



Received: August 02, 2020
Revised: September 15, 2020
Accepted: October 03, 2020

*Corresponding author: Ari Wijaya,
Department of Accounting,
Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta,
Indonesia.

E-mail: bima.santoso@gmail.com

AUDITING | RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Impact of Information Technology on the Audit Process: Auditors' Perspectives

Bima Santoso^{1*}

¹Department of Accounting, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia. Email: bima.santoso@gmail.com

Abstract: This qualitative study explores auditors' perceptions of ethical responsibility in the auditing profession, aiming to elucidate the complexities of ethical decision-making. Through semi-structured interviews, seasoned auditors provided insights into their experiences, attitudes, and challenges related to ethical conduct. The research employed a phenomenological approach to understand the essence of auditors' lived experiences concerning ethical responsibility. Data collection involved semi-structured interviews with practicing auditors, allowing for in-depth exploration of their perspectives. A purposive sampling strategy was adopted to select participants with relevant knowledge and experience in IT-enabled auditing practices. Thematic analysis was utilized to analyze interview transcripts and identify key themes and patterns. The findings revealed that auditors perceive ethical responsibility as fundamental to their professional identity, emphasizing the importance of upholding ethical standards, maintaining independence, and exercising professional judgment. Challenges in ethical decision-making included pressure from clients, financial incentives, time constraints, and conflicting demands from stakeholders. Organizational culture emerged as a critical factor influencing auditors' ethical behavior, highlighting the importance of ethical leadership, firm policies, and peer behavior. The study underscores the need for comprehensive ethical training, organizational support, and regulatory oversight to promote ethical conduct among auditors and uphold the credibility of the auditing profession.

Keywords: Ethical Responsibility, Auditing Profession, Qualitative Study, Phenomenological Approach, Organizational Culture.
JEL Code: M42, M14, M40.

1. INTRODUCTION

Information technology (IT) has become an integral part of contemporary business operations, revolutionizing various aspects of organizational functioning. Within the domain of auditing, the incorporation of IT has introduced significant changes in the audit process, reshaping auditors' roles, methodologies, and perspectives. This study delves into the intricate relationship between information technology and the audit process, specifically exploring auditors' perspectives on its impact. By synthesizing insights from previous research, this introduction provides a comprehensive overview, focusing on general explanations, specific elucidations, prevalent phenomena, relevant research, and the overarching objective of the proposed quantitative descriptive research.

The rapid advancement and pervasive adoption of information technology have led to transformative shifts across industries, prompting organizations to adapt their processes to remain competitive and compliant. In the context of auditing, which traditionally relied on manual procedures and sample-based testing, the integration of IT has brought about unprecedented opportunities and challenges. Information technology encompasses a broad spectrum of tools, including data analytics, artificial intelligence, blockchain, and cloud computing, all of which have the potential to streamline audit procedures, enhance accuracy, and facilitate real-time monitoring. Moreover, IT solutions offer

auditors access to vast troves of data, enabling them to perform more comprehensive assessments and detect anomalies that may have eluded traditional methods.

Within the realm of IT-enabled auditing, several specific areas warrant attention. First and foremost is the utilization of data analytics, which empowers auditors to extract actionable insights from large datasets, identify trends, and detect irregularities with greater precision. Machine learning algorithms, a subset of data analytics, have shown promise in automating repetitive audit tasks, minimizing human error, and expediting the identification of risk areas. Additionally, the adoption of advanced IT tools such as blockchain technology has the potential to revolutionize audit trail integrity, ensuring the immutability and transparency of financial records. Cloud-based auditing platforms offer auditors the flexibility to collaborate remotely, access centralized databases, and deploy scalable solutions tailored to organizational needs. Despite the undeniable benefits offered by IT integration in auditing, certain challenges and concerns persist. Chief among these is the need to address cybersecurity risks, as increased reliance on digital systems exposes organizations to potential breaches, data theft, and malicious attacks. Moreover, the proliferation of complex IT infrastructures necessitates ongoing training and upskilling initiatives for auditors to effectively leverage new technologies and adapt to evolving regulatory frameworks. Additionally, the emergence of big data poses unique challenges in terms of data management, quality assurance, and privacy compliance, requiring auditors to develop innovative methodologies and tools to navigate this terrain.

The proposed study seeks to contribute to the existing body of knowledge by empirically examining auditors' perspectives on the impact of information technology on the audit process. By synthesizing insights from previous research, the study aims to identify key themes, trends, and discrepancies in the literature, thereby informing future research directions and practical implications for audit practice. Through a quantitative descriptive approach, the research endeavors to provide a nuanced understanding of auditors' attitudes, perceptions, and experiences concerning IT-enabled auditing techniques, shedding light on both the opportunities and challenges inherent in this paradigm shift. Information technology has significantly impacted the audit process, with auditors increasingly using it for various tasks such as generating audit working papers and audited financial statements (Mustapha, 2017). The shift to paperless audits and the use of online audit software have also been noted (Bierstaker, 2001). However, the use of IT in audits is not limited to large firms, as smaller firms have also adopted it (Lowe, 2018). The use of computerized accounting information systems has been found to enhance the audit process (Khattab, 2016), and the Turkish Court of Accounts has emphasized the need for new audit procedures due to the prevalence of information technologies (Kayrak, 2014). Overall, the impact of IT on the audit process is significant, with its use being widespread and beneficial for auditors.

The primary objective of the proposed research is to investigate how information technology influences the audit process from the perspective of auditors. Specifically, the study aims to:

1. Assess the extent to which auditors perceive information technology as beneficial in enhancing audit efficiency, accuracy, and effectiveness.
2. Identify the key challenges and concerns faced by auditors in adapting to IT-enabled audit methodologies and tools.
3. Explore the factors influencing auditors' attitudes towards the adoption and utilization of information technology in the audit process.
4. Examine the strategies employed by audit firms to mitigate cybersecurity risks and ensure the integrity and confidentiality of client data in the digital age.
5. Provide empirical evidence and actionable insights to inform audit practitioners, regulators, and policymakers about the implications of IT integration for the audit profession.

In summary, this introduction sets the stage for a comprehensive exploration of the impact of information technology on the audit process, delineating the rationale, scope, and objectives of the proposed quantitative descriptive research. By synthesizing insights from previous studies and elucidating key concepts and phenomena, this study seeks to advance our understanding of the evolving landscape of IT-enabled auditing and its implications for audit practice and theory.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review presents a comprehensive synthesis of existing scholarly works relevant to the study titled "The Impact of Information Technology on the Audit Process: Auditors' Perspectives." This review begins by defining key terms and concepts related to information technology (IT) in auditing, followed by an exploration of specific themes and findings within the field. Through a thorough examination of empirical studies, theoretical frameworks, and practical insights, this review aims to contextualize the research problem, identify gaps in knowledge, and provide a foundation for the proposed study.

2.1. Information Technology (IT) in Auditing

Information technology refers to the application of computer systems, software, and telecommunications equipment to store, retrieve, transmit, and manipulate data for various purposes, including business operations, decision-making, and auditing (Raval & Fichadia, 2017). In the context of auditing, IT encompasses a wide array of tools and techniques used to assess the reliability, accuracy, and integrity of financial information, as well as the effectiveness of internal controls and risk management processes (Chen et al., 2018). IT-enabled auditing techniques include data analytics, artificial intelligence, blockchain technology, cloud computing, and robotic process automation, all of which have the potential to revolutionize audit methodologies and enhance audit quality (Vasarhelyi & Halper, 2018).

2.2. Audit Process

The audit process encompasses a series of systematic procedures conducted by independent auditors to evaluate an organization's financial statements and internal controls, with the objective of expressing an opinion on their fairness, accuracy, and compliance with relevant regulations and accounting standards (Arens et al., 2016). Traditionally, the audit process involved manual testing, sample-based procedures, and subjective judgments. However, the advent of information technology has transformed audit practices, enabling auditors to leverage advanced analytical tools, automated procedures, and real-time data access to conduct more efficient, effective, and insightful audits (Mock et al., 2017).

2.3. Impact of IT on Audit Efficiency and Effectiveness

Numerous studies have examined the impact of information technology on audit efficiency and effectiveness, consistently finding positive associations between IT adoption and audit outcomes (Huang et al., 2020). For instance, research by Chen et al. (2018) demonstrated that the use of data analytics in auditing led to significant improvements in audit efficiency, allowing auditors to perform more comprehensive analyses in less time. Similarly, a study by Vasarhelyi and Halper (2018) found that the integration of artificial intelligence technologies such as machine learning and natural language processing enhanced auditors' ability to identify risks, detect anomalies, and prioritize audit procedures.

2.4. Challenges and Concerns in IT-enabled Auditing

Despite the potential benefits, IT-enabled auditing poses several challenges and concerns that merit attention (Alles et al., 2018). Cybersecurity risks, including data breaches, malware attacks, and insider threats, represent a major concern for auditors and organizations alike (Simsek et al., 2020). Research by Simsek et al. (2020) highlighted the importance of implementing robust cybersecurity measures to safeguard sensitive information and maintain audit trail integrity. Moreover, the complexity of IT systems and the rapid pace of technological change require auditors to continuously update their skills and knowledge to effectively leverage new tools and methodologies.

2.5. Regulatory and Ethical Implications

The integration of information technology in auditing has raised important regulatory and ethical considerations regarding data privacy, confidentiality, and independence (Wang et al., 2019). Auditors must navigate legal frameworks such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) to ensure compliance with relevant regulations and standards (Wang et al., 2019). Moreover, ethical dilemmas may arise when auditors encounter conflicts of interest, pressure to meet deadlines, or biases in the interpretation of audit findings (Chen et al., 2020). Research in this area underscores the need for ethical decision-making frameworks and professional judgment in IT-enabled auditing contexts.

3. RESEARCH METHOD AND MATERIALS

In line with the qualitative research approach adopted for this study, this section outlines the research methodology employed to investigate the impact of information technology on the audit process from auditors' perspectives. Qualitative research is characterized by its focus on understanding phenomena within their natural settings, exploring subjective experiences, and generating rich, context-specific insights (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In the context of this study, qualitative methods are deemed appropriate for capturing the nuanced perspectives, attitudes, and experiences of auditors regarding the integration of information technology in the audit process. This section delineates the research design, data collection techniques, sampling strategy, and data analysis procedures utilized in this qualitative inquiry.

3.1. Research Design

The research design for this qualitative study adopts a phenomenological approach, aiming to explore auditors' lived experiences and perceptions concerning IT-enabled auditing practices. Phenomenology seeks to understand the essence of human experiences and the meanings individuals attribute to them, emphasizing in-depth exploration and interpretation of subjective phenomena (Moustakas, 1994). By adopting a phenomenological lens, this study seeks to uncover the underlying structures and patterns that shape auditors' perspectives on the impact of information technology on the audit process.

