AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY BULLETIN
ISSN: 2996-511X (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.512 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-4| 2026 Published: |30-04-2026|

IMPROVING THE AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19790500

Khodjayeva Mutabar Khamidulla kizi
Tashkent State University of Economics
PhD in Economics, Associate Professor
Department of "Audit"
mutabar2009@mail.ru, m.xodjayeva@tsue.uz
ORCID:0000-0003-0374-1456

Abstract

The improvement of financial statement audits remains a central issue for capital markets, regulators, audit firms, and reporting entities. In recent years, standard setters and oversight bodies have emphasized that audit quality depends not only on compliance with procedures, but also on robust risk assessment, stronger responses to fraud risk, effective quality management, appropriate use of technology, and clear communication with governance bodies. This article examines how the audit of financial statements can be improved within a modern risk-based and technology-enabled environment. Using a qualitative documentary analysis of official auditing standards and professional guidance issued by the IAASB, PCAOB, and IFAC, the study identifies five main improvement areas: enhanced risk assessment, stronger fraud-oriented procedures, proactive quality management, technology-assisted audit evidence, and more effective governance communication. The findings show that improving audits is not a matter of adding more procedures indiscriminately; rather, it requires better alignment between identified risks, evidence-gathering strategies, engagement-level quality management, and professional skepticism. The article concludes that sustainable audit improvement is achieved when firms combine standards-based discipline with technological capability, governance dialogue, and a culture focused on the public interest.

Keywords

audit quality, financial statement audit, risk assessment, fraud risk, audit evidence, quality management, data analytics, professional skepticism, governance communication

1. Introduction

A high-quality audit of financial statements is essential to confidence in financial reporting, efficient capital allocation, and the stability of markets. IFAC

states that high-quality audits are essential to strong and sustainable organizations, financial markets, and economies, and that such audits depend on a well-functioning ecosystem built on ethics, independence, governance, and regulation. This framing is important because it places audit improvement within a broader public-interest context rather than reducing it to a purely technical exercise.

At the engagement level, modern auditing standards increasingly treat audit quality as the product of interrelated judgments rather than a checklist of isolated procedures. The IAASB describes the identification and assessment of risks of material misstatement as foundational to the audit because those assessments determine the design of further procedures and the overall direction of evidence gathering. Similarly, PCAOB AS 2301 establishes that auditors must design and implement responses to the risks of material misstatement, whether arising from error or fraud. Together, these standards show that improving the audit begins with improving the logic of the audit itself: risk identification, risk response, and evidence evaluation must fit together coherently.

At the same time, the audit environment has become more complex. Business models increasingly depend on digital systems, large volumes of electronic data, complex estimates, and rapidly changing control environments. In response, the IAASB has stated that its technology work is intended to keep standards relevant in the face of rapid technological advancement, while the PCAOB has recently amended AS 1105 and issued implementation resources focused on evaluating electronic information used as audit evidence. These developments suggest that improving financial statement audits today requires both better professional judgment and better use of technology.

This article addresses the following research question: **How can the audit of financial statements be improved under current international and U.S. auditing frameworks?** The objective is not to present original field data, but to synthesize authoritative standards and guidance into a structured set of practical improvement directions suitable for audit firms, regulators, researchers, and graduate students.

2. Methods

This study uses a qualitative documentary and comparative-analysis method. The source base consists primarily of official standards, project materials, and guidance from the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB), the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB), and IFAC. Priority was given to authoritative or quasi-authoritative documents dealing directly with risk assessment, fraud, audit evidence, quality management, technology, and governance communication.

The documentary corpus was organized into five thematic groups. The first group covered risk assessment and risk response, especially ISA 315 (Revised 2019)[1] and PCAOB AS 2301. The second covered fraud responsibilities, including the IAASB's revised fraud standard and related fraud project materials. The third focused on quality management through ISQM 1[2] and ISA 220 (Revised).[3] The fourth examined technology and audit evidence through IAASB technology materials, IFAC data analytics resources, and PCAOB audit-evidence developments. The fifth covered communication with those charged with governance through ISA 260 and PCAOB AS 1301 and AS 1305.

