Published: 2022-03-10

Audit Pricing Structures and Their Relationship with Audit Effort Levels

Felix Hayes, Natalie Banks, Harrison West

Abstract

This study investigates the complex relationship between audit pricing structures and the actual effort levels exerted by audit firms, challenging the traditional assumption that higher fees necessarily correlate with greater audit effort. We introduce a novel methodological framework that combines econometric analysis with behavioral audit simulations to disentangle the components of audit pricing—risk premiums, effort compensation, and client-specific premiums—from observable effort metrics. Unlike prior research that relies on fee data as a proxy for effort, we develop and validate a multi-dimensional effort measurement instrument capturing planning hours, testing intensity, review layers, and professional skepticism application. Our analysis of a unique dataset spanning 450 audit engagements from 1998 to 2004 reveals three distinct pricing-effort relationships: (1) a positive but diminishing correlation in high-risk engagements where effort responds to risk-based pricing, (2) a neutral relationship in moderate-risk engagements where standardized pricing dominates, and (3) a negative relationship in low-risk, recurring engagements where fee stickiness coexists with effort reduction. We further identify a previously undocumented 'effort elasticity' phenomenon, where audit effort demonstrates varying sensitivity to fee changes depending on client tenure, auditor size, and regulatory environment. The findings challenge conventional audit pricing models and provide new insights for regulators concerned with audit quality indicators, audit firms designing compensation structures, and clients negotiating audit engagements. This research contributes to the audit literature by providing a more nuanced understanding of how pricing mechanisms actually influence auditor behavior, moving beyond simple input-output models to recognize the complex behavioral and economic interdependencies in audit production.

Keywords: audit pricing, audit effort, audit quality, pricing structures, effort measurement, audit economics

1 Introduction

The relationship between audit pricing structures and the actual effort exerted by auditors represents a fundamental yet poorly understood aspect of audit production. Traditional audit pricing models, grounded in economic theory, assume that audit fees reflect the expected costs of audit effort plus an appropriate risk premium and profit margin. This assumption underpins much of the empirical audit literature, where audit fees are frequently used as a proxy for audit effort and, by extension, audit quality. However, this conventional wisdom masks a more complex reality where pricing structures may diverge from effort levels due to market imperfections, behavioral factors, and institutional constraints.

Our research challenges the linear fee-effort relationship by examining how different pricing structures—including fixed fees, time-based billing, value-based pricing, and hybrid models—actually influence auditor behavior and effort allocation. We posit that the relationship is neither uniform nor straightforward, but rather contingent on multiple factors including client risk characteristics, auditor-client relationship duration, market competition, and regulatory oversight intensity. This investigation is particularly timely given ongoing debates about audit quality indicators and the economic pressures facing the audit profession.

We address three primary research questions that have received limited attention in the literature: First, how do different audit pricing structures (fixed fee versus variable fee arrangements) affect the allocation and intensity of audit effort across engagement phases? Second, to what extent do audit firms adjust their effort levels in response to fee pressures, and does this adjustment vary systematically with client characteristics and engagement circumstances? Third, what is the nature of the 'effort elasticity'—the responsiveness of audit effort to changes in audit fees—and how does this elasticity vary across different segments of the audit market?

This study makes several distinctive contributions. Methodologically, we develop and validate a comprehensive effort measurement framework that moves beyond simple hour counts to capture multidimensional aspects of audit work. Theoretically, we integrate insights from behavioral economics, agency theory, and institutional sociology to develop a more nuanced understanding of audit production. Empirically, we utilize a unique dataset that combines proprietary audit firm data with publicly available information, allowing us to observe actual effort metrics rather than relying on proxies.

2 Methodology

2.1 Conceptual Framework

Our conceptual framework departs from traditional audit production models by recognizing that audit effort is not merely a function of price but is mediated by several intervening variables. We conceptualize audit effort as comprising four distinct dimensions: planning intensity (comprehensiveness of risk assessment and audit strategy development), testing rigor (extent and nature of substantive procedures), review layers (number and depth of supervisory reviews), and professional judgment application (degree of skepticism and critical evaluation). Each dimension may respond differently to pricing structures and external pressures.

We further distinguish between different components of audit pricing: the base effort compensation (theoretical cost of standard audit procedures), risk premium (compensation for engagement risk and client business risk), relationship premium (reflecting client-specific factors and switching costs), and competitive discount (price concessions in competitive situations). This disaggregation allows us to examine how different pricing components relate to different effort dimensions.

2.2 Data Collection

Our primary data source is a proprietary dataset obtained through collaboration with three international audit firms, covering 450 audit engagements from 1998 to 2004. This period is particularly relevant as it encompasses both pre- and post-Sarbanes-Oxley regulatory environments, allowing us to examine regulatory effects. The dataset includes detailed engagement records containing: (1) actual hours worked categorized by staff level and audit phase, (2) detailed workpaper references indicating testing extent, (3) review notes and sign-off documentation, (4) fee arrangements and billing details, and (5) internal risk assessments

and planning memoranda.

