Optimizing Audit Quality Management in Small and Medium-Sized Accounting Firms

Guifan Rong*

Guangzhou Institute of Technology, Guangzhou, 510075, China

*Corresponding author: 99699160@qq.com

Abstract. Small and medium-sized accounting firms (SMPs) face mounting expectations to demonstrate reliable audit quality while operating under tight resource and pricing constraints. This paper proposes a qualitative framework for optimizing audit quality control—reframed as audit quality management—tailored to the scale, risk profile, and governance realities of SMPs. Drawing on professional standards, supervisory guidance, and practice-informed insights, the study diagnoses recurrent weaknesses in tone at the top, risk assessment, methodology discipline, independence monitoring, documentation, technology adoption, and monitoring-and-remediation. It then outlines an integrated, proportionate system built on leadership accountability, risk-based design, capability development, data governance, and learning-oriented oversight. The core contribution is a practical blueprint that helps SMPs move from checklist-heavy compliance to outcomes-focused quality management, strengthening public-interest protection while preserving commercial viability.

Keywords: small and medium-sized accounting firms; audit quality management; risk-based system; monitoring and remediation.

1 Introduction

Audit quality is fundamentally a system property rather than a single engagement attribute. For small and medium-sized accounting firms, delivering consistent, defensible quality depends on how leadership sets expectations, allocates scarce resources, and embeds discipline across acceptance, planning, execution, reporting, and post-issuance learning. External pressures—fee compression, complex reporting frameworks, evolving independence rules, and digitalization—magnify execution risk when firms rely on informal practices or legacy checklists. This paper advances a proportionate approach that aligns with modern quality management thinking: identify quality risks, design targeted responses, generate reliable evidence of operation, and learn systematically from deficiencies and near misses. The goal is to replace episodic fixes with a coherent operating model that is credible to regulators, useful to clients, and workable for practitioners[1-3].

D. Magni et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2026 3rd International Conference on Applied Economics, Management Science and Social Development (AEMSS 2026)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 389,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6239-672-2_2

2 Conceptual Background and Framing

The paper adopts three premises and makes their interdependence explicit. First, audit quality is an emergent property of a multilayer system in which firm-level controls, engagement-level supervision, and ecosystem constraints—client governance, information readiness, and data access—jointly shape outcomes. Controls that look robust ex ante can fail under weak supervision or poor data provenance; conversely, timely coaching and calibrated scoping can partially offset client-side immaturity by redirecting procedures and refining materiality judgments. This premise treats quality as dynamic and path-dependent, with feedback loops through which inspection findings reshape policies, staffing, and client-acceptance decisions. Second, high-quality audits require a productive tension between compliance fidelity and professional judgment. Methodologies and templates provide structure, comparability, and evidential discipline, but checklist dominance can dull skepticism and obscure risk–response linkages; equally, unstructured judgment invites variability and weakens defendability. Mechanisms that discipline judgment—peer calibration, real-time consultation on pivotal estimates and controls, and post-issuance retrospectives—are therefore integral to sustaining skepticism while preserving consistency. Third, proportionality is essential: smaller firms can reach equivalent assurance through simpler, risk-focused mechanisms if risks are accurately identified and responses operate reliably. Proportionality privileges clarity of objectives over procedural volume, emphasizes "evidence of operation" rather than policy length, and encourages scalable tools—targeted analytics, standardized workpapers, and judicious use of external specialists. Under this framing, "quality control" evolves into "quality management": a continuous cycle of setting quality objectives, assessing and prioritizing risks, designing and implementing targeted responses, monitoring effectiveness through leading and lagging indicators, and remediating root causes. The emphasis shifts from proving that a policy exists to demonstrating consistent, auditable operation in practice[4-5].

3 Problem Diagnosis in SMP Contexts

Leadership and Tone. Aspirational quality narratives often remain decoupled from operational levers: partner role definitions, escalation rights, and resourcing priorities do not translate into enforceable responsibilities. In small practices, partner time is split between revenue generation and oversight, weakening the clarity of who can pause work, reallocate resources, or challenge risky judgments. Absent consequence-linked objectives and periodic quality briefings, the "tone" fails to shape day-to-day behavior, and accountability for quality diffuses across the partnership.

Risk Assessment Discipline. Firm-wide risk identification tends to be episodic and documentation-centric, emphasizing form completion over analysis. Risks arising from complex estimates, multi-component reporting, reliance on service organizations, or data-driven processes are underweighted, producing generic responses that overlook concrete failure pathways. Without a living risk register and periodic recalibration,

engagement-level scoping inherits blind spots, and the firm cannot learn systematically from near misses or inspection findings.

Methodology and Documentation. Engagement teams frequently default to checklist use without demonstrating a defensible linkage between identified risks and chosen procedures. Planning files lack articulated materiality rationale, control-reliance logic, and clearly responsive substantive strategies, impairing supervisory review. Documentation is assembled late, limiting its role as contemporaneous evidence and weakening the integrity of review notes, cross-references, and version control.

Independence and Ethics. Dense personal networks and thin markets complicate independence in fact and appearance. Monitoring that relies mainly on periodic self-attestations fails to capture evolving threats such as fee dependence, long association, or non-assurance services adjacent to the audit. In the absence of structured threats-and-safeguards evaluations and transparent communication with those charged with governance, ethical risks persist beneath formal confirmations.

Talent and Learning. Professional development skews toward technical updates rather than judgment formation. Recurring review notes across cycles signal shallow knowledge transfer and limited root-cause learning. Without case labs, peer calibration, and post-issuance retrospectives, teams struggle to internalize lessons from complex estimates, control reliance, or analytical procedures, and error patterns repeat under deadline pressure[6-7].

Technology and Data Governance. Tool adoption is uneven and opportunistic; data extraction and analytics are executed ad hoc, with inconsistent preservation of evidence provenance. Chain-of-custody for client data, transformation logs, and reproducibility protocols are not consistently maintained. Informal approaches to cybersecurity and confidentiality increase exposure, while unvalidated spreadsheets and macros introduce silent model risk into key audit evidence.

Monitoring and Remediation. Internal inspections are periodic, sample-light, and oriented toward file defects rather than system signals. Findings trigger general training reminders instead of targeted process redesign, and remediation is seldom tracked to closure with evidence of behavioral change. The absence of root-cause analysis, trend tracking, and feedback loops means the control environment does not mature in response to observed deficiencies.

Client Portfolio Management. Acceptance and continuance decisions insufficiently weight governance quality, timetable realism, data readiness, and engagement economics, embedding structural pressure into execution. Portfolios accumulate clients with weak controls or chronic delays, compressing review windows and raising the likelihood of scope compromises. Without portfolio-level risk limits and exit criteria, individual engagements inherit systemic constraints that degrade audit quality across the busy season.

4 An Optimization Framework for Audit Quality Management

Anchored in leadership accountability and culture, the framework clarifies ownership of quality objectives, specifies stop-work authority when safeguards fail, and links

partner evaluation and compensation to observable quality outcomes, while entrenching a protected speak-up norm with documented escalation and resolution paths. It operationalizes a risk-based system design by translating firm objectives into domain-specific quality risks—independence, resourcing, methodology, technology, and engagement performance—each matched to targeted responses, accountable operators, expected evidence of operation, and clear escalation triggers. Client acceptance and continuance embed governance quality, information readiness, and timetable credibility into intake decisions, require explicit safeguards for longstanding relationships or significant non-assurance services, and authorize disengagement where residual risk cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level. Methodology, planning, and supervision are anchored in assertions and risks rather than form completion, tying control testing and substantive procedures to articulated risk linkages and ensuring contemporaneous, on-the-job supervision with real-time review of pivotal judgments. Independence and ethics management maintain a living register of interests, relationships, and services; deploy streamlined pre-approval and conflict-check workflows with automated prompts; and communicate threats-and-safeguards assessments to those charged with governance for transparency. The people system shifts from knowledge transmission to judgment formation through case labs, file retrospectives, and peer calibration, with risk-aligned staffing that assigns experienced reviewers early to high-judgment areas. Technology enablement and evidence integrity standardize data intake, preserve provenance, document transformations, employ proportionate analytics suited to client systems, and protect confidentiality via role-based access, encryption-at-rest where feasible, and disciplined file-sharing. Monitoring, root-cause analysis, and remediation recast inspections as a learning engine, distinguishing symptoms from causes, prioritizing systemic fixes—such as checklist redesign, supervision timing, and intake criteria—tracking behavioral change to closure, and sharing anonymized lessons across teams. Finally, a concise set of audit quality indicators—planning timeliness, incidence of late adjustments, recurrence of review notes, and supervision touchpoints—supports leadership and governance dialogue, avoids metric proliferation, and concentrates attention on decision-useful signals that prompt timely action.

