

## Article

# "Becoming an Auditor": An Integrated Pedagogy of Case Instruction and Scenario Simulation in Auditing Course

Ting Song<sup>1,\*</sup> and Ling Wang<sup>2</sup>
<sup>1</sup> School of Economics and Management, Jiangxi University of Applied Science, Nanchang, China

<sup>2</sup> School of Foreign Studies, Jiangxi Normal University, Nanchang, China

\* Correspondence: Ting Song, School of Economics and Management, Jiangxi University of Applied Science, Nanchang, China

**Abstract:** Auditing course faces a persistent instructional dilemma. Students must master highly abstract International Standards on Auditing (ISA) while simultaneously exercising professional judgment in complex business contexts. Yet conventional lecture-based instruction typically presents cases as static, post-hoc reconstruction of completed events, positioning learners as retrospective observers who review completed events rather than as decision-makers grappling with the evolving complexities of live audit engagement. It prevents students from experiencing the dynamic, information-asymmetric negotiation between auditor and client that defines actual fieldwork. Consequently, most students finished their coursework with recited standards yet lacking the professional skepticism and the technical know-how required to apply them in practice. To address this gap, the auditing course was redesigned to incorporate "Becoming an Auditor", a pedagogical model that integrates case instruction with scenario simulation. Grounded in situated learning theory, the 16-week course redesign follows a two-phase scaffolding structure. Firstly, the instructor provides authentic cases, audit roles, and procedural templates. Students act as auditors to interact with clients, assess risk and make decision. Secondly, after the introduction to the whole auditing process, teachers gradually remove scaffolding, requiring students to independently select cases and perform risk assessments. Through the integration of cases and simulation, abstract ISA provisions are translated into operationalized task environments that necessitate professional judgment. The course redesign translates scenario simulation into students' autonomous auditing decision-making ability, facilitating their professional judgement. Besides, it offers a replicable framework for bridging the theory-practice gap in auditing course.

**Keywords:** auditing; situated learning; case instruction; scenario simulation; GONE framework; audit judgment; professional identity

Received: 30 May 2026

Revised: 09 July 2026

Accepted: 24 July 2026

Published: 30 July 2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Auditing courses require students to develop proficiency in the highly abstract language of International Standards on Auditing (ISA) while simultaneously applying that knowledge to exercise professional judgment in complex business contexts. This interplay between standard abstraction and contextual application presents persistent pedagogical challenges widely recognized in accounting education. The current classroom environment faces three interrelated limitations. First, students seldom engage in simulated practice of core audit procedures—such as confirmation of accounts receivable, inventory observation, and tests of controls—resulting in a gap between theoretical understanding of standards and practical procedural competence. Second, classroom interaction is largely structured around instructor-led lectures and question-and-answer exchanges, which do not reflect the dynamic, information-asymmetric dialogue characteristic of real-world auditor–client engagements. Third, summative final examinations remain the dominant assessment method, offering limited insight into how students' professional skepticism evolves across successive audit tasks [1].

Previous efforts to bridge the theory–practice divide have incorporated real corporate audit cases or project-based learning activities [2]. However, conventional case instruction typically treats cases as static, post-hoc reconstructions of completed events, positioning learners as retrospective observers rather than active decision-makers confronting the unfolding complexities of live audit engagements. This approach restricts students' grasp of audit practice dynamics, where negotiation and deliberation between auditors and clients—regarding evidence sufficiency and information reliability—are continuous processes. It has been argued that case instruction must be combined with scenario simulation to enable students to experience these evolving interactions; through role-play, task-driven activities, and real-time decision-making, learners transition from passive observers to engaged participants exercising agency within the audit process.

Scenario simulation has shown promise for enhancing dynamic interaction in disciplines such as law and public administration, yet its integration with case-based instruction remains underexplored in accounting education. This study addresses that gap by designing and implementing an integrated instructional model that combines case-based learning with scenario simulation in the Auditing course. The model assigns students the role of 'auditor' and immerses them in real-time decision tasks and simulated client interactions to cultivate professional capabilities in risk assessment and judgment. The redesigned curriculum targets these competencies through a two-phase scaffolding structure that progressively transitions from instructor-guided case analysis to independent, student-led risk assessment.

