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ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to observe the impact of auditor’s work experience, independence, objectivity, integrity, competency and accountability on audit quality. The population considered in this research consists of active auditors who work in public accounting offices in Indonesia. We use convenience sampling as our sampling method. The sample size in this research is 175 auditors. By using multiple linear regression, we found the $R^2$ value to be 0.828 or 82.8%, and it shows that work experience, independence, objectivity and accountability have significant impacts on audit quality, but the impacts of integrity and competency on audit quality are statistically insignificant.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The financial statement prepared by management is a reflection a company’s general condition regarding management’s performance in managing the funds invested by owners, and it reflects a company’s financial level. The financial statement is used by several external and internal users as it is used to make economic decision (Hastuti, 2010).
According to FASB, the most important characteristics that must be present in a financial statement are relevance and reliability. These two characteristics are very difficult to measure, so users need a third party’s service, that is an independent auditor who makes sure that the financial statement is relevant and reliable (Singgih & Bawono, 2010). The auditor’s service can increase the users’ confidence in the financial statement (SFAC No. 1) and that confidence forces auditors to pay attention to their audit quality (Castellani, 2008). De Angelo (1981) defines audit quality as the probability the auditor finds and reports violations in the client’s accounting system. This probability is affected by the auditor’s technological skills, the accounting procedure used, the sampling process and several other factors. Knowledge, skills, sufficient work experience and sufficient time allocation to finish the audit process are also factors that can affect audit quality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Attribution Theory
The attribution theory explains how a person’s understanding of the events around them are affected by knowing the reason the events happen. In attribution theory, it is explained that there are behaviors that are related to an individual’s attitude and characteristics (Ayuningtyas & Pamudji, 2012). From this statement, it can be stated that by observing a person’s behavior, we can determine a person’s attitude or characteristics and predict the person’s reaction to situations. It is also explained by Luthans (2005) as cited in Ayuningyas & Pamudji (2012) that a person will build perceptions regarding other people and the situations around them which will affect the person’s behavior in social situations.

Professional Ethics
In etymology, the word ethics come from the Greek ethos (plural: ta etha), which means “tradition” or “habit”. Ethics is related to good daily habits that is in a person or society. Good habits are applied as rules or norms that are spread, known, understood and taught in society. Ethics are understood as teachings on how humans should live, as well as rules and violations of human behavior (Keraf, 2010, p. 14-15).

According to IAPI (2011, 100, p. 1-2) one of the aspects that differentiates public accountants from other professions is professional responsibility to public interests. This makes a public accountant’s responsibility to be not limited to the clients. When your action affects public interests, it is very important to obey and apply all basic principles and professional ethical codes. Every auditor must obey basic professional ethics according to SPAP section 100, which is integrity, objectivity, competency, undisclosed and professionalism principle.

Auditor Work Experience
Work experience is the factor that affects business growth the most. The relationship between them is that high work experience causes business growth to increase (Sulaeman, 2014). In general, the more experience an auditor has, the higher their audit quality will be compared to a new auditor. It is assumed that an experienced auditor will be able to do a better job than an inexperienced one. Experience build skills, both technically and psychologically (Singgih & Bawono, 2010).

In the auditing process, an auditor must obtain sufficient business knowledge to identify and understand events, transactions and events that can have an impact on the financial statement or the audit statement. Knowledge regarding the client’s business entity is
usually obtained from an auditor’s experience in the entity or industry, as well as details obtained from the company (Hery, 2011, p. 76-79). According to Kaplan, O’Donnell & Arel (2008) an auditor’s professional working experience tends to affect their evaluation when they integrate evidence from management with the one obtained from an independent source. Experienced auditors do not easily believe the information given by management that supports management’s self interest. Auditors will access information from management thoroughly when there are some persuasion efforts from management.

**Auditor Independence**

Independence is one of the most important characteristics for an auditor and is the basic of integrity and objectivity principles. The reason why there are many financial statement users who depend on external audit reports is because they expect an unbiased view from the auditor (Elder et al., 2011, p. 74). An independent auditor is an auditor that is not easily influenced because they do their job for the public (compared to an internal auditor. Auditors are obligated to be honest not only to company managers and owners, but also creditors and other users that put their trust on the audit statement (IAPI, 2011, SA Seksi 220, PSA No.4, p. 220.1).

