

Limperg Course on Experimental Accounting Research Spring 2026¹

Part A: May 18 (Bart Dierynck) & May 19 (Eddy Cardinaels) (online)

Part B: June 10, 11 & 12 (Willie Choi) (Tilburg)

Part C: June 12, 15 & 16 (Kathryn Kadous) (Tilburg)

INSTRUCTORS

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

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

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

OVERALL COURSE OBJECTIVE

The overall objectives of this course are to provide students with (1) a solid understanding of the role of experiments for addressing accounting research questions and (2) the necessary tools to analyze and run (field) experiments themselves to address their own research questions. To meet these objectives, the course contains of three parts. In Part A, Bart Dierynck and Eddy Cardinaels develop the foundations and focus on (1) developing knowledge and skills related to core aspects of research design, (2) the relevance and usefulness of replications and multi-method research designs. In Part B, Willie Choi will focus on analyzing and running experiments with a focus on behavioral and experimental economics. In Part C, Kathryn Kadous will focus on analyzing and running accounting experiments with a focus on judgment and decision-making. The main theoretical focus will be on psychology theory. Both in Part B and C, all accounting areas will be covered although Kathryn Kadous will pay more attention to financial accounting and auditing while Willie Choi will zoom in more on management accounting. In each part, students will be asked to actively acquire knowledge, ask questions, and present their own insights. This course is useful for any PhD-student interested in experimental research as well as for any PhD-student that needs to sharpen his/her skills regarding research design and methodology.

¹ This syllabus is based on the 2025 edition of the course and will be subject to some small changes. The final syllabus will be communicated on time to registered participants.

PART A (Bart Dierynck & Eddy Cardinaels): Online on May 18 and May 19

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 screencasts 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 screencasts on core topics about research design and running experiments. The screencasts are titled as ‘The Research Cycle’(screencast 1), ‘Basic Topics’(screencast 2), and ‘Running Experiments’(screencast 3). Develop one question about each screencast and submit this question via this LINK before May 14 1pm. Your questions can be of any nature and deal with every aspect of the screencasts. 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 screencasts 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 screencasts. 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* 97(6): 23-43.
- Kadous, K., and D. Zhou. 2016. Maximizing the contribution of JDM-style experiments. *The Routledge Companion to Behavioural Research in Accounting*. Abingdon (UK): Routledge.
- 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 (2025, see attachment), 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 (2025). 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 (2025) and the citation of the paper

you want to replicate via this LINK before May 14 1pm. 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 screencasts' 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. 2023. In search of informed discretion (revisited): are managers concerned about appearing selfish?. *Journal of Management Accounting Research* 37(1): 41-61.
- 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 14 1pm.

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.

COURSE SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE

The schedule for each day will proceed as follows:

Day 1: Monday, May 18, 2026

- 09:00-10:30 Q&A screencasts (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 19, 2026

- 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)

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.

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: (1) What is the research question? (2) Why is it an important question to study? (3) How will you study it?

All students will present a proposal during Session 2 of Day 3.

Experimental Design Write-Up: I will provide you with the hypothesis development section of a paper, and you will prepare a write-up in which you design an experiment (or multiple experiments) to test the theory and hypotheses. At a minimum, your write-up must describe the following: (i) how you will manipulate or measure the independent variable(s), (ii) how you will construct the key dependent and process variables, (iii) who you would recruit as potential participants (e.g., university students, auditors, managers, etc.), and (iv) any key design choices or measures you think are necessary to conduct a valid test of the theory (e.g., design choices to help rule out alternative explanations for the results).

Please email me your write-ups before Session 1 on Day 3, and have a copy of your write-up available during our discussion.

Grades will be determined as follows:

Discussion Points	30%
Discussion Leadership	30%
Research Write-Ups and Presentation	30%
Experimental Design Write-Up	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 Break
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: WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2026

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)

Evans, J. H., M. Feng, V. B. Hoffman, D. V. Moser, and W. Van der Stede. Points to consider when self-assessing your empirical accounting research. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 32 (3): 1162-1192.

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: Audit I (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Bhaskar, L. S., T. M. Majors, and A. Vitalis. 2023. How does depletion interact with auditors’ skeptical dispositions to affect auditors’ challenging of managers in negotiations? *Contemporary Accounting Research* 40 (4): 2288-2313.

Background Reading (skim)

Hurley, P. J. 2015. Ego depletion: Applications and implications for auditing research. *Journal of Accounting Literature* 35 (1): 47-76.

Session 4: Audit II (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Douthit, J. D., S. J. Kachelmeier, and B. W. Van Landuyt. 2024. Does auditor assurance of client prosocial activities affect subsequent reporter-auditor negotiations? *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 112: 101550.

