The Impact of Extended Audit Tenure on Auditor Independence: a Case of Robin Pvt Ltd

Raymond T. Muradzikwa[1], Ongayi Wadesango[2], Lovemore Sitsha[3], Newman Wadesango[4]

Abstract: The independence of an auditor has not exclusively been seen as a moral issue inside the examining proficient bodies, yet additionally it is the bedrock whereupon a fruitful review is based. The partners require the auditors to remain consistent with the primary confidence of the calling as a free external outsider to offer an input on the valid and reasonable perspective on the budget reports introduced by the board. The fundamental purpose of this exploration is to analyze whether stretched out review tenures can prompt the development of threats to auditor independence which will weaken the auditor independence at the auditee – Robin PvT Ltd. The reactions gotten were investigated utilizing a quantitative strategy, autonomous examples test measurements in SPSS, which analyzed comparable circumstances in both short and stretched out review tenures to uncover if there could be any relationship of auditor independence to broadened review tenures. The results uncoverd solid connection between the non-review administrations, review expenses and the effect expanded review tenures on auditor independence since tthey achieved threats to independence explicitly fmiiriarity threat, self-survey threat and personal responsibility threat. All in all, our outcomes show a relationship of auditor independence to broadened review tenures.

Keywords: Auditor independence; audit tenure; audit quality and auditor rotation

JEL Classification: M42

1. Background of the Study

Independence can be defined in two ways. The first is mental independence, which is the perspective that allows a person to carry out a valid administration without being influenced by influences that compromise professional judgment, allowing a person to act with respectability and exercise objectivity and expert distrust. In same way, Independence in appearance is an aversion to circumstances that would lead a reasonable and educated outsider, who is aware of all relevant data, including any shields used, to reasonably believe that a firm's or individual's credibility, objectivity, or expert doubt is jeopardized (AICPA,2020). Hence, the inspector is accused of the obligation of

[1] Midlands State University, Zimbabwe, Address: Senga Road, Gweru, Zimbabwe.
[2] University of Limpopo, South Africa, South Africa, Address: Zimbabwe Private Bag X1106, Sovenga, 0727,
[3] Midlands State University, Zimbabwe, Address: Senga Road, Gweru, Zimbabwe.
[4] University of Limpopo, South Africa, South Africa, Address: Zimbabwe Private Bag X1106, Sovenga, 0727, Corresponding author: newman.wadesango@ul.ac.za.

doing an individual appraisal to confirm if independence hazard can be acknowledged or notBefore accepting an assignment, the examiner must first recognize, investigate, appraise, and implement relevant measures to ensure that the danger of independence is minimized. If such an assignment is not completed, independence and objectivity are jeopardized; therefore, the confirmation commitment should be terminated. The risks of indebtednessindependence are frequently extremely critical and in this way subvert the inspector's adequacy in delivering the evaluating administrations. It turns out to be significantly really testing when the evaluator "over-stays" with a customer, these dangers might sneak in progressively over the long run which thusly, can influence independence. The independence of an inspector exhibits neutrality and fosters trust among people who rely on his or her services. Because independence is so important to the examination profession, the standards that go along with it must be relevant, sustainable, and appropriate in any corporate setting(Eilifsen et al., 2016).

Albeit broadened review residencies could encumber reviewer independence, I imagine that such expanded residencies convey alongside them other notable dangers. These dangers usually alluded to as dangers to inspector independence incorporate commonality, personal circumstance, self-survey, backing and terrorizing dangersWhen they accept another customer of any size or a counseling task, they must embrace an evaluation based on the independence investigation model to ensure that their independence is not harmed by these dangers.

