European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research
Vol.6, No.8, pp.42-53, November 2018
Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

PERCEPTION ON AUDIT EXPECTATION GAP ON THE STATUTORY DUTY OF NIGERIAN AUDITOR

Stephen I Ocheni and Abuh Adah

Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Sciences, Kogi State University, Anyigba - Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *The accountancy profession is a unique one and should be concerned with the provision of true and definitive financial information that can assist all the stakeholders in taking appropriate decisions after meeting auditor's requirements. Undoubtedly, an expectation gap always exists between the stakeholders (as they appear not knowing the exact the duty of a statutory auditor) and auditor (whose duty is spelt out in the statute irrespective of the high demand by the stakeholders). The first objective of this study is to determine whether or not the stakeholders / users of financial statements are conversant with the duty of an auditor under the Nigerian law. The second objective is to find out through the stakeholders' perceptions whether the audit expectation gap can influence them in taking decisions. Questionnaire is used as the instrument for collecting the required data. Descriptive statistic and simple regression (after conversion) are used in analyzing the data. The study reveals that majority of the stakeholders are not familiar with the statutory duty of an auditor and that the audit expectation gap is less significant in taking their decisions. Other finding is that the auditors' report is not detailed enough with a view to disclosing any gap that may arise. The recommendations of the study are that the management and directors of companies should adequately educate the stakeholders on the statutory duty of auditor and the report of the auditor should be detailed enough in order to meet the needs of shareholders especially on any gap that may arise.*

KEYWORDS: Audit Expectation Gap, Auditor, Nigeria, Statutory Duty

INTRODUCTION

The basic understanding of financial accounting is to keep tracks of financial transactions for the foundation of preparing and presenting financial statements about an enterprise's financial position mainly to the owners (and indirectly to the management and others users of the statements). To add unequivocal value to this accounting function, a statutory auditor will perform his function with a view to expressing his professional opinion of true and fair view judgment on the financial statements. It can be added that the purpose of audit is to assure the users including public that the financial statements are free from material misstatements and that the value of the audit will depend on their assessment on the probability that the auditor will discover financial contraventions and errors and that these lapses will be reported accordingly. Following these views, accountancy profession can be described as a unique one and should be concerned with the provision of true and definitive financial information that is expected to cover full disclosure and assurance of an enterprise's financial position which can propel the owners, management, government and other users of the statements in taking financial and or investment decisions.

The function of statutory auditor is enshrined in the Companies and Allied matters Act

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

(CAMA), 2004, anything outside it shall be regarded as violation of the law. The primary objective of the appointed auditor is to express his professional opinion on the financial statements of an enterprise in accordance with the provision of law and relevant standards. However, the secondary objectives of the auditor which most users expect or assume to be the primary and the basis of their expectation gap include i) the detection and prevention of all types of frauds and errors ii) the detection and prevention of any form of irregularities iii) that all material and immaterial financial transactions are completely and accurately disclosed iv) ensure that that effective internal control system is in place and v) preparation and presentation of draft and clean financial statements.

Chambers (2009) states that there is undoubtedly, an expectation gap for auditors in the area of fraud, other parties expect auditors to be effective at detecting and preventing significant fraud and that much effort is needed by the chief audit executive to explain audit's interface with fraud. The difference between the beliefs of these users as non-conversant to the requirement of law and the auditor in his statutory capacity has given rise to the expectation gap. Expectation gap exists because the shareholders and some other users of financial statements do not know the exact role of auditor in his statutory assignment; or if they do the extent is another limitation.

The role of auditor whose report is judged for any gap is clearly stated in the CAMA, 2004. This Act does not differ from other nations' laws because it is an inherent case of the auditor and the users all over. The confusion is that some of the users including the public think openly that the auditor prepares the accounts and deals with other aspect of consultancy services; few of them only realize the restrictive role of the auditor in this regard. Essentially most of the users of auditor's report expect more from him than his actual responsibilities. Monroe and Woodliff (1993) define audit expectation gap as the difference in beliefs between auditors and public about the auditor's duties. Gap will always be anticipated if for instance, Mr. User is made to believe or, if he can reasonably infer due to his ignorance or limitation of the requirement of law or misunderstanding that, the service of A is to produce ABC, while in the opinion of the producer, he is only to produce AB in accordance with the enabling law, there will be a difference that will generate disagreement between the two parties.