Auditors are not allowed to be bias towards any party because their opinion regarding the appropriateness of the financial statement will be questioned if they are not truly independent (Badjuri, 2011). Independence is also a characteristic that an auditor should have so that they are not easily influenced when they are doing their job (Agusti & Pertiwi, 2013). Therefore, independence is a main principle that an auditor should have to gain the public’s trust.

**Auditor Objectivity**

According to Badan Pemeriksaan Keuangan Republik Indonesia rule number 01 year 2007 regarding Public Financial Audit Standards, being objective is a way to think impartially, intellectually honest and free from conflict of interest (Arianti, Sujana, dan Putra, 2014). Objectivity is needed so that auditors can act fairly without any influence from pressure or requests from certain parties who need the audit statement (Sukriah et al., 2009).

Primaraharjo dan Handoko (2011) explained that IAI stated in Indonesia that when dealing with situations and practices that are related to objectivity, there are several considerations that need to be given to the following factors.

1. If an independent auditor is in a situation when they may get pressure, their objectivity can be affected.
2. Appropriateness must be used to determine standards that can identify relationships that can affect a person’s objectivity.
3. Relationships that can make suspicions, bias or any other factors that can affect objectivity must be avoided.
4. Independent auditors are obligated to make sure that involved parties obey the objectivity principle.
5. Independent auditors must not accept not offer any presents that can affect professionalism and their relationship with involved parties. They must avoid situations that can ruin their professionalism.

**Auditor Integrity**

Primaraharjo dan Handoko (2011) states that an auditor must not gain personal benefits from the public’s trust. In reality, the integrity principle accepts negligence and honest mistakes,
but not fraud nor disobeying the principles. Integrity can be measured based on what is right and fair. When auditors are in a situation where there are no rules, standards or guidelines, or when they are facing conflicting opinions they must decide whether their decisions and actions are consistent with their integrity as an independent auditor.

Integrity is the quality that is the basis of public trust and is a guideline for auditors when testing their decisions (Ayuningtyas & Pamudji, 2012). According to Pusdiklatwas BPKP (2008, p. 21) the integrity principle states that auditors need to have characteristics that are based on honesty, courage, wisdom and responsibility to build confidence that leads to reliable decisions. Sukriah et al. (2009) states that integrity is extremely important so that auditors can act honestly during the audit process.

Auditor Competency
Auditor competency represents auditors that can explicitly audit objectively and accurately with sufficient experience and attention to detail. Auditors with a higher education will have more knowledge in their field, which means they can understand problems more thoroughly. In addition, with more knowledge, it is easier for auditors to follow complex developments. This means auditors will be able to produce higher quality audit reports (Agusti & Pertiwi, 2013). A competent auditor is an auditor that has technological skills, understands and acts on the correct audit process while understanding and using the appropriate sampling process (Widiastuty & Febrianto, 2010). Auditors must keep their professional knowledge and skills in a higher level, and work hard in applying their knowledge and skills during their service (Elder et al., 2011, p. 71). In the audit process, auditors must report their professional skills accurately (2011, SA seksi 230).

Auditor Accountability
Accountability represents a person’s psychological push to actualize their social responsibility (Mardisar dan Sari, 2007). According to Adiguna, Satria & Suprayitno (2015), accountability can explain an auditor’s role and responsibility in the auditing process and their discipline in completing the work and the reports. Salsabila dan Prayudiawan (2011) explains that accountability can be defined as the obligation to answer and explain a person or a party’s action towards parties that have the rights to ask for answers from those who have the right to process certain resources. Adiguna et al. (2015) explains that accountability is closely related to transparency in that there is no accountability without transparency is defined as opening to the public to gain correct, honest information that is not discriminative to human rights.

Audit Quality
The term audit quality is still an issue that is debated by involved users. This is caused by the fact that audit quality is a complex subject and there have been no universal decisions regarding its definition and analysis (Mustofa, 2014, p. 357). De Angelo (1981) defines audit quality as the probability of an auditor finding and reporting violations in the client’s accounting system. This probability depends on the auditor’s skills and technology, the sampling process and other factors. According to Mustofa (2014, p. 358) high-quality audit can only be achieved by a team who satisfies the following criteria.

1. Applying appropriate evaluating rules, ethics and behavior;
2. Having knowledge, skills, experience and sufficient time to finish the audit process;
3. Applying the correct audit process and quality control audit procedure according to rules, regulations and standards; and
4. Producing useful reports on time; interact appropriately with relevant users.
3. METHODS

The data type that we are using in this research is the primary data. The data is observed through survey, by spreading written instruments to respondents. The instrument that we are using is a questionnaire, a closed questionnaire where respondents only choose relevant questions.

