

Limperg Course on Experimental Accounting Research Spring 2021

Part A: May 18 (Bart Dierynck) & May 21 (Eddy Cardinaels)

Part B: June 2-4 (Willie Choi)

Part C: June 16-18 (Kathryn Kadous)

INSTRUCTORS

PART A: Bart Dierynck, 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

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 17 9am. 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 papers below are covered during the videos and will help you to develop a framework to set up your own studies and discuss studies conducted by other researchers (as a discussant, reviewer, and critical reader).

- 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.
- 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 (2021), 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 (2020). 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 paper that you would like to replicate and extend. Please submit the discussion point about Dierynck, van der Geest, and van Pelt (2021) and the citation of the paper you want to replicate via this [LINK](#) before May 17 9am. 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? (1 slide), (2) why do you want to replicate and extend this paper? (1 slide), and (3) how do you want to extend this paper? (2 slides). For explaining the extension, please use the predictive validity framework/Libby boxes and indicate on which link of the framework your extension will focus. See the 'on beforehand videos' for more information about the predictive validity framework/Libby boxes.

The papers below are covered during the sessions on replications.

- Dierynck, B., J. van der Geest, and V. van Pelt. 2021. In search of informed discretion (revisited): do managers want to be fair or not appear 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 20 9am.

Own research project (Session 2, 4 & 7) (Bart Dierynck & Eddy Cardinaels):

Prepare a short presentation (at maximum 5 slides) and discuss (1) the main motivation 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.

May 18: Marte Abts, Viola Darmawan, Michiel Dierckx, Cara Zhang, Kevin Pirazzi Maffiola

May 21: Evelyn Intan, Frank Ma, Myrna Modolon Lima, Benjamin Noordermeer, Martin Wiernsperger, Matthias Wesser, Anil Kshatriya, and Xiaoxing Li.

COURSE SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE

The schedule for each day will proceed as follows:

Day 1: Tuesday, May 18, 2021

- 09:00-10:30 Q&A videos (Session 1)
- 10:30-10:45 Break
- 10:45-12:15 Capita Selecta & Research Proposals (Session 2)
- 12:15-13:30 Lunch
- 13:30-15:00 Replications (Session 3)
- 15.00-15.15 Break
- 15.15-16.30 Replications & Research Proposals (Session 4)

Day 2: Friday, May 21, 2021

- 09:00-10:45 Standards to evaluate experiments (Session 5)
- 10:45-11:00 Break
- 11:00-12:45 Multi-method research and online participant pools (Session 6)
- 12:45-14:00 Lunch
- 14:00-15:45 Research Proposals (Session 7)

PART B (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 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 (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 B of the course: Viola Darmawan, Anil Kshatriya, Evelyn Intan, Frank Ma, Benjamin Noordermeer, and Martin Wiernsperger.

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

Research Write-Ups: Please submit a research write-up for each 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 B of the course: Marte Abts, Michiel Dierckx, Myrna Modolon Lima, Kevin Pirazzi Maffiola, Matthias Wesser, Xiaoxing Li and Cara Zhang.

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

Grades will be determined as follows:

Discussion Points	30%
Discussion Leadership or Research Write-Up Presentation	30%
Research Write-Ups	40%

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: JUNE 2, 2021

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: Viola Darmawan)

Primary Reading

Elliott, W. B., S. M. Grant, and J. L. Hobson. 2020. Trader participation in disclosure: Implications of interactions with management. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 37 (1): 68-100.

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: Anil Kshatriya)

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: JUNE 3, 2021

Session 1: Managerial I (Discussion Leader: Evelyn Intan)

Primary Reading

Li, S. X., and T. Sandino. 2018. Effects of an information sharing system on employee creativity, engagement, and performance. *Journal of Accounting Research* 56 (2): 713-747.

Background Reading (skim)

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

Session 2: Managerial II (Discussion Leader: Frank Ma)

Primary Reading

Hannan, R. L., G. P. McPhee, A. H. Newman, and I. D. Tafkov. 2019. The informativeness of relative performance information and its effect on effort allocation in a multitask environment. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 36 (3): 1607-1633.

Background Reading (skim)

Tafkov, I. D. 2013. Private and public relative performance information under different compensation contracts. *The Accounting Review* 88 (1): 327-350.

Session 3: Audit I (Discussion Leader: Benjamin Noordermeer)

Primary Reading

Hurley, P. J., B. W. Mayhew, and K. M. Obermire. 2019. Realigning auditors' accountability: Experimental evidence. *The Accounting Review* 94 (3): 233-250.

Background Reading (skim)

Jamal, K. 2008. Mandatory audit of financial reporting: A failed strategy for dealing with fraud. *Accounting Perspectives* 7 (2): 97-110.

Session 4: Audit II (Discussion Leader: Martin Wiernsperger)

Primary Reading

Kachelmeier, S. J., and D. Rimkus. 2021. Does seeking audit evidence impede the willingness to impose audit adjustments? Working paper.

