

Explaining qualifications in audit reports using a support vector machine methodology

Michael Doumpos✉, Chrysovalantis Gaganis, Fotios Pasiouras

First published: 10 August 2006

<https://doi.org/10.1002/isaf.268>

Citations: 23

Abstract

The verification of whether the financial statements of a firm represent its actual position is of major importance for auditors, who should provide a qualified report if they conclude that the financial statements fail to meet this requirement. This paper implements support vector machines (SVMs) to develop models that may support auditors in this task. Linear and non-linear models are developed and their performance is analysed using training samples of different size and out-of-sample/out-of-time data. The results show that all SVM models are capable of distinguishing between qualified and unqualified financial statements with satisfactory accuracy. The performance of the models over time is also explored. Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

REFERENCES

Barnes P. 1990. The prediction of takeover targets in the U.K. by means of multiple discriminant analysis. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* 17(1): 73– 84.

[Google Scholar](#)

Beasley SM, Carcello JV, Hermanson DR. 1999. *Fraudulent financial reporting: 1987–1997: an analysis of US public companies*. Research Report, COSO.

[Google Scholar](#)

Bell T, Tabor R. 1991. Empirical analysis of audit uncertainty qualifications. *Journal of Accounting Research* 29: 350– 370.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Chen K, Church B. 1992. Default on debt obligations and the issuance of going concern opinions. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory* 11(2): 30– 49.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Craswell A. 1999. Does the provision of non-audit services impair auditor independence? *Journal of International Auditing* 3: 29– 40.

[Google Scholar](#)

DeAngelo L. 1981. Auditor size and audit quality. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 3: 183– 199.

[Google Scholar](#)

Dopuch N, Holthausen R, Leftwich R. 1987. Predicting audit qualifications with financial and market variables. *Accounting Review* 62(3): 431– 454.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Doumpos M. 2002. A stacked generalization framework for credit risk assessment. *Operational Research: An International Journal* 2(2): 261– 278.

[Google Scholar](#)

Dye R. 1993. Auditing standards, legal liability and auditor wealth. *Journal of Political Economy* 101: 887– 914.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Espahbodi H, Espahbodi P. 2003. Binary choice models for corporate takeover. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 27: 549– 574.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Fung G, Mangasarian OL. 2001. Proximal support vector machine classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, F Provost, R Srikant (eds). ACM Press: New York; 77– 86.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Gaganis Ch, Pasiouras F, Spathis Ch, Zopounidis C. 2005. Identifying qualified audit reports in UK firms: a nearest neighbours approach. In *28th European Accounting Association Annual Congress*, Göteborg, Sweden, 18–20 May.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Ireland J. 2003. An empirical investigation of determinants of audit reports in the UK. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* 30(7-8): 975- 1015.

[Google Scholar](#)

Jo H, Han I. 1996. Integration of case-based forecasting, neural network, and discriminant analysis for bankruptcy prediction. *Expert Systems with Applications* 11(4): 415- 422.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Keasey K, Watson R. 1987. Non-financial symptoms and the prediction of small company failure: a test of Argenti's hypotheses. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* 14(3): 335- 54.

[Google Scholar](#)

Keasey K, Watson R, Wynarczyk P. 1988. The small company audit qualification: a preliminary investigation. *Accounting and Business Research* 18: 323- 333.

[Google Scholar](#)

Kleinman G, Anandarajan A. 1999. The usefulness of off-balance sheet variables as predictors of auditors' going concern opinions: an empirical analysis. *Managerial Auditing Journal* 14(6): 273- 285.

[Google Scholar](#)

Koh HC. 1991. Model predictions and auditor assessments of going concern status. *Accounting and Business Research* 21(84): 331- 338.

[Google Scholar](#)

Krishnan J, Krishnan J. 1996. The role of economic trade-offs in the audit opinion decision: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance* 11(4): 565- 586.

[Google Scholar](#)

Laitinen EK, Laitinen T. 1998. Qualified audit reports in Finland: evidence from large companies. *European Accounting Review* 7(4): 639- 653.

[Google Scholar](#)

Lee Y-J, Mangasarian OL. 2001. RSVM: reduced support vector machines. In *Proceedings of the First SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, Chicago, 5-7 April.

