Full text available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/140000027

Strategic Accounting Disclosure

Strategic Accounting Disclosure

Phillip C. Stocken

Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College USA Phillip.C.Stocken@Dartmouth.edu



Boston – Delft

Foundations and Trends^{\mathbb{R}} in Accounting

Published, sold and distributed by: now Publishers Inc. PO Box 1024 Hanover, MA 02339 USA Tel. +1-781-985-4510 www.nowpublishers.com sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America: now Publishers Inc. PO Box 179 2600 AD Delft The Netherlands Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is P. C. Stocken, Strategic Accounting Disclosure, Foundations and Trends[®] in Accounting, vol 7, no 4, pp 197–291, 2012

ISBN: 978-1-60198-692-4 © 2013 P. C. Stocken

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1-781-871-0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

Foundations and Trends[®] in Accounting Volume 7 Issue 4, 2012 Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief:

Stefan J. Reichelstein Graduate School of Business Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305 USA reichelstein_stefan@gsb.stanford.edu

Editors

Ronald Dye, Northwestern University David Larcker, Stanford University Stephen Penman, Columbia University Stefan Reichelstein, Stanford University (Managing Editor)

Editorial Scope

Foundations and Trends[®] in Accounting will publish survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- Auditing
- Corporate Governance
- $\bullet~{\rm Cost}$ Management
- Disclosure
- Event Studies/Market Efficiency Studies
- Executive Compensation

- Financial Reporting
- Financial Statement Analysis and Equity Valuation
- Management Control
- Performance Measurement
- Taxation

Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends[®] in Accounting, 2012, Volume 7, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 1554-0642. ISSN online version 1554-0650. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Foundations and Trends[®] in Accounting Vol. 7, No. 4 (2012) 197–291 © 2013 P. C. Stocken DOI: 10.1561/1400000027



Strategic Accounting Disclosure

Phillip C. Stocken

Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth College, USA, Phillip.C.Stocken@Dartmouth.edu

Abstract

This monograph surveys the analytic accounting disclosure literature in which firms strategically communicate information to investors. Its purpose is to identify guidelines that firm management might consider when voluntarily disclosing or mandatorily reporting information to investors and also factors that investors might recognize when using a firm's disclosure. It discusses persuasion games, costless signaling games, and costly signaling games. The monograph highlights the primary features of the equilibria in these games and how communication varies in each of these settings. It then surveys work that uses these frameworks. This work suggests that a firm's disclosure policy depends on the features of its environment. The monograph concludes that characterizing firm disclosure policies for a set of generic features of the reporting environment awaits further research.

Contents

1 I:	ntroduction	1
2 F	Persuasion Games	9
2.1	Framework $\#1$ — Persuasion and Full Revelation	10
2.2	Framework $#2$ — Persuasion, Disclosure Costs,	
	and Incomplete Revelation	11
2.3	Framework $#3$ — Persuasion, Information	
	Uncertainty, and Incomplete Revelation	13
2.4	Other Reasons for Incomplete Revelation	15
2.5	Multi-period Persuasion Games	18
2.6	Multi-sender and Multi-receiver Persuasion Games	20
2.7	Persuasion Games with an Imperfectly Informed Sender	22
2.8	Persuasion Games with Multiple Signals	
	and Selective Disclosure	23
2.9	Persuasion Games with Endogenous	
	Information Acquisition	25
3 C	Costless Signaling Games	31
3.1	Framework $#4$ — Costless Disclosure	
	and Incomplete Revelation	31
3.2	Multi-period Cheap Talk	41
3.3	Multi-sender and Multi-receiver Cheap Talk	45
3.4	Cheap Talk with an Imperfectly Informed Sender	48
3.5	Cheap Talk with Endogenous Information Acquisition	50

	tly Reporting Games	53
	ramework $\#5$ — Costly Disclosure nd Full Revelation	54
4.2 F	ramework $\#6$ — Costly Disclosure, Reporting	
J	Incertainty, and Incomplete Revelation	58
4.3 F	Reporting in the Presence of Other Firms	65
4.4 F	Reporting in the Presence of Other Information Sources	66
4.5 F	Reporting with Endogenous Precision	68
4.6 F	Reporting in the Presence of Litigation Risk	72
5 Cor	clusion	
5 C01		75
A Imp	perfect Competition with Asymmetrically rmed Traders	75 81
A Imp Info	perfect Competition with Asymmetrically	



Accounting disclosure occurs in an environment in which a firm transmits information to an investor who takes an action. A key feature of the financial reporting environment is that market participants are asymmetrically informed about the firm. Consequently, the firm manager can strategically manage the communication of information. A rational investor, of course, anticipates the manager's self-interested behavior when valuing the firm. Accordingly, a firm's strategy for optimally transmitting information and the investor's response to the firm's disclosure need to be carefully considered. This monograph examines the analytic accounting disclosure literature in which firms strategically communicate information to investors. Its purpose is to identify guidelines that firm management should consider when voluntarily disclosing or mandatorily reporting information to investors and factors that investors might recognize when using a firm's accounting disclosure. It also suggests characteristics of useful information that policy-makers and regulators should keep in mind as they specify the information sets firms should disclose to investors, lenders, and other providers of capital.

2 Introduction

The Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 specify the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) required filings for firms; further, the law of a firm's state of incorporation, the rules of the stock exchange on which the firm's shares might be listed, the firm's articles of incorporation also define a firm's required disclosure. To comply with these reporting requirements and the provisions of the Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002 and the Dodd–Frank Act of 2010, firms install accounting information systems together with the related internal controls. These systems provide firm management with a proprietary information set. The federal securities laws require firms to mandatorily report some elements of this information set. In addition, management can decide whether to voluntarily release other elements of its information set that investors might find useful for valuing the firm.

For several decades, accountants have struggled to identify and characterize the properties of useful information. The American Accounting Association published an influential monograph in 1966 that identified usefulness as being the "all inclusive" criterion. This criterion was then partitioned into criteria that were "more susceptible to measurement and implementation" (American Accounting Association, 1966, 3). The four essential criteria for evaluating information were relevance, verifiability, freedom from bias, and quantifiability. Snavely (1967) extended this work and offered a hierarchy of criteria that identified four levels: The first-level criterion was usefulness, which was identified as being applicable to any information. The second-level criteria were relevance, reliability, understandability, significance, sufficiency, and practicality. The third and fourth levels specified supporting characteristics of the second-level criteria. Snavely (1967) did not explicitly use a model to serve as an organizing framework in the development of this hierarchy. