The Role of Gender Diversity Among Audit Teams in Improving Professional Skepticism and Judgment

Hunter Torres, Ivy Sanchez, Damien Bell

Abstract

This research investigates the underexplored relationship between gender diversity within audit teams and the enhancement of professional skepticism and judgment quality in financial auditing contexts. While prior literature has extensively examined individual cognitive factors influencing auditor judgment, the collective impact of team gender composition remains largely unaddressed. Our study employs a mixed-methods approach combining experimental audit simulations with qualitative analysis of team dynamics across 42 professional audit teams from diverse financial institutions. The experimental component involved teams with varying gender compositions analyzing complex financial scenarios containing subtle fraud indicators, while the qualitative analysis examined communication patterns, challenge behaviors, and evidence evaluation processes. Results demonstrate that gender-balanced teams exhibited 27

1 Introduction

The auditing profession faces increasing pressure to enhance audit quality and detection capabilities in an environment characterized by sophisticated financial fraud and complex business transactions. Professional skepticism, defined as an attitude that includes a questioning mind and critical assessment of audit evidence, represents a cornerstone of audit quality. While extensive research has examined individual auditor characteristics that influence professional skepticism, including experience, personality traits, and cognitive styles, the collective dynamics of audit teams and particularly the role of gender diversity remain significantly underexplored. This research addresses this gap by investigating how gender diversity within audit teams influences the exercise of professional skepticism and the quality of collective judgment in audit contexts.

Contemporary auditing practice increasingly relies on team-based approaches to complex audit engagements, recognizing that collective judgment often surpasses individual capabilities. However, the composition of these teams and how demographic diversity influences team processes represents a critical area for investigation. Gender diversity, in particular, offers a compelling lens through which to examine team dynamics in professional skepticism contexts, given established differences in risk perception, communication styles, and information processing between genders. The banking sector, with its complex financial instruments and significant fraud risks, provides an ideal context for examining these relationships, particularly in light of recent research emphasizing the importance of continuous auditing and monitoring in fraud detection.

This study builds upon foundational work by Ahmad, Zafar, and Tariq (2017) on fraud detection through continuous auditing in banking, extending their framework to consider how team composition influences the effectiveness of these monitoring processes. While their research established the technical foundations for enhanced fraud detection, our study addresses the human factors that determine how effectively these technical capabilities are utilized. The research questions guiding this investigation are: How does gender diversity within audit teams influence the exercise of professional skepticism? What mechanisms explain the relationship between gender diversity and audit judgment quality? And what implications do these relationships have for audit team staffing and composition policies?

2 Methodology

This research employed a mixed-methods approach combining experimental simulations with qualitative analysis to comprehensively examine the relationship between gender diversity and professional skepticism in audit teams. The study involved 42 professional audit teams from banking institutions and public accounting firms, comprising 210 individual auditors with varying levels of experience. Teams were structured to represent five distinct gender composition categories: male-dominated (80

The experimental component required teams to complete four complex audit simulations involving banking scenarios with embedded fraud indicators of varying subtlety. These simulations were developed in consultation with audit partners and fraud examination specialists to ensure realism and appropriate complexity. Each simulation contained between three and five subtle fraud indicators that required professional skepticism to detect, including revenue recognition irregularities, related-party transaction concealment, and asset valuation manipulations. Teams were provided with comprehensive audit documentation, including financial statements, transaction records, management representations, and external confirmations.

Data collection included both quantitative measures of team performance and qualitative assessment of team processes. Quantitative measures included fraud detection rates, time spent on evidence evaluation, documentation completeness, and the number of skeptical inquiries generated. Qualitative assessment involved video recording of team deliberations, which were subsequently analyzed using structured coding frameworks to identify patterns in communication, challenge behaviors, evidence evaluation approaches, and conflict resolution styles. Additionally, post-experiment interviews with team members provided insights into individual perceptions of team dynamics and decision processes.

Statistical analysis employed multivariate regression techniques to examine the relationship between gender composition and audit outcomes while controlling for team experience, individual auditor characteristics, and task complexity. Qualitative data analysis followed established grounded theory approaches, with multiple researchers independently coding team interactions and subsequently reconciling coding frameworks to ensure reliability.

3 Results

The analysis revealed significant relationships between gender diversity and multiple dimensions of professional skepticism and audit judgment quality. Gender-balanced teams demonstrated superior performance across several key metrics, with particularly notable advantages in detecting sophisticated fraud schemes. Balanced teams detected 27

Communication patterns emerged as a critical mediating factor in the relationship between gender diversity and professional skepticism. Gender-diverse teams exhibited more comprehensive evidence evaluation processes, with team members spending approximately 18

Risk assessment approaches differed significantly across team compositions. Gender-balanced teams demonstrated more conservative risk assessments in ambiguous situations, with a lower threshold for escalating concerns and seeking additional evidence. This conservative approach proved particularly valuable in scenarios involving management override of controls and complex estimate validation. Teams with greater gender diversity also displayed reduced confirmation bias, with team members more frequently challenging initial interpretations and considering disconfirming evidence.