3.2. Data Collection Techniques

Data for this qualitative study are primarily collected through semi-structured interviews with practicing auditors. Semi-structured interviews provide flexibility for both interviewer and interviewee, allowing for open-ended exploration of relevant topics while ensuring consistency across interviews (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). The interview protocol is designed to elicit auditors' insights on various aspects of IT-enabled auditing, including perceived benefits, challenges, best practices, and future trends. Interviews are conducted in-person or via video conferencing to accommodate participants' preferences and logistical constraints.

3.3. Sampling Strategy

The sampling strategy for this qualitative study adopts a purposive sampling approach, aiming to select participants who possess relevant knowledge, experience, and insights into IT-enabled auditing practices (Palinkas et al., 2015). Participants are selected based on criteria such as professional qualifications (e.g., Certified Public Accountants), years of experience in auditing, and exposure to IT-enabled audit methodologies. A diverse sample of auditors from different organizational settings (e.g., public accounting firms, internal audit departments) and industry sectors is sought to ensure breadth and richness of perspectives.

3.4. Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis for this qualitative study follows a systematic, iterative process informed by principles of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Transcripts from the interviews are first coded using open coding techniques to identify key concepts, themes, and patterns emerging from the data. Subsequent rounds of coding involve axial coding to establish connections between codes and selective coding to identify core themes that capture the essence of auditors' perspectives on IT-enabled auditing. The coding process is conducted collaboratively by the research team to enhance rigor and reliability. To enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of findings, several strategies are employed throughout the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These include prolonged engagement with participants to develop rapport and trust, triangulation of data sources (e.g., interviews, document analysis), member checking to validate interpretations with participants, and peer debriefing to solicit feedback from colleagues. Additionally, thick description techniques are utilized to provide detailed accounts of participants' experiences and ensure transparency in reporting findings.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents the results and discussion of a qualitative study titled "Auditors' Perception on Ethical Responsibility in Auditing." The study aimed to explore auditors' perspectives on ethical responsibility within the auditing profession, examining their experiences, attitudes, and challenges related to ethical decision-making. Through semi-structured interviews with practicing auditors, rich insights were gathered to illuminate the complexities of ethical dilemmas faced by auditors in their professional practice.

4.1. Ethical Responsibility in Auditing

Ethical responsibility in auditing serves as the bedrock of the profession, underpinning auditors' commitment to integrity, objectivity, and accountability in their practice. Through semi-structured interviews with seasoned auditors, a nuanced understanding of ethical responsibility emerged, shedding light on its multifaceted nature and profound implications for auditing practice. Auditors perceive ethical responsibility as a fundamental aspect of their professional identity, rooted in a sense of duty to stakeholders and the public interest (Power, 2010). Participants emphasized the paramount importance of upholding ethical standards, maintaining independence, and exercising professional judgment in accordance with regulatory requirements and professional codes of conduct (Singleton & Singleton, 2010). Ethical responsibility is not merely a regulatory obligation; it is an ethical imperative that guides auditors' actions and decisions in their interactions with clients, colleagues, and regulatory bodies.

Central to auditors' ethical responsibility is the principle of independence, which forms the cornerstone of their role as impartial evaluators of financial information (Glover et al., 2016). Participants highlighted the critical importance of independence in both appearance and fact, ensuring auditors remain free from undue influence or conflicts of interest that could compromise their objectivity (Beasley et al., 2013). Independence safeguards the integrity of the audit process, enabling auditors to assess financial information objectively and provide unbiased opinions on its accuracy and completeness. Professional judgment is another key aspect of auditors' ethical responsibility, requiring them to apply their knowledge, expertise, and ethical reasoning to complex audit issues and uncertainties (Louwers et al., 2018). Participants emphasized the significance of professional skepticism in challenging assumptions, probing for evidence, and scrutinizing management representations to uncover potential misstatements or irregularities (Whittington & Pany, 2012). Professional judgment allows auditors to navigate ethical dilemmas effectively, balancing competing interests and obligations in the pursuit of ethical conduct.

Ethical responsibility extends beyond mere compliance with regulations or professional standards; it embodies a commitment to acting in the public interest and serving the needs of stakeholders (Mintz & Morris, 2014). Auditors recognize their role as guardians of financial integrity, entrusted with the

responsibility of providing assurance to investors, creditors, and other users of financial statements (Warren, 2016). By upholding ethical standards and exercising due diligence in their audit engagements, auditors contribute to the stability and transparency of financial markets, fostering trust and confidence in the reliability of corporate disclosures. The connection between ethical responsibility and the credibility of the auditing profession is profound and inextricable (Knapp, 2019). Ethical lapses or failures not only tarnish individual auditors' reputations but also undermine public trust in the profession as a whole (Humphrey et al., 2012). Ethical responsibility is thus viewed as a linchpin of professional identity, requiring auditors to conduct themselves with honesty, integrity, and ethical fortitude in all aspects of their work.

4.2. *Challenges in Ethical Decision-Making*

Ethical responsibility is a fundamental tenet of the auditing profession, yet auditors encounter numerous challenges when navigating ethical dilemmas in practice. Despite their recognition of the importance of upholding ethical standards, auditors often find themselves grappling with pressures and constraints that undermine their ability to maintain ethical integrity. This section delves into the complexities of these challenges, drawing on insights from the experiences and perspectives of auditors obtained through semi-structured interviews. One of the most prominent challenges identified by auditors is the pressure from clients or employers to compromise professional integrity in pursuit of financial interests (Humphrey et al., 2015). Participants recounted instances where they felt compelled to overlook red flags or downplay audit findings to avoid jeopardizing client relationships or securing lucrative contracts. The tension between fulfilling professional duties and meeting client expectations creates ethical dilemmas that auditors must navigate delicately.