Review residency has gotten broad consideration from controllers and analysts the same. The duty of setting how long a review residency ought to be, lay on the controllers, who as a rule work pair with the public authority. Following Section 69 (6) of the ZSE Listing Rules, Issuers are needed to change their review accomplices at regular intervals and their review firm like clockwork. In Johnson et al. (2012)'s article on the relationship between review residency and review quality, they defined a long (drawn-out) review residency as A long residency addresses any client type that has been with the inspectors for more than 9 years, whereas a short residency addresses any customer type that has been with the inspectors for less than 3 years. When reviewers have a one-on-one interaction with consumers of any size, which is common when the residence is long, independence is lost..There is a chance that the inspectors' psychological strength will be called into question to such an extent that the objectivity of their assessment will not be sufficient to ensure that all affirmations made by the board address a valid and reasonable perspective on the situation.As a result, there is a risk of a "over-comfortable" relationship developing with increased residencies in office by the examiner for a specific customer, putting the reviewer's independence in jeopardy. We believe that cordial ties between examiners and their customers of any size can exist on a regular basis, especially when they have increased their residences. The present point of disagreement is that these ties may be exaggerated or become too cozy, jeopardizing the examiner's independence.

Similarly, as there is consistently expanding research on review residency and independence separately, Innscor Africa Limited is a shone gathering of light assembling organizations which produce some of Zimbabwe's famous brands in the shopper staple and strong item space. The gathering has been examined by Enerst and Yung for the past 18years, the organization will be my contextual investigation as I research the effect that this long term review residency has on the independence of the evaluators. Despite the fact that other researchers, for example, DeFond et al. (2012) investigated whether examiner independence can be undermined by non-review administration charges as a penchant for giving ongoing concern review sentiments; Gul et al. (2017) investigated the joint impacts of review residency and review Knechel and Vanstraelen (2017) explored the link between review residency and review quality as judged by going concerned; and non-review administrations on reviewer independence in private firms in Belgium, just to specify a couple, the outcomes are not the equivalent. Having the aftereffect of these investigations and others at the top of the priority list, and perceptive of the pertinence of independence and residency in the present examining business just as in the exploration local area, I imagine that this examination will be interesting to embrace.

2. Auditor Independence

As indicated by DeAngelo's (1981b) audit quality definition, past research perceived two crucial elements that choose audit quality: (1) auditor independence and (2) auditor capacity (Kraub and Zülch, 2018). According to Kraub and Zülch (2018), the latter is described as the likelihood that the legitimate auditor can recognize an enormous thwarted expectation in the money related reports and the accounting structure, however auditor independence is portrayed as the likelihood that the committed auditor truly reports that inability to outsiders in the audit report. Independence has not been another wonder, yet it stems directly from the past. The previous relationship of public agents in the United States, the American Association of Public Accountants (AAPA), set up in 1887, didn't believe independence to be a significant issue and thusly rejected it in its constitution and by-laws (Chia-Ah and Karlsson, 2010). Expecting a name change from AAPA to the American Institute of Accountants (AIA) in 1916, this didn't have a basic impact in the model's circumstance of independence. The American Institute of Accountants (AIA) didn't see the significance of independence until 1931, when most clerks did Certified Public Accountants (CPA) over and over and dependably had twofold segments of the two supervisors and auditors of a similar affiliation which they were wanted to be auditing (Chia-Ah and Karlsson, 2010). It is practical to see that independence is the foundation whereupon any amazing audit is gathered. Expecting independence is compromised, the audit report's quality may suffer in this manner. It is possible that auditing a customer for a more broadened time period will make the auditor encourage an interest in the customer. This may grow auditors' reliance on audit costs, expenses paid for giving non-audit associations, and other related benefits that go with giving audit associations. There is furthermore a more genuine risk of the auditor having a monetary interest in the customer, whether or not quick or unusual (Chia-Ah & Karlsson, 2010).