The relationship between gender diversity and professional skepticism appeared moderated by team processes rather than being a direct effect. Teams that established norms of psychological safety and constructive challenge demonstrated the strongest positive relationships between diversity and skepticism. In teams lacking these processes, the benefits of gender diversity were diminished, suggesting that diversity alone is insufficient without supportive team dynamics.

Experience level interactions revealed that the benefits of gender diversity were most pronounced in teams with moderate to high experience levels, suggesting that both diversity and expertise contribute to enhanced professional skepticism. Junior auditors in diverse teams demonstrated accelerated development of skeptical mindsets, indicating potential learning benefits from exposure to diverse perspectives early in their careers.

4 Conclusion

This research makes several important contributions to understanding how gender diversity influences professional skepticism and judgment quality in audit teams. First, it establishes team gender composition as a significant factor in audit quality, challenging the traditional focus on individual auditor characteristics.

The findings demonstrate that gender-diverse teams bring complementary perspectives and approaches that enhance collective skepticism and judgment, particularly in complex auditing environments like the banking sector.

Second, the study identifies specific mechanisms through which gender diversity enhances professional skepticism, including more comprehensive evidence evaluation, reduced confirmation bias, and more conservative risk assessment. These mechanisms provide practical insights for audit firms seeking to enhance audit quality through team composition decisions. The finding that psychological safety moderates the diversity-skepticism relationship highlights the importance of establishing supportive team environments that enable the full benefits of diversity to emerge.

Third, the research has important implications for audit practice and regulation. Audit firms should consider gender balance as a factor in team staffing decisions, particularly for high-risk engagements involving complex estimates or significant fraud risk. Regulatory bodies may wish to consider team composition factors in audit quality monitoring frameworks, moving beyond individual auditor qualifications to consider collective team characteristics.

This study extends the work of Ahmad et al. (2017) on continuous auditing and monitoring by demonstrating how human factors, specifically team composition, influence the effectiveness of technical monitoring systems. While their research established the importance of continuous monitoring technologies, our findings emphasize that these technologies operate within social contexts where team dynamics significantly impact their utilization and effectiveness.

Future research should explore how gender diversity interacts with other forms of diversity, including cultural, educational, and experiential differences. Longitudinal studies examining how diversity effects evolve over time as teams develop shared mental models would provide additional insights. Research examining the specific training and development approaches that maximize the benefits of gender diversity would also be valuable for audit practice.

In conclusion, this research establishes that gender diversity represents more than a social imperative—it constitutes a critical factor in audit quality enhancement. By bringing diverse perspectives, communication styles, and risk approaches to complex audit judgments, gender-diverse teams demonstrate enhanced professional skepticism and improved fraud detection capabilities. As the auditing profession continues to confront increasingly sophisticated financial reporting challenges, leveraging the full potential of diverse audit teams represents a promising pathway to enhanced audit quality and public trust.

References

Ahmad, H. S., Zafar, R., Tariq, H. (2017). Fraud detection through continuous auditing and monitoring in the banking sector. Journal of Financial Crime, 24(4), 558-573.

Bamber, E. M., Iyer, V. M. (2007). Auditors' identification with their clients and its effect on auditors' objectivity. Auditing: A Journal of Practice Theory, 26(2), 1-24.

Carpenter, M. A., Geletkanycz, M. A., Sanders, W. G. (2004). Upper echelons research revisited: Antecedents, elements, and consequences of top management team composition. Journal of Management, 30(6), 749-778.

Fullerton, R. R., Durtschi, C. (2004). The effect of professional skepticism on the fraud detection skills of internal auditors. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.485082

Hurtt, R. K. (2010). Development of a scale to measure professional skepticism. Auditing: A Journal of Practice Theory, 29(1), 149-171.

Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in workgroups. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(4), 741-763.

Nelson, M. W. (2009). A model and literature review of professional skepticism in auditing. Auditing: A Journal of Practice Theory, 28(2), 1-34.

Phillips, K. W., Loyd, D. L. (2006). When surface and deep-level diversity collide: The effects on dissenting group members. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99(2), 143-160.

Trotman, K. T., Simnett, R., Khalifa, A. (2009). Impact of the type of audit team discussions on auditors' generation of material frauds. Contemporary Accounting Research, 26(4), 1115-1142.

Woolley, A. W., Chabris, C. F., Pentland, A., Hashmi, N., Malone, T. W. (2010). Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. Science, 330(6004), 686-688.