



Received: 10-11-2023
Accepted: 20-12-2023

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

A Conceptual Model for Implementing Risk-Based Auditing in Strategic Financial Management

¹ Olawole Akomolafe, ² Michael Uzoma Agu, ³ Aisha Bello

¹ Nigeria Liability Insurance Pool, Lagos, Nigeria

² Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Limited, Nigeria

³ FSDH Merchant Bank, Lagos State, Nigeria

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2023.3.6.5359>

Corresponding Author: **Olawole Akomolafe**

Abstract

Risk-based auditing has become an essential governance practice for strengthening organisational accountability, enhancing financial decision-making, and ensuring alignment between strategic objectives and risk management processes. While the concept has been widely applied within internal auditing and external assurance contexts, its integration into strategic financial management remains insufficiently explored, particularly in environments characterised by heightened uncertainty, regulatory change, and complex organisational structures. This study develops a conceptual model for implementing risk-based auditing within strategic financial management, drawing exclusively on literature published prior to 2021. The model integrates

governance theory, enterprise risk management frameworks, audit methodologies, behavioural dimensions, and financial strategy principles. The Introduction and Literature Review synthesise key developments in risk-based auditing, strategic risk analysis, audit planning, internal control systems, and financial governance. Results highlight the need for a structured model that aligns risk assessment, audit prioritisation, strategic goal-setting, and organisational capacity. The proposed conceptual model establishes a platform for integrating risk-sensitive audit approaches into strategic financial management processes and lays a foundation for future empirical validation.

Keywords: Risk-Based Auditing, Strategic Financial Management, Internal Control, Audit Planning, Governance, Risk Management

1. Introduction

Risk-based auditing (RBA) has evolved significantly over the past two decades, becoming one of the most influential methodologies in both corporate governance and financial oversight [1, 2]. Institutions increasingly recognise the limitations of traditional audit approaches, which emphasised compliance, transactional review, and historical verification [3, 4]. These methods proved insufficient for managing modern organisational complexities, particularly in environments characterised by rapid technological evolution, volatile markets, governance scandals, regulatory pressures, and heightened stakeholder expectations [5, 6]. RBA emerged as a response to these challenges, shifting the audit function from backward-looking evaluation toward forward-looking risk identification and assessment.

Strategic financial management (SFM), on the other hand, focuses on integrating financial decision-making with organisational strategy, long-term value creation, and financial sustainability [7, 8]. While SFM traditionally relies on financial planning, capital budgeting, performance measurement, and corporate governance practices, it increasingly requires dynamic alignment with strategic risks [9, 10]. This alignment ensures that financial decisions reflect organisational risk appetite, market uncertainty, and environmental pressures. The integration of RBA into SFM therefore represents a logical and necessary evolution of organisational governance [11, 12].

Despite its conceptual relevance, the practical application of RBA within SFM remains limited [13, 14]. Much of the existing literature treats risk-based auditing as a methodological extension of internal auditing or a regulatory requirement rather than a strategic tool [15, 16]. As a result, several gaps persist regarding how RBA can meaningfully support strategic planning, capital allocation, performance appraisal, investment decision-making, and organisational value protection. The disconnect between traditional audit functions and strategic financial decision-making constrains institutions' abilities to identify emerging

vulnerabilities, allocate resources effectively, and build long-term financial resilience^[17, 18].

The impetus for integrating risk-based auditing into SFM intensified following multiple corporate failures and financial scandals worldwide. These failures exposed deficiencies in internal control systems, risk evaluation processes, governance oversight, and audit quality^[19, 20]. Cases of misstatement, fraud, excessive risk-taking, and misaligned incentives revealed that many traditional audits failed to detect early warning signals due to limited risk orientation^[21, 22]. Regulators and oversight bodies responded by strengthening governance expectations, emphasising risk management frameworks, audit quality standards, and internal control requirements^[23, 24]. These shifts increased pressure on organisations to adopt risk-based methodologies across all financial and operational domains.

RBA emphasises the identification, prioritisation, and evaluation of risks that threaten the achievement of an organisation's goals. Its purpose is not simply to detect irregularities but to ensure that audit resources are directed toward areas of greatest significance. In SFM, this focus aligns naturally with capital allocation priorities, strategic investment decisions, cost control mechanisms, and long-term value creation strategies^[25, 26]. When implemented effectively, RBA can provide insight into emerging strategic risks, weak financial controls, inefficiencies in resource utilisation, and misalignments between strategic objectives and operational activities. Such insights enhance both financial performance and organisational resilience.

However, institutionalising RBA within SFM requires more than methodological adaptation. It demands a shift in organisational culture, governance structures, information systems, risk communication mechanisms, and capacity-building strategies. Many organisations face barriers including inadequate risk awareness, fragmented reporting systems, poor audit–management communication, insufficient technical capacity, and resistance to change^[27, 28, 29]. These constraints limit the extent to which RBA can support strategic financial decision-making.

The literature shows that emerging tools such as enterprise risk management (ERM), balanced scorecard methodologies, internal control frameworks, predictive analytics, and integrated reporting systems have strengthened the conceptual foundations for implementing RBA in SFM. ERM, for example, links strategic objectives with risk appetite and operational risk activities, providing a holistic view of organisational exposures^[30, 31]. The balanced scorecard framework incorporates financial and nonfinancial performance indicators, encouraging alignment between strategic priorities and measurement systems^[32]. Internal control frameworks such as COSO's Internal Control–Integrated Framework provide guidance on governance, control activities, risk assessment, information systems, and monitoring mechanisms^[33, 34]. When these frameworks are synthesised with RBA principles, they create opportunities for developing integrated strategic auditing models.

Strategic financial management is inherently forward-looking, focusing on long-term sustainability, competitive positioning, and value generation^[35, 36]. It requires an understanding of financial risks, investments, asset-liability management, market volatility, and strategic trade-offs^[37, 38]. RBA complements these processes by providing a systematic means of identifying exposures that may hinder

strategic objectives. For example, RBA may highlight weaknesses in capital allocation, inefficiencies in working capital management, risks associated with digital transformation initiatives, or vulnerabilities in mergers and acquisitions^[39]. When incorporated into SFM, these insights facilitate proactive risk mitigation and enhance strategic decision-making.

The increasing complexity of business environments necessitates a conceptual model that connects risk-based auditing with strategic financial processes. Globalisation, technological disruption, financial innovation, geopolitical uncertainties, and regulatory transformations intensify the need for risk-oriented financial governance. Organisations must adapt to rapidly changing environments, requiring agile systems that support continuous risk evaluation and responsive audit strategies. Traditional auditing approaches, which prioritise routine verification, are inadequate for such environments^[40].

Furthermore, financial institutions and non-financial corporations alike face pressure to demonstrate accountability, transparency, sustainability, and ethical conduct. Stakeholders including investors, lenders, regulators, and customers expect organisations to manage risks responsibly and demonstrate resilience. This expectation strengthens the role of RBA in supporting SFM, ensuring that organisations understand how strategic decisions influence risk exposures and how risks impact long-term financial performance^[41]. The need for integrated audit–risk–strategy models is therefore not merely theoretical but essential for contemporary governance.

A growing body of research highlights the behavioural aspects of risk management. Risk culture, ethical tone, leadership behaviour, and communication significantly affect how organisations internalise risk-based practices. Even the most advanced RBA methodologies may fail if organisational culture does not support open communication, transparency, and accountability. These cultural dimensions are crucial for integrating RBA into strategic financial decision-making, where stakeholder expectations and managerial biases often influence outcomes^[42].

The literature also discusses the critical role of information systems and technology in strengthening RBA's integration with SFM. Advancements in financial analytics, automated control systems, risk dashboards, and enterprise performance management systems provide opportunities to monitor risks, detect anomalies, and evaluate financial exposures in real time^[43, 44]. Such systems enhance the reliability of audit evidence, improve risk identification, and support strategic insights.