3. Determinants that Affect Auditor Independence

As shown by DeAngelo's (1981b) audit quality definition, past research apparent two essential segments that pick audit quality: (1) auditor independence and (2) auditor limit (Kraub and Zülch, 2018). As indicated by Kraub and Zülch (2018), the last is depicted as the probability that the genuine auditor can perceive a massive dissatisfaction in the cash related reports and the bookkeeping structure, anyway auditor independence is portrayed as the probability that the moved auditor really reports that powerlessness to untouchables in the audit report. Independence has not been another miracle, yet it stems straightforwardly from the past. The past relationship of public aides in the United States, the American Association of Public Accountants (AAPA), set up in 1887, didn't accept independence to be a huge issue and subsequently disallowed it in its constitution and by-laws (Chia-Ah and Karlsson, 2010). Expecting a name change from AAPA to the American Institute of Accountants (AIA) in 1916, this didn't have a fundamental effect in the model's condition of independence. The American Institute of Accountants (AIA) didn't see the significance of independence until 1931, when most agents did Certified Public Accountants (CPA) again and again and constantly had twofold portions of the two bosses and auditors of a close to connection which they were needed to be auditing (Chia-Ah and Karlsson, 2010). It is feasible to see that independence is the establishment whereupon any stunning audit is assembled. Expecting independence is compromised, the audit report's quality might endure subsequently. It is conceivable that auditing a client for a more extended time interval will cause the auditor to develop an interest in the client. This might expand auditors' dependence on audit costs, charges paid for giving non-audit affiliations, and other related advantages that go with giving audit affiliations. There is moreover a more real danger of the auditor having a financial interest in the client, regardless of whether fast or misshaped (Chia-Ah & Karlsson, 2010).

4. Research Objectives

i) To assess the association between audit tenure and auditor independence

ii) To explore the connection between audit tenure and threats to auditor independence

iii) To identify other determinants that affect auditor independence

iv) To recommend measures of mitigating risks associated with extended audit tenure.

5. Research Methodology

The study adopted a quantitative research approach. Quantitative examination system remembers a positivistic view of information for where the innate science strategies are significant. This implies that it is an approach to clarify the ideas, the associations and the connection among origination and elements. At last, the quantitative exploration system likewise incorporates the origination that the social the truth is an outer and target reality (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The designated population consisted of Innscor executives, the Internal Audit division, the audit panel, and outside auditors. Data was collected using questionnners. The table below shows the sample size.

Table1. Sample Framework Table

	Population	**Sample**	**%**
Audit committee	10	5	50
Management	15	10	67
InternalAuditors	6	6	100
ExternalAuditors	5	4	80
Total	**36**	**25**	**69**

6. Results

1.6.1 Determinants of threats to auditor independence

1.6.1.1 Non-Audit Services (NAS)

The mean score for non-audit services comparable to auditor independence was determined. The researcher pointed toward examining the impact of NAS on auditor independence, and henceforth remembered this for the questionnaire. The goal was to test the respondents' viewpoint after offering NAS and not offering NAS to the customer on auditor independence. The reactions were arranged and dissected giving out the accompanying gathering measurements:

Table 2. T-Test for NAS

Group Statistics

NAS		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AuditorIndependence	Offering Non-Audit Services	8	9.3250	3.68617	1.30326
	Not offering Non-Audit Services	5	5.1700	.24900	.11136

As shown in the table, the means differ significantly, with the mean score for offering NAS in extended audit tenure being 9.325 compared to a mean of 5.17 for not offering NAS. The standard deviation for the factors is 3.69 in the case of offering NAS and 0.249 in the case of not offering NAS. This implies that offering NAS lessens auditor independence by an enormous deviation accordingly affecting auditor independence, while not offering NAS decreases auditor independence by a little deviation of 0.25 subsequently it smally affects auditor independence.