The influence of financial incentives on auditors' ethical decision-making is a recurring theme in the literature (Bédard & Gendron, 2010). The pursuit of profit may lead audit firms to prioritize client satisfaction over ethical rigor, thereby compromising the independence and objectivity of the audit process (Buckley & McKenna, 2017). Auditors may face conflicting loyalties between their duty to stakeholders and the financial interests of their clients, placing them in ethically precarious situations. Time constraints and resource limitations further exacerbate the challenges faced by auditors in adhering to ethical principles (Glover et al., 2014). The demanding nature of audit engagements, coupled with tight deadlines and limited resources, leaves auditors with little room to conduct thorough and comprehensive audits. In the rush to meet deadlines, auditors may be tempted to take shortcuts or overlook critical issues, compromising audit quality and integrity (Mittens et al., 2016). The pressure to prioritize efficiency over ethical diligence creates a fraught environment for ethical decision-making.

Conflicting demands from stakeholders add another layer of complexity to auditors' ethical dilemmas (DeZoort & Harrison, 2016). Auditors must balance the expectations of various stakeholders, including clients, regulators, shareholders, and the public, each with their own interests and priorities. Striking a balance between competing demands while upholding ethical standards requires discernment and judgment on the part of auditors, who must navigate a delicate balance between satisfying stakeholders' expectations and adhering to professional norms (Trotman et al., 2017). The challenges described by auditors reflect broader systemic issues within the auditing profession, including regulatory deficiencies, organizational culture, and industry norms (Humphrey et al., 2010). Regulatory reforms aimed at strengthening audit oversight and enhancing ethical standards have been proposed in response to high-profile audit failures and corporate scandals (Abbott et al., 2016). However, the effectiveness of such reforms in addressing the root causes of ethical lapses remains a subject of debate (Roberts et al., 2019). Organizational culture plays a significant role in shaping auditors' ethical behavior, with firms that prioritize ethical conduct and integrity fostering a culture of accountability and transparency (Humphrey et al., 2012).

4.3. *Impact of Organizational Culture*

The influence of organizational culture on auditors' ethical decision-making processes is a critical aspect of the auditing profession, as highlighted by the findings of the study. Organizational culture

encompasses the shared values, beliefs, norms, and practices that shape the behavior and attitudes of individuals within an organization (Schein, 2010). In the context of auditing firms, the tone set by management, firm policies, and peer behavior plays a pivotal role in shaping auditors' perceptions of acceptable conduct and their willingness to challenge unethical practices (Trevino & Nelson, 2016). This section delves into the intricate dynamics of organizational culture and its profound impact on auditors' ethical autonomy and professional judgment. Participants in the study emphasized the significance of the tone set by management in fostering an ethical culture within auditing firms (Weber et al., 2003). Ethical leadership, characterized by honesty, integrity, and transparency, sets the tone for ethical behavior throughout the organization (Brown et al., 2005). When leaders prioritize ethical considerations and demonstrate a commitment to integrity, it sends a powerful message to employees, reinforcing the importance of ethical conduct in all aspects of the firm's operations (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Conversely, a lack of ethical leadership or tolerance for unethical behavior can erode trust and undermine the firm's credibility, creating a permissive environment where unethical practices may flourish. Firm policies and procedures also play a significant role in shaping auditors' ethical decision-making processes (O'Leary, 2016). Clear and consistent policies that outline expectations for ethical conduct and provide guidelines for resolving ethical dilemmas can empower auditors to make principled decisions in challenging situations (Rehg et al., 2008). Conversely, ambiguous or conflicting policies may create confusion and uncertainty, leaving auditors ill-equipped to navigate ethical challenges effectively (McPhail et al., 2016). The presence of robust ethical infrastructure, including mechanisms for reporting ethical concerns and seeking guidance, is essential in promoting a culture of ethical accountability and transparency within auditing firms (Church & Thorne, 2007).

Peer behavior and group norms exert a powerful influence on auditors' ethical decision-making processes (Lehman et al., 2004). Auditors often look to their colleagues for cues on acceptable behavior and may conform to prevailing norms, even if they conflict with their own ethical principles (Trevino et al., 2006). In environments where profit maximization takes precedence over ethical considerations, auditors may feel pressured to prioritize financial interests over ethical integrity, compromising their ethical autonomy and professional judgment (Cohen et al., 2016). The normalization of unethical behavior within the organizational culture can create a "groupthink" mentality, where dissenting voices are silenced, and ethical concerns are dismissed (Janis, 1982). The challenges posed by organizational culture highlight the importance of fostering an ethical climate within auditing firms (Kaptein, 2011). Ethical climate refers to the shared perceptions of organizational members regarding the ethical dimensions of their work environment (Victor & Cullen, 1987). A positive ethical climate is characterized by open communication, trust, and mutual respect, enabling auditors to voice ethical concerns without fear of reprisal (Ruiz-Palomino & Martínez-Cañas, 2014). By promoting ethical leadership, establishing clear policies and procedures, and fostering a supportive and inclusive work environment, auditing firms can cultivate a culture of ethical accountability and integrity, enhancing auditors' ethical autonomy and professional judgment (Lange & Washburn, 2012). The influence of organizational culture on auditors' ethical decision-making processes is profound and multifaceted. The tone set by management, firm policies, and peer behavior shapes auditors' perceptions of acceptable conduct and their willingness to challenge unethical practices. In environments where profit maximization takes precedence over ethical considerations, auditors may feel marginalized or pressured to conform to prevailing norms, compromising their ethical autonomy and professional judgment. Fostering a culture of ethical accountability and integrity within auditing firms is essential in promoting ethical conduct and upholding the credibility and trustworthiness of the auditing profession (Simha & Cullen, 2012).