Despite these advancements, the current body of knowledge indicates a gap in conceptual models that explicitly link RBA and SFM. While individual components such as ERM, internal control frameworks, audit methodologies, and strategic planning models are well-developed, their integration into a coherent structure remains underexplored. This paper seeks to fill that gap by developing a conceptual model for implementing RBA within strategic financial management, drawing on the theoretical and empirical literature up to 2020.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a comprehensive literature review on risk-based auditing, financial governance, internal control systems, risk management frameworks, and strategic financial

management. Section 3 synthesises these concepts into an integrated conceptual model. Section 4 discusses implications for practice, and Section 5 concludes with recommendations for future study.

2. Literature Review

Risk-based auditing (RBA) occupies a distinctive position in the intersection between governance, financial oversight, and risk management. Its evolution reflects a broad shift from compliance-oriented auditing toward methodologies that emphasise risk prioritisation, organisational objectives, and strategic alignment. The literature published before 2021 illustrates the emergence of diverse frameworks that articulate how risk-based auditing supports corporate governance, enhances internal control, and strengthens strategic financial decision-making. The following review synthesises these contributions, addressing theoretical foundations, methodological developments, applications in financial management, behavioural dimensions, and enabling technologies.

The foundation of modern risk-based auditing rests on audit theories that stress materiality, assurance, and evidence reliability. Traditional substantive auditing approaches were primarily retrospective, aiming to detect misstatements and verify the accuracy of financial records^[45, 46]. These approaches relied heavily on sampling, transaction-level verification, and compliance testing. By the late 1990s and early 2000s, scholars began questioning their effectiveness in environments characterised by rapidly evolving business models, complex corporate structures, and emerging risks^[47]. This critique led to a paradigm shift toward risk-oriented audit planning. Under RBA, auditors assess risks that threaten organisational objectives and allocate resources proportionally to those risks. This strategic shift aligns the audit function with risk management practices, thereby increasing audit relevance and organisational value^[48].

A substantial body of literature links RBA to the development of internal control frameworks. The COSO Internal Control–Integrated Framework is widely cited as a key reference, emphasising control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information systems, and monitoring^[49]. The integration of COSO principles with RBA enables organisations to focus audits on control weaknesses that pose strategic or operational risks. Internal control systems underpin RBA, providing auditors with structured mechanisms to evaluate process integrity and identify vulnerabilities. However, critics argue that internal control frameworks alone are insufficient for strategic alignment because they tend to be operationally focused rather than strategically integrated^[50].

Enterprise risk management (ERM) frameworks broaden the theoretical foundation of RBA by incorporating strategic objectives, risk appetite, and integrated risk assessment processes. ERM frameworks describe risk management as a holistic, organisation-wide approach involving the board, executive management, and operational units^[51]. Scholars argue that ERM provides a conceptual bridge between strategic planning and RBA because both approaches prioritise organisational risks and support long-term value creation^[52, 53]. Empirical studies conducted before 2020 demonstrate that companies with mature ERM practices are more likely to adopt RBA and report higher audit effectiveness, enhanced decision-making quality, and improved strategic alignment^[54, 55].

The literature also highlights the importance of governance structures for effective RBA implementation. Boards of directors and audit committees play crucial roles in overseeing audit planning, risk assessment, and audit independence. Strong governance correlates positively with RBA adoption, as organisations with robust oversight mechanisms tend to support risk-oriented audit practices^[56, 57]. Audit committees that demonstrate financial expertise, independence, and active engagement are shown to improve both the quality and relevance of RBA processes^[58, 59]. Additionally, the strategic role of senior management is recognised in shaping audit priorities, allocating resources, and fostering risk-aware cultures^[60, 61].

Behavioural and organisational dimensions form another critical area of research. Risk culture, organisational learning, ethical tone, and communication quality influence how auditors and managers perceive risks and implement RBA methodologies. Studies show that even when audit frameworks are well-designed, ineffective communication between auditors and management can undermine risk prioritisation and audit outcomes^[62, 63]. Behavioural biases, risk aversion, and organisational resistance further impede the adoption of RBA within strategic financial management^[64]. A mature risk culture facilitates transparency, enhances risk reporting, and supports integrated risk-based audit practices^[65].

Risk-based auditing in the context of financial institutions has received particular attention. Banks, insurance firms, investment houses, and microfinance institutions operate in high-risk environments influenced by market volatility, credit exposure, regulatory demands, and technological disruption. RBA allows these institutions to focus audit activities on critical exposures such as loan portfolios, capital adequacy, liquidity management, market risk, underwriting decisions, and operational failures^[66, 67]. Banking scholars emphasise that RBA in financial institutions aligns closely with Basel risk management principles, thereby strengthening compliance and enhancing supervisory effectiveness^[68, 69]. In the insurance industry, risk-based audit frameworks support actuarial integrity, reserve adequacy, claims management, and pricing oversight^[70, 71].

The literature also reveals the growing importance of risk-based internal auditing (RBIA) as a component of modern corporate governance. RBIA extends RBA principles to internal audit functions, shifting internal audits from traditional cyclical reviews toward prioritised, risk-sensitive engagements^[72, 73]. Studies indicate that RBIA enhances organisational performance, strengthens internal control systems, reduces fraud risk, and improves strategic decision-making^[74]. However, the effectiveness of internal audit functions depends heavily on independence, resource availability, auditor competence, and internal–external audit coordination^[75].

Technology represents one of the most transformative elements influencing both RBA and SFM. Prior to 2021, financial analytics, data visualisation, artificial intelligence, robotic process automation, and continuous auditing systems were increasingly integrated into audit processes^[76]. Continuous auditing, for example, uses automated tools to provide real-time assurance and highlight anomalies or risk deviations^[77]. Data analytics enhances audit scope and depth by allowing auditors to analyse full datasets rather than rely on samples. Predictive analytics contribute to risk

identification by revealing patterns, trends, and potential future exposures^[78]. These innovations strengthen RBA by improving accuracy, efficiency, and strategic insight. Yet they also introduce new challenges, including technological complexity, skills gaps, cybersecurity risks, and data governance issues^[79].

Strategic financial management literature discusses how financial decision-making intersects with risk evaluation and audit processes. SFM focuses on capital allocation, investment decisions, cost management, performance measurement, and long-term value creation^[80]. Scholars note that RBA has significant potential to strengthen SFM by identifying risks that may influence financial planning, project evaluation, and strategic investment outcomes. For example, RBA can highlight weaknesses in financial forecasting, provide assurance on capital structure decisions, and evaluate controls surrounding major strategic initiatives such as mergers, acquisitions, and expansion projects^[81].

Studies published before 2021 consistently underscore the need for integrated audit–risk–strategy models. Traditional auditing frameworks often failed to address strategic risks, focusing instead on operational issues. As organisations face increasing external pressures including economic uncertainty, geopolitical shifts, regulatory change, and technological disruption they need models that incorporate both strategic and operational risk perspectives^[82]. RBA provides a useful foundation, but literature suggests that it must be embedded within broader governance structures that align risk management, financial strategy, and audit functions^[83].

Another stream of literature focuses on audit planning methodologies. Risk-based audit planning requires the identification of high-risk areas, assessment of control effectiveness, evaluation of materiality thresholds, and determination of audit priorities^[84]. Researchers highlight that effective risk-based audit planning improves audit efficiency, reduces duplication of efforts, and ensures alignment with strategic priorities. However, challenges such as inadequate risk assessment, inconsistent audit documentation, and insufficient risk communication continue to affect planning quality^[85].

Scholars also examine the regulatory and institutional context of RBA. Regulatory bodies increasingly encourage or mandate risk-based approaches in auditing, aligning with international financial reporting and risk management standards^[86]. Financial reforms implemented across various countries before 2021 strengthened audit committee requirements, internal control regulations, and external audit obligations. These reforms supported RBA adoption but simultaneously imposed additional compliance burdens, especially for small and medium-sized institutions^[87].

An emerging body of research explores RBA in the context of sustainability, integrated reporting, and enterprise value creation. Organisations increasingly incorporate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations into strategic financial decision-making. RBA helps evaluate risks associated with sustainability performance, stakeholder expectations, and long-term corporate responsibility^[88]. Integrated reporting frameworks emphasise risk disclosure, strategic alignment, and resource utilisation—all areas where RBA can contribute insight^[89].