From this function, the statutory duty of the auditor is to report his professional opinion based on his work into the financial records of the company in accordance with the law. The law does not however, make any reference to any accounting standards and principles on which the preparation and presentation of financial statements are placed. This has also contributed to the difference between the statutory duty of an auditor and the users of financial statements. Besides, the contents of the law in this respect appear to be technical to some users of the auditor's report except those with financial knowledge instead of been simple and plain for ease of understanding. The greatest question that comes to mind is whether the users are aware and familiar with this enabling law in terms of auditor's duty.

This study assumes that the duty of auditor as contained in the Act is doomed, inexplicit and inconclusive to most of the shareholders and other users, which have accordingly manifested their beliefs into confusion and dilemma of expectation gap. The objective of the study is to find out whether or not the users of financial statements are conversant with the duty of an appointed auditor under the law. The second objective is to find out through the stakeholders' perceptions still whether the audit expectation gap can influence them in taking decision. The second objective is based on the assumption of this study and related literatures that expectation gap exists between the auditor's duty and what is expected from the users' of auditor's report.

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Audit Expectation gap

The shareholders in particular and the public who use the auditor's report appear to misunderstand the nature of auditor's function, especially in the context of expression of unqualified opinion. They believe that such opinion means that the enterprise has a clean bill financial statement that can totally be adopted for any decision making. Some users also expect auditor to perform the management function, but with a view to pointing out all the illegal, fraudulent and irregular transactions because they see auditor as a financial detector. The expectation gap is commonly used to illustrate the circumstances whereby a difference in expectation exists between a group with a certain expertise and a group, which relies upon that expertise (Salehi, 2011).

They are various concepts to this audit expectation gap; they are similar both in context and meaning, indicating that there is no significant disagreement on the term. Some of which are: Liggio (1974a) being the first to introduce the expectation gap, defines it as the difference between the levels of expected performance as envisioned by the independent accountant and by the user of financial statements. According to Guy and Sullivan (1988), it is the difference between what the public and financial statement users believe accountants and auditors are responsible for and what the accountants and auditors themselves believe they are responsible for. Godsell (1992) saw the expectation gap as which is said to exist, when auditors and the public hold different beliefs about the auditors' duties and responsibilities and the messages conveyed by audit reports.

Porter (1993) defined the term as the gap between society's expectations of auditors and the auditor's performance, as perceived by the society. Monroe and Woodliff (1993) and Jennings, Reckers and Kneer (1993) also defined the expectation gap as the difference in beliefs between auditors and the public about the duties and responsibilities assumed by auditors and the message conveyed by the audit reports and the difference between what the public expects from the auditing profession and what the profession actually provides. This definition is supported by Lowe (1994). From the various definitions highlighted above, there is no argument about what the audit expectation gap is; it is clear that there is consensus among these researchers concerning the term.

According to Percy (2007) as cited by Salehi (2011), Public expects that: (a) the accounts are right; (b) companies will not fail; (c) companies will guard against fraud and error; (d) companies will act within the law; (e) companies will be competently managed and (f) companies will adopt a responsible attitude to environmental and societal matters. However, the nature and scope of the auditor's statutory assignment will not permit these extra duties; they can only be recognized as secondary duties and he will not be responsible for this public expectation.

Majority of studies such as Gaa (1991) Lin and Chen (2004) and Dixon, Woohead and Sohliman (2006), indicated that the audit expectation gap is mainly due to users' reasonable expectations of audits as well as their unrealistic perceptions of the audit profession's performance. According to these studies, the differences may be attributable to users' misunderstanding of what is reasonably expected from an audit, and of the actual quality of the audit work. Lee and Azham (2008) were of the view that audit expectation gap exist as a result of the complication nature of audit assignment, conflicting position of an auditor and time lag

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

in responding to changing expectations.

