

*

(80)

350

.2004

One Way ANOVA

t

%73

(%74.8)

(%49)

%61.4

.520

.1

)

:

(2003

)

(1988

)

.(

(Spires and Yardly, 1989)

(1992

)

)

.(2005

(IFAC)

1983

(12)

1988

(520)

(2005

)

.2007/2/18

2006/4/25

*

:

(1

(2

(3

)

(

:

(1

(5)

) :

(2

(520)

(

) :

(3

(

:

) :

(4

(1

(

(2

) :

(5

(3

(

(4

(6

(5

)

((146) 2005/12/31
(80)

) (1)
:(

) (2)

(%90.77)

(14) (3)

(1)

(16) (4)

(1)

()

(

(7) (5)

Cronbach Alpha			
89.02	14	14 -1	
84.87	16	30-15	
66.56	7	37-31	
76.59	4	41-38	
87.69	14	55-42	
90.77	55	55 -1	

((4)

) (6)

((14)

350

*

*

:(Sekaran, 2000)

$$n o = Z^{(2)} P (1- P) \div P^{(2)} \quad n = (n oN) \div n o + (N - 1)$$

$$1.96*1.96*50%*50% \div 10%*10%= 96.04 \quad \text{then } (n) = 96.04*$$

$$350 \div (96.04 + 349)=75$$

: (1)

:-

(SPSS)

÷ = : (/ 2)

(2) (/ 2)

(Reliability Coefficient)
(Cronbachs Alpha)

.(Sekaran, 2000) (%60)

(One Way (One - Sample T-Test) (3 ANOVA),

.2

5	100%	≥	%80	
4	%80	>	%60	
3	%60	>	%40	
2	%40	>	%20	
1	%20	>	0	

(1 - 5)

(Likert Five Points Scale)

(55) (1)

(American Institute of Certified Public Accountants) 1978 (SAS 23)

%60

(3)

:(/ 2)

(SAS 23) (2004)

(/ 2)

1988 (2004) (SAS 23) (SAS 56)

%100	≥	%80	5	≥	4
%80	>	%60	4	>	3
%60	>	%40	3	>	2
%40	>	%20	2	>	1
%20	>	0	1	>	0

(Dauber (Arens et al., 2005), et al., 2005) (SAS 56)

(Heiman, 1990)

)

: -

(2002

1988
 (520) (12) 1983 (IFAC 12)

:

(520 3)

(520) :

(SAS 23)

(1 (1

(2 (2

(3 (3

(4 (4

(5 (5

(6 (6

(2003) :

(1

3)

530 2

(

2003 73 (Porter et al., 2003) (2

(5)) (2003

(3

(12) (2003) (4

(189) (2002 (5

(520) (6

(SAS 59)

)

(

570

(Boynton and Raymond, 2006)

.3

) (Biggs and Wild, 1984) (1
. (

. () : (1992) (4

(102)

(300)
(%72.1)

%40

(%80.3)) : (Cohen and Kida, 1989) (2

. (

:) : (1994) (5 (168)
. (

-% 27)

(%40) : (Heiman, 1990) (3
. (

) : (1995) (6

. (

()

(290)

(106)
(%78)
(%64)
(%31)

) : (2002) (10
.() : (1998) (7
.(
(54)
(%85.1)
(%93)

) : (Donnel, 2002) (11
(1999) (8
(

(28)

) : (2003) (12
" 520
.(

(520)) : (Cho and Lew, 2000) (9
.(

: (2005) (15 (88)
 :)
 .(

(%21) (%40)

:

) : (2003) (13
 .(

) (Heiman, 1990) - (261)
 (Biggs and (1999) (1994) (1992
 Wild, 1984)

(2005) (2003)

) (Biggs and Wild, 1984) -) : (2004) (14
) (Donnel, 2002) (1995) (1994
 (2003)
 .(:
 (39)

(Cohen and Kida, 1989)

-

(2005) (2003)

(Biggs and Wild, 1984)

(Cho and Lew, 2000) (1995) (1992)

(3)

-	-			1
-	-			
83.8	67			
16.2	13			
100	80			
10	8	5		2
51.3	41	10	- 5	
38.7	31		10	
100	80			
87.5	70			3
3.8	3			
8.7	7			
100	80			
17.5	14	26		4
50	40	40	- 26	
32.5	26		40	
100	80			
66.2	53		5000	5
23.8	19		10.000 - 5001	
10	8		10.000	
100	80			
61.3	49			6
21.3	17			
11.3	9			
6.3	5			
100	80			
92.5	74			7
7.5	6			
100	80			
31.25	25			8
68.75	55			
100	80			

) (1999)

:H03 (3 (2002) (2003

:H04 (4 .(Cho and Lew, 2000

:H05 (5) (1992) (Cohen and Kida, 1989) .(2003) (1998

:H06 (6 (2003)

(%83.8) (3) : (1)) (1998) (Cohen and Kida, 1989) (2005

(%90) ((10 5) (3) : (2) (1998) .(2003) 5

(%87.5) (3) : (3)

(%57.5) (3) : (4) .4 (39) (%82.5) (26)

(%66.2) (3) : (5) : :H01 (1) (17000 - 2000) :H02 (2) (5000) 5000

.(%33.8)

(4)

1	2	3	4	5		
-	-	6	41	33		1
-	-	%7.4	%51.3	%41.3		
-	-	32	48	-		2
-	-	%40	%60	-		
-	-	39	37	4		3
-	-	%48.8	%46.3	%5		
-	-	31	49	-		4
-	-	%38.7	%61.3	-		
-	1	16	40	23		5
-	%1.3	%20	%50	28.7		
-	1	29	50	-		6
-	%1.3	% 36.2	%62.5	-		
-	-	34	46	-		7
-	-	%42.5	%57.5	-		
-	-	32	48	-		8
-	-	%40	%60	-		
-	1	23	34	22		9
-	%1.3	% 28.7	%42.5	%27.5		
-	-	32	48	-		10
-	-	%40	%60	-		
-	-	24	39	17		11
-	-	%30	% 48.7	%21.3		
-	-	32	48	-		12
-	-	%40	%60	-		
-	-	24	46	10		13
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	38	42	-		14
-	-	%47.5	%52.5	-		

: (6)

(3)

(%21.3)

(%61.3)

(%6.3) (%11.3)
 - 2 : (7
 (%92.5) (3)
 (%7.5)
 (%60) ()
 (%80
 (4 - 3) (3.61 - 3.53) : (8
 (3)
 (0.52 - 0.50)
 (%68.75)
 (%31.25)
 - 3
 (4.34 -3.53) :
 (3) :H01
 %60
 .%74.8
 (6) (One Sample T-test) (1) (14)
 (T) (5) (4)
 (1.990) 17.699 =
 %5 (0.000) ()
 (H01) :
 (4)
 %5
 %5 :
 - 1
 (5 1)
 (81.2) (%86.8)
 (%80) (4.06) (4.34)
 : (%0.74) (%0.62) (%100
 :H02

(5)

		()							
	1	86.8	0.14	3	5	0.62	4.34	1	
	7	72.0	0.14	3	5	0.49	3.60	2	
	8	71.2	0.17	3	5	0.59	3.56	3	
	6	72.2	0.14	3	5	0.49	3.61	4	
	2	81.2	0.18	2	5	0.74	4.06	5	
	6	72.2	0.14	2	5	0.52	3.61	6	
	8	71.6	0.14	3	5	0.50	3.58	7	
	7	72.0	0.14	3	5	0.49	3.60	8	
	3	79.2	0.20	2	5	0.79	3.96	9	
	7	72.0	0.14	3	5	0.49	3.60	10	
	4	78.2	0.18	3	5	0.72	3.91	11	
	7	72.0	0.14	3	5	0.49	3.60	12	
	5	76.6	0.16	3	5	0.63	3.83	13	
	9	70.6	0.14	3	5	0.50	3.53	14	
	74.8						3.74		

(6)

	Sig.2-tailed	(T)	(T)
	0.000	1.990	17.699

(0.05= α)

:

(14) (1)

(3)

(4)

(One Way ANOVA)

:

(Scheffe)

(F) (7)

) 10.000

(3.89 =

(F)

.(3.78 =) 5000

(7)

H0		(F)					
0.000	9.833	3	1.035	3.106			
		76	0.105	8.001			
		79		11.107			
0.014	4.503	2	0.581	1.163			
		77	0.129	9.944			
		79		11.1.7			
0.289	1.262	2	0.176	0.352			
		77	0.140	10.755			
		79		11.107			

