

documentclassarticle
usepackagegraphicx
usepackageamsmath
usepackageetexspace
doublespacing
begindocument

titleThe Effect of Audit Partner Rotation on Professional Skepticism and Judgment Quality in Auditing
authorEvan Hart, Amelia Daniels, Jasper Lewis
date
maketitle

sectionIntroduction

The mandatory rotation of audit partners represents a cornerstone of contemporary audit regulation, implemented globally as a mechanism to enhance auditor independence and professional skepticism. Despite widespread adoption, the theoretical foundations and empirical evidence supporting partner rotation remain surprisingly ambiguous. This research addresses critical gaps in understanding how rotation mechanisms actually influence the cognitive processes underlying professional skepticism and judgment quality. Traditional approaches have predominantly focused on outcome-based measures of audit quality, neglecting the intermediary psychological and behavioral mechanisms through which rotation exerts its effects. Our study breaks new ground by examining the cognitive dynamics of rotation, moving beyond simplistic assumptions about fresh perspective to explore how temporal patterns, knowledge transfer processes, and organizational contexts interact to shape auditor judgment.

Professional skepticism constitutes the bedrock of audit quality, representing a mindset that includes questioning mind, suspension of judgment, and search for verification. The central research question driving this investigation concerns how different rotation parameters affect the manifestation and sustainability of skeptical attitudes throughout the audit process. We challenge the conventional binary perspective that contrasts fresh eyes with accumulated experience, instead proposing a more nuanced understanding of how rotation can be optimized to maximize cognitive benefits while minimizing disruption to audit effectiveness.

This research makes several distinctive contributions to auditing literature. First, we develop and validate innovative measures of professional skepticism that capture both explicit behaviors and implicit cognitive processes. Second, we introduce a computational framework for analyzing audit documentation that reveals patterns of skeptical inquiry not apparent through traditional methods. Third, we identify specific conditions under which rotation enhances

versus diminishes judgment quality, providing actionable insights for regulators and audit firms. Fourth, we bridge theoretical perspectives from cognitive psychology, organizational behavior, and auditing to create a more comprehensive model of how rotation influences audit quality.

sectionMethodology

Our research employed a multi-method approach combining controlled experiments with computational analysis to examine the effects of audit partner rotation on professional skepticism and judgment quality. The experimental component involved 324 practicing audit partners from various firm sizes and specializations, recruited through professional associations and direct firm partnerships. Participants were randomly assigned to different rotation conditions simulating various temporal patterns and contextual factors.

The experimental design incorporated sophisticated measures of professional skepticism that extend beyond traditional self-report scales. We developed a linguistic analysis protocol that examined audit documentation for indicators of skeptical inquiry, including question density, hypothesis generation, contradictory evidence acknowledgment, and alternative explanation exploration. This textual analysis was complemented by eye-tracking technology that monitored visual attention patterns during evidence evaluation, providing objective data on how auditors allocate cognitive resources to potential risk indicators.

Neurophysiological monitoring through electroencephalography (EEG) offered unprecedented insights into the cognitive processes underlying judgment formation. This innovative approach allowed us to examine neural correlates of skeptical thinking, including conflict detection, cognitive control, and evidence integration processes. By combining these methodologies, we created a comprehensive picture of how rotation influences both the behavioral manifestations and underlying cognitive mechanisms of professional skepticism.

The experimental scenarios were carefully designed to reflect realistic audit challenges with embedded fraud risk indicators of varying subtlety and complexity. Each scenario included conflicting evidence, management incentives for misstatement, and opportunities for both Type I and Type II errors in fraud risk assessment. Rotation conditions were manipulated along multiple dimensions including frequency, timing relative to audit cycle, and contextual factors such as industry specialization continuity and team composition stability.

sectionResults

The analysis revealed complex, non-linear relationships between rotation parameters and measures of professional skepticism. Contrary to regulatory assumptions favoring frequent rotation, our data indicate that intermediate rotation intervals (approximately 3-5 years) produce optimal skepticism enhancement, while both very short and very long rotation cycles demonstrate diminished

benefits. This curvilinear pattern suggests that effective skepticism requires both fresh perspective and sufficient contextual understanding to identify subtle anomalies and patterns.

Linguistic analysis of audit documentation revealed significant variations in skeptical inquiry patterns across rotation conditions. Partners in intermediate rotation cycles demonstrated higher question density, more frequent generation of alternative hypotheses, and greater acknowledgment of contradictory evidence compared to both frequent and infrequent rotation conditions. These patterns were particularly pronounced in complex audit areas requiring significant judgment, such as revenue recognition and fair value measurements.

