

Limperg Course on Experimental Accounting Research Spring 2022

Part A: May 16 (Bart Dierynck) & May 17 (Eddy Cardinaels)

Part B: May 30-31 & June 3 (Kathryn Kadous)

Part C: June 23-24 & 27 (Willie Choi)

INSTRUCTORS

PART A: Bart Dierynck, Tilburg University, b.dierynck@tilburguniversity.edu & Eddy Cardinaels, Tilburg University, e.cardinaels@tilburguniversity.edu

PART B: Kathryn Kadous, Emory University, kathryn.kadous@emory.edu

PART C: Jongwoon (Willie) Choi, University of Wisconsin-Madison, willie.choi@wisc.edu

PART A (Bart Dierynck & Eddy Cardinaels)

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of Part A is to (1) provide every participant with a solid background in research design in general and experimental research design in particular and (2) help participants with structuring their research ideas. To realize the course objective, Part A will cover three parts. In the first part, core topics about theory testing and research design in general and designing and running experiments in particular will be covered. In the second part, we will discuss two core aspects to generate and advance knowledge by means of experiments. Specifically, we will discuss the role of replications and multi-method research in accounting research. In the third part, participants present their own research project in a structured way.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The course objectives will be realized through watching videos on beforehand, completing assignments, interactive online teaching sessions and group discussions. A solid preparation is core to facilitate the learning process. Please read the information below about the different sessions (and related assignments) carefully.

On beforehand (Session 1+2) (Bart Dierynck): Please watch the three videos on core topics about research design and running experiments. The videos are titled as ‘The Research Cycle’(video 1), ‘Basic Topics’(video 2), and ‘Running Experiments’(video 3). Develop one question about each video and submit this question via this [LINK](#) before May 11 5pm. Your questions can be of any nature and deal with every aspect of the videos. We will discuss your questions in Session 1 and cover some additional, but more specialized, topics related to research design and running experiments in Session 2. The goal of session 1 and 2 is that you develop a solid foundation regarding the core building blocks of running experiments allowing you to maximize your learning experience from the rest of the course.

Topics from the papers below are covered during the videos and will help you to develop a framework to replicate studies, set up your own studies and discuss studies conducted by other researchers (as a discussant, reviewer, and critical reader). Please read these articles before or after watching the videos. The questions you submit can also deal with topics covered in these papers.

- Bloomfield, R., M.W. Nelson, and E. Soltes. 2016. Gathering data for archival, field, survey, and experimental accounting research. *Journal of Accounting Research* 54(2): 341-395.
- Asay, S., R. Guggenmos, K. Kadous, L. Koonce, and R. Libby. 2021. Theory Testing and Process Evidence in Accounting Experiments. *The Accounting Review* Forthcoming. See https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3485844
- Kadous, K., and D. Zhou. 2016. Maximizing the contribution of JDM-style experiments. See https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2887033
- Sugden, R. 2005. Experiments as exhibits and experiments as tests. *Journal of Economic Methodology* 12(2): 291-302.
- Rennekamp, K. 2012. Processing fluency and investors reactions to disclosure readability. *Journal of Accounting Research* 50: 1319-1354. (*just skim this paper, we will use the design as an example to discuss several topics related to experimental design*)

Replications (Session 3 + 4) (Bart Dierynck): Carefully read the paper of Dierynck, van der Geest, and van Pelt (2022), which replicates the paper of Maas, van Rinsum, and Towry (2012, *The Accounting Review*), and develop 1 discussion point about Dierynck, van der Geest, and van Pelt (2022). A discussion point should address the strengths and/or weaknesses related to the paper’s motivation/contribution, theory, research design, or data analyses. Also, come up with one experimental paper that you would like to replicate and extend. Please submit the discussion point about Dierynck, van der Geest, and van Pelt (2022) and the citation of the paper you want to replicate via this LINK before May 11 5pm. Be prepared to give a 5-minute presentation about the paper you want to replicate and extend. The presentation covers the following topics: (1) what are the main results of the paper you want to replicate? (1 slide), (2) why do you want to replicate and extend this paper and how will your replication and extension contribute to the existing body of knowledge? (1 slide), and (3) how do you want to extend this paper? (2 slides). For the ‘how-question’, please (1) use the predictive validity framework/Libby boxes and indicate on which link of the framework your extension will focus and (2) explain how you will adapt the experimental design of the paper in your extension. See the ‘on beforehand videos’ for more information about the predictive validity framework/Libby boxes. The goal of session 3 and 4 is to sharpen your skills to understand and extend the work of others in a critical but constructive way. Such skills are important to build a coherent and relevant research area.