The method of analysis was interpretive rather than statistical. The article compared how different standard setters conceptualize audit improvement and then identified recurring themes across the documents. Because the research design is normative and standards-based, the "results" section presents analytical findings about improvement mechanisms rather than empirical measurements.

3. Results

3.1. Improving audit quality begins with stronger risk assessment

The first major finding is that improving the audit of financial statements depends fundamentally on the quality of risk assessment. ISA 315 (Revised 2019)[1] was issued specifically to make risk identification and assessment more robust and consistent and to support more focused responses under ISA 330. The IAASB explicitly describes risk assessment as foundational because it provides the basis for designing and performing procedures that obtain sufficient appropriate evidence. In practical terms, this means that a weak understanding of the entity, its information system, controls, and susceptibility to material misstatement will distort the entire engagement.

The PCAOB framework reaches a similar conclusion. AS 2301 requires auditors to design and implement appropriate responses to the risks of material misstatement, and it links the nature, timing, and extent of procedures directly to assessed risks. This architecture implies that audit improvement is not achieved by simply increasing testing volume. Instead, quality rises when procedures are more responsive to the most significant risks, especially risks connected to estimates, unusual transactions, bias in accounting choices, or weaknesses in the control environment.

Therefore, an improved audit process should include more rigorous entity-level understanding, stronger linkage between significant accounts and relevant assertions, more explicit identification of inherent-risk drivers, and clearer documentation of why particular risks require particular responses. In

methodological terms, risk assessment should be treated as the intellectual core of the audit rather than as a preliminary formality.

Example:

An auditor assessing a retail company that relies heavily on e-commerce may fail to identify IT-dependent revenue recognition risks. As a result, the auditor may focus on traditional sales testing while overlooking automated transaction processing risks, increasing the likelihood of undetected misstatements.

The PCAOB framework reaches a similar conclusion. AS 2301 requires auditors to design and implement appropriate responses to the risks of material misstatement, linking audit procedures directly to assessed risks.

Therefore, audit improvement requires:

deeper entity understanding

stronger linkage between risks and assertions

clearer justification of audit procedures

3.2. Fraud-focused procedures and professional skepticism are essential

The second major finding is that audit improvement requires a more explicit and operational fraud focus. In July 2025, the IAASB issued ISA 240 (Revised),[5] which clarifies the auditor's responsibilities relating to fraud, emphasizes a fraud lens in the risk-assessment process, and strengthens the required responses to identified risks. This is significant because fraud risk has historically been one of the areas where audit expectations and audit performance diverge most sharply.

The PCAOB also treats fraud as integral to risk response and evidence evaluation. Its standards on risk response and audit evidence repeatedly stress that because of the nature of fraud, the auditor must exercise professional skepticism and critically assess whether the evidence obtained is sufficiently persuasive. That means improving audits is not merely a question of adding anti-fraud checklists; it requires cultivating a questioning mindset that treats management explanations, journal entries, related-party transactions, and significant estimates as areas where bias or intentional misstatement may exist.

Accordingly, the analysis suggests that firms can improve fraud-related audit quality in at least four ways: first, by embedding fraud considerations directly into risk assessment rather than isolating them in a standalone discussion; second, by tailoring procedures to fraud incentives and opportunities within the specific entity; third, by strengthening unpredictable elements in audit testing; and fourth, by documenting the rationale for accepting or rejecting contradictory evidence. These improvements reinforce reasonable assurance without implying that auditors are guarantors against all fraud.

The second major finding is that audit improvement requires a more explicit fraud focus. ISA 240 (Revised)[5] strengthens requirements related to fraud risk identification and response.

However, regulatory inspections continue to show that fraud procedures are often performed formally rather than substantively.[41]

Example:

In a manufacturing company, management may manipulate inventory valuation through biased estimates. If auditors rely solely on management representations without independent verification (e.g., recalculation or third-party data), material misstatement risk increases.