1. Dependent Variable (Ka)
The dependent variable used for this research is audit quality. Audit quality is defined as the probability an auditor finds and reports violations in the client’s accounting system (De Angelo, 1981). This probability depends on the auditor’s work experience, knowledge, and competency. It also depends on independence and the basic principles of the public accountant’s ethics. According to Sukriah et al. (2009) audit quality is measured by the following indicators:
   I. Consistency of the auditing process with the auditing standards.
      Auditors must always refer to the auditing standards.
   II. The quality of the audit report.
      The audit report must explain things that are relevant with the real condition.

2. Independent Variable (X)

a. Auditor Work Experience (Pk)
Auditor work experience is an auditor’s experience in auditing a company’s financial statement. According to Futri dan Juliarsa (2014), the more often an auditor works at a complex work, the more experience and knowledge they have. According to Sukriah et al. (2009) work experience can be measured with the following indicators:
   I. Time spent working as an auditor.
      How much time have been spent working as an auditor will affect their work.
   II. Amount of audit work.
      The things needed and obtained from an auditor’s amount of work.

b. Auditor Independence (Ind)
According to IAPI (2011, SA Seksi 220, PSA No. 4, p. 220.1), auditor independence can be observed from whether or not the auditor is intellectually honest. To be acknowledged as an independent person, the auditor must be free from their obligations to the client and has no business with the client. According to Sukriah et al. (2009) auditor independence can be measured by the following indicators:
   I. Program disposition independence.
      In building the program, the auditor must be free from certain parties.
   II. Process independence.
      During the working process, the auditor must be free from certain parties.
   III. Reporting independence.
      When reporting the results of the audit, the auditor must be free from certain parties.

c. Auditor Objectivity (Obj)
Objectivity is a condition where the auditor is obligated to not let subjectivity, conflict of interest or inappropriate influences from other parties to affect their professional or business
judgement (IAPI, 2011, Seksi 120, p.9). According to Sukriah et al. (2009) auditor objectivity can be measured by the following indicators:

I. Free from conflict of interest.
   Things that the auditor can do to be free from conflict of interest.

II. Stating conditions according to facts.
   Things that the auditor can do to state conditions according to facts.

d. **Auditor Integrity (Int)**

   Integrity is one of the characteristics that plays as the basis of professional acknowledgement. Integrity is the quality that is the basis of public trust and is the benchmark for auditors in testing their decisions (Mulyadi, 2011, p. 56). According to et al. (2009) auditor integrity can be measured by the following indicators:

   I. Auditor honesty.
   Auditor does not add, subtract or manipulate their audit results.

   II. Auditor courage.
   Auditor has the courage to do all the audit process according to standards and ethics.

   III. Auditor wisdom.
   Auditor can judge the problems impartially with wisdom.

   IV. Auditor responsibility.
   Things that the auditor can do to fulfill their responsibility as an auditor.

e. **Auditor competency (Cmp)**

   Competency is related to sufficient education and experience that the accountant has in accounting and auditing. In the audit process, public accountants must act as a someone who is knowledgeable in accounting and auditing (Gunawan, 2012). According to Sukriah et al. (2009) auditor competency can be measured by the following indicators:

   I. Personal quality.
   Quality that an auditor has.

   II. General knowledge.
   General knowledge that an auditor has.

   III. Specific skills.
   Specific skills that an auditor has.

f. **Auditor Accountability (Aktbs)**

   Accountability is a psychological-social push that a person must fulfill their public responsibility. According to Mardisar dan Sari (2007) auditor accountability can be measured by the following indicators:

   I. Auditor motivation.
   An auditor’s motivation to finish their job.

   II. Auditor confidence
   Confidence that the work will be reviewed by a supervisor.

   III. Auditor effort.
   An auditor’s effort to finish their job.

**Research Object General View**

The respondents in this research are auditors who work at public accounting offices in Jakarta. The researcher spread questionnaires through events and seminars made by IAPI and approaches big and small public accounting offices in Jakarta. Auditors involved in this
research include associates, supervisors, managers, partners etc. The researcher spread the questionnaires to 263 auditors. From 263 questionnaires, 210 of them made back and there are 31 who omitted because they represent outliers and 4 more that are incomplete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Number of questionnaires spread</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Number of questionnaires returned</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>79,85 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Number of questionnaires that are invalid</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>13,31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of questionnaires that are valid</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>66,54 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondent characteristics are divided into several categories, based on gender, age, position and highest education. The following table represents the categories.