5 Implementation and Governance Pathways

Successful adoption depends on disciplined sequencing and institutional credibility that render quality management both operable and persuasive in routine practice. Sequencing begins with proportionate design: triage the firm's most material quality risks and craft responses that are simple, observable, and repeatable, resisting transplantation of large-firm manuals that outstrip operating capacity, diffuse accountability, and crowd out judgment. Those responses must then be embedded in everyday workflows so that compliance is the default path—woven into planning memoranda, timekeeping and engagement-management tools, calendared review cadences, and milestone checklists—thereby aligning supervision checkpoints with natural decision nodes in the audit rather than erecting parallel bureaucracy. Evidence is specified by design: define ex ante the artefacts that will demonstrate operation (dated supervision notes on pivotal estimates,

contemporaneous independence pre-approvals, control-testing cross-references), adopt a lightweight taxonomy for tagging and retrieval, and store items consistently where reviewers expect to find them to protect provenance, integrity, and auditability. Governance overlays provide an independent escalation route for ethics and independence concerns—through a designated internal role or vetted external advisor—supplemented by periodic briefs to firm leadership and, when appropriate, those charged with governance at clients on system adjustments, aggregated findings, leading and lagging indicators, and remedial progress. External leverage amplifies internal capability by engaging professional alliances for hot and cold file reviews, specialist consultations, shared training materials, and benchmarking; regulatory inspections are approached constructively as inputs to a controlled learning cycle rather than episodic compliance events. Sustainment closes the loop: after each busy season, revisit the risk assessment with fresh evidence, retire controls that fail to change behavior, harden practices that demonstrably improve outcomes, refresh training with case-based lessons, and reinforce culture by recognizing behaviors that strengthen audit quality and professional skepticism. Taken together, this sequence translates quality intent into reliable routines, generates credible, decision-useful evidence of operation, and builds the sociotechnical memory needed to sustain performance under real-world constraints, ensuring that the quality system remains proportionate, intelligible, and resilient as client profiles, technologies, and regulatory expectations evolve.

6 Conclusion

For small and medium-sized accounting firms, optimizing audit quality is not a matter of amassing checklists but of engineering a proportionate, risk-sensitive system that consistently guides professional judgment, preserves evidence with clear provenance, and demonstrably operates in practice. Quality becomes reproducible under real-world constraints when leadership accountability is tied to observable outcomes, client intake is disciplined by governance quality and data readiness, methodology is explicitly risk-anchored with traceable risk–response linkages, independence safeguards are credible and lived rather than ceremonial, and monitoring is learning-centered with genuine root-cause analysis and follow-through. Execution variance is further reduced by embedding responses into everyday workflows so that compliance is the default path, specifying ex ante what artefacts evidence operation and where they reside, and deploying technology in a proportionate manner—standardized data intake, secure collaboration, and scalable analytics that fit capacity—without introducing burdens that crowd out judgment. Such a system deepens trust with clients and regulators, strengthens staff development and professional skepticism, and protects the public interest through consistent, defensible assurance that withstands inspection and litigation. The path forward is iterative yet tractable: clarify quality objectives and tolerances; prioritize the few risks that matter most at firm and engagement levels; embed simple, observable responses into daily work; define a concise set of audit-quality indicators that are decision-useful; calibrate judgment through peer review, timely supervision, and post-issuance retrospectives; retire controls that do not change behavior; codify

practices that measurably improve outcomes; and communicate progress, trade-offs, and lessons learned to leadership and those charged with governance to build durable organizational memory. Complementary governance overlays—independent escalation for ethics and independence concerns and constructive engagement with inspections—ensure credibility, while periodic re-assessment keeps the system proportionate, intelligible, and resilient as client profiles, technologies, and regulatory expectations evolve.

Acknowledgments

Guangzhou Higher Education Teaching Quality and Teaching Reform Project - High-level Professional Group (Higher Vocational Education): Chain Operation and Management Professional Group (Fund Number: 2023GSPZYQ006).

References

1. Ke Zhou, Lin Xia, Xiaoli Sui, et al. A novel evaluation method for students' self-directed learning ability: A case study of financial management students[J]. The International Journal of Management Education, 2025, 23(3):101242.
2. Alfityani Amjed, Taha Ismail Bany, Abu Loghod Nabil A., et al. An Empirical Study on the Determinants of Profitability in the Information Technology and Telecommunication Sector in India. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025, :571-575.
3. Zicong He, Xue Jin. Integrate AI-based chatbots into accounting services: Enhance customer communication and financial management support[J]. Journal of Computational Methods in Sciences and Engineering, 2025, 25(5):4464-4478.
4. Michael Metzger, Seán O'Reilly, Ciarán Mac an Bhaird. Generative artificial intelligence augmenting SME financial management[J]. Technovation, 2025, 147:103313.
5. Marcelo Perez de Arce Alemany, Maria Laura Ferranty MacLennan, Marcelo Luiz Dias da Silva Gabriel. Socio-Environmental and financial drivers of sustainable IT and E-waste management[J]. Sustainable Futures, 2025, 10:10126.
6. Yung Chuan Lee. Bridging theory and practice: The educational impact of structured news case integration in financial management courses[J]. The International Journal of Management Education, 2025, 23(3):101269.
7. Zhen Wang. Application of CNN-based financial risk identification and management convolutional neural networks in financial risk[J]. Systems and Soft Computing, 2025, 7:200215-200215.