The papers below are covered during the sessions on replications.

- Dierynck, B., J. van der Geest, and V. van Pelt. 2022. In search of informed discretion (revisited): are managers concerned about appearing selfish?. Working paper Tilburg University. See [HERE](#) for the paper.
- Maas, V.S., M. van Rinsum, and K.L. Towry. 2012. In search of informed discretion: an experimental investigation of fairness and trust reciprocity. *The Accounting Review* 87(2): 617-644.

Standards to evaluate theory testing via lab and field experiments (Session 5) (Eddy Cardinaels): Read the papers listed below. Make your own ranking of the papers where you would rank papers from best to worst (1, 2, and 3). You can make one ranking on contribution/creativity (beauty of the exercise) and the other ranking on execution (beauty

of the execution). Can you describe why you made this ranking (e.g. short section what elements did you find problematic; what was good; weaknesses to defend your ranking)?

- Presslee, A., T. Vance, and A. Webb. 2013. The Effects of Reward Type on the Difficulty of Self-Set Goals, Goal Commitment, and Performance. *The Accounting Review* 88(5): 1805-1831
- Bloomfield R. J, and J. Luft. 2006. Responsibility for Cost Management Hinders Learning to Avoid the Winner's Curse. *The Accounting Review* 81 (1): 29-47.
- Hales, J., L. Wang and M.G. Williamson. 2015. Selection Benefits of Stock-Based Compensation for the Rank-and-File. *The Accounting Review* 90(4): 1497-1516.

Multi-method research and online participant pools (Session 6) (Eddy Cardinaels):

Read the papers of Cardinaels, Hollander and White (2019) and Asay, Elliot and Rennekamp (2017). You can pick one of the papers and raise a discussion point on either the participant pool, the internal validity, the external validity of the research question. This could relate to both the use of the method for theory testing as well as issues that may limit or strengthen the contribution.

- Cardinaels, E., S. Hollander and B. White. 2019. Automatic summarization of earnings releases: Attributes and effects on investors' judgments. *Review of Accounting Studies* 24(3): 860-890.
- Asay, S., B. Elliott, and K. Rennekamp. 2017. Disclosure readability and the sensitivity of investors' valuation judgments to outside information. *The Accounting Review* 92(4): 1-25.

Use this survey [LINK](#) to complete your answers on the assignments of Session 5 and 6. Please submit your answers before May 11 5pm.

Own research project (Session 7 & 8) (Eddy Cardinaels):

Prepare a short presentation (maximum 3 slides, 5 min presentation, 10 min feedback) and discuss (1) the main motivation/background of this research project, (2) the predictive validity framework of this research project, (3) two points you are currently struggling with when developing or executing this research project. The research project you discuss could be in the data development phase, data collection phase, or write-up phase. Depending on the phase of your research project, your struggling points will differ. Please see the schedule below for the allocation of students over days.

COURSE SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE

The schedule for each day will proceed as follows:

Day 1: Monday, May 16, 2022

- 09:00-10:30 Q&A videos (Session 1)
- 10:30-10:45 Break
- 10:45-12:15 Capita Selecta (Session 2)
- 12:15-13:15 Lunch
- 13:15-14:45 Replications & Extensions (Session 3)
- 14.45-15.00 Break
- 15.00-16.00 Replications & Extensions (Session 4)

Day 2: Tuesday, May 17, 2022

08:45-10:30 Standards to evaluate experiments (Session 5)

10:30-10:45 Short Break

10:45-12:30 Multi-method research and online participant pools (Session 6)

12:30-13:30 Lunch

13:30-15:00 Research Proposals – I (Session 7)

15:00-16:00 Long Break

16:00-17:00 Research proposals – II (Session 8)

PART B (Kathryn Kadous)

COURSE OBJECTIVES

There are two main course objectives. The first objective is to provide you with a broad exposure to experimental accounting research that adopts a JDM perspective (vs. an experimental economics perspective) and spans financial and audit topics. Certainly, our coverage of even these topics will not be comprehensive. But, by the end of the course, you should have a good idea of the important themes that are studied across these accounting topics. To that end, we will focus on recently published papers and working papers, as these highlight the themes at the “frontier” of experimental accounting research. While we will not cover the “classics” that form the foundation of experimental accounting research, I believe it is important for you to become familiar with them. Many of these are cited in the papers we will cover in the course, and I encourage you to read them.