**Table 2. Respondent Characteristics based on Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>57.71 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42.29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Respondent Characteristics based on Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>56.57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Respondent Characteristics based on Professional Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jabatan</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46.29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Respondent Characteristics based on Highest Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.71 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. RESULTS

Classic Assumptions must be tested before doing any multiple linear regression analysis. This includes normality, multicollinearity and heteroscedasticity tests.

1. Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Parameters</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.98171365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Parameters</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.98171365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Extreme Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Table 6 shows the normality test that is used to test whether the dependent and independent variables are normally distributed. The normality test that is used in this research is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The significance level is 0.200. Therefore, the dependent and independent variables are normally distributed.

2. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test is done when the data is normally distributed. This test is used to test whether there are correlations in the independent variables. A good model does not have multicollinearity in the independent variables. The way to test multicollinearity is to look at VIF and Tolerance. The results show that the model is free from multicollinearity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Coefficients

a. Dependent Variable: Audit Quality
3. Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity test is used to test whether the variance of the error term is constant. One way to do this is to use the Glejser test. It can be seen from Table 7 that the p-value is higher than the significance level \( \alpha \) that is 0.05 (5%). So, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity in the model.

Table 8: Heteroscedasticity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.328</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>3.235</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Uji_Hetero

Test Results

Hypothesis Testing is used to determine whether the null hypothesis based on theory or previous research is accepted or rejected. This paper uses multiple linear regression.

1. Coefficient of Determination (R square)

Coefficient of Determination is used to see how much the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables, as measured in R Square.

In this research, R square is 0.828 or 82.8% which means 82.8% of the variation in audit quality is explained by the variation in work experience, independence, objectivity, competency and accountability. The other 17.2% remains unexplained.

Table 9. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.913a</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>2.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Accountability, Experience, Independence, Competency, Integrity, Objectivity

b. Dependent Variable: Quality Audit

2. F Test

The result of the F-test shows that p-value is lower than 5% which means the independent variables are jointly significant.
Table 10. ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3441.446</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>573.574</td>
<td>141.016</td>
<td>.000^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>683.331</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4124.777</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Quality Audit
b. Predictors: (Constant), Accountability, Experience, Independence, Competency, Integrity, Objectivity

3. T Test

Table 11. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.086</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-2.382</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>4.423</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>3.970</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-7.81</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>10.767</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Quality Audit

The multiple linear regression estimated equation is:

\[ K_a = 3.086 - 0.079P_k - 0.173I_n + 0.304O_b + 0.007I_n - 0.460K_m - 0.528A + e \]

where:

- \( K_a \): Audit Quality
- \( P_k \): Work Experience
- \( I_n \): Independence
- \( O_b \): Objectivity
- \( I_n \): Integrity
- \( K_m \): Competency
- \( A \): Accountability

The explanation that we can get is the following.

1. **Auditor Work Experience**

It can be seen from Table 11 that the -value is 0.018. Since it is lower than 0.05, we can reject H1 and conclude that work experience has a significant impact on audit quality.
2. Auditor Independence
It can be seen from Table 11 that the -value is 0.000. Since it is lower than 0.05, we can reject H2 and conclude that independence has a significant impact on audit quality.

3. Auditor Objectivity
It can be seen from Table 11 that the -value is 0.000. Since it is lower than 0.05, we can reject H3 and conclude that objectivity has a significant impact on audit quality.

4. Auditor Integrity
It can be seen from Table 11 that the -value is 0.822. Since it is higher than 0.05, we can reject H4 and conclude that integrity has no significant impact on audit quality.

5. Auditor Competency
It can be seen from Table 11 that the -value is 0.436. Since it is higher than 0.05, we can reject H5 and conclude that competency has no significant impact on audit quality.

6. Auditor Accountability
It can be seen from Table 11 that the -value is 0.000. Since it is lower than 0.05, we can reject H6 and conclude that accountability has a significant impact on audit quality.

5. DISCUSSION

Impact of Auditor Work Experience on Audit Quality
The first hypothesis (H1) states that auditor work experience has a significant impact on audit quality, and it is accepted. An auditor is considered experienced if they have worked for a significant time and have dealt with many audit works. The time spend as auditor will cause the auditor to understand how to face audit objects in obtaining data and information needed as well as analyzing whether the information is relevant or not. Furthermore, auditors can detect the cause of mistakes easier and are able to give recommendation to remedy the mistake according to the rules.