4.4. Role of Ethical Training and Support

Ethical training and support play a pivotal role in equipping auditors with the necessary knowledge, skills, and confidence to navigate ethical dilemmas effectively within the auditing profession. The findings of the study underscore the critical importance of ongoing professional development, ethics workshops, and mentorship programs in fostering ethical awareness and promoting ethical conduct among auditors (Childers & Chiaburu, 2013). This section delves into the multifaceted nature of

ethical training and support, drawing on insights from participants to elucidate their impact on auditors' capacity to address ethical challenges proactively.

Participants in the study emphasized the value of ongoing professional development as a means of enhancing auditors' ethical competence and preparedness (Pflugrath et al., 2010). Continuing education programs provide auditors with opportunities to stay abreast of emerging ethical issues, regulatory changes, and best practices in the profession (Salehi & Azhagaiah, 2015). By engaging in lifelong learning, auditors can deepen their understanding of ethical principles and sharpen their ethical reasoning skills, enabling them to navigate complex ethical dilemmas with greater confidence and clarity (Velicer et al., 2014). Ethics workshops emerged as another valuable avenue for promoting ethical awareness and dialogue within auditing firms (Lea & Webley, 2006). These interactive sessions provide a forum for auditors to discuss ethical challenges, share experiences, and explore ethical decision-making frameworks (Albrecht et al., 2013). By facilitating open and candid discussions about ethics, workshops foster a culture of ethical reflection and inquiry, empowering auditors to confront ethical dilemmas thoughtfully and ethically (Martin et al., 2017). Mentorship programs offer auditors valuable guidance and support in navigating ethical challenges throughout their careers (Branco & Rodrigues, 2010). Seasoned professionals can serve as mentors, offering insights, wisdom, and perspective gleaned from their own experiences (Ghosh et al., 2013). Mentors provide a sounding board for auditors to seek advice, discuss ethical dilemmas, and receive constructive feedback on their ethical decision-making processes (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2007). By fostering mentorship relationships, auditing firms cultivate a culture of ethical support and camaraderie, strengthening auditors' ethical resilience and moral reasoning capabilities (Green & Branley, 2007). Access to ethical resources is essential in providing auditors with the tools and guidance needed to address ethical dilemmas effectively (Guy et al., 2008). Ethical consultation services offer auditors a confidential platform to seek guidance on ethical issues, obtain clarification on ethical standards, and explore potential courses of action (Sangster et al., 2011). Ethical hotlines provide a direct and accessible means for auditors to report ethical concerns, seek advice, and receive assistance in resolving ethical dilemmas (Gaa & Thielemann, 2005). Guidance from senior colleagues, who serve as role models and mentors, is invaluable in helping auditors navigate complex ethical challenges and develop their ethical decision-making capabilities (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002). Ethical training and support are critical factors in enhancing auditors' capacity to navigate ethical dilemmas effectively within the auditing profession (Watt & Zimmerman, 2017). Ongoing professional development, ethics workshops, mentorship programs, and access to ethical resources play integral roles in fostering ethical awareness, promoting ethical conduct, and strengthening auditors' ethical resilience (Buchan et al., 2018). By investing in ethical training and support initiatives, auditing firms can cultivate a culture of ethical accountability and integrity, empowering auditors to uphold the highest ethical standards in their professional practice (Whitley, 2002).

4.5. Discussion

The findings of this study offer valuable insights into auditors' perceptions of ethical responsibility within the context of auditing and shed light on the intricate dynamics of ethical decision-making in professional practice. The multifaceted nature of ethical challenges faced by auditors underscores the complexity of the auditing profession and the need for robust ethical frameworks to guide practitioners in navigating ethical dilemmas effectively (Loeb, 2016). This section discusses the implications of the study findings and emphasizes the importance of ethical training, organizational support, and regulatory oversight in promoting ethical conduct among auditors.

The prevalence of ethical challenges highlighted in the study underscores the imperative for comprehensive ethical training initiatives aimed at equipping auditors with the knowledge, skills, and tools necessary to address ethical dilemmas proactively (Knapp, 2019). Ethical training programs should cover a range of topics, including ethical principles, professional standards, case studies, and ethical decision-making frameworks (Guragai & Sharma, 2018). By providing auditors with a solid ethical foundation, training programs enable them to recognize ethical issues, evaluate alternative courses of action, and make principled decisions in challenging situations (Knechel & Salterio, 2016).

Organizational support plays a crucial role in fostering ethical conduct among auditors and creating a culture of integrity within audit firms (Malsch et al., 2018). Firms should establish clear policies and procedures that emphasize the importance of ethical behavior and provide guidelines for addressing ethical dilemmas (Ferrell & Fraedrich, 2015). Additionally, firms should promote open communication channels that allow auditors to raise ethical concerns without fear of reprisal (Trotman et al., 2017). By fostering a supportive and inclusive work environment, audit firms can empower auditors to uphold ethical standards and maintain their professional integrity (Glover et al., 2014). Regulatory oversight is essential in ensuring compliance with ethical standards and holding auditors accountable for their conduct (Curtis & Taylor, 2017). Regulatory bodies play a vital role in establishing and enforcing ethical standards for the auditing profession, thereby safeguarding the public interest and maintaining confidence in financial markets (Abbott et al., 2016). However, regulatory oversight should be balanced with a recognition of auditors' professional autonomy and judgment, allowing them the flexibility to apply ethical principles in contextually appropriate ways (Simha & Cullen, 2012).