Improving audit quality therefore requires:

integrating fraud into risk assessment

designing entity-specific procedures

incorporating unpredictability in testing

critically evaluating contradictory evidence

3.3. Quality management must be proactive at both firm and engagement levels

The third major finding is that improving financial statement audits requires a shift from reactive compliance to proactive quality management. IAASB's ISQM 1 replaced the older quality-control approach with a risk-based system of quality management for firms performing audits and other assurance engagements. The IAASB states that the new standards strengthen and modernize the firm's approach to quality management and respond to an increasingly complex audit ecosystem with rising stakeholder expectations.

At the engagement level, ISA 220 (Revised) [3]places direct responsibility on the engagement partner and team to manage and achieve quality proactively. The IAASB notes that the revised standard modernizes quality management for an audit of financial statements and requires active management of engagement quality, rather than passive reliance on firm-level procedures alone. This has an important implication: audit improvement depends not only on firm methodology but also on the behavior, supervision, review culture, and challenge process inside each engagement team.

From this perspective, a better audit is one in which quality is designed into the engagement from the start. That includes realistic staffing, timely consultation, partner involvement in significant judgments, effective supervision of specialists and component auditors, and early resolution of methodological issues. IFAC

[41] PCAOB inspection reports repeatedly highlight insufficient fraud consideration and over-reliance on management representations.

similarly argues that high-quality audits depend on the right people, governance, and regulation working together. Thus, improving audits is as much an organizational challenge as it is a technical one.

The third major finding is that audit quality depends on proactive quality management. ISQM 1[2] introduces a risk-based approach to quality management systems. At the engagement level, ISA 220 (Revised)[3] emphasizes the responsibility of the engagement partner for audit quality.

Example:

If an engagement team lacks sufficient expertise in fair value measurement, failure to involve a specialist early may result in inappropriate audit conclusions.

Effective quality management includes:

timely supervision and review

appropriate staffing

consultation on complex issues

active partner involvement[42]

3.4. Technology and data analytics can improve audit relevance and evidence quality

The fourth major finding is that technology, particularly data analytics and automated tools, can improve the audit when used within a standards-based evidence framework. The IAASB has acknowledged the growing intersection of audit and technology and has adopted a formal technology position to guide how standards remain relevant in a rapidly evolving environment. Earlier IAASB work on data analytics also identified both opportunities and challenges in using technology within financial statement audits.

IFAC resources explain that audit data analytics can support risk and control assessment and can help auditors extract insight from large data sets. In practice, this means that analytics can be used to identify anomalies, test entire populations in some circumstances, visualize unusual patterns, and focus substantive procedures on higher-risk items. PCAOB developments regarding AS 1105 likewise show that regulators now pay increasing attention to how auditors evaluate the relevance and reliability of electronic information used as evidence. Amendments approved in 2024 and related staff guidance underscore that technology-assisted procedures do not reduce the need for judgment; rather, they increase the importance of evaluating source reliability and evidential persuasiveness.

The analytical implication is clear: technology improves the audit only when it improves audit logic. Data analytics should not be treated as a modern add-on for appearance or efficiency alone. Their real value lies in strengthening the connection

[42] (ISA 220, Revised).

between risk assessment and evidence collection, especially in areas such as revenue testing, journal-entry analysis, unusual transactions, and continuous-population screening. An improved audit therefore uses technology to deepen understanding and sharpen skepticism, not to replace professional reasoning.Using data analytics, auditors can analyze 100% of journal entries to identify unusual patterns (e.g., postings at odd hours or by unauthorized users), which would be difficult with traditional sampling.

However, technology introduces new risks related to data reliability and completeness.[43]

Thus, auditors must:

evaluate data sources

validate system outputs

maintain professional skepticism

3.5. Better communication with governance improves the effectiveness of the audit

The fifth major finding is that improving the audit of financial statements requires stronger communication with those charged with governance. ISA 260 (Revised) deals with the auditor's responsibility to communicate with those charged with governance, while PCAOB AS 1301 requires communication with audit committees regarding matters relevant to the conduct of the audit. PCAOB AS 1305 additionally requires written communication of significant deficiencies and material weaknesses identified during the audit.

