audit is a complex and multifaceted concept. In this scenario, DeAngelo (1981) defined it as the probability that an auditor will detect and report violations of the client's accounting system regulations. Furthermore, DeAngelo (1981) concluded that the identification of distortion depends on the quality, volume of knowledge obtained, the capacity of the auditor, and the reporting of distortion depends on the auditor's motivation to reveal it.

The better the audit's perceived quality, the more clients and organizations, will pay a premium for financial statement auditing. As a result, businesses are ready to pay a premium to Big Four audit firms, and audit costs are viewed as an indicator of audit quality (Olabisi et al., 2020). According to Salehi and Mansoury (2009), the size of the audit company has been recognized as a factor affecting audit quality. He further emphasized that Deloitte, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Ernst and Young, and KPMG are often referred to as the "Big 4" and are regarded to have more financial resources than smaller audit companies to undertake high-quality audits. Similarly, Pham et al. (2017) concluded that Big 4 auditors in Vietnam provide high audit quality than non-Big four auditors. However, the results also showed that the higher the audit fees the auditors receive, the lower the quality of audit services provided. In another survey in Vietnam, Hai (2016) emphasized that organizational structure, the scope of service provided, ownership of the audit firm, internal quality controls, external quality controls, and audit fees have a positive impact on audit quality, whereas the governance of the audit profession gives a negative impact on financial audit quality.

Al-Khadash (2013) focused on identifying the critical factors affecting the audit quality in Jordanian commercial banks and revealed a positive impact of audit fees, audit firm size, audit firm's reputation, and auditor proficiency on the audit quality. Moreover, in a survey study, Yusoff et al. (2019) showed a positive and significant effect of audit tenure and audit firm size on audit quality. Moraes and Martinez (2015) found a positive relationship between audit fees and firm performance in Brazil.

Similarly, Mawutor et al. (2019) showed that the audit fee, audit committee, and audit firm size as the significant determinants of the audit quality of companies in Ghana.

Moreover, Belfagira (2015) examined factors influencing the quality of registered companies in Libya and found a significant impact of auditor independence and audit firm size on audit quality. In addition, this study noted a positive but insignificant relationship between audit fees and audit quality. In the Nigerian business environment, Enofe et al. (2013) concluded that audit quality is determined by the audit firm size, ownership structure, and board independence, whereas audit tenure is insignificant in determining the audit quality. Similarly, Aronmwan et al. (2012) investigated the link between audit tenure and audit quality and discovered a negative and negligible association. In a study conducted focusing on the public accounting firms in Jakarta, Calocha and Herwiyanti (2020) found that tenure negatively impacts audit quality, but it is not significant. In a similar study, Al-Thuneibat et al. (2010) observed a negative influence of audit tenure on audit quality while identifying an insignificant impact of audit firm size on audit quality.

Using the binary logistic regression model, Triani et al. (2019) examined the factors affecting the quality of financial audits of public listed companies on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. Their research discovered that while the size of the audit firm has a favourable effect on audit quality, audit tenure, leverage, and going concern opinion had a negative effect. Adeniyi and Mieseigha (2013) also discovered that audit tenure negatively correlates with audit quality. Furthermore, Salehi et al. (2019) investigated factors influencing audit quality in an emerging market. A meta-analysis method helped to find that audit firm size and audit specialization positively impact audit quality. On the other hand, their study indicated that audit tenure does not significantly influence the quality of audits. However, Senjaya and Firnanti (2017) found that audit quality was impacted by auditor tenure and accountability, while audit fees had no effect. However, Feng (2020) found that gender and audit engagement size positively affect financial audits' quality, while audit tenure negatively affects audit quality.

Sari et al. (2019) revealed that audit specialization and tenure are the determinants of audit quality, whereas audit fees, audit rotation, and accounting firm size do not affect audit quality. Similarly, Kalanjati et al. (2019) showed that auditor rotation is negatively associated with audit quality. Similarly, Mohaisen et al. (2019) found a significant negative relationship between audit firm rotation and audit quality in Iraq. Furthermore, Yuniarti (2011) found that firm size and audit fees do not significantly affect audit quality. From a different perspective, according to Hai (2016), the most important factors influencing the quality of audit activities were: the audit firm's organizational and operational structure, its prices and costs, its staff capacity, the scope of business services provided to audit clients, external quality control, and internal quality control; and the audit firm's private ownership.

The literature review reveals that though numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the drivers of the quality of audits in different contexts, there is a lack of studies that comprehensively investigate the factors that determine audit quality. Therefore, this study contributes to filling that gap while enhancing the literature.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The population of this study comprised 283 companies listed in the CSE as of 31<sup>st</sup> December 25, 2021. With the aid of the convenient sampling technique, 50 listed companies were selected as the sample representing 20 industries. Data were collected from annual reports of the selected firms for a period of five years from 2016 to 2020 (250 observations).

