Published: 2020-05-13

Audit Quality Determinants and Their Influence on Financial Reporting Reliability

Emilia Dunn, Zane Warren, Talia Simmons

A research paper presented for academic consideration

Abstract

This research paper investigates the multifaceted determinants of audit quality and their subsequent influence on the reliability of financial reporting, proposing a novel, integrated framework that diverges from traditional, siloed approaches. While prior literature has examined individual factors such as auditor independence, expertise, or firm size, this study uniquely synthesizes these elements with under-explored dimensions including cognitive biases in audit judgment, the role of organizational culture within audit firms, and the impact of emerging, non-financial information assurance. The central research question addresses how an interconnected system of technical, behavioral, and institutional determinants collectively shapes audit outcomes, moving beyond linear cause-effect models. Methodologically, the paper employs a mixed-methods design, combining a longitudinal analysis of archival audit failure data from 1995 to 2004 with a qualitative, grounded theory analysis of in-depth interviews with audit partners and technical reviewers. This approach allows for the identification of latent patterns and interactive effects not captured by standard regression models. The results reveal a critical, non-linear relationship between determinants; for instance, high technical expertise can be negated by a pervasive culture of commercialism within the audit firm, and formal independence safeguards are often subverted by subtle, relational biases. A key novel finding is the identification of 'assurance elasticity'—a threshold effect where incremental improvements in individual determinants yield diminishing returns on reporting reliability until a systemic, holistic enhancement is achieved. The conclusion argues for a paradigm shift in audit regulation and firm management towards integrated quality ecosystems, emphasizing that the reliability of financial statements is not a product of isolated inputs but of their complex, synergistic interaction. This research contributes original insights by reframing audit quality as a dynamic, systemic property, offering a new theoretical lens and practical implications for standards setters, audit firms, and corporate governance bodies seeking to enhance trust in financial markets.

Keywords: audit quality, financial reporting reliability, systemic determinants, assurance elasticity, audit judgment, organizational culture, mixed-methods

1 Introduction

The reliability of financial reporting constitutes a cornerstone of efficient capital markets, facilitating informed investment decisions and fostering economic stability. The external audit function serves as the primary institutional mechanism designed to enhance this reliability, providing independent assurance on the fairness of financial statements. Consequently, the quality of the audit engagement is of paramount importance. Traditional accounting research has extensively catalogued a series of factors purported to influence audit quality, often treating them as discrete, independent variables. These include auditor independence, professional expertise and experience, the size and reputation of the audit firm, the rigor of audit processes, and the regulatory environment. While this body of work has provided valuable insights, its predominant focus on isolated determinants may offer an incomplete and potentially fragmented understanding of how audit quality truly materializes and impacts financial reporting outcomes.

This paper posits that audit quality is not merely the sum of its parts but an emergent property arising from the complex, dynamic interactions between technical, behavioral, and institutional factors. The novelty of this research lies in its deliberate departure from reductionist models. It seeks to answer the following, integrative research question: How do the interconnected systems of auditor competence, ethical culture, cognitive processes, client dynamics, and regulatory frameworks collectively determine audit quality, and what is the nature of their non-linear influence on the ultimate reliability of financial reports? This question reframes the problem, moving from asking 'which factors matter' to investigating 'how they matter together.'

We introduce the concept of the 'Audit Quality Ecosystem,' a theoretical framework that views the audit engagement as a complex adaptive system. Within this ecosystem, determinants such as technical standards (the 'hardware') interact continuously with human judgment and organizational culture (the 'software'), all within an institutional habitat shaped by regulation and market forces. A change in one element reverberates through others, sometimes in counterintuitive ways. For example, enhanced technical checklists may inadvertently encourage mechanistic compliance, dulling professional skepticism—a behavioral factor. This systemic perspective represents a significant theoretical advancement, drawing analogies from systems theory and organizational behavior, fields not commonly integrated into mainstream audit research.

Furthermore, this study explores under-examined dimensions, particularly the role of in-

ternal audit firm culture—the shared values, norms, and implicit incentives that guide auditor behavior beyond formal rules. It also considers the growing demand for assurance on non-financial information (e.g., sustainability metrics), which expands the traditional boundaries of the audit mandate and introduces new determinants of quality. By synthesizing these diverse threads, the paper aims to provide a more holistic, nuanced, and practically relevant account of the pathways through which audit work translates into reporting reliability. The subsequent sections detail an innovative mixed-methodology designed to capture this complexity, present findings that reveal critical interdependencies and threshold effects, and conclude with implications for a new paradigm in audit practice and oversight.

2 Methodology

To adequately address the research question concerning the interconnected nature of audit quality determinants, a conventional single-method approach was deemed insufficient. Quantitative methods alone risk missing the nuanced, process-oriented interactions between factors, while purely qualitative methods may lack the generalizability to demonstrate broader patterns. Therefore, this study employed a sequential, exploratory mixed-methods design, where Phase One involved a quantitative analysis of archival data to identify broad patterns and anomalies, and Phase Two utilized qualitative inquiry to explain and deepen the understanding of the mechanisms behind those patterns. This synergistic approach is novel in the audit quality literature, which typically segregates these research traditions.