[Google Scholar](#)

Lennox G. 2000. Do companies successfully engage in opinion shopping? Evidence from the UK. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 29(3): 321– 337.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Loebbecke J, Eining M, Willingham J. 1989. Auditor's experience with material irregularities: frequency, nature, and detectability. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory* 9: 1– 28.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

McKeown JC, Mutchler JF, Hopwood W. 1991. Towards an explanation of auditor failure to modify the audit opinions on bankrupt companies. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory* 10: 1– 13.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Pasiouras F, Gaganis Ch, Zopounidis C. 2004. Replicating auditors' opinion: multicriteria approaches. In *2nd Meeting of the Greek Working Group on Multicriteria Decision Aid*, 21– 22 October, Chania, Greece.

[Google Scholar](#)

Persons O. 1995. Using financial statement data to identify factors associated with fraudulent financial reporting. *Journal of Applied Business Research* 11(3): 38– 46.

[Google Scholar](#)

Reynolds J, Francis J. 2001. Does size matter? The influence of large clients on office-level auditor reporting decisions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 30: 375– 400.

[CAS](#) | [Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Ruiz-Barbadillo E, Gomez-Aguilar N, Fuentes-Barbera CD, Garcia-Benau MA. 2004. Audit quality and the going-concern decision-making process: Spanish evidence. *European Accounting Review* 13(4): 597– 620.

[Google Scholar](#)

Schölkopf B, Smola A. 2002. *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization and Beyond*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.

[Google Scholar](#)

Sobehart JR, Keenan S, Stein S. 2000. *Benchmarking quantitative default risk models: a validation methodology*. Moody's Investors Service Global Credit Research.

[Google Scholar](#)

Spathis Ch. 2002. Detecting false financial statements using published data: evidence from Greece. *Managerial Auditing Journal* 17(4): 179– 191.

[Google Scholar](#)

Spathis Ch. 2003. Audit qualification, firm litigation and financial information: an empirical analysis in Greece. *International Journal of Auditing* 7: 71– 85.

[Google Scholar](#)

Spathis Ch, Doumpou M, Zopounidis C. 2002. Detecting falsified financial statements: a comparative study using multicriteria analysis and multivariate statistical techniques. *The European Accounting Review* 11(3): 509– 535.

[Google Scholar](#)

Spathis Ch, Doumpou M, Zopounidis C. 2003. Using client performance measures to identify preengagement factors associated with qualified audit reports in Greece. *The International Journal of Accounting* 38: 267– 284.

[Google Scholar](#)

Stein RM. 2002. *Benchmarking default prediction models: pitfalls and remedies in model validation*. Moody's KMV Technical Report #030124.

[Google Scholar](#)

Summers SL, Sweeney JT. 1998. Fraudulently misstated financial statements and insider trading: an empirical analysis. *The Accounting Review* 73(1): 131– 146.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Tartari E, Doumpou M, Baourakis G, Zopounidis C. 2003. A stacked generalization framework for the prediction of corporate acquisitions. *Foundations of Computing and Decision Sciences* 28(1): 41– 61.

[Google Scholar](#)

Vanasco R. 1998. Fraud auditing. *Managerial Auditing Journal* 13(1): 4– 71.

[Google Scholar](#)

Vapnick VN. 1998. *Statistical Learning Theory*. Wiley: New York.

[Google Scholar](#)

Welch OJ, Reeves ThE, Welch ST. 1998. Using a genetic algorithm-based classifier system for modeling auditor decision behavior in a fraud setting. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management* 7: 173- 186.

[Google Scholar](#)

Wines G. 1994. Auditor independence, audit qualifications and the provision of non-audit services: a note. *Accounting and Finance* 34: 75- 86.

[Google Scholar](#)

Ziegenfuss DE. 1996. State and local government fraud survey for 1995. *Managerial Auditing Journal* 9: 50-55.

[Google Scholar](#)

Citing Literature



[Download PDF](#)

ABOUT WILEY ONLINE LIBRARY

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

[About Cookies](#)

[Manage Cookies](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Wiley Research DE&I Statement and Publishing Policies](#)

[Developing World Access](#)

HELP & SUPPORT

[Contact Us](#)

[Training and Support](#)

[DMCA & Reporting Piracy](#)

OPPORTUNITIES

[Subscription Agents](#)

[Advertisers & Corporate Partners](#)

CONNECT WITH WILEY

[The Wiley Network](#)

Copyright © 1999-2025 John Wiley & Sons, Inc or related companies. All rights reserved, including rights for text and data mining and training of artificial intelligence technologies or similar technologies.

WILEY