In dealing with many audit jobs, attention to detail and accuracy are needed to minimize mistakes. The chance to keep learning from mistakes or accomplishments from previous jobs are used to improve an auditor’s skills. Experienced auditors have the skills to analyse whether the audit object is consistent with the standards and whether the quality of the audit has been thorough. This result is supported by Herliansyah dan Ilyas (2006), Wiratama dan Budiartha (2015), and Sukriah et al. (2009) who proved that auditor work experience has an impact on audit quality.

Impact of Auditor Independence on Audit Quality
The second hypothesis which states the auditor independence has an impact on audit quality is accepted. An independent auditor is an auditor who is able to plan, audit and report the auditing process without any interventions from other parties, especially management. Independence shows external manifestation, a condition that prevents auditors from relationships that can ruin an auditor’s objectivity. Independence is considered as an important attribute that protects financial information integrity that is trusted by the public. Independence makes the object the focus for auditor to work on and it will affect audit quality. This result is supported by Agusti & Pertiwi (2013), Wiratama dan Budiartha (2015), and Castellani (2008) who proved that auditor independence has an impact on audit quality.
Impact of Auditor Objectivity on Audit Quality
The third hypothesis which states that auditor objectivity has an impact on audit quality is accepted. An objective auditor is an auditor that does not allow subjectivity, conflict of interest and other inappropriate influences to affect their professional judgement. When auditors are free from conflict of interest, they are able to act fairly without any pressure from any parties, and they are aware of their condition if they are in a position that may cause conflict of interest. Auditors will be able to defend their criteria and wisdom formally and that will affect audit quality. This result is supported by Ayuningtyas & Pamudji (2012), Arianti et al. (2014), and Gunawan (2012) who proved that auditor objectivity has an impact on audit quality.

Impact of Auditor Integrity on Audit Quality
The fourth hypothesis which states auditor integrity has an impact on audit quality has been rejected. An auditor who has integrity is an auditor who is honest with their work, has the courage to say what needs to be said, has the wisdom to judge fairly, and is responsible for the work. The reason why these do not have a significant impact on audit quality is proved by Wiratama dan Budhiarta (2015), due to professional care. Accuracy and attention to detail must be applied professionally by accountants so that sufficient audit quality is achieved. The integrity principle forces auditors to act with honesty, courage, wisdom and responsibility to build trusts that can be used for decision making. Based on the answers received, there are doubts regarding the statements that state auditors do not agree with behaviors that violates rules, and one that states auditors do not blame others that can hurt the other party. According to the auditors, when they have the courage to not correct a violation, they automatically hurt other parties. In attribution theory, it is also explained that a person’s behavior is influenced by internal and external factors, which means their integrity is also affected by themselves and others surrounding them. This result is supported by Sukriah et al. (2009) and Gunawan (2012) who proved that auditor integrity has no impact on audit quality.

Impact of Auditor Competency on Audit Quality
The fifth hypothesis which states that auditor competency has an impact on audit quality is rejected. A competent auditor is an auditor who has quality, general knowledge and specific knowledge. This does not guarantee audit quality because specific knowledge gained from experience is more needed. In attribution theory, a person will create ideas regarding their situation and that is the one that affects their behavior. This result is supported by Tarigan & Susanti (2013), Hastuti (2010) and Gunawan (2012) who proved that auditor competence has no impact on audit quality.

Impact of Auditor Accountability on Audit Quality
The sixth hypothesis which states auditor accountability has an impact on audit quality is accepted. An accountable auditor is an auditor who has the will and motivation to finish their work and take responsibility from the public, use all their maximum effort, and is aware that their work will be reviewed by their supervisor. This makes auditors to be more careful in doing their work. Naturally, humans want to anticipate this and have the fear to make mistakes because they are being supervised. So, this will affect an auditor’s work and hence audit quality. This result is supported by Mardisar dan Sari (2007), Wiratama dan Budiartha

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion
Based on the results, analysis and discussion, we can conclude the following points.
1. Work experience, independence, objectivity and accountability have significant impact on audit quality. The p-value is below $\alpha = 5\%$.
2. Integrity and competency have no significant impact on audit quality. The p-values are above $\alpha = 5\%$.

Recommendation
In future research, the following points should be considered.
1. Future research should add more variables such as auditor ethics and skepticism.
2. Future research is recommended to give different weights to questionnaire answers based on professional positions. Higher positions should have higher weight because they represent public accountants more.
3. Future research should use interviews to complete the information from the questionnaires.
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