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ABSTRACT

The foundation of this study is to examine the task performance fraud risk assessment (TPFRA) among forensic accountants and auditors in the Nigerian public sector. Most importantly, the study explored the role of fraud related problem representation (FRPR) as a mediator on the relationship between knowledge, skills and mindset (forensic accountant and auditor) and task performance fraud risk assessment. Importantly, this research employed the second generation statistical analysis tools of PLS-SEM and IBM SPSS. The ten out of fifteen hypotheses were tested through the use of PLS-SEM algorithm and bootstrap techniques on the hypothesized relationships while the remaining five hypotheses of differences among groups were tested using the Mann-Whitney U Test. The results provided verifiable support for the hypothesized relationships of the study. Specifically, knowledge, skills and mindset (forensic accountant and auditor), and fraud related problem representation are significant and positively related to task performance fraud risk assessment.

In addition, knowledge, skills and mindset (forensic accountant and auditor) are significantly and positively related to fraud related problem representation. Most gratifying is the significant positive influences of knowledge, skills and mindset and fraud related problem representation indicate that the variables are essential requirements in enhancing task performance fraud risk assessment. The research findings provided support for the differences between groups (forensic accountants and auditors) hypotheses in the area of fraud detection, prevention and response. Importantly, forensic accountants have higher levels of knowledge (KR), skills (SR), mindset (MR), fraud related problem representation (FRPR), and task performance fraud risk assessment (TPFRA) than auditors. Therefore, accountants and auditors in the Nigerian public sector should be encouraged to acquire forensic accounting knowledge, skills, mindset, fraud related problem representation (i.e. capability requirement) to enhance task performance fraud risk assessment (i.e. competences requirement) in the workplace.

Keywords: forensic accountants, auditors, fraud, capability, competence
ABSTRAK

Asas kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji penilaian risiko penipuan prestasi tugas (TPFRA) di kalangan akauntan forensik dan juruaudit dalam sektor awam Nigeria. Paling penting, kajian ini menerokai peranan perwakilan masalah berkaitan penipuan (FRPR) sebagai pengantara kepada hubungan antara pengetahuan, kemahiran dan pemikiran (akauntan forensik dan juruaudit) dan penilaian risiko penipuan prestasi tugas. Yang penting, kajian ini menggunakan generasi kedua alat analisis statistik PLS-SEM dan IBM SPSS. Sepuluh daripada lima belas hipotesis telah diuji melalui penggunaan algoritma PLS-SEM dan teknik Bootstrap pada hubungan hipotesis tersebut manakala baki lima hipotesis berkaitan perbezaan di kalangan kumpulan telah diuji menggunakan Mann-Whitney U Test. Keputusan tersebut menyokong hubungan hipotesis kajian. Secara khusus, pengetahuan, kemahiran dan pemikiran (akauntan forensik dan juruaudit), dan perwakilan masalah berkaitan penipuan adalah penting dan dapat dikaitkan secara positif dengan penilaian risiko penipuan prestasi tugas.

Di samping itu, pengetahuan, kemahiran dan pemikiran (akauntan forensik dan juruaudit), adalah penting dan dapat dikaitkan secara positif dengan perwakilan masalah berkaitan penipuan. Paling menggembirakan adalah pengaruh positif pengetahuan, kemahiran dan cara berfikir dan perwakilan masalah berkaitan penipuan yang berkaitan menunjukkan bahawa pembolehubah adalah penting dalam meningkatkan penilaian risiko penipuan prestasi tugas. Dapatkan kajian memberikan sokongan bagi perbezaan antara hipotesis kumpulan-kumpulan (akauntan forensik dan juruaudit) dalam bidang pengesanan penipuan, pencegahan dan tindak balas penipuan. Yang penting, akauntan forensik mempunyai tahap pengetahuan (KR), kemahiran (SR), pemikiran (MR), perwakilan masalah berkaitan penipuan (FRPR), dan penilaian risiko penipuan prestasi tugas (TPFRA) yang lebih tinggi daripada juruaudit. Oleh itu, akauntan dan juruaudit dalam sektor awam Nigeria harus digalakkan untuk memperoleh pengetahuan forensik perakaunan, kemahiran, cara berfikir, masalah perwakilan berkaitan penipuan (iaitu keupayaan keperluan) untuk meningkatkan penilaian risiko penipuan prestasi tugas (iaitu kompetensi keperluan) di tempat kerja.

Kata kunci: akauntan forensik, juruaudit, penipuan, keupayaan, kompetensi
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The accounting and auditing services are yet to address effectively, and enhance significantly, accountability and transparency challenges in the public governance of Nigeria. Because corrupt and fraudulent practices increases at an alarming rate while public utilities, infrastructure and facilities are fast deteriorating (Civil Liberty Organisation (CLO), 2012; This Day Newspaper, November 23 and 25, 2012; The Punch, November 26, 2012; Leadership, November 26, 2012; Campaign for Democracy (CD), 2011).

Similarly, there is public outcry from civil societies, opposition leaders and academic community condemning fraud and corruption at all levels of the public sector in Nigeria. Newspapers are not left out with scintillating headlines: “$31 billion stolen under President Jonathan of Nigeria” (Ogunseye, Okpi & Baiyewu, 2012); “KPMG Nigeria: Nigeria most fraudulent country in Africa” (KPMG, 2012); “Nigeria: Court remands two in Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) custody for alleged N14.6 million fraud” (Ugwu, 2012); “Nigeria: More boost for corruption” (Lamorde, 2012), “Nigeria: Ahmadu Ali’s son arraigned over N4.4 billion subsidy fraud” (Usani, 2012); and “Nigeria: Lamorde’s sermon on corruption” (Obia, 2012).

The Fiscal Responsibility Act (2007) and the Public Procurement Act (2007) introduced as panacea for public accountability and good governance in Nigeria with the objective of restoring and improving the effectiveness, economy and efficiency in
The contents of the thesis is for internal user only
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