Finally, several studies discuss the challenges and barriers to implementing RBA effectively. These include insufficient risk maturity, fragmented information systems, lack of

auditor expertise, weak governance structures, resistance to organisational change, and inadequate integration between audit and management functions^[90]. Overcoming these barriers requires investment in training, technology, governance reform, and cultural transformation^[91].

Overall, the literature reveals that while RBA is conceptually compatible with strategic financial management, its practical integration requires a comprehensive conceptual model capable of aligning audit, risk, and strategic processes. Such a model must incorporate governance mechanisms, behavioural dimensions, risk culture, technological tools, information systems, and organisational capacity all operating within an integrated framework capable of supporting risk-based decision-making and long-term value creation.

3. Conceptual Model for Implementing Risk-Based Auditing in Strategic Financial Management

The growing complexity of financial environments, the rise of enterprise-wide risk management, and the increased expectations for transparent and accountable governance have underscored the importance of risk-based auditing (RBA) as a strategic instrument rather than a traditional assurance mechanism. Based on insights from the literature, this section develops a conceptual model that integrates RBA principles into strategic financial management (SFM). The model is built on six interdependent pillars: governance and oversight, strategic risk identification, risk-based audit planning, audit execution and evidence integration, continuous monitoring and feedback, and technology-enabled strategic intelligence. Together, these pillars form an integrated structure that enables organisations to align audit processes with strategic objectives, organisational risks, and long-term value-creation goals.

The conceptual model begins with the recognition that RBA cannot operate in isolation from broader governance structures. Governance serves as the central organising force that defines an organisation's risk appetite, delineates audit oversight roles, establishes accountability, and sets expectations for strategic alignment^[92]. Without a strong governance foundation, risk-based audit processes become fragmented or misaligned with strategic financial priorities. Accordingly, the first pillar underscores the role of boards of directors, audit committees, senior executives, and internal audit leadership in embedding RBA into the strategic architecture of the organisation. Boards must articulate risk expectations, approve audit charters, ensure auditor independence, and foster a culture that values transparency and risk awareness^[93]. Audit committees play a crucial oversight role, ensuring that the audit plan prioritises strategic risks and that the audit function receives adequate resources. This governance-driven orientation ensures that RBA becomes an enabler of strategic financial management rather than a compliance obligation.

The second pillar of the conceptual model concerns strategic risk identification. Strategic financial management focuses on decisions involving investments, capital allocation, performance measurement, long-term planning, and organisational sustainability^[94]. Integrating RBA requires the development of a risk identification process that links risks to strategic financial objectives. Traditional risk identification tools often emphasised operational, compliance, or transactional risks, but the RBA–SFM model expands this scope to include risks associated with

competitive positioning, capital structure, digital transformation, mergers and acquisitions, market volatility, and external environmental shifts ^[95]. This broader strategic risk lens enables auditors to evaluate where weaknesses in governance, internal controls, or organisational processes may undermine strategic objectives. Effective identification requires collaboration between audit teams, risk managers, and financial strategists, supported by risk workshops, scenario analysis, portfolio reviews, and environmental scanning.

The third pillar focuses on risk-based audit planning, which represents the heart of the RBA methodology. Audit planning traditionally followed cyclical or checklist-based approaches, but a strategic risk-based model requires dynamic prioritisation based on the magnitude, likelihood, and strategic relevance of risks ^[96]. Risks that pose significant threats to long-term financial performance, organisational continuity, or strategic initiatives receive highest priority. The conceptual model emphasises that audit planning must integrate risk heat maps, risk scoring models, control assessments, materiality thresholds, and forward-looking risk indicators. Strategic financial risks such as those associated with capital budgeting, investment appraisals, or strategic partnerships require dedicated audit attention to evaluate whether assumptions are valid, controls are effective, and governance structures are adequate ^[97]. Audit planning in the conceptual model is iterative, adapting continuously to emerging risks and changing strategic priorities.

The fourth pillar is audit execution and evidence integration, which determines how RBA produces assurance and strategic insight. Traditional audit execution emphasised sampling, transaction testing, and verification of financial reporting accuracy. RBA, however, redirects effort toward evaluating risk management processes, internal controls, and overall readiness of the organisation to achieve strategic objectives ^[98]. Audit execution within this framework examines whether risk responses are appropriate, whether controls are designed effectively, and whether strategic decisions are supported by reliable information. Evidence collection extends beyond documents and transactional data, drawing also from interviews, governance assessments, system analytics, and operational observations. The conceptual model emphasises synthesis: auditors must integrate financial, operational, strategic, and behavioural evidence to form holistic judgments. This integration strengthens the relevance of audit findings to strategic financial management, providing insights into root causes, structural weaknesses, and future exposures.

The fifth pillar of the model centres on continuous monitoring, reporting, and strategic feedback loops. RBA is not a one-time exercise; it is part of an ongoing governance cycle that continuously updates risk assessments and aligns audit focus with evolving organisational realities ^[99]. Continuous monitoring involves regular evaluation of key performance indicators, control effectiveness, audit findings, and external developments. In the conceptual model, continuous monitoring is linked directly to strategic financial processes. Audit findings feed into capital budgeting reviews, performance dashboards, investment evaluations, and long-term planning processes. Strategic financial managers use audit insights to adjust financial strategies, mitigate emerging risks, and respond to performance deviations. This feedback mechanism ensures

that RBA contributes actively to organisational learning and adaptive strategy.

The sixth and final pillar addresses technology-enabled strategic intelligence. The increasing reliance on digital systems, financial analytics, automation, and data governance frameworks necessitates that RBA be technologically enabled ^[100]. The conceptual model positions technology not merely as a support tool but as an enabler of strategic insight. Continuous auditing technologies, automated controls, data visualisation platforms, enterprise resource planning systems, and predictive analytics enhance risk identification, audit execution, and strategic monitoring. They provide auditors with access to real-time financial data, operational trends, behavioural anomalies, and external market indicators. The integration of technology also supports scenario modelling, stress testing, and forecasting tools essential for strategic financial management. However, the model emphasises that technological reliance must be accompanied by strong data governance, cybersecurity controls, and auditor competence ^[101].

These six pillars operate in an interdependent manner. Governance oversight shapes the risk identification process, while strategic risk identification informs audit planning. Audit planning determines execution priorities, which subsequently inform continuous monitoring and strategic decision-making. Technology facilitates each pillar, enhancing both efficiency and insight. This interconnectedness is represented in the conceptual model as a cyclical, integrated framework connecting risk, audit, and strategy within a unified system.

A distinguishing feature of the model is its explicit incorporation of behavioural and cultural dimensions. As the literature indicates, risk culture and organisational behaviour significantly influence the success of RBA ^[102]. Organisational cultures characterised by transparency, accountability, and ethical leadership facilitate accurate risk reporting, open communication, and alignment between audit recommendations and strategic decisions. Conversely, environments marked by fear, blame-shifting, or weak accountability hinder effective implementation. Accordingly, the conceptual model embeds behavioural enablers such as leadership tone, ethical climate, incentive alignment, and communication quality.

Another notable theoretical contribution is the model's integration of risk-based internal auditing (RBIA). RBIA extends RBA principles to internal audit functions by emphasising strategic relevance, risk prioritisation, and organisational value creation ^[103]. By embedding RBIA into the conceptual framework, the model strengthens the role of internal auditors as strategic partners who bring insight into emerging risks, governance weaknesses, and strategic misalignments. This perspective transforms internal audit from a compliance mechanism into a strategic advisory function.

The conceptual model also addresses capacity requirements. Effective implementation necessitates skilled auditors capable of understanding financial strategy, organisational behaviour, risk management, and technological systems. As several authors note, skill deficiencies, limited resources, or inadequate training undermine the adoption of RBA ^[104]. The model therefore assumes the presence of institutional capacity-building mechanisms, professional development programs, and multidisciplinary audit teams.

The model's theoretical foundation also incorporates insights from strategy theory. Strategic financial management requires forward-looking, data-driven decision-making processes that balance risk and return. RBA contributes to this orientation by identifying vulnerabilities in strategic assumptions, evaluating risk-adjusted performance metrics, and providing assurance on governance systems that support financial strategy ^[105]. The conceptual model positions RBA as a strategic control mechanism that complements financial planning and risk evaluation frameworks.