Audit expectation gap is the different view perceived by one party, that is the user of financial statement (of what he believes to be the function of an auditor either because of his inability / lack of knowledge to understand the scope and limitation of the auditor in his statutory assignment or his thinking that an auditor is a full time but independent member of staff and a financial detector) and the other party, the statutory auditor, whose function is spelt out in the statute irrespective of the high demand by the other party. It is a situation that can be described as a common mistake between the two parties.

Literatures (Okaro, 2009; Dixon, Woodhead and Sohliman, 2006; Siddiqui and Nasreen, 2004; Lin and Chen, 2004 and Fadzly and Ahmad, 2004) have shown that there exist strong evidences of expectation gap between the function of statutory auditor and what his function should be on part of the users of the auditor's report – financial statements. The difference, that is expectation gap does not exist in isolation but must arise from unilateral mistake by one party to the knowledge of the other party.

Auditor's Expectation Gap and the CAMA

The CAMA section 357 has made it mandatory for the appointment of external auditor in order to audit draft accounts of registered companies in Nigeria. The appointment of such auditor according to the law should be done by the shareholders at annual general meeting (AGM) of such company but the proposal for deliberation is made by the management or directors of the company. On few occasions, the management or directors are by implication appoint this auditor but must be subjected to ratification by the shareholders at the AGM, else it will be invalid. In practice, the shareholders may not know the implications of such appointment because they will are in most cases required to attest to the proposal made by the management. Their less or absence of knowledge regarding the appointment of auditor may not have any implication on the auditor's duty and their decisions on his report.

The appointment of auditor should have been attached with their clear statutory duties, responsibilities and powers and what is expected from the appointed auditor. If truly the appointment is done by the shareholders at the AGM, there should be a possibility of demanding to know his statutory duty, relevance of his appointment and what is expected of his report in order to remove or narrow any gap that may arise. In practice, it is apparent that auditors are appointed by the management or directors of a company, not by the shareholders as spelt out by the CAMA. The purported appointment by the shareholders can be one major component or source of audit expectation gap.

Opinions from interactions with public as to the role of auditor show that he is only appointed to detect frauds and irregularities and provide a police work of scaring the accounts and finance officers and any other persons occupying the position of physical cash or its equivalent from stealing companies money. From the perceptions of the public including existing shareholders, the service provided by the auditor is not relevant while few of them will state that it is only statutory (Kantudu, 2004).

According to Salehi (2011), the need for audit arises from the potential conflict of interest that exists between stakeholders and the management of a firm. The understanding between these two parties normally necessitates that the directors or management of the company produce a complete set of financial information that claims to reflect the financial position including the

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

operations of a company. Adeniji (2012) believed that the need for an independent professional auditor includes i) the separations of ownership from management and the need to safeguard the interest of the owners who do not participate in the day-to-day decision of the organization by the management ii) the companies and Allied matters Act 2004 and iii) to provide credibility reports and accounts prepared by the Directors which may a) contain errors b) not disclose fraud c) unintentionally misleading d) be deliberately misleading e) fail to conform with regulations and g) not disclosing relevant information.

The CAMA section 360 states that, the auditors in preparing their report to the shareholders and indirectly to other users, shall "carry out such investigation as may enable them to form an opinion as to the following whether: a) proper accounting records have been kept by the company and proper returns adequate for their audit have been received from branches not visited by them and b) the company's balance sheet and (if not consolidated) its profit and loss account are in agreement with the accounting records and returns". In addition, the auditor shall received from branches not visited them or if the balance sheet (if not consolidated) and the profit and loss account are not in agreement with accounting records and returns. The auditor's report under reference is all about the financial information required by the users especially the owners at all levels.

Empirical Review

There are ample numbers of empirical studies on the audit expectation gap. Some of the studies (Siddiqui & Nasreen, 2004; Fadzly & Ahmad 2004; Hudaib, 2002; Noordin, 1999 & Chandler, Edwards & Anderson, 1993) revealed differences in perceptions on audit expectation gap among the different categories that benefit from financial statements of companies. The empirical studies of Best, Buckby and Tan (2001), Hojskov, 1998, Guy, and Sullivan (1988), Epstein and Gregor (1994) and Porter (1993) have discovered existence, nature, impact and how to minimize the gap between the two parties using different methodologies. Some of the major respondents used in the study were the major stakeholders in the financial statements. They include accountants, auditors, bankers, lawyers and other financial users.