A free samples test was led to assess whether there is an effect of NAS on auditor independence. The outcomes are introduced in the table beneath:

Table 3. Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
AuditorIndependence	Equal variances assumed	14.592	.003	2.475	11	.031	4.15500	1.67855	.46053	7.84947
	Equal variances not assumed			3.177	7.102	.015	4.15500	1.30801	1.07103	7.23897

Source: Own research

The above table shows a Levene's test at $\alpha = 0.05$ giving $p \leq 0.003$ which is below the α and hence significant; therefore the researcher interpreted the bottom row of the Independent Samples Test table. The bottom row shows a $p - value$ of 0.015 which is lower than the α. This means that the test is significant, offering NAS reduces auditor independence. To sum up, there is a significant relationship between offering NAS and reduced auditor independence.

$t(7.102) = 3.177, p = 0.015.$

Regardless, the findings are consistent with those of Canning and Gwilliam (2019), who discovered an apparent decrease in auditor independence when NAS are provided to audit customers by audit staff. However thought of NAS is restricted uniquely to instructing and that with respect to Canning and

Gwilliam (2019) think about different NAS just as counseling services, nonetheless, prompting services likewise comprised a vital piece of NAS in the investigation of Canning and Gwilliam (2019). As a result, relating discoveries to those of Canning and Gwilliam (2019) does not expose the relationship of the two examinations to any errors. This is because Canning and Gwilliam (2019) investigated NAS and auditor independence, with auditor independence being the focal point of interest, allowing us to easily relate the outcomes.

1.6.1.2 Audit Fees

The mean score for audit fees according to auditor independence was determined. The researcher pointed toward examining the impact of audit fees on auditor independence, and consequently remembered this for the questionnaire. The goal was to test the respondents' point of view upon settled up audit fees and neglected audit fees to the customer on auditor independence. The reactions were arranged and dissected giving out the accompanying gathering measurements:

Table 4. T-Test for Audit Fees

Group Statistics

AuditFees		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AuditorIndependence	Paid-up Audit Fees	7	11.3000	3.35857	1.26942
	Unpaid Audit Fees	6	7.8583	.20595	.08408

Source: Own Research

As shown in the table above, the means differ significantly, with the mean score settled up fees in expanded audit tenure being 11.3 versus 7.86 for neglected audit fees. The factors' standard deviations are 3.36 for settled up fees and 0.21 for neglected audit fees.This implies that settled up fees diminishes auditor independence by an enormous deviation along these lines affecting auditor independence, while neglected audit fees lessens auditor independence by a little deviation of 0.21 henceforth it smallly affects auditor independence.

A free samples test was conducted to determine whether audit fees have an effect on auditor independence. The results are presented in the table below:

Table 5. Independent Samples Tests for audit fees

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
AuditorIndependence	Equal variances assumed	14.519	.003	2.490	11	.030	3.44167	1.38217	.39954	6.48379
	Equal variances not assumed			2.705	6.053	.035	3.44167	1.27220	.33525	6.54808

Source: Own research

The above table shows a Levene's test at $\alpha = 0.05$ giving $p \leq 0.003$ which is below the α and hence significant; therefore the researcher interpreted the bottom row of the Independent Samples Test table.

The bottom row shows a $p - value$ of 0.035 which is lower than the α. This means that the test is significant, paid-up audit fees reduces auditor independence. To sum up, there is a significant relationship between audit fees and reduced auditor independence.

$t(6.053) = 2.705, p = 0.035.$

As distinguished by Eilifisen et al. (2016), acting in self-interest and as a promoter for prosecution cases or questions for the benefit of the customer, and selling or endorsing portions of a customer undermines the auditor independence. An auditor is considered to be probable influenced without anyone else interest dangers when audit fees are both paid and neglected, subsequently may direct amateurishly for the reasons for finance.