## **2. Design of Integrating Case Instruction and Scenario Simulation**

Situated learning theory provides the foundational framework for this course design. Its central concept, legitimate peripheral participation, reconceptualizes learning as participation in social practice rather than as the transmission of decontextualized knowledge. The Community of Practice framework argues that learners internalize professional norms, discourse conventions, and judgment standards as they move from peripheral to core membership in a joint enterprise. For auditing courses, this has significant implications. Students should not learn auditing standards solely through lectures, but rather assume imaginative audit roles within simulated engagement teams, gradually taking on complex procedures as they develop professional identity.

Building on this theoretical foundation, the course restructures case instruction as contextualized audit tasks rather than static textual analysis. Teachers provide cases with corporate background, transaction facts, and indicators of potential reporting anomalies. After careful investigation of the case, students are required to perform specific procedures as part of the audit team. This redesign changes the instructor–student relationship [3]. The teacher acts as program supervisor, setting audit objectives, providing formative feedback, and evaluating the adequacy of evidence. Students form collaborative teams, assuming hierarchical roles—staff auditor, senior auditor, and audit manager—through which they progress from understanding audit objectives to executing procedures and assessing evidence adequacy. Under the teacher's scaffolding, this task enables students to incrementally construct an audit judgment framework.

In the "Being an Auditor" practice, the integration of case and simulation operates as follows. First, cases are drawn from authentic financial reporting incidents involving material misstatements. Second, critical decision points—such as risk assessment or transactions within business cycles (e.g., revenue and receivables, procurement and payables)—are extracted and embedded with inconsistent evidence and information asymmetry between auditor and client. These elements reconstruct the classroom as a simulated audit field. Within this environment, students must identify and evaluate audit evidence, negotiate with a simulated client regarding audit findings, prepare working papers, and report their conclusions to the engagement partner [4]. This design shifts students from retrospective analysts to real-time decision-makers.

Here, the case ceases to be a reading assignment and becomes a simulated audit context in which students must make real-time decisions. Abstract International

Standards on Auditing provisions are translated into procedural demands: when confronted with inconsistent statements from management, for example, students must assess evidence reliability under ISA 500 and evaluate risks related to financial reporting integrity under ISA 240. Through role-play, task collaboration, and situational negotiation, students gradually construct the logic for professional skepticism and develop professional identity [1]. To reinforce this instructional shift, the assessment system was also restructured. Formative assessment now comprises 50 percent of the course grade, anchored by a financial reporting integrity case analysis task using the GONE framework as an analytical structure. Without the teacher's scaffolding, students independently select a corporate financial reporting integrity case, apply the GONE framework to identify underlying pressures and incentives, and design risk mitigation approaches from the perspective of the auditor.

### 3. The Implementation of Case-Scenario Design

The course spans a 16-week semester. Instead of following the textbook's original ten-chapter sequence, the instructor restructured the content into two modules aligned with the logical progression of an audit program. Chapters 1–4 and 9–10 constitute the theoretical module, covering auditing concepts, planning, evidence collection, risk assessment, reporting, and professional ethics [2]. Chapters 5–8 form the procedural module, focusing on business-cycle audits. Each module is integrated into contextualized tasks to ensure a coherent progression from foundational theory to simulated practice, with increasing complexity. The specific scenario designs are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Chapter Design of Contextualized Scenario

| Chapter                  | Core Knowledge                                                                                         | Role                                                              | Scenario/Case                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Introduction to Audit | Fraud risk factors (ISA 240); historical evolution of the audit function                               | Parliamentary investigator                                        | The South Sea Bubble (1720): identify fraud risk factors based on inconsistencies between financial statements and management representations (e.g., management override, anomalous related-party transactions)                                            |
| 2. Audit Planning        | Overall audit strategy (ISA 300); planning materiality (ISA 320)                                       | Engagement partner / Audit manager                                | Client acceptance meeting (ISA 220): design inquiry procedures and determine preliminary audit direction, timing, and resource allocation for a prospective IPO client; Tesla lifecycle and materiality benchmark selection                                |
| 3. Audit Evidence        | Sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence (ISA 500)                                            | Engagement team member, Senior auditor (international engagement) | Missing pen investigation: establish an evidence-reliability hierarchy (external independent > internal; written > oral); Nuclear facility inspection: apply ISA 500 to evaluate conflicting evidence under information asymmetry and adversarial pressure |
| 4. Risk Assessment       | Risk assessment procedures (ISA 315); analytical procedures (ISA 520); COSO Internal Control Framework | Audit manager                                                     | Missfresh (Chinese instant-retail platform, 2022 liquidity crisis): perform analytical procedures to identify anomalies between marketing expense ratio and transaction frequency; assess COSO control environment deficiencies                            |