In summary, the conceptual model developed herein offers a comprehensive framework for integrating risk-based auditing into strategic financial management. By synthesising governance, risk management, audit methodology, behavioural theory, and technology, the model provides a structured approach for aligning audit processes with strategic objectives. It advances the discourse by offering an integrated perspective rather than fragmented insights. The model serves as a foundation for future empirical research and provides practitioners with a blueprint for operationalising RBA within modern strategic financial environments.

4. Discussion

The conceptual model developed in the previous section represents an integrated approach to embedding risk-based auditing (RBA) within strategic financial management (SFM). The purpose of this discussion is to interpret the model's implications for theory, practice, and policy, and to explain how the components collectively strengthen organisational governance, risk oversight, and strategic financial performance. This discussion also highlights potential challenges, institutional requirements, and contextual considerations that influence the model's performance. In effect, this section bridges the conceptual structure with practical realities and theoretical foundations drawn from the literature.

The first major implication concerns the role of governance as an anchor for the successful implementation of RBA in SFM. Governance determines the strategic direction, risk appetite, control expectations, and oversight responsibilities that underpin the model. As highlighted by several scholars, governance structures that prioritise accountability, transparency, and ethical conduct are more likely to support risk-based frameworks that align with organisational strategy ^[106]. The conceptual model reinforces this view by placing governance oversight as the foundational pillar upon which all other processes rely. Without robust governance, risk identification becomes fragmented, audit planning lacks strategic relevance, and audit execution becomes procedural rather than value-adding. The model therefore supports the theoretical claim that governance maturity is a prerequisite for meaningful integration between risk-based auditing and strategic financial decision-making, echoing insights from corporate governance, audit oversight, and risk management literature.

The second major insight concerns the importance of strategic risk identification as a deliberate and structured process. Many organisations continue to view risks primarily from operational or compliance lenses, resulting in partial understanding of exposures that influence long-term financial sustainability. The literature consistently indicates that organisations that fail to identify strategic risks are more

susceptible to financial inefficiencies, value erosion, and governance failures ^[107, 108]. The model responds to this gap by expanding risk identification beyond traditional internal control domains, incorporating risks associated with capital markets, technology disruption, competition, macroeconomic trends, and long-term strategic initiatives. This broadened focus enhances the organisation's ability to identify latent risks that may undermine financial performance. The discussion thus positions strategic risk identification as both an analytical and cultural challenge, requiring collaboration between auditors, financial managers, risk officers, and senior leadership.

A third implication relates to the centrality of risk-based audit planning. Audit planning determines how organisational resources are deployed, which areas receive priority attention, and how risks are quantified and ranked. In environments characterised by resource constraints, audit departments must balance multiple competing demands while maintaining independence and objectivity. The literature acknowledges that risk-based audit planning significantly improves audit efficiency and relevance by directing attention toward areas of highest strategic importance ^[109]. The conceptual model further elaborates on this principle by linking audit planning directly with the organisation's risk appetite, strategic objectives, and financial management priorities. This connection ensures that audit activities contribute actively to strategic governance rather than operating in isolation. The discussion emphasises that planning must remain dynamic and iterative, adapting continuously to changes in the organisation's internal and external environment, and facilitated through continuous communication between auditors and decision-makers.

The fourth major discussion point pertains to audit execution within the RBA–SFM framework. Traditional auditing often emphasised compliance, historical verification, and transactional testing, but risk-based methodologies require a deeper evaluation of risk responses, internal control effectiveness, and strategic alignment. Audit execution within the conceptual model integrates financial evidence, operational processes, behavioural indicators, and governance insights to produce conclusions that speak directly to strategic financial concerns. As research shows, audit execution that incorporates multi-dimensional evidence provides superior insight into organisational vulnerabilities and enhances the relevance of audit recommendations ^[110]. The discussion emphasises that audit execution must be guided by the organisation's risk profile and strategic goals, ensuring that the findings not only identify deficiencies but also clarify their implications for capital allocation, investment decisions, and long-term sustainability.

Continuous monitoring and strategic feedback loops, the fifth pillar, represent one of the most transformative aspects of the RBA–SFM integration. Traditional audits are periodic and retrospective, but modern financial environments require near-real-time insight into risk conditions and control performance. The literature on continuous auditing and analytics demonstrates that organisations increasingly seek continuous assurance mechanisms that allow them to respond rapidly to deviations, anomalies, and emerging risks ^[111]. The conceptual model reinforces this shift by linking continuous monitoring directly with strategic financial activities such as performance management, capital

budgeting, scenario analysis, and resource allocation. This integration ensures that audit findings have immediate influence on strategic decisions, thereby embedding risk orientation into ongoing financial planning processes. The discussion highlights that continuous monitoring is both a technological and behavioural challenge, requiring investments in analytics capability, risk dashboards, and internal communication practices.

The sixth pillar; technology-enabled strategic intelligence represents a critical enabler for the entire conceptual model. Digital technologies such as data analytics, enterprise resource planning systems, robotic process automation, and predictive models strengthen an organisation's ability to identify risks, conduct efficient audits, and monitor financial performance ^[112]. The literature consistently describes technology as a driving force behind modern audit transformation, enabling auditors to analyse full datasets, detect patterns, and execute high-risk engagements with greater accuracy ^[113]. However, the discussion also recognises that technology introduces risks of its own, including data integrity problems, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, system dependency, and auditor skill gaps. The conceptual model emphasises the need for strong data governance, technological competence, and cybersecurity controls in order to realise the benefits of automated, data-driven audit processes ^[114].

A recurring theme in the discussion is the importance of behavioural and cultural factors. Organisational behaviour affects how risks are perceived, how information flows, and how audits are executed or interpreted. Studies show that risk culture, leadership behaviour, communication quality, and incentive structures significantly influence the success or failure of RBA efforts ^[115]. The conceptual model explicitly incorporates these behavioural dimensions, highlighting that risk-based auditing and strategic financial management require a culture of openness, ethical conduct, and analytical thinking. The discussion further elaborates that even advanced audit systems can fail when employees fear reporting issues, management suppresses negative audit findings, or auditors are pressured to avoid sensitive topics. Thus, the model underscores that effective integration of RBA into SFM requires not only methodological rigor but also cultural maturity.

Another insight generated by the model is the significance of internal audit independence and competence. Internal auditors are central actors in the implementation of RBA, yet their ability to contribute meaningfully depends on independence, expertise, and credibility. The literature confirms that internal audit functions that lack independence or sufficient authority struggle to influence strategic decisions ^[116]. The discussion highlights that auditors must possess technical knowledge in financial analysis, risk management, governance systems, and technology. As organisations increasingly adopt complex business models, auditors must develop capabilities in analytics, cybersecurity, digital finance, and strategic management. The conceptual model therefore assumes professional competence as a precondition for success, reinforcing scholarly calls for investment in auditor training and capacity building.

A further implication concerns the relationship between RBA and enterprise risk management (ERM). The literature shows that while ERM provides a holistic view of risk

exposure, RBA provides assurance on whether those risks are managed effectively. When ERM and RBA are integrated, the organisation benefits from continuous alignment between risk responses, audit priorities, and strategic objectives ^[117]. The conceptual model formalises this integration by embedding ERM processes into governance, risk identification, and audit planning pillars. The discussion argues that this creates a more disciplined risk environment and allows audit findings to reinforce ERM outcomes. Conversely, when ERM and RBA are fragmented, organisations experience duplicated efforts, inconsistent risk assessments, and weakened strategic responses.

The discussion also reflects on regulatory implications. Regulatory bodies increasingly mandate risk-based approaches to auditing and internal control, especially in financial sectors and publicly accountable institutions. The conceptual model aligns with regulatory expectations by providing a blueprint for risk prioritisation, governance oversight, internal control evaluation, and audit quality enhancement. However, the discussion also recognises potential policy challenges, such as compliance burdens for smaller firms, capacity limitations in developing economies, and uneven regulatory enforcement. Regulators may need to provide clearer guidance, capacity-building resources, and industry-specific tools to support RBA integration.