1.6.1.3 Audit Tenure

The mean score for audit tenure corresponding to auditor independence was determined. The researcher pointed toward exploring the impact of expanded audit tenures on auditor independence, and consequently remembered this for the questionnaire. The goal was to test the respondents' point of view upon short audit tenure and long audit tenures to the customer on auditor independence. The reactions were organized and dissected giving out the accompanying gathering insights:

Table 6. T-Test for Audit Fees

Group Statistics

Audit Tenure		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Auditor Independence	Short Tenure	7	5.8571	2.90336	1.09737
	Long Tenure	6	2.6333	1.39236	0.56843

As shown in the table, the means differ significantly, with the mean score for long/extended audit tenure being 2.9 and the mean score for short tenure being 0.57. The variables' standard deviations are 1.1 for long tenures and 0.57 for short tenures. This means that long audit tenures reduces auditor independence by a large deviation thus having a strong negative influence on auditor independence, whereas short audit tenures reduces auditor independence by a small deviation of 0.57 hence it has a small impact on auditor independence.

An independent samples test was performed to determine whether audit tenure has an effect on auditor independence. The outcomes are shown in the table below:

Table 7. Independent Samples Tests for Audit Tenure

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
AuditorIndependence Equal Variances assumed	3.759	0.079	2.476	11	0.031	3.22381	1.30228	0.35752	6.0901
Equal variances not assumed			2.609	8.884	0.029	3.22381	1.23585	0.42256	6.02506

Source: Own research

The above table shows a Levene's test at $\alpha = 0.05$ giving $p = 0.079$ which is above the α and hence significant; therefore the researcher interpreted the top row of the Independent Samples Test table. The top row shows a $p - value$ of 0.031 which is lower than the α. This means that the test is significant, extended audit tenures reduce auditor independence. To sum up, there is a significant relationship between audit tenure and reduced auditor independence.

$t(11) = 2.476, p = 0.031$.

The results show that survey residency has no effect on shared trait perils, which is consistent with the findings of Knechel and Vanstraelen (2017) and Carcello and Nagy (2014), among others, implying that audit tenure is not an impediment in and of itself. Furthermore, we can relate the results to the security of the independence dangers in the same way. A couple of comments claim that the survey's commonality dangers are actually renouncing the ethical rules that govern the auditing calling. This suggests that the shields created are convincing and that the evaluators are adhering to the established rules.

7. Major Findings and Discussion

7.1. The Effects of s Non-Audit Services on Auditor Independence

The researcher discovered from the questionnaires and autonomous samples test that offering NAS decreases auditor independence by a huge deviation subsequently affecting auditor independence, though not offering NAS diminishes auditor independence by a little deviation of 0.25 thus it smallly affects auditor independence. This is because of the radiation of dangers to independence that spring up as the auditor offers NAS to a customer like self-interest dangers, commonality and self-survey danger. From the questionnaires the respondents showed this worry by endeavoring questions 1 to 5 with reactions going from 4-5 (consent to emphatically concur).

7.2 Impact of Audit Fees on Auditor Independence

The discoveries showed that settled up fees lessens auditor independence by a huge deviation in this manner affecting auditor independence, though neglected audit fees decreases auditor independence by a little deviation of 0.21 consequently it smallly affects auditor independence. This is most likely because of self-interest dangers that become present when audit fees are settled up or owing, hence making the auditor survey in inclination (Lys, 2010). As distinguished by Eilifisen et al. (2016), acting in self-interest and as a backer for prosecution cases or questions for the benefit of the customer, and selling or endorsing portions of a customer compromises the auditor independence. An auditor is considered to be reasonable influenced without anyone else interest dangers when audit fees are both paid and neglected, consequently may lead amateurishly for the motivations behind finance.

7.3 The Effects of Audit Tenure on Auditor Independence

The researcher discovered long audit tenures decreases auditor independence by an enormous deviation along these lines affecting auditor independence, while short audit tenures lessens auditor independence by a little deviation of 0.57 consequently it smallly affects auditor independence. As demonstrated in the results that shared trait risks isn't impacted by survey residency, this is consistent with the findings of Knechel and Vanstraelen (2017) and Carcello and Nagy (2014), among others, indicating that audit tenure is not an impediment in and of itself. This can also be identified by the outcomes of the independence dangers' shields. A couple of comments that the survey's commonality dangers are unquestionably violating the ethical rules that guide the auditing calling.This proposes that the protections made are to be sure convincing and that the evaluators are keeping the rules set out.

8. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to find out if auditor independence could be hampered when audit tenures were extended. The researchers used sub-factors related to audit tenure and looked for dangers to auditor independence to assess the hindrance of auditor independence considering extended audit tenures as a wellspring of the increased likelihood of more danger to independence. The results conclude that there is a link between auditor independence and longer audit tenures. The measurable results demonstrated that there is an effect on auditor independence when they have extended audit tenures and are confronted with threats to auditor independence. The researchers believe that both extended audit tenures and short audit tenures can be a hotspot for the rise of threats to auditor independence, with the risk being significantly higher when auditors have short audit tenures.While some risks may increase with longer audit tenures, others, as our findings show, are unaffected by the length of tenure. The reasons for this could very well be based on the safeguards that have been put in place.

References

*** (2010). *FAR hompage*. ISA-volymen2010 <http://www.farforlag.se/E-handel/Bocker-2010/ISA-volymen-2010/> [Retrieved 2021-07-14].

*** (2014). *Auditing Practice Board.* ES3-v5 clean.pdf.Auditing Practice Board home page, <http://www.frc.org.uk/images/uploaded/documents/ES3%20%20v5%20clean.pdf> [Retrieved 2021-07-24].

*** (2014). *Websites and e-books Auditing Practice Board*. ES1vprint12004.pdf. Auditing Practice Board home page,<http://www.frc.org.uk/documents/pagemanager/apb/ES1vprint12004.pdf> [Retrieved 2021-07-24].

Antle, R.; Gordon, E.; Narayanamoorthy, A. G. & Zhou, L. (2012). The joint determination of audit fees, non-audit fees, and abnormal accruals. *Working Paper*, June: 1-34.

Arruñada, B. & Paz-Ares, C. (1997). Mandatory rotation of company auditors: a critical examination. *International Review of Law and Economics*,17, pp. 31-61.

Articles and Books American Accounting Association (1973). *Committee on basic auditing concepts.A statementof basic auditing concepts*. Sarasota, FL: American Accounting Association.

Bamber, E. M. &Iyer, V. M. (2017). Auditors identification with their clients and Its effect on auditors objectivity. *Auditing*, 26(2), pp. 1-24.

Beattie, V.; Brandt, R. &Fearnley, S. (1999). Perceptions of auditor independence: U.K.evidence. *Journal of international Accounting, Auditing & Taxation*, 8(1), pp. 67-107.

Becker, C. L.; DeFond, M. L.; Jiambalvo, J. &Subramanyam, K. R. (1998). The effect of audit quality on earnings management. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 15(1), pp. 1-24.

Boritz, J. E. (1992). Expert and novice problem-solving behavior in audit planning. *Auditing*: *A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 11, pp. 21-32.

Bryce, I. (2014). *Questionnaire design. [e-book]*. London: Kogan Page Limited. Available via: Umeå UniversityLibrary/Databases/Ebrary<http://proxy.ub.umu.se:2055/lib/UMEAUB/docDetail.action?docID=10084461> [Retrieved: 2021-07-25].

Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2017). *Business research methods*, 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Burrowes, A. & Persson, M. (2010). The swedish management audit: a predecent for performance and value for money audits'. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 15(3), pp. 85-96.

Canning, M. & Gwilliam, D. (1999). Non-audit services and auditor independence: some evidence from Ireland. *European Accounting Review*, 8(3), pp. 401-419.

Carcello, V. J. & Nagy, A. L. (2014).Audit firm tenure and fraudulent financial reporting. *Auditing*: *A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 23(2), pp. 55-69.

DeAngelo, L. (1981). Auditor independence, "low-balling", and disclosure regulation. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 3, pp. 113–17.