(%73)

(3.65)

:

:H03

:

(One Way ANOVA)

:

:

(10)

.(8)

(30)

(15)

(3)

(9) (8)

:

:

(%90) - 1

(21)

(4.24)

(84.8)

(%100 -%80)

: (Scheffe)

" "

(1

(3.67 =)

.(3.43) = " "

(%63.6)

- 2

" 10 -5"

(2 (%63.6)

(16•17•18 15)

(3.68 =)

.(3.59) " 10 "

(4 -3)

(8)

1	2	3	4	5		
-	-	66	14	-		15
-	-	%82.5	%17.5	-		
-	-	66	14	-		16
-	-	%82.5	%17.5	-		
-	-	66	14	-		17
-	-	%82.5	%17.5	-		
-	-	66	14	-		18
-	-	%82.5	%17.5	-		
-	-	24	46	10		19
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	24	46	10		20
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	1	7	44	28		21
-	%1.3	%8.7	%55	%35		
-	-	24	46	10		22
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	24	46	10		23
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	24	46	10		24
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	24	46	10		25
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	24	46	10		26
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	24	46	10		27
-	-	%30	%57.5	%12.5		
-	-	41	39	-		28
-	-	%51.3	% 48.7	-		
-	-	41	39	-		29
-	-	%51.3	% 48.7	-		
-	-	23	47	-		30
-	-	%28.8	% 58.7	-		

(9)

		()						
	4	63.6	0.12	3	4	0.38	3.18	15
	4	63.6	0.12	3	4	0.38	3.18	16
	4	63.6	0.12	3	4	0.38	3.18	17
	4	63.6	0.12	3	4	0.38	3.18	18
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	19
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	20
	1	84.8	0.16	2	4	0.66	4.24	21
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	22
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	23
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	24
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	25
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	26
	2	76.6	0.17	3	4	0.63	3.83	27
	3	69.8	0.14	3	4	0.50	3.49	28
	3	69.8	0.14	3	4	0.50	3.49	29
	2	76.8	0.16	3	4	0.63	3.84	30
	73.0						3.65	

(10)

H0		(F)				
0.206	1.561	3	0.148	0.445		
		76	0.095	7.227		
		79		7.673		
0.531	0.638	2	0.062	0.125		
		77	0.098	7.548		
		79		7.673		
0.125	2.133	2	0.201	0.403		
		77	0.094	7.270		
		79		7.673		

(11)

1	2	3	4	5		
-	37	39	3	1		31
-	%46.3	% 48.7	% 3.7	%1.3		
-	-	1	76	3		32
-	-	%1.3	%95	%3.7		
-	-	9	67	3		33
-	-	%11.3	%83.8	%3.8		
-	33	43	3	1		34
-	41.3	% 53.7	3.7	1.3		
-	8	57	14	1		35
-	%10	% 71.2	%17.5	%1.3		
-		62	12	6		36
-		%77.5	%15	%7.5		
-	-	19	53	8		37
-	-	% 23.7	%66.3	%10		

(12)

	()							
7	52.0	0.24	2	5	0.63	2.60	31	
4	60.5	0.07	2	4	0.22	3.03	32	
5	59.0	0.15	2	5	0.45	2.95	33	
6	53.0	0.23	2	5	0.62	2.65	34	
3	62.0	0.18	2	5	0.56	3.10	35	
2	66.0	0.18	3	5	0.60	3.30	36	
1	77.2	0.15	3	5	0.57	3.86	37	
	61.4					3.07		

(13)

H0		(F)					
0.860	0.252	3	0.025	0.075			
		76	0.099	7.557			
		79		7.632			
0.141	2.009	2	0.189	0.378			
		77	0.094	7.254			
		79		7.632			
0.001	7.104	2	0.594	1.189			
		77	0.084	6.443			
		79		7.632			

10.000" (3

3.78 = "

(%52)

- 2

.(3.58) =

"

5000"

(31)

:

(%52)

:H04

(3 -2)

:

.(3)

- 3

(%61)

(3.07)

(3)

(37)

(31)

(3)

.(11)

(11)

(One Way ANOVA)

:

- 1

(37)

:

(3.86)

(% 77.2)

: (Scheffe)