Background Reading (skim)

Moser, D. V., and P. R. Martin. 2012. A broader perspective on corporate social responsibility research in accounting. *The Accounting Review* 87 (3): 797-806.

DAY 2: THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2026

Session 1: Financial Accounting I (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Wong, T. J., G. Yu, S. Zhang, and T. Zhang. 2024. Calling for transparency: Evidence from a field experiment. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 77: 101604.

Background Reading (skim)

Blankespoor, E. 2018. Firm communication and investor response: A framework and discussion integrating social media. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 68-69: 80-87.

Session 2: Financial Accounting II (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Belnap, A. 2023. The effect of intermediary coverage on disclosure: Evidence from a randomized field experiment. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 75: 101522.

Background Reading (skim)

Blankespoor, E., E. deHaan, and I. Marinovic. 2020. Disclosure processing costs, investors' information choice, and equity market outcomes: A review. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 70: 101344.

Session 3: Managerial Accounting I (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Sauciuc, A. K. 2025. The effects of performance-based incentive frequency on collusion. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 114: 101591.

Background Reading (skim)

Evans III, J. H., D. V. Moser, A. H. Newman, and B. R. Stikeleather. 2016. Honor among thieves: Open internal reporting and managerial collusion. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 33 (4): 1375-1402.

Session 4: Managerial Accounting II (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Kachelmeier, S. J., R. A. Webb, and M. G. Williamson, 2024. Do performance-contingent incentives help or hinder divergent thinking? *The Accounting Review* 99 (2): 229-248.

Background Reading (skim)

Kachelmeier, S. J., B. E. Reichert, and M. G. Williamson. 2008. Measuring and motivating quantity, creativity, or both. *Journal of Accounting Research* 46 (2): 341-373.

DAY 3: FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 2026

Session 1: Experimental Design Write-Up 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.

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 currently being 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, 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 the primary course readings. The course requirements are intended to facilitate our discussions and your learning.

Discussion Points: Please submit at least 3 discussion points (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 strengths and/or weaknesses related to the paper’s motivation/contribution, theory, research design, or data analyses. If your discussion point focuses on a strength of the paper, explain *why* it is a strength. If your discussion point focuses on a weakness, explain *why* it is 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. You may find it best facilitates discussion is you provide your summary in the form of powerpoint slides.

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 paragraph” 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.

All students will present a proposal during Session 2 of Day 3.

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	30%
Research Write-Ups and Presentation	30%
Referee Report	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 Break
13:30-15:00: Session 3
15:00-15:15: Break
15:15-16:45: Session 4

For Day 1, please note we will meet only for Session 3 and 4.

DAY 1: FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 2026

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. 2022. Theory testing and process evidence in accounting experiments. *The Accounting Review* 97 (6): 23-43. <https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2019-1001>

Barcellos, L. P. and K. Kadous. 2022. Do managers' nonnative accents influence investment decisions? *The Accounting Review* 97 (3): 51-75. <https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2020-0228>

DAY 2: MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2026

Session 1: Investor Judgment I (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Clor-Proell, S., N. MacKenzie, K. Rennekamp. 2023. Invest in what you know? How customer investors react to corporate restatements. *Accounting Organizations and Behavior* 111 (November) 101496. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1016/j.aos.2023.101496>

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. <https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-52005>

Session 2: Auditor Judgment I (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Hong, Y. (B.) 2022. Initial task engagement: Unlocking the value of fit and non-fit to improve audit judgments. *The Accounting Review* 97 (6): 327-356. <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. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1111/1911-3846.12658>

Session 3: Investor Judgment II (Discussion Leader: TBA)

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 4: Auditor Judgment II (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Peecher, M. E., M. A. Ricci, and Y. Zhou. 2024. Promoting proactive auditing behaviors. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 41 (1): 620-644. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1111/1911-3846.12914>

Background Reading

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. <https://doi.org/10.2308/AJPT-2021-015>

DAY 3: TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2026

Session 1: Investor Judgment III (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Hodge, F. D., K. I. Mendoza, K.I., and R. K. Sinha, R.K. 2021. The effect of humanizing robo-advisors on investor judgments. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 38: 770-792. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/10.1111/1911-3846.12641>

Background Reading

None.

Session 2: Auditor III (Discussion Leader: TBA)

Primary Reading

Blum, E. S., and Hatfield, R. C. 2025. Do apprenticeship norms encourage supervisors' audit quality enhancing behaviors? *The Accounting Review* <https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2023-0165>.

Background Reading

None.

Session 3: 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 reading

Berk, J. B., C. R. Harvey, and D. Hirshleifer. 2017. How to write an effective referee report and improve the scientific review process. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31 (1): 231-244. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.31.1.231>

Session 4: Sharing Your Write-Up Ideas

You will present one of your research write-ups to me and your fellow students and receive initial feedback on those ideas.