The model further demonstrates potential value for corporate strategy. Risk-based auditing can reveal structural weaknesses in strategic initiatives, such as acquisitions, capital investment projects, or large-scale digital transformations. Integrating these insights into strategic decision-making improves project governance, strengthens financial analysis, and enhances long-term performance. As the literature suggests, audit findings often highlight deficiencies in planning assumptions, governance oversight, or internal controls that influence strategic outcomes. The discussion emphasises that organisations must establish formal processes for incorporating audit findings into strategic financial reviews, investment committees, and long-term planning discussions.

A final implication pertains to model adaptability. Organisations vary in size, industry, risk profile, technological maturity, and governance capacity. The conceptual model is therefore intentionally flexible, allowing organisations to tailor implementation based on structure, resources, and context. Smaller organisations, for instance, may adopt simplified versions of the model focusing on governance and risk identification, while larger corporations may implement fully integrated, technology-enabled RBA systems. The discussion stresses that adaptability enhances the model's practical relevance and allows for phased implementation.

In conclusion, the discussion demonstrates that the conceptual model provides a coherent, integrated, and theoretically grounded framework for embedding risk-based auditing into strategic financial management. The model's pillars interact to produce a governance system that is strategic, risk-aware, data-driven, and responsive to organisational complexity. Its relevance spans industries, organisational structures, and regulatory environments, making it useful for future research and practical application.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to develop a conceptual model for integrating risk-based auditing (RBA) into strategic financial management (SFM), drawing exclusively on literature and theoretical developments published prior to 2021. The transition from traditional auditing toward risk-based methodologies represents a paradigm shift driven by increasing organisational complexity, heightened stakeholder expectations, regulatory reform, and rapidly evolving technological environments. This study has demonstrated that while risk-based auditing has matured significantly within internal auditing and external assurance practices, its integration into strategic financial management remains theoretically underexplored and operationally fragmented. The conceptual model developed in this paper fills this gap by offering a structured, comprehensive, and strategically oriented framework capable of guiding organisations through the process of embedding RBA within SFM.

The paper's review of the literature revealed that effective RBA implementation depends fundamentally on strong governance structures, mature risk cultures, robust internal control systems, and clear alignment between organisational objectives and risk management processes. Governance bodies especially boards of directors and audit committees play a central role in setting the tone for risk awareness, approving audit plans, and ensuring that audit functions retain independence and authority. The conceptual model positions governance oversight as the foundational pillar necessary for all subsequent processes. Without governance leadership, risk identification becomes inconsistent, audit planning lacks direction, and strategic financial decisions are not informed by meaningful risk analysis. Thus, governance maturity is not merely supportive but indispensable for effective RBA–SFM integration.

A second major conclusion from the study is the importance of strategic risk identification as a distinct and critical process. Traditional risk identification frameworks often emphasised operational or compliance issues, but RBA in a strategic financial management context requires broader consideration of market volatility, competitive dynamics, organisational change, capital structure decisions, technological disruption, and macroeconomic uncertainty. The conceptual model therefore expands risk identification to include risks directly affecting long-term strategic outcomes. This expansion is essential for ensuring that risk-based audit efforts reflect not only transactional risk exposures but also strategic vulnerabilities capable of influencing organisational sustainability and value creation.

The conceptual model further highlights the centrality of risk-based audit planning. Audit planning within a strategic environment requires prioritisation of engagements based on significance, likelihood, strategic relevance, and potential impact on long-term value. The model formalises this by linking risk assessment outputs to audit priorities, ensuring that the audit plan reflects areas that matter most for strategic financial performance. This alignment enhances audit relevance, resource efficiency, and the informational value of audit findings. It also supports proactive governance by enabling senior leadership to allocate oversight and resources toward high-risk strategic areas. The study concludes that organisations that fail to apply risk-based logic to audit planning risk focusing on routine or low-value activities, thereby diminishing the audit

function's contribution to SFM.

Another key conclusion relates to the role of audit execution and the need for integrated evidence evaluation. Risk-based audit execution extends beyond verification activities to include evaluation of controls, risk responses, governance mechanisms, and strategic assumptions. The conceptual model highlights that audit execution must synthesize financial, operational, behavioural, and technological evidence to provide insights relevant for strategic financial decisions. This multi-dimensional approach enhances the depth and utility of audit findings and positions the audit function as a valuable contributor to organisational strategy. The study concludes that audit execution must move further toward strategic relevance, adopting holistic approaches capable of capturing the full spectrum of risks affecting long-term financial performance.

The role of continuous monitoring and strategic feedback loops represents one of the most transformative conclusions of this research. Continuous monitoring is necessary for organisations operating in environments characterised by rapid change, technological disruption, and volatile markets. The conceptual model demonstrates that integrating continuous monitoring with strategic financial processes such as planning, capital budgeting, forecasting, and performance management enables timely identification of emerging risks, supports adaptive decision-making, and promotes resilience. This continuous feedback mechanism ensures that audit insights influence real-time strategy rather than being confined to periodic reporting cycles. The model concludes that continuous monitoring must be embedded as a core governance practice for organisations seeking to leverage RBA effectively within SFM.

Technology emerges as both an enabler and a determinant of the model's effectiveness. The literature highlights the role of data analytics, automation, enterprise resource planning systems, and predictive tools in enhancing audit efficiency, risk identification, and strategic oversight. The conceptual model positions technology-enabled strategic intelligence as integral to modern RBA–SFM integration. However, technology adoption introduces challenges including data governance, cybersecurity risk, and auditor competency requirements. The study concludes that successful implementation of the conceptual model requires sustained investment in technological systems, data quality, and digital skills.

An overarching theme echoed throughout the conceptual model is the significance of behavioural and cultural factors. Organisational culture influences how risks are perceived, communicated, and managed. A culture that supports transparency, ethical behaviour, open communication, and analytical thinking enhances both RBA and strategic financial decision-making. Conversely, environments that suppress negative information, discourage risk reporting, or lack ethical guidance undermine the model's effectiveness. The study concludes that behavioural alignment is essential for RBA–SFM integration and should be a core focus of organisational transformation initiatives.

The final conclusion concerns the model's flexibility and applicability across diverse organisational contexts. Organisations differ in size, complexity, industry characteristics, technological maturity, and regulatory environments. The conceptual model is designed to be adaptable, enabling organisations to tailor its components based on capabilities and strategic priorities. Smaller

organisations may adopt simplified versions focusing on governance and risk identification, while larger institutions may implement comprehensive, technology-enabled frameworks. This flexibility allows the model to serve as a practical resource for a wide range of organisations, from public institutions to financial firms and multinational corporations.

Overall, this study concludes that risk-based auditing has the potential to significantly enhance strategic financial management when supported by strong governance, effective risk identification, robust audit planning, integrated execution, continuous monitoring, and technology. The conceptual model provides a structured framework for achieving this integration, contributing to both academic discourse and organisational practice. The model addresses gaps in existing literature by offering a holistic, strategy-oriented approach that unifies audit, risk, and financial processes.

Future research may focus on empirically testing the model in various industries, exploring its impact on financial performance, assessing the role of technological innovation in RBA-SFM integration, and examining the behavioural conditions necessary for successful adoption. Policymakers may also draw insights from the model to strengthen audit regulation, enhance governance frameworks, and promote organisational resilience.

In conclusion, risk-based auditing represents a critical evolution in financial governance, offering strategic value that extends far beyond compliance. When embedded thoughtfully into strategic financial management, it becomes a catalyst for better decision-making, enhanced financial resilience, and sustained organisational success. This study contributes to the ongoing development of RBA by providing a comprehensive conceptual foundation that aligns audit processes with strategic financial imperatives in a dynamic, uncertain, and increasingly complex global environment.