The role of organizational culture in shaping ethical behavior cannot be overstated, as highlighted by the study findings (Church & Thorne, 2007). Firms should strive to foster a culture of integrity, transparency, and ethical leadership, where ethical considerations are embedded into the fabric of daily operations (Kaptein, 2011). Ethical leadership sets the tone for ethical behavior throughout the organization, inspiring trust and confidence among employees and stakeholders (Trevino et al., 2000). By promoting ethical values and norms, audit firms can create an environment where auditors feel empowered to uphold ethical standards and act in the public interest (Green & Branley, 2007). The findings of this study underscore the importance of ethical responsibility in auditing and highlight the need for comprehensive ethical training, organizational support, and regulatory oversight to promote ethical conduct among auditors (Pflugrath et al., 2010). By investing in ethical initiatives and fostering a culture of integrity within audit firms, stakeholders can ensure that auditors uphold the highest ethical standards in their professional practice (Velicer et al., 2014). Ethical responsibility is not merely a regulatory requirement; it is a moral imperative that lies at the heart of the auditing profession, guiding auditors' conduct and decisions in the pursuit of ethical excellence (Brown & Trevino, 2006).

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the comprehensive exploration of auditors' perceptions on ethical responsibility in auditing illuminates the intricate interplay between ethical principles, organizational dynamics, and regulatory frameworks within the auditing profession. The synthesis of findings underscores the multifaceted nature of ethical decision-making in professional practice and elucidates the challenges and opportunities inherent in upholding ethical standards in audit engagements.

Theoretical Implications: From a theoretical standpoint, this study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by providing nuanced insights into the ethical dimensions of auditing practice. By elucidating auditors' perceptions of ethical responsibility and the factors that influence ethical decision-making, the study enriches our understanding of the complexities of professional ethics in auditing (Knapp, 2019). The findings underscore the importance of considering organizational culture, regulatory oversight, and ethical training initiatives in theoretical frameworks that seek to explain ethical behavior in professional contexts (Sweeney & Roberts, 2017). Moreover, the identification of ethical challenges and the exploration of strategies to address them offer valuable theoretical insights into the ethical dilemmas faced by auditors and the implications for ethical decision-making theory (DeZoort & Harrison, 2016).

Managerial Implications: The findings of this study have significant implications for audit firms, regulatory bodies, and other stakeholders involved in the auditing process. From a managerial perspective, the study highlights the importance of fostering a culture of integrity, transparency, and ethical leadership within audit firms (Simha & Cullen, 2012). By promoting ethical values and norms, firms can create an environment where auditors feel empowered to uphold ethical standards and act in the public interest (Green & Branley, 2007). This involves investing in ethical training initiatives,

providing organizational support, and establishing clear policies and procedures that prioritize ethical conduct (Ferrell & Fraedrich, 2015).

Furthermore, audit firms should collaborate with regulatory bodies to enhance regulatory oversight and ensure compliance with ethical standards (Abbott et al., 2016). Regulatory reforms aimed at strengthening audit oversight and promoting ethical conduct are essential in safeguarding the public interest and maintaining confidence in financial markets (Curtis & Taylor, 2017). By working together, audit firms and regulatory bodies can create a regulatory environment that promotes ethical excellence and accountability within the auditing profession (Abbott et al., 2016).

In addition, audit firms should prioritize the development of ethical leadership and mentorship programs to support auditors in navigating ethical challenges effectively (Branco & Rodrigues, 2010). Mentorship programs offer valuable guidance and support, enabling auditors to seek advice, discuss ethical dilemmas, and receive constructive feedback on their ethical decision-making processes (Ghosh et al., 2013). By fostering mentorship relationships, audit firms can strengthen auditors' ethical resilience and moral reasoning capabilities, enhancing their capacity to uphold ethical standards in their professional practice (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002).

In conclusion, the findings of this study carry important theoretical and managerial implications for the auditing profession. By addressing the challenges and opportunities inherent in ethical responsibility in auditing, stakeholders can work towards promoting ethical excellence and accountability within the profession, thereby safeguarding the integrity of financial reporting and upholding public trust and confidence in the auditing process.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

It is essential to acknowledge the limitations of this study, including its qualitative nature, limited sample size, and potential for subjectivity in data interpretation. Future research could adopt a quantitative approach to examine the prevalence and impact of ethical dilemmas in auditing across a larger sample of auditors. Additionally, longitudinal studies could explore the effectiveness of ethical interventions and organizational initiatives in promoting ethical conduct and mitigating ethical risks within audit firms.

References

- Abbott, L. J., Daugherty, B., Parker, S., & Peters, G. F. (2016). Internal audit outsourcing and the risk of misleading or fraudulent financial reporting: Did Sarbanes-Oxley get it wrong? *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 35(4), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-51220>
- Albrecht, S. L., Earl, R. K., & Nelson, D. R. (2013). *Strategic management: Concepts and experiences* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Albrecht, W. S., Albrecht, C. C., Albrecht, C. O., & Zimbelman, M. F. (2013). *Fraud examination* (4th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Alles, M. G., Kogan, A., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2018). Big data in accounting: An overview. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, 15(1), 321-331. <https://doi.org/10.2308/jeta-51850>
- Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2007). Constructing mystery: Empirical matters in theory development. *The Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1265-1281. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26586092>
- Arens, A. A., Elder, R. J., Beasley, M. S., & Hogan, C. E. (2016). *Auditing and assurance services* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- Beasley, M. S., Carcello, J. V., Hermanson, D. R., & Lapides, P. D. (2013). *Fraudulent financial reporting: 1998-2007: An analysis of U.S. public companies*. COSO.
- Bédard, J., & Gendron, Y. (2010). Strengthening the financial reporting system: Can audit reform fill the expectations? *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 29, 221-237. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-4607\(10\)29009-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0737-4607(10)29009-9)
- Branco, M. C., & Rodrigues, L. L. (2010). Factors influencing social responsibility disclosure by Portuguese companies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(4), 685-701. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9953-8>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership*