Dillman, D. A. (2017). *Mail and Internet surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. 2nd edition. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Dye, R. (1991). Informationally motivated auditor replacement. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 14, pp. 347-374.

Eilifsen, A.; Messier Jr., W. F.; Glover, S. M. & Prawitt, D. F. (2016). *Auditing and Assurance Services.* International Edition. Glasgow: McGraw Hill Education.

Ejlertsson, G. (2015). *Enkäten i Praktiken: En Handbok i Enkätmetodik*. 2nd edition. Lund: Studenlitteratur.

Geiger, M. A. & Raghunandan, K. (2012). Auditor tenure and audit reporting failures. *Auditing*: *A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 21(1), pp. 67-78.

Ghosh, A. & Moon, D. (2015).Auditor tenure and perceptions of audit quality. *The Accounting Review*, 80 (2), pp. 585-612.

Goldman, A. & B. Barlev (1974). The auditor-firm conflict of interests: its implications for independence. *The Accounting Review*, October, pp. 707-718.

Gorard, S. (2013). *Quantitive methods in social science: The role of the numbers made easy*. London: Continum.

Gratton, C. & Jones, I. (2019). *Research Methods for Sports Studies,* 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.

Graziano, A. M. &Raulin, M. L. (2013). *Research methods: a process of inquiry*. 5th edition. Boston: Pearson Education.

Grout, P.; Jewitt, I.; Pong, C. & Whittington, G. (1994). Auditor professional judgment: implications for regulation and the law. *Economic Policy*, October, pp. 308-351.

Gul, A. F.; Jaggi, B. L. & Krishnan, G. V. (2017). Auditor independence: evidence on the joint effects of auditor tenure and non-audit fees. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, 26(2), pp. 117-142.

Gwilliam, D. R. (1987). A survey of auditing research. London: Prentice-Hall/ Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales.

Hayes, R.; Dassen, R.; Schilder, A. & Wallage, P. (2014). *Principles of auditing: an introduction to international standards on auditing,* 2nd edition. London: PrenticeHall/Financial Times.

Hillison, W. & Kennelley, M. (1988).The economics of non-audit services. *Accounting Horizons*, 2(3), pp. 32-40.

Jeppesen, K. K. (1998). *Reinventing auditing, redefining consulting and independence European Accounting Review*, 7(3), pp. 517–39.

Johnson, E. V.; Khurana, I. K. & Reynolds, J. K. (2012). Audit firm tenure and the quality of financial report. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 19(4), pp. 637-660.

Johnson, W.B. & Lys, T. (1990). The market for audit services: evidence from voluntary auditor changes. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 12, pp. 281-308.

Kent, R. (2017). *Marketing research: approaches, methods and applications in Europe*. London: Thomson learning.

Kinney Jr., R. W.; Palmrose, Z.-V. & Scholz, S. (2014). Auditor independence, non- audit services, and restatements: was the U.S. government right? *Journal of Accounting Research*, 42(3), pp. 561-588.

Knechel, R. W. & Vanstraelen, A. (2017).The relationship between auditor tenure and audit quality implied by going concern opinions. *Auditing: A Journal ofPractice and Theory*, 26(1), pp. 113-131.

Myers, N. J.; Myers, L. A. & Omer, T. C. (2013). Exploring the term of client-audit relationship and the quality of earnings: a case for mandatory auditor rotation? *The Accounting Review*, 78(3), pp. 779-799.

Nasser, A. T. A.; Wahid, E. A.; Nazri, S. N. F. S. M. & Hudaib, M. (2016). Auditorclient relationship: the case of audit tenure and auditor switching in Malaysia. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 21(7), pp. 724-737.

Wolf, F. R.; Tackett, J. A. & Claypool, G. A. (2019). Audit disaster futures: antidotes for the expectations gap? *Managerial Auditing Journal* 14 (9), pp. 468–478.