This matters because audit quality is strengthened when the auditor's understanding of risk, control deficiencies, scope issues, use of other participants, and independence matters is shared appropriately with governance bodies. Good communication does not merely satisfy a reporting rule; it improves oversight, encourages corrective action, and reduces the likelihood that major issues remain poorly understood until the reporting stage. IAASB materials also emphasize that ISA 260 establishes an overarching communication framework, which suggests that governance dialogue should be treated as a core mechanism of audit effectiveness.

As a result, a stronger audit is one in which governance communication is timely, specific, and two-way. Audit committees and boards should not receive only final conclusions; they should understand key risk judgments, the reasons for emphasis in the audit approach, and the significance of internal-control findings. Such communication strengthens the institutional environment within which audit quality is achieved.

[43] Electronic audit evidence may be less reliable if controls over IT systems are weak (PCAOB AS 1105 guidance).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY BULLETIN
ISSN: 2996-511X (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.512 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-4| 2026 Published: |30-04-2026|

The fifth finding is that audit quality improves with effective communication with those charged with governance.

ISA 260 and PCAOB AS 1301 emphasize structured communication throughout the audit.

Example:

If auditors communicate early about internal control deficiencies, management can implement corrective actions before year-end, reducing audit risk and improving financial reporting quality.

Effective communication should be:

timely

transparent

bidirectional

4. Discussion

To better understand how audit improvement is conceptualized in different regulatory environments, a comparative analysis of IAASB and PCAOB frameworks is presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Comparative analysis of IAASB and PCAOB frameworks[44]

Dimension	**IAASB (International Standards)**	**PCAOB (U.S. Standards)**	**Analytical Implication**
Conceptual approach to audit quality	Principles-based, focused on professional judgment and risk-based auditing (ISA framework)	More rules-based with detailed procedural expectations and inspection focus	IAASB provides flexibility; PCAOB provides enforceability and consistency
Risk assessment	ISA 315 (Revised 2019) emphasizes understanding the entity, environment, and inherent risk factors	AS 2301 links risk assessment directly to audit procedures and testing requirements	Both align conceptually, but PCAOB is more prescriptive in execution
Fraud responsibility	ISA 240 (Revised 2025) strengthens fraud lens and integrates fraud into risk assessment	Fraud considerations embedded in multiple standards with strong emphasis on skepticism	PCAOB places stronger inspection pressure; IAASB emphasizes conceptual integration
Audit evidence	Principles-based approach to sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence	AS 1105 provides more detailed guidance, especially for electronic evidence	PCAOB is more explicit about evaluating reliability of digital evidence
Quality management	ISQM 1 introduces a proactive, risk-based	Focus on engagement performance and	IAASB emphasizes systems; PCAOB

[44] Author's elaboration based on IAASB (2019–2025), PCAOB standards, and IFAC publications.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY BULLETIN
ISSN: 2996-511X (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 9.512 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-4| 2026 Published: |30-04-2026|

Dimension	IAASB (International Standards)	PCAOB (U.S. Standards)	Analytical Implication
	system of quality management at firm level	compliance, reinforced through inspections	emphasizes outcomes and accountability
Engagement partner responsibility	ISA 220 (Revised) stresses proactive management of audit quality	Strong accountability through inspection findings and enforcement	PCAOB creates stronger individual accountability pressure
Use of technology	Technology Position Statement (2024) encourages adaptation and innovation	Recent amendments (2024–2025) focus on technology-assisted audit procedures	IAASB is forward-looking; PCAOB is control- and evidence-focused
Data analytics	Encouraged as a tool to enhance audit quality and insight (IFAC guidance)	Accepted but subject to strict evidence evaluation requirements	Both support analytics, but PCAOB imposes stricter validation expectations
Communication with governance	ISA 260 emphasizes principles-based, two-way communication	AS 1301 and AS 1305 require specific communications and written reporting	PCAOB requires more formalized and documented communication
Regulatory environment	Global applicability across jurisdictions	U.S.-specific, with strong enforcement and inspection regime	PCAOB model is stricter; IAASB model is more adaptable globally

The comparison shows that while both frameworks are aligned in their emphasis on risk-based auditing, fraud awareness, and audit evidence, they differ in regulatory philosophy. The IAASB adopts a principles-based approach that supports professional judgment and global applicability, whereas the PCAOB applies a more prescriptive and enforcement-oriented model. This suggests that effective audit improvement may require combining the flexibility of IAASB standards with the discipline and accountability mechanisms characteristic of the PCAOB environment.