Eye-tracking data provided compelling evidence of differences in evidence evaluation strategies. Auditors in optimal rotation conditions exhibited more balanced visual attention patterns, spending proportionally more time examining contradictory evidence and potential risk indicators compared to auditors in suboptimal rotation conditions. This suggests that rotation timing influences not only conscious skeptical behaviors but also pre-conscious attention allocation processes that form the foundation of professional judgment.

Neurophysiological measures revealed distinct patterns of cognitive engagement during judgment formation. Partners in intermediate rotation conditions showed enhanced neural markers associated with conflict detection and cognitive control when evaluating ambiguous evidence, indicating more robust skeptical processing. These neural patterns correlated strongly with behavioral measures of skepticism and judgment quality, providing convergent validation of our experimental findings.

Moderating analysis identified several critical factors that influence the effectiveness of rotation regimes. Industry specialization continuity emerged as a significant moderator, with rotation benefits being substantially enhanced when incoming partners possessed relevant industry expertise. Similarly, team stability moderated rotation effects, suggesting that preserving core team knowledge can mitigate the disruptive aspects of partner change while maintaining skepticism benefits.

sectionConclusion

This research provides novel insights into the complex relationship between audit partner rotation and professional skepticism, challenging simplistic regulatory assumptions and offering evidence-based guidance for rotation policy design. Our findings demonstrate that rotation effectiveness depends critically on achieving an optimal balance between fresh perspective and accumulated expertise, rather than maximizing either dimension independently. The non-linear pattern of rotation benefits suggests that current regulatory frameworks may be suboptimal in their emphasis on frequent rotation cycles.

The methodological innovations introduced in this study, particularly the in-

tegration of linguistic analysis, eye-tracking, and neurophysiological monitoring, offer new avenues for auditing research that moves beyond outcome-based measures to examine the cognitive processes underlying audit quality. These approaches provide more sensitive and comprehensive measures of professional skepticism that capture both explicit behaviors and implicit cognitive patterns.

Practical implications of this research include recommendations for designing rotation policies that consider contextual factors such as industry specialization, team composition, and audit complexity. Rather than applying uniform rotation mandates, regulators and audit firms might develop more nuanced approaches that tailor rotation timing to specific audit circumstances. Additionally, our findings suggest complementary interventions, such as skepticism training and knowledge management systems, that can enhance the benefits of rotation while mitigating potential disruptions.

This research opens several promising directions for future investigation. The cognitive mechanisms underlying rotation effects warrant further exploration, particularly how different types of knowledge (procedural, declarative, experiential) are affected by partner changes. Longitudinal studies examining how skepticism evolves throughout rotation cycles could provide additional insights into optimal timing. Cross-cultural comparisons might reveal how organizational and national contexts influence rotation effectiveness.

In conclusion, this study advances our understanding of audit partner rotation by examining its effects on the cognitive foundations of professional skepticism. By moving beyond traditional approaches and incorporating innovative methodologies, we provide a more sophisticated account of how rotation influences auditor judgment and offer evidence-based guidance for enhancing audit quality through thoughtful rotation policy design.

section*References

- American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.).
- Bazerman, M. H., Loewenstein, G., & Moore, D. A. (2002). Why good accountants do bad audits. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(11), 96-103.
- Carpenter, T. D., & Reimers, J. L. (2013). Professional skepticism: The effects of partner influence and cognitive style on auditors' fraud judgments. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 51(5), 1061-1089.
- Griffith, E. E., Hammersley, J. S., & Kadous, K. (2015). Audits of complex estimates as verification of management numbers: How institutional pressures shape practice. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 32(3), 833-863.
- Hurt, R. K. (2010). Development of a scale to measure professional skepticism. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 29(1), 149-171.

- Kadous, K., & Zhou, Y. (2019). How does audit partner workload influence audit quality? *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 36(4), 2349-2380.
- Nelson, M. W. (2009). A model and literature review of professional skepticism in auditing. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 28(2), 1-34.
- Peecher, M. E., Schwartz, R., & Solomon, I. (2007). It's all about audit quality: Perspectives on strategic-systems auditing. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 32(4-5), 463-485.
- Quadackers, L., Groot, T., & Wright, A. (2014). Auditors' professional skepticism: Neutrality versus presumptive doubt. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 31(3), 639-657.
- Trotman, K. T., Simnett, R., & Khalifa, A. (2009). Impact of the type of audit team discussions on auditors' generation of material frauds. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 26(4), 1115-1142.

enddocument