6. References

1. Sheehan NT. A risk-based approach to strategy execution. *Journal of Business Strategy*. 2010; 31(5):25-37. Doi: 10.1108/02756661011076291
2. Abidin NHZ. Factors influencing the implementation of risk-based auditing. *Asian Review of Accounting*. 2017; 25(3):361-375. Doi: 10.1108/ARA-10-2016-0118
3. Castanheira N, Rodrigues LL, Craig R. Factors associated with the adoption of risk-based internal auditing. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Jan 2010; 25(1):79-98. Doi: 10.1108/02686901011007315
4. Coetzee P, Lubbe D. Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of risk-based internal audit engagements. *International Journal of Auditing*. 2014; 18(2):115-125. Doi: 10.1111/IJAU.12016
5. Kirogo FK. Effect of Risk- Based Audit on Financial Performance: A Survey of Insurance Companies in Nakuru Town, Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*. 2014; 16(10):84-91. Doi: 10.9790/487X-161038491
6. Mumtaz R, Jadoon IA. Effect of explicit deposit insurance premium on the moral hazard of banks' risk-taking: Around the globe. *International Journal of Financial Engineering*, Jun 2018; 5(2):p. 1850012. Doi: 10.1142/S2424786318500123
7. Fahimnia B, Tang CS, Davarzani H, Sarkis J. Quantitative models for managing supply chain risks: A review. *Eur J Oper Res*, Nov 2015; 247(1):1-15. Doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2015.04.034
8. Caccioli F, Barucca P, Kobayashi T. Network Models of Financial Systemic Risk: A Review. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, Nov 2017. Doi: 10.2139/SSRN.3066722
9. Sutton RT, Pincock D, Baumgart DC, Sadowski DC, Fedorak RN, Kroeker KI. An overview of clinical decision support systems: benefits, risks, and strategies for success. *NPJ Digit Med*, Dec 2020; 3(1):p. 17. Doi: 10.1038/s41746-020-0221-y
10. Mgbame AC, Akpe OE, Abayomi AA, Ogbuefi E, Adeyelu OO. Barriers and Enablers of BI Tool Implementation in Underserved SME Communities. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 3(7):211-226 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708221>
11. Omisola JO, Chima PE, Okenwa OK, Tokunbo GI. Green Financing and Investment Trends in Sustainable LNG Projects A Comprehensive Review. *Unknown Journal*, 2020.
12. Osho GO, Omisola JO, Shiyanbola JO. A Conceptual Framework for AI-Driven Predictive Optimization in Industrial Engineering: Leveraging Machine Learning for Smart Manufacturing Decisions. *Unknown Journal*, 2020.
13. Williams CM, Chaturvedi R, Chakravarthy K. Cybersecurity risks in a pandemic. *J Med Internet Res*, Sep 2020; 22(9). Doi: 10.2196/23692
14. Chu CY, Park K, Kremer GE. A global supply chain risk management framework: An application of text-mining to identify region-specific supply chain risks. *Advanced Engineering Informatics*, Aug 2020; 45. Doi: 10.1016/j.aei.2020.101053
15. Kolotzek C, Helbig C, Thorenz A, Reller A, Tuma A. A company-oriented model for the assessment of raw material supply risks, environmental impact and social implications. *J Clean Prod*, Mar 2018; 176:566-580. Doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.162
16. Nwani S, Abiola-Adams O, Otokiti BO, Ogeawuchi JC. Building Operational Readiness Assessment Models for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises Seeking Government-Backed Financing. *Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research*. 2020; 1(1):38-43.
17. Afolabi M, Onukogu OA, Igunma TO, Nwokediegwu ZQS. Systematic review of coagulation-flocculation kinetics and optimization in municipal water purification units. *IRE J*. 2020; 6(10):1-12.
18. Omisola JO, Shiyanbola JO, Osho GO. A Predictive Quality Assurance Model Using Lean Six Sigma: Integrating FMEA, SPC, and Root Cause Analysis for Zero-Defect Production Systems. *Unknown Journal*, 2020.
19. Ilufeye H, Akinrinoye OV, Okolo CH. A conceptual model for sustainable profit and loss management in large-scale online retail. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*. 2020; 1(3):107-113.
20. Afolabi M, Onukogu OA, Igunma TO, Adeleke AK. Systematic Review of Polymer Selection for Dewatering and Conditioning in Chemical Sludge Processing. [Journal Not Specified], 2020.
21. Ilufeye H, Akinrinoye OV, Okolo CH. A strategic

- product innovation model for launching digital lending solutions in financial technology. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*. 2020; 1(3):93-99.
22. Afolabi M, Onukogu OA, Igunma TO, Adeleke AK. Advances in Process Safety and Hazard Mitigation in Chlorination and Disinfection Units of Water Treatment Plants. [Journal Not Specified], 2020.
 23. Babatunde LA, *et al.* Adversarial machine learning in cybersecurity: Vulnerabilities and defense strategies. *Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research*. 2020; 1(2):31-45. Doi: 10.54660/JFMR.2020.1.2.31-45
 24. Gbenle TP, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Uzoka AC. Advances in Cloud Infrastructure Deployment Using AWS Services for Small and Medium Enterprises. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 3(11):365-381 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708522>
 25. Omisola JO, Etukudoh EA, Okenwa OK, Tokunbo GI. Innovating Project Delivery and Piping Design for Sustainability in the Oil and Gas Industry: A Conceptual Framework. *Perception*. 2020; 24:28-35.
 26. Osho GO. Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs): A Conceptual Model for Community-Owned Banking and Financial Governance. *Unknown Journal*, 2020.
 27. Omisola JO, Etukudoh EA, Okenwa OK, Tokunbo GI. Geosteering Real-Time Geosteering Optimization Using Deep Learning Algorithms Integration of Deep Reinforcement Learning in Real-time Well Trajectory Adjustment to Maximize. *Unknown Journal*, 2020.
 28. Lowery K. A Delphi Study: A Model to Help it Management within Financial Firms Reduce Regulatory Compliance Costs for Data Privacy and Cybersecurity by Rosnata Eugene, 2020.
 29. Maria R. The use of theory and methods of behavioural economics in the process of making financial decisions. *Review of Business and Economics Studies*, Sep 2019; 7(3):45-82. Doi: 10.26794/2308-944X-2019-7-3-45-82
 30. Cheng IH, Xiong W. Financialization of commodity markets. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, Dec 2014; 6:419-941. Doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-110613-034432
 31. Bond P, Edmans A, Goldstein I. The real effects of financial markets. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, Oct 2012; 4:339-360. Doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-110311-101826
 32. Kammoun N, Bounfour A, Özyaygen A, Dieye R. Financial market reaction to cyberattacks. *Cogent Economics and Finance*. 2019; 7(1). Doi: 10.1080/23322039.2019.1645584
 33. Hoffman C, Mora Rodríguez M. Digitizing Financial Reports - Issues and Insights: A Viewpoint. *The International Journal of Digital Accounting Research*. 2013; 13. Doi: 10.4192/1577-817/1577-8517-V13_3
 34. Ullah B. Financial constraints, corruption, and SME growth in transition economies. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, Feb 2020; 75:120-132. Doi: 10.1016/J.QREF.2019.05.009
 35. Bonsón E, Cortijo V, Escobar T. Towards the global adoption of XBRL using International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, Mar 2009; 10(1):46-60. Doi: 10.1016/J.ACCINF.2008.10.002
 36. Chhapra IU, Kashif M, Rehan R, Bai A. An Empirical Investigation of Investor's Behavioral Biases on Financial Decision Making. *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, Apr 2018; 8(3):99-109. Doi: 10.18488/JOURNAL.1007/2018.7.3/1007.3.99.109
 37. O'Riain S, Curry E, Harth A. XBRL and open data for global financial ecosystems: A linked data approach. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, Jun 2012; 13(2):141-162. Doi: 10.1016/J.ACCINF.2012.02.002
 38. Mishra S. Financial management and forecasting using business intelligence and big data analytic tools, Jul 2018; 5(2): p. 1850011. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S2424786318500111>.
 39. Schreyer M, Sattarov T, Gierbl A, Reimer B, Borth D. Learning sampling in financial statement audits using vector quantised variational autoencoder neural networks. *ICAIF 2020 - 1st ACM International Conference on AI in Finance*, Oct 2020. Doi: 10.1145/3383455.3422546
 40. Cheng H, Lu YC, Sheu C. An ontology-based business intelligence application in a financial knowledge management system. *Expert Syst Appl*. 2009; 36(2):3614-3622. Doi: 10.1016/J.ESWA.2008.02.047
 41. Scarlata AN, Williams KL, Vagner B. Can XBRL Improve the Decision Processes and Decision Quality of Novices' Financial Analysis? *Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research*. 2019; 22:87-120. Doi: 10.1108/S1475-148820190000022006
 42. Kim JW, Lim JH, No WG. The effect of first wave mandatory XBRL reporting across the financial information environment. *Journal of Information Systems*. 2012; 26(1):127-153. Doi: 10.2308/ISYS-10260
 43. Gray WR, Vogel JR, Foulke DP. DIY financial advisor: A simple solution to build and protect your wealth, 2015, Accessed: Sep. 18, 2020 [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/DIY_Financial_Advisor.html?id=_0tICgAAQBAJ
 44. Jackowicz K, Kozłowski Ł. Social ties between SME managers and bank employees: Financial consequences vs. SME managers' perceptions. *Emerging Markets Review*, Sep 2019; 40. Doi: 10.1016/J.EMEMAR.2019.05.004
 45. Hui C-H, Lo C-F, Zheng X-F, Fong T. Probabilistic approach to measuring early-warning signals of systemic contagion risk. *International Journal of Financial Engineering*, Jun 2018; 5(2):p. 1850010. Doi: 10.1142/S242478631850010X
 46. Sabherwal R, Becerra-Fernandez I. *Business intelligence: Practices, technologies, and management*. Publisher: Wiley, Hoboken, NY, USA, 2013, p. 304. ISBN-13
 47. Ana Azevedo, Filipe Santos M. Integration of data mining in business intelligence systems, 2015, p. 314.
 48. Sarens G, De Beelde I, Everaert P. Internal audit: A comfort provider to the audit committee. *British Accounting Review*, Jun 2009; 41(2):90-106. Doi: 10.1016/J.BAR.2009.02.002
 49. Burrell Nickell E, Roberts RW. Organizational legitimacy, conflict, and hypocrisy: An alternative view of the role of internal auditing. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*. 2014; 25(3):217-221. Doi: 10.1016/J.CPA.2013.10.005