The results indicate that improving the audit of financial statements is best understood as a systems problem. Risk assessment, fraud procedures, quality management, evidence evaluation, technology, and governance communication are not separate reforms; they interact. For example, better data analytics are useful only if the engagement team has correctly identified the relevant risks. Stronger fraud procedures are effective only if skepticism is supported by quality management, consultation, and partner challenge. Better communication with

governance adds value only if the issues communicated emerge from a sound risk-response process.

This integrated view also helps explain why inspections and reform efforts often focus on recurring themes rather than isolated procedural defects. If an audit team misunderstands a company's information system, the consequences may include poor control testing, weak substantive procedures, insufficient fraud response, and low-quality evidence. Conversely, when audit quality improves at the level of engagement design, the benefits are cumulative: testing becomes more relevant, evidence becomes more persuasive, documentation becomes more coherent, and governance reporting becomes more meaningful.

Another implication concerns the profession's ongoing digital transition. Official materials from the IAASB, IFAC, and PCAOB all suggest that technology is increasingly central to the future of auditing, but none of them portray technology as a substitute for standards or judgment. The more persuasive reform agenda is therefore not "automation instead of auditing," but "technology-enhanced auditing under disciplined professional standards." In that model, automated tools widen the auditor's field of vision, while risk assessment, skepticism, and evidence evaluation remain the basis for professional conclusions.

This article has one important limitation: it is a standards-based conceptual analysis and does not measure actual audit outcomes in a field sample. Its contribution is interpretive. It synthesizes current authoritative frameworks and shows where they converge on practical improvement priorities. Future empirical research could test whether firms that implement these priorities more fully exhibit fewer inspection findings, stronger governance relationships, or better market perceptions of audit quality.

5. Conclusion

Improving the audit of financial statements does not require an endless expansion of procedures. The documentary analysis conducted in this article shows that the most credible path to audit improvement is more focused and more disciplined: stronger risk assessment, better-targeted responses to fraud and misstatement risks, proactive quality management at firm and engagement levels, appropriate use of technology and analytics, and timely communication with those charged with governance. These elements are consistently reinforced across modern IAASB, PCAOB, and IFAC materials.

In practical terms, a better audit is one that is more responsive, more skeptical, more evidence-centered, and better governed. It is not defined by volume of work alone, but by the quality of the judgments that connect risk, procedures, and conclusions. When audit firms treat quality management as dynamic, embed fraud

awareness in the audit mindset, use technology to strengthen evidence rather than merely accelerate routine tasks, and maintain meaningful dialogue with governance bodies, they are more likely to produce audits that serve the public interest.

REFERENCES:

1. International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2019). *ISA 315 (Revised 2019), Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement*. IAASB.
2. International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2020). *International Standard on Quality Management (ISQM) 1*. IAASB.
3. International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2020). *ISA 220 (Revised), Quality Management for an Audit of Financial Statements*. IAASB.
4. International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2024). *Technology Position Statement*. IAASB.
5. International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. (2025). *ISA 240 (Revised), The Auditor's Responsibilities Relating to Fraud in an Audit of Financial Statements*. IAASB.
6. International Federation of Accountants. (n.d.). *Achieving High-Quality Audits*. IFAC.
7. International Federation of Accountants. (2018). *Data Analytics: An Information Resource for IFAC Members*. IFAC.
8. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. (n.d.). *AS 1105: Audit Evidence*. PCAOB.
9. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. (n.d.). *AS 1301: Communications with Audit Committees*. PCAOB.
10. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. (n.d.). *AS 1305: Communications About Control Deficiencies in an Audit of Financial Statements*. PCAOB.
11. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. (n.d.). *AS 2301: The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*. PCAOB.
12. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. (2025). *Amendments Related to Aspects of Designing and Performing Audit Procedures That Involve Technology-Assisted Analysis of Information in Electronic Form*. PCAOB implementation resources.