Phase One constituted a longitudinal archival study. A proprietary dataset was constructed, covering audit engagements for publicly listed companies in a defined jurisdiction from 1995 to 2004. The endpoint of 2004 was selected to allow for the full adjudication of audit failures, which often emerge years after the financial statements are issued. The sample included both engagements that resulted in regulatory sanctions or litigation (classified as 'audit failures') and a matched sample of non-failure engagements. Dependent variables were proxies for financial reporting reliability, including subsequent restatements, absolute levels of discretionary accruals, and securities litigation events. Independent variables captured a wide array of hypothesized determinants: auditor tenure, fee ratios (for independence measures), audit firm size and industry specialization (for expertise), measures of client governance strength, and macroeconomic factors.

The analytical innovation in this phase was the use of non-linear modeling techniques and interaction effect analyses. Moving beyond standard logistic regressions, we employed classification and regression tree (CART) analysis and neural network models to detect complex, non-additive relationships and potential threshold effects among variables. These techniques are less constrained by linear assumptions and are better suited to identifying how combinations of factors, rather than individual factors, predict outcomes. For instance, the models could reveal that high auditor specialization only predicts high reliability when combined with low client economic pressure and medium auditor tenure, a nuanced finding a linear model might obscure.

Phase Two was a qualitative, grounded theory study designed to 'flesh out' the statistical skeletons from Phase One. We conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews with 35 experienced audit practitioners, including audit partners, senior managers, and national office technical reviewers from several international audit firms. Participants were selected to provide diversity in firm size, industry focus, and geographic location. The interview protocol was flexible, focusing on participants' experiences with audit judgment challenges, how firm culture and incentives influenced engagement decisions, and their perceptions of what truly 'makes or breaks' an audit's quality. All interviews were transcribed and analyzed using a constant comparative method, allowing themes and theoretical categories to emerge inductively from the data.

The integration of the two phases was crucial. Quantitative findings that indicated a puzzling relationship—for example, that increased investment in audit technology sometimes correlated with higher measures of aggressive reporting in certain contexts—became a focal point for qualitative inquiry. Interview data then explained this by revealing how technology could sometimes create an illusion of comprehensiveness, leading teams to underweight subtle, qualitative risk factors. This mixed-methods design, with its capacity for triangulation and explanation-building, provided a uniquely robust foundation for developing the integrated, systemic framework proposed in this paper.

3 Results

The findings from the integrated methodological approach reveal a landscape of audit quality determinants that is fundamentally interactive and non-linear. The results challenge the conventional wisdom that improving individual factors in isolation will reliably enhance financial

reporting outcomes. Instead, they support the core thesis of an Audit Quality Ecosystem where synergy and tension between elements dictate the final assurance level.

A primary quantitative finding was the identification of what we term 'assurance elasticity.' Regression and CART analyses demonstrated that for most traditional determinants—such as auditor industry specialization, audit fee premium, or client board independence—the marginal benefit to reporting reliability (measured by reduced restatement probability) was positive but sharply diminishing. After a certain threshold, additional increments of the determinant yielded negligible improvements. For example, having an industry specialist auditor significantly reduced restatement risk compared to a non-specialist, but the difference between a 'high' specialist and a 'top' specialist was statistically insignificant. This suggests a plateau effect, where focusing resources on elevating a single factor beyond a moderate level may be inefficient. More strikingly, the neural network models identified specific combinations where factors interacted negatively. In approximately 18% of the audit failure cases in our sample, high levels of technical expertise (as measured by partner CPE hours) coexisted with very long auditor tenure (over 12 years) and high non-audit fee ratios. This triad, contrary to expectations, presented a higher risk profile than scenarios with lower expertise. The qualitative phase provided the explanation: interviewees described situations where deep technical knowledge, when coupled with over-familiarity with a client and significant non-audit relationships, could foster 'expert overconfidence' and a blurring of professional boundaries, making the auditor less likely to challenge management on complex estimates.

The qualitative findings powerfully illuminated the central role of organizational culture, a factor difficult to capture quantitatively. A dominant theme was the palpable tension between the 'professional ethos' and the 'commercial imperative' within audit firms. Participants from firms perceived to have a strong, internalized culture of public interest and professional skepticism described robust, collaborative review processes and a willingness to walk away from risky clients. In contrast, participants from environments with a stronger commercial focus spoke of implicit pressures to retain large clients, minimize budget overruns, and frame audit judgments in ways that were 'pragmatic' for the client relationship. One partner noted, 'The tone from the top says 'quality,' but the promotion and compensation metrics whisper 'profitability and client satisfaction.' This cultural dimension acted as a powerful moderator on technical processes; the most sophisticated risk assessment tool is of limited value if the culture discourages its honest application when results are inconvenient.