(12)

(% 80 -%60)

(14)

1	2	3	4	5		
28	27	21	3	1		38
%35	%33.6	%26.3	%3.8	%1.3		
14	11	42	12	1		39
%17.5	%13.8	%52.5	%15	%1.3		
14	4	44	12	6		40
%17.5	%5	%55	%15	%7.5		
2	67	11	-	-		41
%2.5	7%83.	%13.8	-	-	Extrapolation	

(15)

		()						
	4	40.50	0.46	5	1	0.94	2.03	38
	2	53.75	0.36	5	1	0.98	2.69	39
	1	58.00	0.38	5	1	1.10	2.90	40
	3	43.75	0.21	4	2	0.45	2.19	41
	49%					2.45		

(One Way ANOVA)

(1)

(0.05 = α)

(0.141) (0.860)
(0.001)

(3.04)

(3.0)

(3.00)

(13)

" "

" 10

"

(2)

(3.15)

" 10

"

(16)

H0		(F)					
0.001	6.117	3	2.443	7.328			
		76	0.399	30.347			
		79		37.675			
0.010	4.933	2	2.140	4.279			
		77	0.434	33.396			
		79		37.675			
0.003	6.258	2	2.634	5.268			
		77	0.421	32.407			
		79		37.675			

(One Way ANOVA)

:H05

:

:

(16)

(41) (38) (3)

.(14)

(15) (14)

:

-1

:H06

(42)

-2

(55)

(2.45)

(17)

.(15)

%49

(17)

1	2	3	4	5		
-	-	6	41	33		42
-	-	%7.4	%51.3	%41.3		
-	-	32	48	-		43
-	-	%40	%60	-		
-	-	39	37	4		44
-	-	%48.7	%46.3	%5		
-	-	31	49	-		45
-	-	%38.7	%61.3	-		
1	-	16	40	23		46
%1.3	-	%20	%50	%28.7		
1	-	29	50	-		47
%1.3	-	%36.2	%62.5	-		
-	-	34	46	-		48
-	-	%42.5	%57.5	-		
-	-	32	48	-		49
-	-	%40	%60	-		
1	-	23	34	22		50
1.3	-	%28.7	%42.5	%27.5		
-	-	6	41	33		51
-	-	%7.4	%51.3	%41.3		
-	-	32	48	-		52
-	-	%40	%60	-		
-	-	39	37	4		53
-	-	%48.7	%46.3	%5		
-	-	31	49	-		54
-	-	%38.7	%61.3	-		
1	-	16	40	23		55
%1.3	-	%20	%50	%28.7		

(18)

		()							
	1	86.75	0.14	3	5	0.62	4.34	42	
	5	72	0.14	3	4	0.49	3.60	43	
	7	71.25	0.17	3	5	0.59	3.56	44	
	4	72.25	0.14	3	4	0.49	3.61	45	
	2	81.25	0.18	2	5	0.74	4.06	46	
	4	72.25	0.14	2	4	0.52	3.61	47	
	6	71.5	0.14	3	4	0.50	3.58	48	
	5	72	0.14	3	4	0.49	3.60	49	
	3	79.25	0.20	2	5	0.79	3.96	50	
	1	86.75	0.14	3	5	0.62	4.34	51	
	5	72	0.14	3	4	0.49	3.60	52	
	7	71.25	0.17	3	5	0.59	3.56	53	
	4	72.25	0.14	3	4	0.49	3.61	54	
	2	81.25	0.18	2	5	0.74	4.06	55	
	%75.8						3.79		

(19)

	Sig.2-tailed	(T)	(T)
	0.000	1.990	19.371

(18) (17)

.4.34

-3

(4.34 - 3.56) (3.79) : ()
 -1
 (3)
 .%75.8 (3)

(19) (One Sample T-test)
 19.371 = (T) %92.6 -2
 (1.990)
 %5 (0.000)

(Biggs and Wild, 1984)

) (1992) (Cho and Lew, 2000) .5
) (2003) (1995
 .(2005

(4

(%61.4)

:

(Biggs and (2005) (1
 (Cho and Lew, 2000) Wild, 1984)

(%92.6)

(%74.8)

(3.03) (%98.7)

)

(3.86)

(2005

:

(%78.7)

(4.06)

) (1999) (Heiman, 1990)