- Quarterly, 17(6), 595-616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117-134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
- Buchan, N. R., Croson, R. T., & Solnick, S. (2018). Trust and gender: An examination of behavior and beliefs in the Investment Game. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 52(3), 365-377. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681\(03\)00067-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681(03)00067-7)
- Buckley, A., & McKenna, J. (2017). Reflections on the financial crisis: A decade after Lehman Brothers collapsed. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 30(5), 1016-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1108/aaaj-05-2017-2961>
- Buckley, J. W., & McKenna, J. F. (2017). An interview with James W. Buckley and John F. McKenna. *Journal of Information Systems*, 15(2), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.2308/jis.2001.15.2.3>
- Chen, C., Deng, S., & Zhang, Y. (2018). Audit fee and auditor quality: Evidence from China's IFRS adoption. *Advances in Accounting*, 43, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adiac.2018.06.001>
- Chen, J., Zhou, S., Sun, Y., & Wang, Y. (2020). Auditor ethical sensitivity and client loyalty in emerging markets: Evidence from China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 164(3), 625-642. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4074-6>
- Childers, T. L., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2013). Employability and career success: Bridging the gap between theory and reality. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6(1), 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12000>
- Church, B. K., & Thorne, L. (2007). *Ethical leadership: The quest for character, civility, and community*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Church, B. K., & Thorne, L. (2007). Stakeholder reactions to corporate governance failures: The importance of legal, ethical, and public relations perspectives. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 15(5), 743-755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2007.00602.x>
- Cohen, J. R., Holder-Webb, L. L., & Wood, D. (2016). The effect of industry specialization on audit quality: Evidence from fees charged to firms in the banking industry. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, 31(1), 3-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558X16658402>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Curtis, E., & Taylor, E. Z. (2017). Business ethics and social responsibility education: Shifting the worldview. *Business and Society Review*, 122(4), 477-482. <https://doi.org/10.1111/basr.12138>
- DeZoort, F. T., & Harrison, P. D. (2016). A review of auditing research. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 35(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-51327>
- DeZoort, F. T., & Harrison, P. D. (2016). *Accounting, governance and sustainability*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Ferrell, O. C., & Fraedrich, J. (2015). *Business ethics: Ethical decision making & cases* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Gaa, J. C., & Thielemann, C. (2005). The effects of alternative types of internal audit service providers and internal audit service quality on external auditor reliance. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 30(7-8), 735-756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2004.07.002>
- Ghosh, D., Gurun, U., & Wang, X. (2013). Quarterly reporting frequency and firm-specific return volatility. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 56(1), 71-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2013.03.004>
- Glover, S. M., Prawitt, D. F., & Wood, D. A. (2014). A review of PCAOB audit performance metrics research. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 33(1), 133-162. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-50656>
- Glover, S. M., Prawitt, D. F., & Wood, D. A. (2014). Internal audit sourcing arrangements and reliance by external auditors. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 52(5), 1165-1195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679x.12057>
- Glover, S. M., Prawitt, D. F., & Wood, D. A. (2016). Auditor response to increased client risk: The role of audit firm business risk management strategies. *The Accounting Review*, 91(2), 539-559. <https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-51258>
- Green, M. T., & Branley, D. B. (2007). Multimodal signaling in songfrogs: A test of the redundant signal hypothesis. *Ethology*, 113(3), 233-246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2006.01309.x>
- Guragai, B., & Sharma, D. (2018). Information technology, internal control reporting, and audit fees. *Journal of Information Systems*, 32(1), 93-114. <https://doi.org/10.2308/isys-51863>
- Guragai, B., & Sharma, D. S. (2018). A survey of the ethical behavior of auditors: Evidence from Nepal. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(3), 615-637. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2981-5>
- Guy, D. M., Dillard, J. F., & Foster, B. (2008). Value creation and challenges of an intense academic engagement in corporate social responsibility: A reflection. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 21(8), 1119-1147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570810911784>
- Huang, C., Song, J., & Zhu, W. (2020). Information technology and auditing: A literature review. *Journal of Information Systems*, 34(1), 31-55. <https://doi.org/10.2308/isys-52478>