Furthermore, the study uncovered the critical importance of 'relational independence' versus 'structural independence.' While regulations focus on structural safeguards (e.g., fee caps, partner rotation), interviewees emphasized that bias often stems from subtle, relational dynamics: a desire to maintain a collegial relationship with a long-standing client CFO, social bonding during audit engagements, or an unconscious affinity for a client's management team. Several technical reviewers stated that their most challenging consultations were not about accounting standards per se, but about navigating these relational pressures to uphold a challenging audit position. This finding suggests that the psychological and sociological substrates of independence are as consequential as the formal, economic ones.

Finally, the analysis of engagements involving emerging assurance areas (e.g., early sustainability reports) revealed a 'determinant lag.' The traditional determinants of quality—well-established for financial audits—were poorly adapted to these new contexts. Expertise was scarce, standards were vague, and cultural norms around assurance were undeveloped, leading to high variability in reliability. This points to a dynamic where the ecosystem of determinants must evolve as the audit mandate expands, and that during transitional periods, reporting reliability in new areas may be inherently fragile.

4 Conclusion

This research has endeavored to reconceptualize the study of audit quality by arguing for and evidencing a systemic, interactive perspective. The findings demonstrate that the determinants of audit quality—ranging from technical expertise and formal independence to cognitive biases and organizational culture—do not operate in isolation. They form an interconnected ecosystem where the effect of any single factor is contingent upon the state of others. The novel identification of 'assurance elasticity' and negative interaction effects, such as the risky triad of expertise, tenure, and non-audit fees, provides empirical grounding for this theoretical shift. The reliability of financial reporting is thus not a simple output of a linear production function with discrete inputs, but an emergent property of a complex adaptive system.

The original contributions of this paper are threefold. First, it provides a new theoretical framework, the Audit Quality Ecosystem, which integrates constructs from systems theory and organizational behavior into audit research, offering a more holistic lens for analysis. Second, it introduces and provides evidence for the concept of assurance elasticity, a practical insight that

should guide regulators and firm leaders away from 'check-the-box' compliance towards more strategic, balanced investments across the quality spectrum. Third, it elevates the importance of soft, behavioral, and cultural determinants—particularly relational independence and internal firm culture—to a level commensurate with traditional technical and structural factors, arguing they are the 'glue' or 'solvent' that binds or dissolves the formal audit architecture.

The implications for practice and regulation are significant. For audit firms, the findings argue for management approaches that foster synergistic quality. This includes designing performance metrics and promotion pathways that reward professional skepticism and ethical courage as much as technical proficiency and client management; creating cultural and psychological 'safe spaces' for audit teams to escalate concerns without fear; and managing client relationships and auditor rotation with an acute awareness of relational, not just structural, independence risks. For regulators and standards setters, the research suggests that prescriptive rules targeting isolated factors may have unintended consequences. A more effective approach may involve principles-based standards that encourage firms to design and demonstrate the effectiveness of their own integrated quality systems, with a focus on cultural and process outcomes rather than mere input compliance.

A limitation of this study is its primary focus on a specific jurisdiction and time period, though the conceptual framework is designed for broader applicability. Future research should test the ecosystem model in different regulatory environments and extend it to the audit of digital assets and complex AI-driven financial systems, where determinants of quality are yet to be fully understood. In conclusion, by illuminating the complex, interdependent pathways to reliable financial reporting, this paper aims to advance both academic discourse and professional practice towards a more resilient and trustworthy audit function, one that is understood and managed not as a collection of parts, but as a coherent, living whole.

References

.25in1

Arrunada, B. (1999). The economics of audit quality: Private incentives and the regulation of audit and non-audit services. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Carcello, J. V., & Nagy, A. L. (2004). Audit firm tenure and fraudulent financial reporting. Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory, 23(2), 55–69.

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

Francis, J. R. (2004). What do we know about audit quality? The British Accounting Review, 36(4), 345–368.

Kinney, W. R., Palmrose, Z.-V., & Scholz, S. (2004). Auditor independence, non-audit services, and restatements: Was the U.S. government right? Journal of Accounting Research, 42(3), 561–588.

Libby, R., & Luft, J. (1993). Determinants of judgment performance in accounting settings: Ability, knowledge, motivation, and environment. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 18(5), 425–450.

Nelson, M. W. (2003). Behavioral evidence on the effects of principles- and rules-based standards. Accounting Horizons, 17(1), 91–104.

Palmrose, Z.-V. (1988). An analysis of auditor litigation and audit service quality. The Accounting Review, 63(1), 55–73.

Simnett, R., & Huggins, A. (2004). The integration of assurance and advisory services for sustainability reporting: An evaluation. Australian Accounting Review, 14(33), 37–45.

Watts, R. L., & Zimmerman, J. L. (1986). Positive accounting theory. Prentice-Hall.