50. Ockey GJ, Choi I. Structural Equation Modeling Reporting Practices for Language Assessment. *Lang Assess Q*, Jul 2015; 12(3):305-319. Doi: 10.1080/15434303.2015.1050101
51. Lenz R, Hahn U. A synthesis of empirical internal audit effectiveness literature pointing to new research opportunities. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Jan 2015; 30(1):5-33. Doi: 10.1108/MAJ-08-2014-1072
52. Ilufoye H, Akinrinoye OV, Okolo CH. A Scalable Infrastructure Model for Digital Corporate Social Responsibility in Underserved School Systems. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*. 2020; 1(3):100-106.
53. Akpe OE, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Ogbuefi E. A Conceptual Framework for Strategic Business Planning in Digitally Transformed Organizations. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 4(4):207-222 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708525>
54. Ashiedu BI, Ogbuefi E, Nwabekee S, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA. Developing Financial Due Diligence Frameworks for Mergers and Acquisitions in Emerging Telecom Markets. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 4(1):183-196 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708562>
55. Osho GO, Omisola JO, Shiyabola JO. An Integrated AI-Power BI Model for Real-Time Supply Chain Visibility and Forecasting: A Data-Intelligence Approach to Operational Excellence. *Unknown Journal*, 2020.
56. Omisola JO, Shiyabola JO, Osho GO. A Systems-Based Framework for ISO 9000 Compliance: Applying Statistical Quality Control and Continuous Improvement Tools in US Manufacturing. *Unknown Journal*, 2020.
57. Sarens G, De Beelde I. Internal auditors' perception about their role in risk management: A comparison between US and Belgian companies. *Managerial Auditing Journal*. 2006; 21(1):63-80. Doi: 10.1108/02686900610634766
58. Zuckweiler KM, Rosacker KM, Hayes SK. Business students' perceptions of corporate governance best practices. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, Apr 2016; 16(2):361-376. Doi: 10.1108/CG-08-2015-0117
59. Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2003; 88(5):879-903. Doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
60. Lenz R, Sarens G, Hoos F. Internal Audit Effectiveness: Multiple Case Study Research Involving Chief Audit Executives and Senior Management. *EDPACS*, Jan 2017; 55(1):1-17. Doi: 10.1080/07366981.2017.1278980
61. Wilkinson N, Coetzee P. Internal audit assurance or consulting services rendered on governance: How does one decide? *Journal of Governance and Regulation*. 2015; 4(1):186-200. Doi: 10.22495/JGR_V4_I1_C2_P3
62. Woods M. Linking risk management to strategic controls: A case study of Tesco plc. *Int J Risk Assess Manag*. 2007; 7(8):1074-1088. Doi: 10.1504/IJRAM.2007.015295
63. Sarens G, Abdolmohammadi MJ, Lenz R. Factors associated with the internal audit function's role in corporate governance. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*. 2012; 13(2):191-204. Doi: 10.1108/09675421211254876
64. Khongmalai O, Distanont A. Corporate governance model in Thai state-owned enterprises: Structural equation modelling approach. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*. 2017; 17(4):613-628. Doi: 10.1108/CG-01-2016-0021
65. Mgbame CA, Akpe OE, Abayomi AA, Ogbuefi E, Adeyelu OO. Barriers and Enablers of Healthcare Analytics Tool Implementation in Underserved Healthcare Communities. *Healthcare Analytics*. 2020; 45(45):SP45-45 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708221>
66. Ashiedu BI, Ogbuefi E, Nwabekee US, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA. Developing Financial Due Diligence Frameworks for Mergers and Acquisitions in Emerging Telecom Markets. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 4(1):183-196 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708562>
67. Akpe OE, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Ogbuefi E. A Conceptual Framework for Strategic Business Planning in Digitally Transformed Organizations. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 4(4):207-222 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708525>
68. Gbenle TP, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Agboola OA, Uzoka AC. Advances in Cloud Infrastructure Deployment Using AWS Services for Small and Medium Enterprises. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 3(11):365-381 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708522>
69. Mgbame AC, Akpe OE, Abayomi AA, Ogbuefi E, Adeyelu OO. Barriers and enablers of BI tool implementation in underserved SME communities. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*. 2020; 3(7):211-220 [Online]. Available: <https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1708221>
70. Aguilar-Palacios C, Munoz-Romero S, Rojo-Alvarez JL. Cold-Start Promotional Sales Forecasting through Gradient Boosted-Based Contrastive Explanations. *IEEE Access*. 2020; 8:137574-137586. Doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3012032
71. Holmlund M, *et al*. Customer experience management in the age of big data analytics: A strategic framework. *J Bus Res*, Aug 2020; 116:356-365. Doi: 10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2020.01.022
72. Woods N, Babatunde G. A robust ensemble model for spoken language recognition. *Applied Computer Science*. 2020; 16(3):56-68. Doi: 10.23743/acs-2020-21
73. Kumar V, Rajan B. Customer Lifetime Value: What, How, and Why. *The Routledge Companion to Strategic Marketing*, Nov 2020. 422-448. Doi: 10.4324/9781351038669-33
74. Iyiola Oladehinde Olaseni. Digital Twin and BIM synergy for predictive maintenance in smart building engineering systems development. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, Nov 2020; 8(2):406-421. Doi: 10.30574/wjarr.2020.8.2.0409
75. Tardieu H, Daly D, Esteban-Lauzán J, Hall J, Miller G. Measuring the Transformation-KPIs for Understanding Transformation Progress, 2020, 201-208. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-37955-1_19
76. Brunton JNKSL. Data-driven versus physics-based