We supplement this proprietary data with publicly available information from SEC filings, including client financial characteristics, industry classifications, and auditor disclosures. This combination creates a rich dataset that links pricing information with actual effort metrics, overcoming the limitations of prior studies that relied solely on fee data.

2.3 Effort Measurement Instrument

We developed and validated a multi-dimensional audit effort measurement instrument through an iterative process involving audit partners, managers, and academics. The instrument comprises four primary scales:

1. **Planning Intensity Scale (PIS)**: Measures the comprehensiveness of audit planning through 12 items assessing risk assessment thoroughness, materiality determination rigor, and response design appropriateness.

2. **Testing Rigor Scale (TRS)**: Evaluates substantive testing through 18 items covering sample sizes, selection methods, evidence quality, and alternative procedure consideration.

3. **Review Quality Scale (RQS)**: Assesses supervisory review through 10 items examining review depth, challenge intensity, and resolution tracking.

4. **Professional Judgment Scale (PJS)**: Captures judgment application through 15 items measuring skepticism, alternative consideration, and conclusion justification.

Each scale demonstrated acceptable reliability (Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.78 to 0.86) and was validated through comparison with independent quality assessments and peer reviews.

2.4 Econometric Models

We estimate a series of econometric models to examine the pricing-effort relationship. Our primary model takes the form:

$$Effort_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 PriceStruct_{it} + \beta_2 Risk_{it} + \beta_3 Controls_{it} + \beta_4 (PriceStruct \times Risk)_{it} + \epsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

Where $Effort_{it}$ represents our multi-dimensional effort measure for engagement i in year t, $PriceStruct_{it}$ captures pricing structure variables, $Risk_{it}$ represents client risk measures, and $Controls_{it}$ includes client size, complexity, auditor characteristics, and year fixed effects.

We extend this basic model to test for nonlinear relationships, threshold effects, and differential responses across effort dimensions. We also employ instrumental variable approaches to address potential endogeneity between pricing and effort decisions.

2.5 Behavioral Simulations

Complementing our quantitative analysis, we conducted behavioral simulations with 85 audit partners and managers. Participants made effort allocation decisions in response to varying pricing scenarios, client characteristics, and time pressures. These simulations provide insights into the decision processes underlying the observed statistical relationships and help identify behavioral mechanisms that may not be apparent in archival data.

3 Results

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Our sample of 450 engagements represents diverse clients across industries, with market capitalizations ranging from $50 million to 15 billion. Audit fees varied from $150,000 to 5.2 million, with a mean of $1.4 million. The distribution of pricing structures showed 58% fixed fee arrangements, 32% time-based with caps, and 10% pure time-based billing.

Effort measures demonstrated substantial variation across engagements, with the Planning Intensity Scale scores ranging from 42 to 89 (mean = 68.3), Testing Rigor Scale from 51 to 92 (mean = 71.8), Review Quality Scale from 47 to 88 (mean = 70.1), and Professional Judgment Scale from 45 to 91 (mean = 69.7). The intercorrelations among effort dimensions were moderate (ranging from 0.32 to 0.48), supporting their treatment as distinct though related constructs.

3.2 Pricing Structure Effects

Our analysis reveals significant differences in effort levels across pricing structures, but these differences are not uniform across effort dimensions. Fixed fee arrangements were associated with higher Planning Intensity Scale scores (coefficient = 4.32, p ¡ 0.01) but lower Testing Rigor Scale scores (coefficient = -2.87, p ¡ 0.05) compared to time-based arrangements. This suggests that auditors under fixed fee contracts invest more in upfront planning to control engagement scope but may reduce testing intensity to maintain profitability.

Time-based billing with caps showed the most complex pattern, with higher Review Quality Scale scores (coefficient = 3.15, p ¡ 0.05) but lower Professional Judgment Scale scores (coefficient = -3.42, p ¡ 0.01). This pattern indicates that capped arrangements may encourage thorough review processes (to avoid costly rework) but discourage time-intensive judgment exercises.

3.3 The Effort Elasticity Phenomenon

A key finding is the identification of 'effort elasticity'—the responsiveness of audit effort to fee changes. We estimate an overall effort elasticity of 0.38, meaning that a 10% increase in audit fees is associated with a 3.8% increase in overall effort. However, this elasticity varies substantially across conditions:

1. **High-risk engagements**: Elasticity = 0.62 (p ¡ 0.01) 2. **Moderate-risk engagements**: Elasticity = 0.25 (p ¡ 0.05) 3. **Low-risk engagements**: Elasticity = -0.18 (p ¡ 0.10)

The negative elasticity in low-risk engagements is particularly noteworthy, suggesting that fee increases in routine audits may actually reduce effort, possibly due to perceived 'overpayment' or profit cushion effects.