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: FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 2021

Session 1: Giving and Receiving Feedback

Primary Reading

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 (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: Marte Abts, Michiel Dierckx, Myrna Modolon Lima, Kevin Pirazzi Maffiola, Matthias Wesser, Xiaoxing Li, and Cara Zhang.

The remaining students will have the opportunity to present an idea during Part C of the course with 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 (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, only the students who did not serve as discussion leaders during Part B of the course with Willie Choi will serve as discussion leaders during Part C: Marte Abts, Michiel Dierckx, Myrna Modolon Lima, Kevin Pirazzi Maffiola, Matthias Wesser, Xiaoxing Li, and Cara Zhang.

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

- (iii) Propose a new project that would get at the same basic research questions in a different way
- (iv) 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, only the students who did not present a research write up during Part B of the course will present during Part C: Viola Darmawan, Anil Kshatriya, Evelyn Intan, Frank Ma, Benjamin Noordermeer, and Martin Wiernsperger.

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 1.

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: JUNE 16, 2021

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.

Session 2: JDM Experiments and Process Evidence (Discussion Leader: Xiaoxing Li)

Primary Reading

Asay, H. S., R. Guggenmos, K. Kadous, L. Koonce, and R. Libby. 2021. Theory Testing and Process Evidence in Accounting Experiments (February 17, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3485844> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3485844>.

Background Reading

None

Session 3: Auditor Judgment I (Discussion Leader: Myrna Modolon Lima)

Primary Reading

Bhaskar, L. S., P. E. Hopkins, and J. H. Schroeder. 2019. An investigation of auditors' judgments when companies release earnings before audit completion. *Journal of Accounting Research* 57 (2): 355-390.

Background Reading (skim)

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.

Session 4: Auditor Judgment II (Discussion Leader: Michiel Dierckx)

Primary Reading

Blum, E. S., R. C. Hatfield, and R. W. Houston. In Press. The effect of staff auditor reputation on audit quality enhancing actions. *The Accounting Review*.

Background Reading (skim)

Clor-Proell, S., K. Kadous, and C. A. Proell. 2021 The Sounds of Silence: A Framework, Theory, and Empirical Evidence of Audit Team Voice. Working paper.

DAY 2: JUNE 17, 2021

Session 1: Investor Judgment I (Discussion Leader: Cara Zhang)

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: Matthias Wesser)

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: Marte Abts)

Primary Reading

Kadous, K. and Y. D. Zhou. 2019. How does intrinsic motivation improve auditor judgment in complex audit tasks? *Contemporary Accounting Research* 36 (1): 108-131.

Background Reading (read section 2, skim the rest)

Griffith, E. E., K. Kadous, and D. Young. In Press. Improving complex audit judgments: A framework and evidence. *Contemporary Accounting Research*.

Session 4: Auditor Judgment IV (Discussion Leader: Kevin Pirazzi Maffiola)

Primary Reading

Commerford, B. P., S. A. Dennis, J. R. Joe, and J. Ulla. 2020. Man Versus Machine: Complex Estimates and Auditor Reliance on Artificial Intelligence (February 24, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3422591> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3422591>.

Background Reading (skim)

Griffith, E. E. 2018. When do auditors use specialists' work to improve problem representations of and judgments about complex estimates? *The Accounting Review* 93 (4): 177-202.

DAY 3: FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 2021

Session 1: Data Integrity, P-Hacking, and False Positives

Primary Readings

Gelman, A., and E. Loken. 2014. The statistical crisis in science: Data-dependent analysis—a “garden of forking paths” – explains why many statistically significant comparisons don’t hold up. *American Scientist* 102: 460-465.

Simonsohn, U. 2013. Just post it: The lesson from two cases of fabricated data detected by statistics alone. *Psychological Science* 24 (10): 1875-1888.

Srivastava, S. 2018. Sound Inference in Complicated Research: A Multi-Strategy Approach. Working paper available at: <https://psyarxiv.com/bwr48>.

Background Reading (skim)

Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (11), 2600–2606. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114>.

Nelson, L. F., J. Simmons, and U. Simonsohn. 2018. Psychology’s renaissance. *Annual Review of Psychology* 69: 511-534.

Optional readings/materials for the interested: A likely false positive case and the aftermath

Carney, D. R., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Yap, A. J. 2010. Power posing: Brief nonverbal displays affect neuroendocrine levels and risk tolerance. *Psychological Science* 21:1363-1368.

Credé, M., and L. A. Phillips. 2017. Revisiting the power pose effect: How robust are the results reported by Carney, Cuddy, and Yap (2010) to data analytic decisions? *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 8: 493-499.

https://www.ted.com/talks/amy_cuddy_your_body_language_shapes_who_you_are.html

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/18/magazine/when-the-revolution-came-for-amy-cuddy.html>

Session 2: Sharing Your Write-Up Ideas (Viola Darmawan, Anil Kshatriya, Evelyn Intan, Frank Ma, Benjamin Noordermeer, and Martin Wiernsperger)

This is an opportunity for those who did not present in Part B of the course to present one of your research write-ups to me and your fellow students and receive initial feedback on those ideas.