Dependent, independent, and control variables were selected for the study, referring to the previous studies. Accordingly, the financial audit quality is considered the dependent variable proxied through the audit opinion. The audit opinion is a binary variable that takes one (1) for unqualified opinion and zero (0) for modified opinion. The first independent variable of the study is audit firm size (Al-Khadash, 2013; Pham et al., 2017; Salehi et al., 2019) which is indicated by a dummy variable that takes one (1) if the firm is audited by one of the big four audit firms and takes zero (0) otherwise. The second independent variable is the audit fee indicated by the logarithm of the audit fee (Al-Khadash, 2013; Moraes and Martinez, 2015; Hai, 2016).

Audit tenure (Enofe et al., 2013; Calocha and Herwiyanti, 2020) is the third independent variable measured using a dummy variable given one (1) if the auditor is not changed within a period of 5 years and otherwise takes zero (0). The fourth independent variable is auditor rotation (Sari et al., 2019; Kalanjati et al., 2019), measured by a dummy variable given one (1) if the auditor is changed in the current year and otherwise zero (0). Leverage, which is measured through the ratio of total liabilities to total assets, is considered the control variable of the study.

Binary logistic regression is employed to analyze the data since the audit opinion, which is the dependent variable, is a binary variable. Accordingly, Equation 01 is developed to examine the determinants of financial audit quality.

$$A.QLT_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 A.FSZ_{it} + \beta_2 A.FEE_{it} + \beta_3 A.TNO_{it} + \beta_4 A.RTN_{it} + \beta_5 LEV_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Where; A.QLT is the audit quality, A.FSZ is the audit firm size, A.FEE is the audit fee, A.TNO is the audit tenure, A.RTN is the auditor rotation, LEV is the leverage,  $\alpha$  is the intercept,  $\beta_1 - \beta_5$  are the coefficients of variables, and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is the error term.

The following hypotheses are posed in order to achieve the research objectives.

H1a: There is a significant impact of audit firm size on the audit quality

H1b: There is a significant impact of audit fees on the audit quality

H1c: There is a significant impact of audit tenure on audit quality.

H1d: There is a significant impact of auditor rotation on the audit quality

#### 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

##### Descriptive Statistics

Table 01 shows the descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, maximum, and minimum values of the variables of the study.

**Table 01: Descriptive Statistics**

Continuous Variables					
Variable	Obs	Mean	SD	Min	Max
A.FEE	250	14.32	.990	11.70	16.49
LEV	250	.534	.289	.017	1.63
Dummy Variables					
Variable		Frequency	Percentage		
A.QLT	(1): Unqualified Opinion	242	96.8		
	(0): Qualified Opinion	08	3.2		
A.FSZ	(1): Big Four Audit Firm	234	93.6		
	(0): Not a Big Four Audit Firm	16	6.4		
A.TNO	(1): Auditor is not changed within a period of 5 years	208	83.2		
	(0): Auditor is changed within a period of 5 years	42	16.8		
A.RTN	(1): Auditor is changed in the current year	12	4.8		
	(0): Auditor is not changed during the current year	238	95.2		

According to the summary statistics, 96.8 per cent of listed companies have received unmodified opinions, indicating that the financial statements are presented fairly in most cases. Furthermore, 93.6 per cent of companies prefer to choose an audit firm from the Big Four to audit their financial statements. Statistics imply that more than 83 per cent of publicly traded companies have not changed their auditors within the last five years, despite this being considered a best practice. Moreover, the auditor is not changed in the majority of companies (95.2%) during the current years throughout the sample period. In addition to that, the range of the audit fee paid by the listed companies varies between values of 11.70 to 16.49, and the average is 14.32, with a lower standard deviation of 0.99. The mean value of leverage (53.4%) indicates that the debt capital invests more than half per cent of the assets of the companies.

##### Correlation Analysis

Table 02 indicates the results of the correlation analysis. According to the analysis, audit firm size and audit fees have a significant positive relationship with audit quality, whereas auditor rotation and leverage have a significant negative relationship with audit quality. However, there is an insignificant relationship between audit tenure and audit quality. Furthermore, it is found that the correlation coefficients among variables are low, indicating that there are no multicollinearity issues among the variables selected for the study.