|                         |                                                                                                          |                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5–8. Business Cycles    | Walkthroughs (ISA 315); risk responses across business cycles (ISA 330); inventory observation (ISA 501) | Engagement team members                    | Revenue cycle: walkthrough based on fictitious shipment, tracing consistency of documentary, physical, and cash flows; Production and inventory cycle: Huishan Dairy cross-cycle fraud involving biological assets and fixed assets |
| 9. Audit Reporting      | Types of audit opinions (ISA 700/705/706); going concern (ISA 570)                                       | Engagement quality control reviewer (EQCR) | Audit opinion decision under going concern uncertainty and inadequate disclosure: evaluate whether to issue a qualified opinion or disclaimer of opinion                                                                            |
| 10. Professional Ethics | Professional ethics and independence (IESBA Code)                                                        | Engagement partner                         | Independence threat scenario: apply the IESBA Code to resolve a conflict of interest (e.g., close relative serving as executive at the client)                                                                                      |

### 3.1. Theoretical Module: Progressive Analogical Reasoning for Abstract Standards

The theoretical module of the course conveys abstract concepts embedded in international auditing standards concerning sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence, overall audit strategy, planning materiality, and risk assessment procedures. Under conventional teacher-centered instruction, students often find it challenging to connect these standard provisions with concrete decision contexts. To address this challenge, the teacher employed progressive analogical reasoning, designing two scenarios—from routine investigative tasks to complex audit assignments—that required students to independently evaluate evidence reliability and justify their reasoning across varied professional environments.

#### 3.1.1. From Usual Asset Investigation to Complex Audit Tasks: Progressive Analogical Reasoning on Evidence Reliability

When introducing the appropriateness of audit evidence, the teacher began with a familiar analogical scenario. A valuable pen was reported missing from the classroom. Acting as engagement team members, students evaluated three pieces of evidence: peer rumor (oral, internal source), the statement from the owner of the pen (oral, internal source), and a time-stamped, anti-counterfeit receipt from a store (written, external source). Through a process of exclusion, students identified the external written source as the most reliable and constructed a reliability hierarchy: external evidence is generally more reliable than internally generated evidence; written evidence is generally more reliable than oral evidence [5].

The scenario then shifted to a complex audit environment. Students assumed the role of senior auditors on an international program, evaluating whether a country's nuclear facility had ceased uranium enrichment. Four pieces of evidence were provided: (1) a government official's compliance declaration (written, internal source—subject to management overriding risk); (2) a resigned scientist's journal published overseas (written, external source—provider's motivation unclear); (3) commercial satellite infrared thermal imaging of cooling towers (external, physical evidence—technical interpretation requiring expert validation); and (4) an independent mass spectrometry report from pipe samples (external, expert evidence—access subject to procedural constraints). In a 20-minute group discussion, students applied the evidence evaluation framework to analyze source origin, access conditions, susceptibility to alteration, and timeliness, and debated which combination of evidence would sufficiently support the audit conclusion that nuclear activity had ceased [5]. Through this complex scenario, students extended the evidence reliability hierarchy—initially developed in everyday contexts—to a high-uncertainty

environment characterized by information divergence, competing stakeholder perspectives, and time pressure.

### 3.1.2. Audit Planning and Materiality: From Client Communication to Benchmark Selection

When introducing the general audit strategy, the teacher drew an analogy to the client acceptance process. The classroom simulated an audit acceptance scenario for a prospective initial public offering client [1]. Students assumed roles on both the client side—including governance representatives and management—and as external advisors and engagement team members, such as engagement partner and audit manager. In the simulated meeting, students acting as engagement team members designed inquiry procedures to identify significant changes in the client's business environment—such as supply chain restructuring or departure of key personnel—assessed management integrity and governance effectiveness, and determined preliminary audit direction, timing, and resource allocation. This scenario required students to apply the strategic considerations of scope, timing, and direction to develop specific inquiry procedures and interview protocols, moving beyond rote completion of audit planning templates.