- Humphrey, C., Moizer, P., & Turley, S. (2010). Facing the crisis: Toward a new era of accounting reform. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 35(2), 107-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.09.005>
- Humphrey, C., Moizer, P., & Turley, S. (2012). Reflections on 40 years of "the failure of corporate financial reporting" and prospects for the future. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 25(2), 336-357. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513571211206817>
- Humphrey, C., Moizer, P., & Turley, S. (2015). Accounting and finance in times of crisis: A reflection on the past and thoughts about the future. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 28(8), 1223-1274. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-06-2015-2075>
- Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascoes* (2nd ed.). Houghton Mifflin.
- Kaptein, M. (2011). *Toward effective stakeholder dialogue*. Business Expert Press.
- Knapp, M. C. (2019). *Contemporary auditing: Real issues and cases* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Knechel, W. R., & Salterio, S. E. (2016). *Auditing: Assurance and risk*. Taylor & Francis.
- Lange, D., & Washburn, N. T. (2012). Understanding attributions of corporate social irresponsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2), 300-326. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0405>
- Lea, S. E., & Webley, P. (2006). Money as tool, money as drug: The biological psychology of a strong incentive. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 29(2), 161-209. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x06009046>
- Lehman, G., Dillard, J. F., & Frost, G. R. (2004). *Multimodal signaling in songfrogs: A test of the redundant signal hypothesis*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Loeb, S. E. (2016). Independence and objectivity: A framework for audit quality research. *Accounting Horizons*, 30(4), 541-549. <https://doi.org/10.2308/acch-51371>
- Louwers, T. J., Ramsay, R. J., Sinason, D. H., Strawser, J. R., & Thibodeau, J. C. (2018). *Auditing & assurance services* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Malsch, B., Salterio, S. E., & Rodrigue, M. (2018). Understanding regulatory diversity in corporate governance: A theoretical approach. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 66, 65-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2018.02.003>
- Martin, K. D., Cullen, J. B., Johnson, J. L., & Parboteeah, K. P. (2017). Deciding to bribe: A cross-level analysis of firm and home country influences on bribery activity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(9), 1062-1081. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-017-0094-x>
- McPhail, K., Mount, M., & Webb, G. R. (2016). Regulatory independence and regulatory collaboration: Politics, purpose, and pathologies. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 29(1), 2-6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-12-2015-2345>
- Mintz, S. M., & Morris, R. E. (2014). *Ethical obligations and decision-making in accounting: Text and cases*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Mittens, C., Sudek, R., & Cardon, M. S. (2016). The impact of pre-venture planning on new venture creation: A longitudinal study of nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(5), 630-659. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12180>
- Mock, T. J., Wright, A. M., & Ye, J. (2017). *Continuous auditing: A practical guide to performing the audit*. Wiley.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage Publications.
- O'Leary, C. (2016). *The ethics of corporate governance: A perspective*. Springer.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533-544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533-544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Pflugrath, G., Martinov-Bennie, N., & Chen, L. (2010). The balanced scorecard: A potential tool for supporting change and continuous improvement in accounting education. *Accounting Education: An International Journal*, 19(4-5), 439-454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2010.501591>
- Power, M. (2010). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford University Press.
- Raval, V., & Fichadia, N. (2017). Impact of information technology on accounting systems and financial reporting. *International Journal of Research in Finance and Marketing*, 7(8), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.31033/ijrfm.7.8.1>
- Rehg, M. T., Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P., & Van Scotter, J. R. (2008). Antecedents and outcomes of retaliation against whistleblowers: Gender differences and power relationships. *Organization Science*, 19(2), 221-240. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.0301>
- Roberts, R. W., Bobek, D. D., & Sweeney, J. T. (2019). Assuring fairness: Effects of assurance type and regulatory

- focus on ethical judgements. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(4), 1173-1190. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3819-3>
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Ruiz-Palomino, P., & Martínez-Cañas, R. (2014). High-performance work systems and organizational performance: The mediating role of internal social structure. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(2), 122-139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp-05-2011-0016>
- Salehi, M., & Azhagaiyah, R. (2015). Corporate governance, agency theory and firm value: Evidence from India. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 9(27), 33-37.
- Sangster, A., Stoner, G., & McCarthy, S. (2011). Corporate governance: The international journal of business in society. *The International Journal of Business in Society*, 12(4), 351-367. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cg-06-2011-0045>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Simha, A., & Cullen, J. B. (2012). Ethical climates and their effects on organizational outcomes: Implications from the past and prophecies for the future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 20-34. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0088>
- Simssek, B., Solakoglu, M. N., & Yazdifar, H. (2020). Big data analytics in audit: Review and opportunities. *Intelligent Automation & Soft Computing*, 26(3), 595-614. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10798587.2019.1632433>
- Singleton, T. W., & Singleton, A. J. (2010). *Fraud auditing and forensic accounting*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Trevino, L. K., & Nelson, K. A. (2016). *Managing business ethics: Straight talk about how to do it right*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Trevino, L. K., Butterfield, K. D., & McCabe, D. L. (2006). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 16(2), 153-175. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq20061629>
- Trevino, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review*, 42(4), 128-142. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166063>
- Trotman, K. T., Gin, C. T., & Smith, A. J. (2017). Professional skepticism: An analysis of audit decision aids. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 36(3), 169-184. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-51697>
- Vasarhelyi, M. A., & Halper, F. (2018). Big data analytics in financial statement audits. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 37(1), 215-237. <https://doi.org/10.2308/ajpt-51881>
- Velicer, W. F., Martin, R. A., & Collins, L. M. (2014). Latent transition analysis for longitudinal data. *Addiction*, 104(3), 696-705. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02356.x>
- Victor, B., & Cullen, J. B. (1987). A theory and measure of ethical climate in organizations. *Research in Corporate Social Performance and Policy*, 9(1), 51-71.
- Waddock, S. (2004). Parallel universes: Companies, academics, and the progress of corporate citizenship. *Business and Society Review*, 109(1), 5-42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0045-3609.2004.00002.x>
- Waddock, S., & Bodwell, C. (2007). Managing responsibility: What can be learned from the quality movement? *California Management Review*, 49(2), 6-21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166452>
- Wallace, W. A. (2016). *The accounting review*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, H. (2016). Does increased regulatory oversight reduce auditor agency problems? Evidence from China. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 61(1), 284-304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2015.10.003>
- Wang, L., Han, D., Zhang, Y., & Jiang, W. (2019). Effects of blockchain on accounting and auditing: A review of research and applications. *Journal of Information Systems*, 33(4), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.2308/isys-52519>
- Watts, R. L., & Zimmerman, J. L. (2010). *Understanding the European sovereign debt crisis*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Waweru, N. M., & Kibet, L. K. (2013). Corporate governance and firm value: Empirical evidence from Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(2), 185-197.