The second objective is to provide opportunities to critically evaluate experimental research and generate/develop your own research. While we will use a limited set of research as the context for these opportunities, I hope that you will find the experience applies beyond the research we will cover in this part of the course.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

Group discussion will be the primary means of learning. I expect you to carefully read the primary readings and be prepared to discuss them (background readings can be skimmed). A key objective is to have a balanced discussion of both the strengths and weaknesses of primary reading. The course requirements are intended to facilitate our discussions (and thus, your learning in the course).

Discussion Points: Please submit at least 1 discussion point (i.e., questions or comments) for each primary reading for Days 1 and 2 (only). For Sessions 1 and 2 on Day 1, these can be comments or questions about any material in the paper. For the remaining sessions, discussion points should address strengths and/or weaknesses related to the paper’s motivation/contribution, theory, research design, or data analyses. If your discussion point focuses on the paper’s strengths, explain *why* it is a strength. If your discussion point focuses on the paper’s weaknesses, explain *why* you think it a weakness (e.g., how does it affect the interpretation of the results), and how the issue could have been avoided (while keeping in mind the trade-offs that the authors were facing). Importantly, *the goal is to be critical, but constructive.*

Please email your discussion points directly to the assigned discussion leader at least 24 hours before we discuss the paper in class (for Sessions 1 and 2 on Day 1 this is the instructor, for the remaining sessions please see the course schedule for discussion leader assignments).

Discussion Leadership: A discussion leader is assigned for each of the primary readings (except for Sessions 1 and 2 on Day 1 and Day 3). The discussion leader assignments are listed in the schedule at the end of this syllabus. When you are the assigned discussion leader, please provide a written summary of the paper to me and the other students at the start of our discussion of the paper. The summary should describe the research question(s), theory and hypotheses, an overview of the experiment, and the key findings. Your summary should embed your fellow students’ discussion points for that paper.

Due to time constraints, students Sara Bibler, Mariza Chavez Steinmann, Rene Eichler, Michele Fumagalli, Benjamin Kinnart and Qinnan Ruan will serve as discussion leaders during this part of the course. The remaining students will serve as discussion leaders during Part C of the course with Willie Choi.

Research Write-Ups: Please submit a research write-up for *any three* of the primary readings from any of the sessions for which discussion leaders are assigned. Your write-ups should do one of the following:

- (i) Propose a new project that would get at the same basic research questions in a different way
- (ii) Propose a new project that would extend or expand on the findings of the paper

Your write-ups should be brief (about one page). I recommend using the “Kinney’s 3 paragraphs” format in which the write-ups address three basic questions: What is the research question? Why is it important? How will you investigate it?

Please email me your write-ups before Session 1 on Day 3.

Research Write-Up Presentation: Please prepare a short presentation of one of your research write-ups (no more than five slides). In the presentation, please indicate whether you are proposing a new project that gets at the same basic research question of the primary reading in a different way or extends/expands the findings of the primary reading. Also, please organize the presentation around the three basic questions per the “Kinney’s 3 paragraphs” format.

Due to time constraints, students Sara Bibler, Mei-Wen Oolgaard, Qinnan Ruan, Bei Shi, Jens Van Mele, and Dwight Waeye will present during this part of the course and the remaining students will present during Part C of the course.

Referee Report: Please prepare a referee report (i.e., a review) for the working paper that I provide. Although formats differ, the referee report should first very briefly summarize the paper and then describe major and minor concerns regarding the paper. When possible, the referee should make suggestions that would help the author address those concerns, though this is not the main goal of the report. Generally, a concise referee report should address no more than two or three major concerns and four or five minor concerns. A common rookie mistake is to try to impress the editor by raising every issue possible. A good report, on the other hand, focuses on the most relevant concerns. For this assignment, please follow the guidelines listed under “How to Structure Your Report” [here](#). You may also find the step-by-step instructions and other information [here](#) useful. Please do not include an editorial recommendation in the referee report.

Please email me your review of the assigned paper before Session 1 on Day 3.

Grades will be determined as follows:

Discussion Points	30%
Discussion Leadership or Research Write-Up Presentation	30%
Research Write-Ups	30%
Referee Report	10%

COURSE SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE

The schedule for each day will proceed as follows (based on times in the Netherlands):

- 14:00-15:15: Session 1
- 15:15-15:30: Break
- 15:30-16:45: Session 2
- 16:45-17:00: Break
- 17:00-18:15: Session 3
- 18:15-19:30: Dinner Break

19:30-20:45: Session 4

For Day 3, please note we will meet only for Session 1 and 2.