When introducing planning materiality, the teacher used a case study involving an internationally recognized electric vehicle manufacturer and asked students to adopt the auditor's perspective in analyzing how corporate life cycle stage influences the information needs of financial statement users. The discussion began with the following question: For a research-intensive startup with continuing losses, should financial statement users primarily focus on net profit, total assets, or the capitalization of R&D expenditure? Through structured discussion, students recognized that the life cycle stage significantly shapes users' sensitivity to financial information, thereby informing the auditor's selection of an appropriate materiality benchmark. For instance, total assets or revenue may serve as suitable benchmarks for startups with volatile earnings, whereas profit before tax is commonly adopted for mature entities with stable profitability. The instructor then provided four sets of anonymized financial data from Chinese new-energy vehicle enterprises and the international case company [5]. Without knowledge of the company identities, students were tasked with inferring the life cycle stage from financial characteristics and selecting the corresponding materiality benchmark. This exercise transformed benchmark selection from a mechanical calculation into a professional judgment rooted in user-oriented financial reporting objectives.

### 3.1.3. Risk Assessment and Internal Control: Analytical Procedures and COSO Deficiency Evaluation in the Missfresh Case

Risk assessment serves as the foundational step in every audit engagement [6]. However, textbooks frequently present the procedural framework as a decontextualized, linear sequence, limiting students' ability to apply it within the dynamic complexity of real-world audit practice. To bridge this gap, the instructor selected Missfresh—an instant-retail platform operating a front-warehouse fresh-food model in China—as the central case study for teaching risk assessment. Students assumed the role of engagement team members and carried out authentic risk assessment tasks, including analytical review.

The instructor introduced the flywheel theory—where repeat purchase rates drive scale, and scale enhances operational efficiency—as an analytical lens to identify key drivers of sustainable operations in instant retail. Students conducted a horizontal comparison between Missfresh and its listed peer Dingdong Maicai across two dimensions. First, they analyzed financial metrics such as marketing expense ratio, monthly transaction frequency per user, and average order value. Second, they assessed front-warehouse density, supply chain resilience, and financing patterns.

Calculations revealed that Missfresh's marketing expense ratio reached 15.3 percent, substantially exceeding the industry average of 6.2 percent, while its monthly user transaction frequency stood at only 0.6. This pronounced disparity between marketing

investment and customer engagement signaled an audit anomaly requiring deeper scrutiny [7].

Building on this finding, students connected business-level risks to financial statement assertions. They reasoned that, under pressure to achieve listing objectives, management had increased transaction volume through substantial consumer incentives. However, these incentives were inconsistently utilized, failing to yield meaningful customer retention or repeat purchasing behavior. Consequently, this business risk translated into a heightened risk of material misstatement—particularly concerning revenue recognition and selling/marketing expenses.

Students then evaluated internal control deficiencies using the COSO Internal Control Framework. The instructor outlined six observed operational irregularities: procurement-related irregularities, unrecorded packaging costs, non-standard recruitment practices, discrepancies in ground-staff compensation records, misallocation of advertising rebates, and improper coupon usage. In collaborative groups, students mapped these issues to weaknesses in the control environment. For example, they identified insufficient segregation between recruitment oversight and subsidy approval functions; absence of system-based monitoring for unusually high-frequency transactions originating from identical IP addresses; and management tolerance of non-compliant sales practices to meet strategic milestones. These findings aligned with COSO components including control environment, risk assessment processes, and information and communication controls.

### *3.2. Procedural Module: Transaction Tracing and Evidence Cross-Verification in Business Cycles*

The procedural module transitions to business-cycle audits, focusing specifically on the revenue and receivables, procurement and payables, and production and inventory cycles as governed by established auditing standards. Instructional design shifts from conceptual understanding to transaction tracing, wherein students cross-verify documentary, physical, and cash flows to identify indicators of potential misstatement.

#### *3.2.1. Revenue Cycle Audit: A Walkthrough Test Based on a Fictitious Shipment*

To introduce walkthrough testing, the teacher designed a simulated audit task involving a RMB 5 million transaction in December for Company A, documented by a complete trail within the ERP system. Acting as engagement team members, students traced from accounting records to supporting documents and verified consistency between physical flows and documentary records, identifying indicators suggestive of potential revenue recognition misstatements. The scenario highlighted anomalies across three dimensions [5].