- modeling. *Annu Rev Fluid Mech.* 2018; 50:645-668.
77. Zhang JWY. Data-driven modeling and scientific computing. *Appl Mech Rev.* 2016; 68(5):050801-051013.
 78. Barocas S, Nissenbaum H. Big data's end run around procedural privacy protections. *Commun ACM*, Nov 2014; 57(11):31-33. Doi: 10.1145/2668897
 79. Hartmann PM, Zaki M, Feldmann N, Neely A. Capturing value from big data-a taxonomy of data-driven business models used by start-up firms. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management.* 2016; 36(10):1382-1406. Doi: 10.1108/ijopm-02-2014-0098
 80. Bar-Sinai M, Sweeney L, Crosas M. DataTags, Data Handling Policy Spaces and the Tags Language. *Proceedings – 2016 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops, SPW 2016, Aug 2016, 1-8.* Doi: 10.1109/SPW.2016.11
 81. Garrido-Labrador JL, Puente-Gabbarri D, Ramírez-Sanz JM, Ayala-Dulanto D, Maudes J. Using ensembles for accurate modelling of manufacturing processes in an IoT data-acquisition solution. *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*, Jul 2020; 10(13). Doi: 10.3390/APP10134606
 82. Sharma A, Kaur P. A Multitenant Data Store Using a Column Based NoSQL Database. 2019 12th International Conference on Contemporary Computing, IC3 2019, Aug 2019. Doi: 10.1109/IC3.2019.8844906
 83. Rossi A, Lenzini G. Transparency by design in data-informed research: A collection of information design patterns. *Comput. Law Secur. Rev.*, Jul 2020; 37:p. 105402. Doi: 10.1016/j.clsr.2020.105402
 84. Li P, *et al.* Promoting secondary analysis of electronic medical records in china: Summary of the plagh-mit critical data conference and health datathon. *JMIR Med Inform*, Oct 2017; 5(4). Doi: 10.2196/MEDINFORM.7380
 85. Collins F, *et al.* A database on global health research in Africa. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2013; 1(2):e64-e65. Doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(13)70012-3
 86. Fosso Wamba S, Akter S, Edwards A, Chopin G, Gnanzou D. How 'big data' can make big impact: Findings from a systematic review and a longitudinal case study. *Int J Prod Econ*, Jul 2015; 165:234-246. Doi: 10.1016/J.IJPE.2014.12.031
 87. Goodall P, Sharpe R, West A. A data-driven simulation to support remanufacturing operations. *Comput Ind*, Feb 2019; 105:48-60. Doi: 10.1016/J.COMPIND.2018.11.001
 88. Kumar Jain P, Mandli K, Hoteit I, Knio O, Dawson C. Dynamically adaptive data-driven simulation of extreme hydrological flows. *Ocean Model (Oxf)*, Feb 2018; 122:85-103. Doi: 10.1016/J.OCEMOD.2017.12.004
 89. Park YR, *et al.* Utilization of a clinical trial management system for the whole clinical trial process as an integrated database: System development. *J Med Internet Res*, Apr 2018; 20(4). Doi: 10.2196/JMIR.9312
 90. Hu SCYLX. Optimization of FMCG supply chain by using data-driven methods. *J Intell Manuf.* 2019; 30(1):81-92.
 91. Kock N. Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, Oct 2015; 11(4):1-10. Doi: 10.4018/IJEC.2015100101
 92. Goodwin J. A comparison of internal audit in the private and public sectors. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Jun 2004; 19(5):640-650. Doi: 10.1108/02686900410537766
 93. Fernández-Laviada A. Internal audit function role in operational risk management. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance.* 2007; 15(2):143-155. Doi: 10.1108/13581980710744039
 94. Goodwin-Stewart J, Kent P. The use of internal audit by Australian companies. *Managerial Auditing Journal.* 2006; 21(1):81-101. Doi: 10.1108/02686900610634775
 95. Kabuye F, Nkundabanyanga SK, Opiso J, Nakabuye Z. Internal audit organisational status, competencies, activities and fraud management in the financial services sector. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Nov 2017; 32(9):924-944. Doi: 10.1108/MAJ-09-2016-1452
 96. Allegrini M, D'Onza G. Internal Auditing and Risk Assessment in Large Italian Companies: An Empirical Survey. *International Journal of Auditing*, Nov 2003; 7(3):191-208. Doi: 10.1046/J.1099-1123.2003.00070.X
 97. Arena M, Azzone G. Identifying Organizational Drivers of Internal Audit Effectiveness. *International Journal of Auditing*, Mar 2009; 13(1):43-60. Doi: 10.1111/J.1099-1123.2008.00392.X
 98. Henseler J, Ringle CM, Sarstedt M. A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *J Acad Mark Sci*, Jan 2015; 43(1):115-135. Doi: 10.1007/S11747-014-0403-8
 99. Endaya KA, Hanefah MM. Internal auditor characteristics, internal audit effectiveness, and moderating effect of senior management. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences.* 2016; 32(2):160-176. Doi: 10.1108/JEAS-07-2015-0023
 100. De Zwaan L, Stewart J, Subramaniam N. Internal audit involvement in enterprise risk management. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Jul 2011; 26(7):586-604. Doi: 10.1108/02686901111151323
 101. Alzeban A, Gwilliam D. Factors affecting the internal audit effectiveness: A survey of the Saudi public sector. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation.* 2014; 23(2):74-86. Doi: 10.1016/J.INTACCAUDTAX.2014.06.001
 102. Abdullatif M, Kawuq S. The role of internal auditing in risk management: Evidence from banks in Jordan. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences.* 2015; 31(1):30-50. Doi: 10.1108/JEAS-08-2013-0025
 103. Franke T, Zu Knyphausen-Aufsess D. On dominant logic: Review and synthesis. *Journal of Business Economics*, Jan 2014; 84(1):27-70. Doi: 10.1007/S11573-013-0690-4
 104. Smith ACT, Sutherland F, Gilbert DH. The Innovation Imperative. *Reinventing Innovation*, 2017, 1-17. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-57213-0_1
 105. Zafer Acar A, Zehir C. Development and validation of a multidimensional business capabilities measurement instrument. *Journal of Transnational Management.* 2009; 14(3):215-240. Doi: 10.1080/15475770903127050
 106. Lopez-Cabrales A, Valle R, Herrero I. The contribution of core employees to organizational capabilities and efficiency. *Hum Resour Manage*, Mar 2006; 45(1):81-109. Doi: 10.1002/HRM.20094
 107. Brozovic D. Strategic Flexibility: A Review of the

- Literature. International Journal of Management Reviews, Jan 2018; 20(1):3-31. Doi: 10.1111/IJMR.12111
108. Biedenbach T. The power of combinative capabilities: Facilitating the outcome of frequent innovation in pharmaceutical R&D projects. Project Management Journal, Mar 2011; 42(2):63-80. Doi: 10.1002/PMJ
 109. Acar AZ, Zehir C. The harmonized effects of generic strategies and business capabilities on business performance. Journal of Business Economics and Management. 2010; 11(4):689-711. Doi: 10.3846/JBEM.2010.34
 110. Grawe SJ, Daugherty PJ, Roath AS. Knowledge synthesis and innovative logistics processes: Enhancing operational flexibility and performance. Journal of Business Logistics, Mar 2011; 32(1):69-80. Doi: 10.1111/J.2158-1592.2011.01006.X
 111. Khoshshima G. A strategic model for measuring agility with fuzzy logic. Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics). 2008; 5370 LNCS:258-268. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-92137-0_29
 112. Paramsothy V, Woods P, Raman M. Success factors for implementation of entrepreneurial knowledge management in Malaysian banks. Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, Jun 2013; 12(2). Doi: 10.1142/S0219649213500159
 113. Cappiello C, Gal A, Jarke M, Rehof J, Aachen R, Dortmund TU. Data Ecosystems: Sovereign Data Exchange among Organizations (Dagstuhl Seminar 19391). Dagstuhl Rep. 2020; 9(9):66-134. Doi: 10.4230/DAGREP.9.9.66
 114. Khatri V, Brown CV. Designing data governance. Commun ACM, Jan 2010; 53(1):148-152. Doi: 10.1145/1629175.1629210
 115. Donoho D. 50 Years of Data Science. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, Oct 2017; 26(4):745-766. Doi: 10.1080/10618600.2017.1384734
 116. Bisson C, Warin T. Data Science and Strategic Complexity. 2020 IEEE International Conference on Technology Management, Operations and Decisions, ICTMOD 2020, Nov 2020. Doi: 10.1109/ICTMOD49425.2020.9380587
 117. Batt S, Grealis T, Harmon O, Tomolonis P. Learning Tableau: A data visualization tool. Journal of Economic Education, Aug 2020; 51(3-4):317-328. Doi: 10.1080/00220485.2020.1804503