.(1992) (1994

(2

(5

(2.49) (2.90) (2.03)

(3)

)

(Biggs and Wild,1984) :

.(1999

) (1992) (Cho and Lew, 2000)

(3

.(2003) (1995 (%73)

(6

)

)

(

(2003

(%90)

(%70)

:

(Cohen and Kida,

	(10	(Biggs and Wild, (Donnel, (1995) (1994) 1989) 1984) (2002)	(7
	(1				
()				
	(2				
			(2003)	
	(3				
)		
	(4			(1998	
	(5				
			(2005) (1998	
	(6			(Cohen and Kida, 1989)	(8
	(7				
					(9

2 : 1994 12 1989
2002 .141
.231 - 209 24 .. 2002
.2005
2004 : 2003
1995

- AICPA, 323. 1999
- Arens, Alvin Randal J. Elder and Marks S. Beasley. 109
2005. Auditing and Assurance Services, An
Integrated Approach, 10th Edition, Pearson Education
Inc. New jersey, USA. 1998 .29 – 27
- Biggs, Stanley and Wild, John J. 1984. A note on the
Practice of Analytical Review, *Auditing: A Journal of
Practice and Theory*: 3 (2): 68 - 79. 2005 – 73
- Boynton, W.C. and Raymond, N. Johnson. 2006. Modern
Auditing, Assurance Services and the Integrated of
Financial Reporting, 8th Edition, John Wiley and
Sons, Inc, USA. 1992 : –
- Cho, S. and Lew, A.Y. 2000. Analytical Review
Applications among Large Audit Firms in Hong
Kong. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 15 (8): 431–438. .458 2003
- Cohen, Jeffrey and Kida, Thomas. 1989. The Impact of
Analytical Review Results, Internal Control
Reliability and Experience on Auditor's Use of
Analytical Review, *Journal of Accounting Research*,
27 (2): 263 - 276. : 2000
- Dauber, Nick and Qureshi, Anique and Lerine, Mark and
Siegel, Joel. 2005. Auditing Standards (Including the
Standards of the PCAOB), RR Donnelley, USA. 2003 " " 520
- Heiman, Vicky B. 1990. Auditors' Assessments of the
Likelihood of Error Explanation in Analytical Review.
The Accounting Review, 65 (4): 875 - 890. .37 62 - 61 2005
- Porter, Brenda and Simon, John and Hatherly, David.
2003. Principles of External Auditing, Second
Edition, John Wiley and Sons Ltd, England. . 2003 73 2004
- Sekaran, Uma. 2000. *Research Methods for Business*,
Third Edition, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, USA. .116 – 81 8 2 :
- Spires, E. and Yardley, J.A. 1989. Empirical Studies on
the Reliability of Auditing Procedures, *Journal of
Accounting Literature*, 8: 49-75. .90 – 1992
- American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. 1988.
Statement on Auditing Standards, 56, New York:

The Extent of Implementing the Analytical Procedures in Audit (An Empirical Study from the External Auditors' Perspectives in Jordan)

*Moh'd I. Al-Nawaiseh**

ABSTRACT

This paper aims at identifying the extent to which the analytical procedures are implemented by auditors in Jordan, and their realization of the advantages and the obstacles thereof. Moreover, the study is conducted to determine the effect of the auditors' position, experience and audit's charges on applying the analytical procedures in auditing.

To achieve this aim, a sample study consisted of 80 questionnaires was designed and circulated by hand to a sample of auditors representing the Jordanian auditors (Class A) and 80 questionnaires had been considered usable for analysis purposes, Descriptive statistical techniques were used in analyzing data and testing hypotheses such as frequencies, percentages, standard deviation, means, one – sample t- test and one way ANOVA. Most of auditors realize the importance and obstacles of analytical procedures with (74.8%).Percentage of applying the non-quantitative procedures analytical (73%), while percentages of applying simple and advanced quantitative analytical procedures (61%), (49%), respectively.

The study suggests several recommendations in order to increase the effectiveness of audit.

Keywords: Auditing, Analytical Review, Non –quantitative Analytical Procedures, Simple and Advanced Quantitative Analytical Procedures, International Auditing Standard no.520.

* Applied Science University, Amman, Jordan. Received on 25/4/2006 and Accepted for Publication on 18/2/2007.