First, customer creditworthiness was inconsistent with transaction size. The sales order indicated that Company A placed a 5-million-yuan order on December 25, yet corporate registry records showed the company had been incorporated on December 20 with registered capital of only 100,000 yuan. This significant mismatch between credit capacity and transaction scale constituted a risk indicator for revenue recognition.

Second, authorization controls were ineffective. Inspection of the credit approval document revealed that the RMB 5 million credit sale had been approved solely by the sales manager, contrary to the company's policy requiring credit director approval for transactions exceeding RMB 3 million. Further inquiry confirmed that the credit director had resigned in November and the approval responsibility had not been formally reassigned, indicating a lapse in control effectiveness.

Third, physical flow diverged from documentary records. The audit trail referenced a shipping document dated December 26 and a courier pickup record; however, the recorded weight of 0.1 kg was materially inconsistent with the system's entry of several tons for the mobile phone accessories. This discrepancy between physical evidence and documentary records raised questions about whether the goods were actually dispatched [3, 8].

Through this evidence chain analysis, students reconstructed a scenario of unsupported shipment used to artificially inflate revenue. The task required tracing from accounting records to source documents, verifying alignment between source documents and physical movement, and assessing the appropriateness of shipment dates relative to revenue recognition timing in cut-off procedures. The divergence between physical evidence and documentary records signaled a heightened risk of misstatement concerning the occurrence assertion for revenue.

### 3.2.2. Cross-Cycle Fraud Identification: The Huishan Dairy Case

In the later stage of the business-cycle module, the teacher introduced the Huishan Dairy case [9]. Huishan Dairy, a Chinese dairy company whose financial irregularities were identified in 2017, served as a representative example for cross-cycle risk assessment across production and inventory, procurement and payables, and fixed-asset cycles. Students worked in groups to detect discrepancies between financial and non-financial data, cross-validate information from multiple independent sources, and formulate reasoned interpretations of potential misstatements based on converging evidence.

First, students performed analytical procedures to detect discrepancies between financial and non-financial data. They extracted production-cycle data from publicly available annual reports: the number of dairy cows, average annual milk yield per cow, and annual alfalfa consumption per cow. By establishing that growth in milk output should correspond with proportional increases in feed input, they observed that alfalfa cultivation area and consumption had not risen commensurately, despite a doubling in both dairy cow numbers and total milk output [10, 11]. This divergence from expected operational relationships triggered a signal indicating potential material misstatement.

Second, students gathered external corroborating information. They reviewed third-party reports accessible in the public domain and identified inconsistencies with management disclosures. Aerial imagery obtained by the production and inventory cycle group showed discrepancies between reported ranch counts and construction progress versus actual site conditions. Alfalfa bales observed on-site bore packaging labels from overseas suppliers, contradicting management's assertion of domestic self-sufficiency. Meanwhile, the fixed-asset cycle group secured an independent valuation report indicating that the assessed construction value of the ranches was materially lower than the amount reported. These divergences between external evidence and internal disclosures raised questions about the accuracy and completeness of management representations.

Third, all groups synthesized evidence across cycles to reconstruct the underlying operational narrative. Integrating findings from production, fixed-asset, and procurement analyses, they identified a pattern of interrelated reporting anomalies: biological asset valuations (dairy cow counts) and fixed-asset valuations (ranch construction costs) appeared overstated relative to verifiable capacity indicators, while procurement-related disclosures suggested inconsistencies in supply chain structure and cost attribution. This cross-cycle integration enabled students to develop a holistic, financial-statement-level risk assessment aligned with internationally recognized professional standards for risk identification.

### 3.3. Formative Assessment: Autonomous Audit Judgment under the GONE Framework

During the initial phase, the instructor provided cases, assigned roles, and structured analytical pathways as instructional scaffolding. In the latter half of the course, this scaffolding was gradually reduced. The instructor introduced the GONE framework (Greed, Opportunity, Need, Exposure) as an analytical lens for their independent inquiry. Drawing on this framework, students worked in groups to select their own cases, assumed responsibility for professional audit judgment, and produced a case analysis presentation. This progression marked the shift from instructor-supported scaffolding to student-directed analytical capability.

The analytical lens for this task was the GONE framework (Greed, Opportunity, Need, Exposure), a conceptual model widely applied in professional auditing education.