DAY 1: MONDAY, MAY 30, 2022

Session 1: The Role of Theory in Accounting Research

We will discuss what constitutes theory and the role of theory in empirical accounting research.

Primary Readings

Sutton, R., and B. Staw. 1995. What Theory is *Not*, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 371-384.

Whetten, D. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review* 490-495.

Session 2: Process Evidence in Accounting Experiments

We will discuss the hows and whys of collecting process evidence for accounting experiments.

Primary Readings

Asay, H. S., R. Guggenmos, K. Kadous, L. Koonce, and R. Libby. In Press. Theory Testing and Process Evidence in Accounting Experiments. *The Accounting Review*.

<https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2019-1001>

Barcellos, L. P. and K. Kadous. In Press. Do managers' nonnative accents influence investment decisions? *The Accounting Review*. <https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2020-0228>

Session 3: Auditor Judgment I (Discussion Leader: Sara Bibler)

Primary Reading

Hong, Y. (B.) In Press. Initial task engagement: Unlocking the value of fit and non-fit to improve audit judgments. *The Accounting Review*. <https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2019-0607>

Background Reading (read especially section 2)

Griffith, E. E., K. Kadous, and D. Young. 2021. Improving complex audit judgments: A framework and evidence. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 38 (3): 2071-2104.

Session 4: Auditor Judgment II (Discussion Leader: Mariza Chavez Steinmann)

Primary Reading

Blum, E. S., R. C. Hatfield, and R. W. Houston. 2022. The effect of staff auditor reputation on audit quality enhancing actions. *The Accounting Review* 97 (1): 75-97.

Background Reading (skim)

Clor-Proell, S. M., K. Kadous, and C. A. Proell. 2022. The sounds of silence: A framework, theory, and empirical evidence of audit voice. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory* 41(1): 75-100.

DAY 2: TUESDAY, MAY 31, 2022

Session 1: Investor Judgment I (Discussion Leader: Rene Eichler)

Primary Reading

Brown, T., S. M. Grant, and A. M. Winn. 2020. The effects of mobile device use and headline focus on investor judgments. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 83: 101100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2019.101100>.

Background Reading

Grant, S. M. 2020. How does using a mobile device change investors' reactions to firm disclosures? *Journal of Accounting Research* 58: 741-775. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1111/1475-679X.12299>.

Session 2: Investor Judgment II (Discussion Leader: Michele Fumagalli)

Primary Reading

Clor-Proell, S. N., R. D. Guggenmos, and K. Rennekamp. 2020. Mobile devices and investment news apps: The effects of information release, push notification, and the fear of missing out. *The Accounting Review* 95 (5): 95–115, <https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-52625>.

Background Reading

None

Session 3: Auditor Judgment III (Discussion Leader: Benjamin Kinnart)

Primary Reading

Hammersley, J.S., and M. A. Ricci 2021. Using Audit Programs to Improve Auditor Evidence Collection. *The Accounting Review* 96 (1): 251–272. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2308/tar-2018-0120>

Background Reading

None

Session 4: Auditor Judgment IV (Discussion Leader: Qinnan Ruan)

Primary Reading

Commerford, B. P., S. A. Dennis, J. R. Joe, and J. Ulla. 2022. Man Versus Machine: Complex Estimates and Auditor Reliance on Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Accounting Research* 60 (1): 171-201.

Background Reading (read carefully if you are not familiar with the paper, skim otherwise)

Guggenmos, R. D., M. D. Piercey, and C. P. Agoglia. 2018. Custom contrast testing: Current trends and a new approach. *The Accounting Review* 93 (5): 223-244.

DAY 3: FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 2022

Session 1: The Review Process: Preparing and Responding to Reviews

We will discuss the reviews that you prepared for class and compare them to the reviews received from the journal. We will discuss responding to reviews and the remainder of the review process.

Primary Readings

Berk, J. B., C. R. Harvey, and D. Hirshleifer. 2016. Preparing a referee report: Guidelines and perspectives. Working paper.

Oler, D. K., and W. R. Pasewark. 2016. How to review a paper. *Issues in Accounting Education* 31 (2): 219-234.

Cook, K. A., M. Hart, M. R. Kinney, and D. K. Oler. 2016. How to discuss a paper: Developing and showcasing your scholarly skills. *Issues in Accounting Education* 31 (2): 211-218.