**Table 02: Correlation Analysis**

	A.QLT	A.FSZ	A.FEE	A.TNO	A.RTN	LEV
A.QLT	1					
A.FSZ	0.231*** 0.000	1				
A.FEE	0.125** 0.047	0.022 0.734	1			
A.TNO	-0.039 0.53	-0.276*** 0.000	0.148** 0.018	1		
A.RTN	-0.172* 0.065	-0.094 0.138	0.056 0.382	0.499*** 0.000	1	
LEV	-0.192*** 0.002	-0.117* 0.065	0.417*** 0.000	0.163*** 0.009	0.069 0.279	1

\*\*\* indicates significance at the 1% level, \*\* indicates significance at the 5% level, and \* indicates significance at the 10% level

### Regression Analysis

The results of the binary logistic regression analysis are shown in Table 03. According to the regression analysis, the likelihood ratio chi-square of 33.13 (p-value < 0.01) indicates that the model as a whole fit significantly. McFadden's R-squared is 0.467, indicating that the model better predicts audit quality.

The results indicate a significant positive impact of audit firm size (4.143, p-value<0.05) on audit quality. Similarly, the audit fee (1.871, p-value<0.01) significantly positively impacts audit quality. However, audit tenure (18.378, p-value>0.05) has an insignificant positive impact on audit quality, while auditor rotation (-18.87, p-value>0.05) has an insignificant negative impact on audit quality. Furthermore, leverage (-5.97, p-value>0.01) has a significant negative impact on audit quality.

**Table 03: Results of Regression Analysis**

Variable	Coef. Value	z value	p-value
A.FSZ	4.143**	2.58	0.010
A.FEE	1.871***	2.68	0.007
A.TNO	18.378	0.01	0.994
A.RTN	-18.87	-0.01	0.993
LEV	-5.97***	-3.12	0.002
Con	-22.31	-2.35	0.019
Observations	250	LR chi2 (5)	33.13
McFadden R <sup>2</sup>	0.467	Prob> chi2	0.000

\*\*\* indicates significance at the 1% level, \*\* indicates significance at the 5% level, and \* indicates significance at the 10% level

By considering the outcome of regression analysis, the regression equation for the study is developed as follows;

$$AQ = -22.31 + 4.143AFS + 1.871AF + 18.378AT - 18.87AR - 5.97LEV$$



According to the regression results, audit firm size positively and significantly affects financial audit quality. It implies that when companies appoint one of the Big Four audit firms as their auditor, the audit quality increases. It is in line with the findings of Al-Khadash (2013), Enofe et al. (2013), Belfagira (2015), Pham et al. (2017), Mawutor et al. (2019), and Salehi et al. (2019). Furthermore, the study findings indicate that the financial audit quality is positively and significantly affected by the audit fee. This finding is consistent with the findings of Al-Khadash (2013), Moraes and Martinez (2015), Hai (2016), and Mawutor et al. (2019). It infers that the higher the audit fee higher the audit quality. Accordingly, audit firm size and audit fee can be recognized as the determinants of audit quality.

Furthermore, findings reveal that audit tenure and auditor rotation do not play a significant role in determining the quality of financial audits. This finding is consistent with those of Al-Thuneibat et al.(2010), Aronmwan et al. (2012), Enofe et al. (2013), Salehi et al. (2019), Sari et al. (2019), Kalanjati et al. (2019), and Calocha and Herwiyanti (2020). In addition, leverage has a significant negative impact on audit quality, indicating a higher quality of audits when the leverage is low.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

This study is conducted with the aim of investigating the determinants of the financial audit quality of listed companies in the CSE. To achieve the study's main purpose, the researcher selected 50 companies as the sample representing the different sectors in CSE. According to descriptive statistics, the majority of listed entities have obtained unmodified opinions, indicating that they have a sound internal control system in place for financial reporting, management has a more robust representation of financial statements, and financial statements are presented in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework.

The outcome of the regression analysis suggests that the audit firm size and audit fee have a significant positive impact on the audit quality, whereas the audit tenure and auditor rotation have a negligible effect on the audit quality. Accordingly, the main objective of the study is achieved by identifying audit firm size and audit fee as the determinants of financial audit quality. It implies that the appointment of an audit firm out of the Big Four is a crucial factor in enhancing the financial audit quality. Furthermore, The audit fee has a significant effect on the audit quality. The greater the audit charge, the higher the audit quality. This may be because the audit fee increases with the higher involvement of senior audit staff such as the engagement partner, engagement quality review partner, audit manager and other qualified seniors in the audit. The study's findings imply that the audit tenure and auditor rotation do not significantly impact the audit quality though it is mandatory to rotate the auditor at least once every five years.

Although the study's findings are considered robust, there are some limitations, including the study's use of a secondary data analysis approach to analyze the drivers of audit quality, sample size constraints, and sample period constraints. Therefore, future studies are encouraged to incorporate managers' and auditors' perceptions, utilizing a triangulation technique and a sufficiently high sample size.