The framework posits that certain financial reporting irregularities emerge from the simultaneous presence and interaction of four factors: Greed—an undue pursuit of personal or managerial gain; Opportunity—control deficiencies and governance limitations that create conditions conducive to misrepresentation; Need—financial pressure stemming from sources such as valuation adjustment mechanisms, regulatory listing requirements, or capital availability considerations; and Exposure—the likelihood of detection and the nature of subsequent accountability measures [12].

Students were required to work in groups to select a corporate financial reporting incident, adopt the auditor's perspective to build an analytical structure, and produce an audit judgment grounded in the GONE framework. Based on the following four pre-defined criteria, the instructor ceased providing scaffolding and instead evaluated students' audit judgments and challenged their reasoning as a critical interlocutor rather than offering direct guidance.

First, case quality and accessibility. The instructor focused on whether the selected company offered publicly available multi-source information—annual reports, regulatory findings, third-party investigation summaries, and media analyses—sufficient to support layered GONE analysis. Typical examples included Luckin Coffee, Zhangzidao, and Dongfang Group. The accessibility of these cases allowed students to reconstruct underlying motivations from financial data, regulatory filings, and industry analyses [13]. Some groups, however, selected companies with insufficient disclosure, and their GONE analyses rested on definitional restatement rather than evidence-driven reasoning. This outcome revealed differences in case-selection competence, which were then incorporated into formative feedback.

Second, professional identity construction [14]. The instructor examined whether students transferred the auditor role established in earlier classroom scenarios to the independent case analysis setting. Observable indicators included the use of professional audit discourse (e.g., "engagement team," "professional skepticism," "risk of material misstatement"), adoption of engagement team reporting structures (lead presenter, supplementary speaker, respondent), and the deployment of audit logic when responding to challenges. For instance, some groups explained the audit trail for off-book cash flows by identifying anomalous related-party transactions, tracing bank records and contracts, and evaluating commercial substance. Others presented simulated working paper documentation or cited international auditing standards—such as inquiry procedures regarding financial reporting risks—when responding to the instructor's challenges. These responses signaled a shift from role-playing to professional reasoning.

Third, integrative reasoning within the GONE framework. The instructor assessed whether students established the interplay among the four GONE factors rather than restating each factor in isolation [15]. In the Zhangzidao case, for example, one group located Need in the financial pressure of continuing losses approaching regulatory listing thresholds; traced Opportunity to the inherent difficulty of reliable inventory observation for biological assets (ISA 501) and the over-reliance on management's representations; linked Greed to management's motivation to record biological assets fictitiously in order to facilitate shareholder divestment; and analyzed Exposure by focusing on technological limitations and enforcement timing in the pre-BeiDou era. The analysis constructed an interactive logic loop: financial pressure (Need) compelled management to identify manipulable accounting areas (Opportunity), which were addressed under personal gain motives (Greed) with a reduced probability of detection (Exposure).

Finally, cross-verification of multi-source evidence. Drawing on principles of evidence sufficiency and appropriateness, the instructor examined whether students obtained information from multiple independent sources and identified consistencies and inconsistencies. The group analyzing Dongfang Group not only constructed trend charts using annual report data on revenue and operating cash flow, but also used the evidence of revenue growth alongside persistent negative operating cash flow to support the Need dimension [16]. For Erkang Pharmaceutical, the group spotted a jump in days inventory outstanding (DIO) from 64 to 187 days concurrent with reported net profit growth—a

sharp inconsistency pointing to possible misstatements in inventory existence or cost recognition. Using BeiDou satellite navigation data as non-financial external evidence, the Zhangzidao group cross-checked it against management's sampling locations and inventory records, uncovering discrepancies. The diversity of these evidence sources and the cross-verification methods corresponded to established reliability hierarchies: external independent sources exceed internally generated sources.

From a course design perspective, the GONE task shifted assessment from knowledge recall to professional judgment rehearsal [7]. Students were required to independently select the audit case, identify evidence gaps, perform cross-source verification, and produce audit conclusions, all of which demand integration of multi-source information within the international auditing standards framework rather than merely producing a descriptive report. The task required students to produce an audit risk assessment memorandum, presenting their judgment rationale and reasoning from the auditor's perspective. Through this task, the course design extended the "Becoming the Auditor" role from classroom simulation to self-directed decision-making contexts, testing students' audit judgment in the absence of instructional scaffolding.

#### 4. Conclusion and Implication

This course redesign is grounded in situated learning theory and structured around a two-phase scaffolding sequence. In the initial phase, the instructor provides authentic cases, audit roles, and procedural templates; in the subsequent phase, support is gradually faded so that students independently select cases and perform risk assessments. The central mechanism of this design is the translation of abstract ISA provisions—such as the appropriateness of audit evidence (ISA 500), risk assessment procedures (ISA 315), and business cycle tests (ISA 330)—into executable professional judgment contexts through simulated audit tasks. As students perform walkthroughs and analytical procedures, assess control deficiencies, and draw risk inferences, they construct an audit judgment framework that bridges evidence evaluation and risk response. The GONE presentation task extends this progression by requiring students to integrate multi-source evidence and produce a risk assessment memorandum without direct instructional scaffolding, thereby mirroring the autonomous professional judgment demanded in audit practice. Along this trajectory, the "Becoming the Auditor" role moves from classroom simulation to self-directed decision-making, enabling students to develop professional identity through progressive involvement.

However, the GONE task also exposed a design limitation. Students performed ex post analysis with knowledge of the outcome, making them susceptible to hindsight bias—the tendency to overestimate their ability to anticipate the outcome and to underestimate the difficulty of judgment amid incomplete information and ambiguous signals in authentic audit settings. In practice, auditors must design audit procedures ex ante, execute tests in high-risk areas, and form judgments without knowing whether irregularities exist. This cognitive bias suggests a direction for instructional refinement: introducing audit procedure design tasks with undisclosed outcomes. In these tasks, students receive only financial data and industry background, identify anomalies, and design specific audit responses (e.g., expanded confirmations, inventory observation, or additional analytical procedures) without knowing whether irregularities are present. This adjustment shifts the training focus from ex post explanation to ex ante judgment, aligning instructional practice more closely with the risk assessment and response design logic of the ISA framework.

**Funding:** This article is supported by Jiangxi Provincial Education Science Fund. Grant Number: 23YB026.

#### References

1. B. Apostolou, J. W. Dorminey, J. M. Hassell, and J. E. Rebele, "Accounting education literature review (2013–2014)," *Journal of Accounting Education*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 69–127, 2015.

2. A. Abraham and H. Jones, "Facilitating student learning in accounting through scaffolded assessment," *Issues in Accounting Education*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 29–49, 2016.
3. K. Ashford-Rowe, J. Herrington, and C. Brown, "Establishing the critical elements that determine authentic assessment," *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 205–222, 2014.
4. A. A. Austin, J. S. Hammersley, and M. A. Ricci, "Improving auditors' consideration of evidence contradicting management's estimate assumptions," *Contemporary Accounting Research*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 696–716, 2020.
5. A. J. Singleton and T. Singleton, *Fraud Auditing and Forensic Accounting*, pp. 1–37, 2010.
6. W. M. Burdon and K. Munro, "Simulation—is it all worth it? The impact of simulation from the perspective of accounting students," *The International Journal of Management Education*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 429–448, 2017.
7. R. Bautista-Mesa, H. Molina Sánchez, and J. N. Ramírez Sobrino, "Audit workplace simulations as a methodology to increase undergraduates' awareness of competences," *Accounting Education*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 234–258, 2018.
8. J. Collins, *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap and Others Don't*, 2009.
9. R. Fay and N. R. Montague, "Witnessing your own cognitive bias: A compendium of classroom exercises," *Issues in Accounting Education*, forthcoming, 2014.
10. R. Hayes and P. Wallage, *Principles of International Auditing and Assurance*, Routledge, 2025.
11. L. Quadackers, T. Groot, and A. Wright, "Auditors' professional skepticism: Neutrality versus presumptive doubt," *Contemporary Accounting Research*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 639–657, 2014.
12. T. Stanley and S. Marsden, "Accountancy capstone: Enhancing integration and professional identity," *Journal of Accounting Education*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 363–382, 2013.
13. J. Lave and E. Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
14. J. Van de Pol, M. Volman, and J. Beishuizen, "Scaffolding in teacher–student interaction: A decade of research," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 271–296, 2010.
15. R. Taplin, A. Singh, R. Kerr, and A. Lee, "The use of short role-plays for an ethics intervention in university auditing courses," *Accounting Education*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 383–402, 2018.
16. E. Wenger, *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.