Humphrey, Moizer and Turley (1993) carried out a study on audit expectation gap by obtaining perceptions of individuals of audit expectations. The study found out that there is a significant difference between auditors and the respondents. Low (1980) examines audit expectation gap with a view to finding out the extent of auditors' detection and disclosure responsibilities concerning errors, irregularities and illegal acts as perceived by auditors and the stakeholders. It was found out that the two parties varied significantly in their opinions regarding the detection and disclosure responsibilities.

Mohamed and Muhamad-Sori (2002) revealed that the audit expectation gap exists in Malaysia. The existence of the gap is due to a number of contributing factors such as, uncertainties concerning the actual role of auditor; the satisfaction of clients with services provided by the auditors; and the audit firm's lack of independence and objectivity.

In a study carried out by Fadzly and Ahmad (2004) to examine the audit expectation gap among auditors and major users of financial statements which include bankers, investors, and stockbrokers, the result proved existence of expectation gap. Similarly, Lee and Palaniappan (2006) and Lee, Azham and Kandasamy (2008) who conducted a survey on audit expectation gap and examined whether or not audit expectation gap exists in Malaysia among the auditors, auditees and audit beneficiaries in relation to auditors' duties, it was revealed that audit

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

expectation gap exist in Malaysia.

According to the study conducted by Appah and Oyadongham (2011), there is a significant relationship between audit expectation gap and auditors in the prevention of financial misappropriation of funds. The study also discloses a significant difference between the perceptions of auditors and users irrespective of the management intervention. In the study carried out by Jenny and Elna (2005), it was also found out that there is a significant expectation gap between the auditors and the members of the councils and committees that were the users of auditors' report.

Chinwuba and John (2013) conducted a study on the expectation gap; their finding reveals that the public is ignorant of the auditor's duties and this circumstance is responsible for the unreasonable expectation from public auditor. A study conducted by Muhammad and Zainab (2013) equally revealed that, the perception on the auditor's report in identifying financial problems will depends on the auditor's status to the respondents. In another study conducted by Glen, Jerry, Paul and Theodore (2011), the finding discloses that the users of auditor's financial statements have value for the statutory audit but they hardly read the entire report to know exactly the information content of the report.

Theoretical Framework

Policeman theory - According to Hayes, Dassen, Schilder and Wallage (1999), police theory is a widely pronounced auditing theory before 1950s. The theory believes that auditor should act like a policeman but with the main aim of arithmetical and correctness of financial transactions with a view to detecting and preventing frauds and irregularities. With the development of auditing standards and techniques, the theory is gradually losing its relevance.

Another theory is called agency theory which analysis the relationship between two parties: investors and managers. The agent, referred to as manager undertakes to perform certain duties for the principal that is, the investors and he undertakes to reward the agent (Jensen and Meckling, 1976). As cited by Salehi (2011), the principal will always be interested in the outcomes generated by the agent, as the theory demonstrates that accounting and auditing have an important task in providing information and this task is often associated with stewardship, in which an agent reports to the principal on the companies' events (Ijiri, 1975). The need for auditing is to have some means of independent confirmation to reduce record keeping faults, asset misclassification, and fraud within business organization.

Literature has further suggested that while the shareholders (who are the owners of the business entity) have the goal of value maximization as their primary objective, the managers (appointed employees) do have different objectives which are mostly self satisfaction and be opposing to that of the shareholders (Gbadago, 2015). According to Andresson and Emander (2005) agency theory, stated that the role of the auditor is to supervise the relationship between the manager and the owners and that a difference will have to occurs when the distribution of the responsibility is not well defined. Other relevant theories are quasi-judicial, theory of inspired confidence, credibility, and others. This study follows the agent theory.

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

METHODOLOGY

The objective of this study is to determine through the perception of varied users of financial statements whether or not majority of the users of auditor's report are conversant with the role of an auditor according to law. The second objective is to establish whether or not the audit expectation gap can influence the shareholders in taking decision. Based on these objectives, the instrument for collecting the required data to achieve them is questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to the expected respondents to get their perceptions on the case. The respondents included available management and middle management staff and representative auditors (internal and external) and accountants in companies within north west and north central states, available shareholders of these companies, bankers, stockbrokers, management and financial scholars at tertiary institutions and few other users of financial statements.