Elasticity also varied by auditor tenure: first-year engagements showed elasticity of 0.71, declining to 0.29 by year three, and becoming statistically insignificant thereafter. This pattern suggests that effort is most responsive to pricing in new engagements, with established relationships showing fee-effort decoupling.

3.4 Threshold Effects and Nonlinear Relationships

We identified several threshold effects in the pricing-effort relationship. Below a fee level of approximately $500,000, effort showed strong positive responsiveness to fees (elasticity = 0.82). Between 500,000 and 2 million, the relationship flattened (elasticity = 0.21). Above 2 million, we observed a slight negative relationship (elasticity = -0.12), though this was not statistically significant at conventional levels.

Nonlinear analysis revealed an inverted U-shaped relationship between fee premium (actual fee relative to predicted fee) and effort quality. Moderate positive fee premiums (10-30% above predicted) were associated with highest effort scores, while both discount engagements and very high premium engagements showed lower effort. This suggests that both fee pressure and excessive fees may undermine optimal effort allocation.

3.5 Behavioral Simulation Findings

The behavioral simulations provided insights into the mechanisms underlying our quantitative results. Participants consistently reported that fixed fee arrangements created strong incentives for efficiency and scope control, sometimes at the expense of thoroughness in unexpected areas. Time-based arrangements, while reducing efficiency pressures, created different distortions including 'hour maximization' in some cases and premature sign-off in others.

Notably, 68% of simulation participants indicated they would reduce effort in response to fee increases in low-risk, recurring engagements, citing 'fairness' considerations and relationship management concerns. This behavioral pattern helps explain the negative elasticity observed in our archival data for such engagements.

4 Conclusion

This study provides compelling evidence that the relationship between audit pricing structures and audit effort levels is far more complex than traditionally assumed. Our findings challenge the straightforward fee-effort correlation that underpins much audit research and practice. Instead, we demonstrate that the relationship is contingent, nonlinear, and multidimensional, varying systematically with client risk, auditor tenure, fee level, and pricing structure.

The identification of 'effort elasticity' and its variation across engagement types represents a significant theoretical contribution. Our results suggest that audit effort responds to economic incentives in ways that are sometimes counterintuitive—for instance, the negative elasticity in low-risk engagements indicates that higher fees may not always purchase greater effort. This has important implications for audit regulators concerned with fee transparency and audit quality indicators.

Our multi-dimensional effort measurement framework advances methodological approaches in audit research by moving beyond simple hour counts to capture the qualitative aspects of audit work. The differential effects we observe across planning, testing, review, and judgment dimensions highlight the importance of this multidimensional perspective.

Practically, our findings suggest that audit committees and clients should consider not just the level of audit fees but the structure of fee arrangements and their likely effects on auditor behavior. Fixed fee arrangements may encourage efficient planning but potentially reduce testing flexibility, while time-based arrangements may reduce efficiency pressures but create other distortions.

Several limitations should be noted. Our sample, while rich in detail, comes from a limited number of audit firms and may not fully represent the entire audit market. The period studied, while advantageous for examining regulatory changes, may not reflect current market conditions. Future research could extend our framework to different institutional contexts and more recent periods.

In conclusion, this research provides a more nuanced understanding of audit production economics, recognizing the complex interplay between pricing mechanisms, auditor incentives, and effort allocation. By moving beyond simplistic input-output models, we offer a foundation for more sophisticated approaches to audit quality assessment, pricing strategy, and regulatory oversight.

References

Antle, R., Nalebuff, B. (1991). Conservatism and auditor-client negotiations. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 29(Supplement), 31-54.

Beattie, V., Fearnley, S., Brandt, R. (2001). Behind the audit report: A descriptive study of discussions and negotiations between auditors and directors. *International Journal of Auditing*, 5(2), 177-202.

Bell, T. B., Landsman, W. R., Shackelford, D. A. (2001). Auditors' perceived business risk and audit fees: Analysis and evidence. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 39(1), 35-43.

Carcello, J. V., Hermanson, D. R., McGrath, N. T. (1992). Audit quality attributes: The perceptions of audit partners, preparers, and financial statement users. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 11(1), 1-15.

DeAngelo, L. E. (1981). Auditor size and audit quality. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 3(3), 183-199.

Francis, J. R. (1984). The effect of audit firm size on audit prices: A study of the Australian market. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 6(2), 133-151.

Hackenbrack, K., Nelson, M. W. (1996). Auditors' incentives and their application of financial accounting standards. *The Accounting Review*, 71(1), 43-59.

Kinney, W. R., Martin, R. D. (1994). Does auditing reduce bias in financial reporting? A review of audit-related adjustment studies. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 13(1), 149-156.

Palmrose, Z. V. (1986). Audit fees and auditor size: Further evidence. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 24(1), 97-110.

Simunic, D. A. (1980). The pricing of audit services: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 18(1), 161-190.