Background Reading

None.

Session 2: Sharing Your Write-Up Ideas (Sara Bibler, Mei-Wen Oolgaard, Qinnan Ruan, Bei Shi, Jens Van Mele, Dwight Waeye)

This is an opportunity for you to present one of your research write-ups to me and your fellow students and receive initial feedback on those ideas.

PART C (Willie Choi)

COURSE OBJECTIVES

There are two main course objectives. The first objective is to provide you with a broad exposure to experimental accounting research that adopts an experimental economics perspective (vs. a JDM-style perspective), and spans financial, managerial, and audit topics. Certainly, our coverage of even these topics will not be comprehensive. But, by the end of the course, you should have a good idea of the important themes that are studied across these accounting topics. To that end, we will focus on recently published and forthcoming papers, as these highlight the themes at the “frontier” of experimental accounting research. While we will not cover the “classics” that form the foundation of experimental accounting research, I believe it is important for you to become familiar with them. Many of these are cited in the papers we will cover in the course, and I encourage you to read them.

The second objective is to provide opportunities to critically evaluate experimental research and generate/develop your own research. While we will use a limited set of research as the context for these opportunities, I hope that you will find the experience applies beyond the research we will cover in this part of the course.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

Group discussion will be the primary means of learning. I expect you to carefully read the primary readings and be prepared to discuss them (background readings can be skimmed). A key objective is to have a balanced discussion of both the strengths and weaknesses of primary reading. The course requirements are intended to facilitate our discussions (and thus, your learning in the course).

Discussion Points: Please submit at least 1 discussion point (i.e., questions or comments) for each primary reading (except for Sessions 1 and 2 on Day 1 and Day 3). These discussion points should address the strengths and/or weaknesses related to the paper’s motivation/contribution, theory, research design, or data analyses. If your discussion point focuses on the paper’s strengths, explain *why* it is a strength. If your discussion point focuses on the paper’s weaknesses, explain *why* you think it a weakness (e.g., how does it affect the interpretation of the results), and how the issue could have been avoided (while keeping in mind the trade-offs that the authors were facing). Importantly, *the goal is to be critical, but constructive.*

Please email your discussion points directly to the assigned discussion leader at least 24 hours before we discuss the paper in class (see the course schedule for discussion leader assignments).

Discussion Leadership: A discussion leader is assigned for each of the primary readings (except for Sessions 1 and 2 on Day 1 and Day 3). The discussion leader assignments are listed in the schedule at the end of this syllabus. When you are the assigned discussion leader, please provide a written summary of the paper to me and the other students at the start of our discussion of the paper. The summary should describe the research question(s), theory and hypotheses, an overview of the experiment, and the key findings. Your summary should embed your fellow students’ discussion points for that paper.

Due to time constraints, the following students will serve as discussion leaders during Part C of the course: Mariza Chavez Steinmann, Rene Eichler, Mei-Wen Oolgaard, Bei Shi, Jens Van Mele and Dwight Waeye.

The remaining students will serve as discussion leaders during Part B of the course with Kathryn Kadous.

Research Write-Ups: Please submit a research write-up for *any three* of the primary readings (except for Sessions 1 and 2 on Day 1 and 3). Your write-ups should do one of the following:

- (i) Propose a new project that would get at the same basic research questions in a different way
 - (ii) Propose a new project that would extend or expand on the findings of the paper
- Your write-ups should be brief (about one page). I recommend using the “Kinney’s 3 paragraphs” format in which the write-ups address three basic questions: What is the research question? Why is it important? How will you investigate it?

Please email me your write-ups before Session 1 on Day 3.

Research Write-Up Presentation: Please prepare a short presentation of one of your research write-ups (no more than five slides). In the presentation, please indicate whether you are proposing a new project that gets at the same basic research question of the primary reading in a different way or extends/expands the findings of the primary reading. Also, please organize the presentation around the three basic questions per the “Kinney’s 3 paragraphs” format.

Due to time constraints, the following students will present their research write-up ideas during Part C of the course: Mariza Chavez Steinmann, Rene Eichler, Michele Fumagalli, Benjamin Kinnart.

The remaining students will have the opportunity to present an idea during Part B of the course with Kathryn Kadous.

Abstract/Introduction Writing Assignment: For this assignment, I will provide you with the hypothesis development, experimental design, and results sections of a paper, and you will submit a draft of the abstract and introduction section for the paper.

Please email me your write-ups before Session 1 on Day 3.