Five hundred (500) copies of questionnaire were distributed at random to these groups of respondents. A seven-point itemised rating type scale questionnaire was designed to give the respondents wide choice to express their objective view. The scale measurement is from 7 very likely agreed down to 1 very unlikely. To measure the scale, twelve items were used in the questionnaire. Three hundred and sixteen (316) numbers of the completed questionnaires, representing about 63 percent were retrieved.

The first four items in the questionnaire is designed to capture the respondents' perceptions on the first objective of this study. Simple descriptive statistic is used by comparing the actual mean obtained with the average mean. In the second objective, the mean score was obtained by summing up the responses from the last eight items in the questionnaire. Simple regression is used after necessary numeric conversion to find out whether the audit gap can influence the shareholders in taking decision. The eight items were categorized into independent and dependent variables based on the objective of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The primary data used for this study both for indirect and direct variables were subjected to reliability test. This test or the test of internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was less than .70 as recommended by Pallant (2007). This result means that reliability test of questionnaire has failed. However, we reviewed the result and found out that it was due to few items in the questionnaire. This led us to conduct the mean inter-item correlation test. The result of this second test was within the range of .2 and .4 to confirm the reliability of the questionnaire as recommended by Briggs and Check (1986).

Descriptive Statistics

The first objective of this study is to determine whether or not the users of financial statements are conversant with the role of an appointed auditor under the law. To achieve his objective, only descriptive statistic is required and the result is presented below:

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

Table 1: Result of Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
EXPG1	316	1	6	2.73	.055	.972
EXPG2	316	2	7	5.53	.057	1.006
EXPG3	316	1	7	2.68	.057	1.018
EXPG4	316	3	7	5.72	.054	.955
Valid N (listwise)	316					

Table 1 above shows mainly the mean (average) in respect of each variable for the first four items in the questionnaire and their standard deviation (degree of dispersion). The results provide some insight into the nature of the respondents of the questionnaire. This descriptive statistic reveals that there is no sample selection bias or outlier in the primary data that will harm the generalization of this work.

The first item in the questionnaire is on familiarity with the contents of law regarding the auditor's duties; the result indicates that the majority of the stakeholders said no. The average mean is 4, meaning that a result less than 4 is disagreement on part of the respondents. Item 2 with 5.53 is a strong agreement with a question on 'the importance of statutory auditor and his report not known to the shareholders'. The relevance of the auditor and his report need to be explained to those that have the power to appoint the auditor, even though that is not truly done by them.

The third question which is on appointment as to its definition and understanding by the stakeholders has a disagreement result mean of 2.68 when compared with the average of 4 point. The last question on the respondents' perceptions is whether the stakeholders can differentiate between the internal and external auditors. The result on table 2 above shows that the respondents recorded high mark of 5.72 against average of 4 in favour of agreement but the question is on a null form. This means that the shareholders that appoint the auditor cannot differentiate between their employee auditor and one they appoint.

Apart from the response to third question, the results of the analyses are in line with the studies of Lin and Chen (2004) and Dixon, Woohead & Sohliman (2006) which indicated that the audit expectation gap is mainly due to users' reasonable expectations from audit, and their unrealistic perceptions of the audit profession's performance and that the differences may be attributable to users' misunderstanding of what is reasonably expected from the statutory audit.

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

SUMMARY OF THE REGRESSION RESULT

Table: The table 2 shows the summary of the regression result which is given below.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.322[a]	.104	.101	.60883	.104	36.274	1	314	.230

a. Predictors: (Constant), EXPIV

The second objective is to find out through the stakeholders' perceptions whether or not the audit expectation gap can influence them in taking decision. Only model summary was generated for direct result as other results are not necessary. Result from table 2 above shows that the coefficient of determination for the regression as represented by the adjusted R square is .010. This reveals that only about 10 percent of the variation of dependent variable, auditor's statutory report can be accounted for by the explanatory variable of audit expectation gap. The remaining about 90 percent is accounted for by other factors including error term.