**REFERENCES**

- Adeniyi, S. I., Mieseigha, E. G. (2013). Audit tenure: an assessment of its effects on audit quality in Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 3(3), 275–283.
- Al-Khaddash, H., Al Nawas, R., Ramadan, A. (2013). Factors affecting the quality of auditing: the case of Jordanian commercial bank. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(11), 206–222.
- Al-Thuneibat, A. B., Al Issa, R. T. I., Baker R. A. A. (2011). Do audit tenure and firm size contribute to audit quality?: empirical evidence from Jordan. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 26, 317-334.
- Aronmwan, E. J., Ashafoke, T. O., Mgbame, C. O. (2013). Audit Firm Reputation and Audit Quality. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(7), 66-75.
- Belfagira, K. G. E. (2015). Factors affecting audit quality in registered companies in Libya. [https://etd.uum.edu.my/5586/1/s815023\\_01.pdf](https://etd.uum.edu.my/5586/1/s815023_01.pdf)
- Calocha, R., Herwiyanti, E. (2020). Factors that affect audit quality. *Journal of Contemporary Accounting*, 2(1), 35-48.
- DeAngelo et al. (1981). Auditor size and audit quality. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 3(3), 183-199.
- Enofe, A. O., Mgbame, C., Aderin, A., Ehi-Oshio, O. U. (2013). Determinants of audit quality in the Nigerian business environment. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 4(4), 36-43.
- Feng, N.C. (2020). Individual auditor characteristics and audit quality: evidence from nonprofits in the US. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, Forthcoming.
- Hai, P. T. (2016). The Research of Factors Affecting the Quality of Audit Activities: Empirical Evidence in Vietnam. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(3), 83-94.
- Hategan, C. D., (2019). Factors influencing the quality of financial audits. *Oradea Journal of Business and Economics*, 4(2), 7-15.
- Jones, J.J. (1991). Earnings management during import relief investigations, *Journal of Accounting Research*, 29(2), 193-228.
- Kalanjati, D. S., Nasution, D., Jonnergard, K., and Sutedjo S. (2019). Auditor rotations and audit quality: a perspective from cumulative number of audit partner and audit firm rotations. *Asian Review of Accounting*, 27(4), 639-660.
- Kim, H., Lee, H., & Lee, J. E. (2015). Mandatory audit firm rotation and audit quality. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 31(3), 1089–1106.

- Knechel, W. R., Krishnan, G. V., Pevzner, M., Bhaskar, L. S. and Velury, U. (2013) audit quality: insights from the academic literature. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 32(1),35-63
- Limperg, T. (1985). *The social responsibility of the auditor*. Limperg Institute.
- Mawutor, J. K. M., (2019). Assessment of Factors Affecting Audit Quality: A Study of Selected Companies Listed on the Ghana Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting*, 9(2),123-151
- Mohaisen, H. A., Ali, K. S., Ibrahim, A. T. (2019). The effect of audit rotation on the audit quality: empirical study on Iraq. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 14(13), 4553-4558.
- Moraes, A. D. J., Martinez, A. L. (2015). Audit Fees and Audit Quality in Brazil. *Conference: XV Congresso USP de Controladoria e Contabilidade*.
- Moutinho, V., Cerqueira, A., Brandao, E. F. M. (2012). Audit fees and firm performance.
- Myers, J. N., Myers, L. A., & Omer, T. C. (2003). Exploring the term of the auditor-client relationship and the quality of earnings: a case for mandatory auditor rotation? *The Accounting Review*, 78(3), 779–799.
- Olabisi J., Kajola S.O., Abioro M.A., Oworu O.O. (2020). Determinants of audit quality: evidence from Nigerian listed insurance companies. *Journal of Volgograd State University. Economics*,22(2), 182-192.
- Pham N.K., Duong H.N., Pham T.O., Ho N.T.T. (2017). Audit firm size, audit fee, audit reputation, and audit quality: the case of listed companies in Vietnam. *Asian Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 9(1), 67-79.
- Salehi, M. and Mansoury, A. (2009). Firm size, audit regulation, and fraud detection: empirical evidence from Iran. *Management*, 4(1), 5-19.
- Salehi, M., Mahmoudi, M. R. F., Gah, A. D. (2019). A meta-analysis approach for determinants of effective factors on audit quality: evidence from emerging market. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 9(2), 287-312.
- Sari, S. P., Diyanti, A. A., Wijayanti, R. (2019). The effect of audit tenure, audit rotation, audit fee, accounting Firm size and auditor specialization to audit quality. *JURNAL Riset Akuntansi dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 4(3), 186-196.
- Senjaya, M., Firmanti, F. (2017). Auditor characteristics, audit tenure, audit fee and audit quality. *Global Journal of Business and Social Science Review (GJBSSR)*, 5(3), 94-99
- Sulanjaku, M., Shingjergji, A. (2015). An Overview of Factors Affecting Auditing Quality in Albania. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(3), 223-228.
- Yuniarti R. (2011). Audit firm size, audit fee and audit quality. *Journal of Global Management*, 2(1), 84-97.