Pangilinan, Allen Hendryx M.
BSA44

Error Rates, Error Projection, and Consideration of Sampling Risk: Audit Sampling Data from the Field

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2245866

The research paper "Error Rates, Error Projection, and Consideration of Sampling Risk: Audit Sampling Data from the Field" investigates the characteristics of error rates and auditor performance in evaluating sample errors in the post-Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) era. Using proprietary data from 160 audit sampling applications conducted by a large auditing firm, the study examines error frequency, magnitude, and auditor adherence to sampling standards. The findings highlight that error rates in accounting populations post-SOX are significantly lower than those assumed in prior research, which relied heavily on data predating SOX or hypothetical scenarios. Additionally, the study evaluates how well auditors project errors and consider sampling risk during their assessments.

The authors reveal that error rates in the post-SOX environment are lower in both magnitude and frequency compared to prior studies. This decline is attributed to improved financial reporting and internal control measures mandated by SOX, alongside enhanced regulatory oversight by bodies such as the PCAOB. The average misstatement rate identified in this study is 0.2%, markedly lower than the 1.06% reported in earlier research. These results suggest that the traditional criticisms of audit sampling methods, especially their inefficiency and ineffectiveness, may no longer be applicable to current practices.

Another critical finding is the improved performance of auditors in projecting errors. Auditors in the study projected over 99% of detected errors, demonstrating a stark contrast to the lower projection rates observed in pre-SOX studies, such as those by Elder and Allen. The reduction in unprojected errors, particularly those deemed immaterial or contained, underscores auditors' increased compliance with professional standards and heightened awareness of regulatory expectations. This trend indicates a shift towards greater rigor in sampling evaluations and the projection of misstatements to the population.

The paper also emphasizes auditors' improved consideration of sampling risk. Unlike earlier findings, which showed limited attention to sampling risk, this study notes uniform compliance with incorporating an allowance for sampling risk in sample size determination and result evaluation. The auditing firm's use of computerized templates significantly ensured consistency and adherence to professional guidelines. This procedural enhancement aligns with AU-C 530 and ISA 530 standards, which advocate for comprehensive error projection and risk assessment.

In conclusion, the study provides a contemporary perspective on audit sampling, showcasing significant advancements in error management and auditor performance in the post-SOX era. By offering empirical evidence from real-world audit applications, it challenges outdated assumptions about error rates and sampling inefficiencies, contributing valuable insights to auditors, educators, and regulators. However, the authors acknowledge limitations related to the specificity of their data and call for further research to validate their findings across different auditing firms and contexts.