The F-statistics value is 36.274 showing the position of the model as satisfactory however, the significant level is at .230 point, indicating that there is no significant relationship between the two variables in the study. On the other hand, it is to say that audit expectation gap has cannot influence the shareholders' in taking decision. This result is at variance with the outcome of Glen, Jerry, Paul & Theodore (2011)'s study; where it was found that audit of financial statements is useful to the shareholders, but they hardly read the content in order to be more useful to them.

CONCLUSION

The first objective of this study is to determine whether or not the users of financial statements are conversant with the role of an appointed auditor under the law while the second objective is to find out through the stakeholders' perceptions whether or not the audit expectation gap can influence them in taking decision. From the statistical results on tables 2 and 3 above, it is apparent that the majority of the stakeholders are not familiar with the statutory duties of an auditor in their companies. Again, it is revealed that audit expectation gap is less significant to the shareholders' in taking decision.

The other findings from the statistical results include: i) the shareholders are only called upon to attest to the appointment of auditor as packaged by the directors ii) the affairs of the companies be subjected to efficient internal control system rather than the duty of statutory auditor that is not understood and iii) if the report of the auditor goes beyond the requirement of law, any difference in the gap between the two parties would be minimized.

Based on these findings, the study recommends that i) the management and directors of companies should put in place adequate machinery to educate the stakeholders on the statutory

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

duties of an appointed auditor ii) the report of the auditor should be detailed enough in order to meet the needs of shareholders especially on any gap that may arise and iii) if the statutory duty of an auditor must continue, the appointment of an auditor should be done by an honest audit committee of a company.

REFERENCE

Adeniji, A. A (2012). Auditing & assurance services (ed. 2nd), Value Analysis Consult: Lagos

Andresson, C. and Emander, C. (2005). The new auditing standards in Sweden, unpublished bachelor thesis, Goteborg University.

Appah, A and Oyadongham (2011). *Role theory and the concept of audit expectation gap in South- South, Nigeria.* Current Research Journal of Social Sciences, 3 (6).

Best, P. J., Buckby, S. and Tan, C. (2001). *Evidence of the audit expectation gap in Singapore,* Managerial Auditing Journal, 16, No. 3, pp. 134-144.

Briggs, S. R. and Check, J. M. (1986). *The role of factor analysis in the developmental and evaluation of personality scale.* Journal of Personality, 54(1): 106-48.

Chambers, A. (2009). Tolley's internal auditor's handbook (2nd ed). Edinburgh, UK

Chandler, R, Edwards, J. R. and Anderson, M. (1993). *Changing perceptions of the role of the company auditor, 1840- 1940,* Accounting and Business Research, 23, No. 92, pp. 443-459.

Chinwuba, O. and John, I. O. (2013). *Narrowing the expectation gap in auditing: The role of the audit profession.* Research Journal of Finance and Accounting, 4, 2.

Dixon, R., Woodhead, A. D. and Sohliman, L. (2006). *An investigation of the expectation gap in Egypt,* Managerial Auditing Journal, 21, 3: 293-302.

Epstein, M. J. and Gaiger, M. A. (1994). *Investor views of audit assurance: Recent evidence of the expectation gap*, Journal of Accountancy, 177, January, pp. 60-6.

Fadzly, M. N. and Ahmad, Z. (2004). *Audit expectation gap: The case of Malaysia,* Managerial Auditing Journal, 19, No. 17, pp. 897-915.

Gaa, J. C. (1991). The expectation game: Regulation of auditors by government and the profession, Critical

Gbadago, F. Y. (2015). *Audit expectation gap and MBA accounting students' knowledge on auditor(s)' responsibilities: Evidence from a public university in Kumasi Ashanti region of Ghana.* Academic Journals, 7(4).

Glen, L. Jerry, L. T, Paul, J. C. and Theodore, J. M. (2011). *Perceptions and misperceptions regarding the unqualified auditor's report by financial statements preparers, users, and auditors.* Journal of Accounting horizons, 25 (4)

Godsell, D. (1992). *Legal Liability and the Audit Expectation Gap.* Singapore Accountant, 8: 25- 28.

Guy, D. M. and Sullivan, J. (1988). *The Expectation Gap Auditing Standards*, J. Account., 165: 36-46.