Grades will be determined as follows:

Discussion Points	30%
Discussion Leadership or Research Write-Up Presentation	30%
Research Write-Ups	30%
Abstract/Introduction Writing Assignment	10%

COURSE SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE

The schedule for each day will proceed as follows (based on times in the Netherlands):

09:00-10:30 Session 1
 10:30-10:45 Break
 10:45-12:15 Session 2
 12:15-13:30 Lunch
 13:30-15:00 Session 3
 15:00-15:15 Break
 15:15-16:45 Session 4

For Day 3, please note we will meet only for Session 1 and 2.

DAY 1: THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 2022

Session 1: The “Science” of Developing an Experimental Research Paper

Primary Reading

Libby, R., R. Bloomfield, and M. W. Nelson. 2002. Experimental research in financial accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 27: 775-810.

Background Reading (skim)

None.

Session 2: The “Art” of Developing an Experimental Research Paper

Primary Reading

Cochrane, J. H. 2005. Writing tips for Ph. D. students. Working paper.

Background Reading (skim)

None.

Session 3: Financial Accounting I (Discussion Leader: Mei-Wen Oolgaard)

Primary Reading

Elliott, W. B., B. T. Gale, and J. L. Hobson. 2021. The joint influence of information push and value relevance on investor judgments and market efficiency. *Journal of Accounting Research* (forthcoming).

Background Reading (skim)

Bloomfield, R. J. 2002. The “incomplete revelation hypothesis” and financial reporting. *Accounting Horizons* 16 (3): 233-243.

Session 4: Financial Accounting II (Discussion Leader: Bei Shi)

Primary Reading

Lawrence, A., J. Ryans, E. Sun, and N. Laptev. 2018. Earnings announcement promotions: A Yahoo Finance field experiment. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 66: 399-414.

Background Reading (skim)

Libby, R., and S. A. Emmett. 2014. Earnings presentation effects on manager reporting choices and investor decisions. *Accounting and Business Research* 44 (4): 410-438.

DAY 2: FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2022

Session 1: Managerial I (Discussion Leader: Jens Van Mele)

Primary Reading

Haesebrouck, K. 2021. The effects of information acquisition effort, psychological ownership, and reporting context on opportunistic managerial reporting. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 38 (4): 3085-3112.

Background Reading (skim)

Evans III, J. H., R. L. Hannan, R. Krishnan, and D. V. Moser. 2001. Honesty in managerial reporting. *The Accounting Review* 76 (4): 537-559.

Session 2: Managerial II (Discussion Leader: Dwight Waeye)

Primary Reading

Chan, E. W., and X. Zhang. 2021. Understanding and deterring misreporting in nonprofits: The joint effects of pay level and penalty type. *The Accounting Review* 96 (4): 157-177.

Background Reading (skim)

Chen, C. X., H. L. Pesch, and L. W. Wang. 2020. Selection benefits of below-market pay in social-mission organizations: Effects on individual performance and team cooperation. *The Accounting Review* 95 (1): 57-77.

Session 3: Audit I (Discussion Leader: Mariza Chavez Steinmann)

Primary Reading

Hurley, P. J., B. W. Mayhew, K. M. Obermire, and A. C. Tegeler. 2021. The impact of risk and the potential for loss on managers' demand for audit quality. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 38 (4): 2795-2823.

Background Reading (skim)

DeFond, M., and J. Zhang. 2014. A review of archival auditing research. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 58: 275-326.

Session 4: Audit II (Discussion Leader: Rene Eichler)

Primary Reading

Kachelmeier, S. J., and D. Rimkus. 2022. Does seeking audit evidence impede the willingness to impose audit adjustments? *The Accounting Review* (forthcoming).

Background Reading (skim)

Church, B. K., J. G. Jenkins, and J. D. Stanley. 2018. Auditor independence in the United States: Cornerstone of the profession or thorn in the side? *Accounting Horizons* 32 (3): 145-168.

DAY 3: MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2022

Session 1: Abstract/Introduction Writing Assignment Discussion

Primary Reading

None.

Background Reading (skim)

None.

Session 2: Sharing Your Write-Up Ideas

This is an opportunity for you to present one of your research write-ups to me and your fellow students and receive initial feedback on those ideas.

Due to time constraints, the following students will present during this session: Mariza Chavez Steinmann, Rene Eichler, Michele Fumagalli, Benjamin Kinnart

The remaining students will have the opportunity to present an idea during Part B of the course with Kathryn Kadous.