Hayes, R. S., Schilder, A., Dassen, R. and Wallage, P. (1999). Principles of auditing: An international perspective, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, London

Hojskov, L. (1998). The Expectation Gap Between Users' and Auditors' Materiality Judgments in Denmark, Paper Presented at the Second Asian Pacific Interdisciplinary Research in Accounting Conference 4- 6 August, Japan. Available atwww3.bus.osaka-cu.ac.jp/apira98/ archives/pdfs/36.pdf.

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)

Hudiab, M. (2002). An empirical investigation of audit perception gap in Saudi Arabia, available at www.ex.ac.UK/rbp/research/discussionpapers AccFin/AccFin 2002.viewed 8th

Humphrey, C. G., Moizer, P. and Turley, W. S. (1993). *The audit expectation gap in Britain: An empirical investigation,* Accounting and Business Research, 23, summer, pp. 395-411.

Ijiri, Y. (1975). Theory of accounting management, Sarasota: American Accounting Association

Jennings, M. M., Reckers, P. M. J and Kneer, D. C. (1991). *The Auditors dilemma: The incongruous judicial notions of auditing profession and actual audit practice,* American Business Law Journal, 29, spring, pp. 99-125.

Jenny, B. and Elna, M. (2005). Does an expectation gap exist in the municipal auditor? Integrerad civilekonomutbildning. Bachelor thesis, School of Economic and Commercial Law, Goteborg University

Jensen, C. and Mechling, W. (1976). *Theory of firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure,* Journal of Finance and Economics, 3

Kantudu, A. S. (2004). The relevance of auditors' report in enhancing management accountability in Nigeria: In Dandago & Tanko (eds), Prudence, transparency and Accountability. Kano, Gidan Dabino Publishers.

Lee, T. H. and Azham, M. A. (2008). *The audit expectation gap: A review of contributing factors.* Journal of Modern Accounting and Auditing, 4, No. 8 (39).

Lee, T. H, Azham, Md. Ali and Kandasamy, S. (2008). *Towards reducing the audit expectation gap: Possible mission?* Accountants Today, pp. 18-22, Feb. Available at: http://www.mia.org.my/at/at/200802/06.pdf.

Liggio, C. D. (1974). *The expectation gap: the accountant's waterloo,* Journal of Contemporary Business, 3, Spring, pp. 27-44.

Lin, Z. and Chen, J. (2004). *Auditors responsibility and independence: Evidence from China,* Research in Accounting Regulation, 17.

Low, A. M. (1980). *The auditor's detection responsibility: Is there an expected gap?* Journal of Accountancy, 150, October, pp. 65-70.

Low, A. M., Foo, S. L. and Koh, H. C. (1988). *The expectation gap between financial analysts and auditors – Some empirical evidence,* Singapore Accountant, 4, May, pp. 10-13.

Lowe, D. J. (1994). *The expectation gap in the legal system: Perception difference between auditors and judges.* Journal of Applied Business Research, 10, summer, pp. 39-44.

Monroe, G. S. and Woodliff, D. R. (1994). *An empirical investigation of the audit expectation gap: Australia evidence,* Accounting and Finance, 34, May, pp. 47-74.

Muhammad, T. and Zainab, D. (2013). *Improving the content of auditor's report as a means of fathom to audit expectation gap in Nigeria.* International Review of Management and Business Research, 2 (2).

Noordin, H. D. (1999). The existence of expectation gap and the usefulness of auditors' report. Available at: http://www.alrinhan.com/thisis/ack.sta. Viewed 10th August, 2011.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual – A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows, (*1st ed), England: Ligare Book Printer.

Porter, B. (1993). *An empirical study of the audit expectation-performance gap,* Accounting and Business Research, 24,No .93 ,Winter, pp. 49-68.

Salehi, M. (2011). *Audit expectation gap: Concept, nature and trace*, African Journal of Business Management, 5(21)

Siddiqui, J., and Nasreen, T. (2004). Audit expectation gap in Bangladesh: Perceptual differences between accounting professionals and students, June, http://ssrn.com/abstract=557542

Print ISSN: 2053-4086(Print), Online ISSN: 2053-4094(Online)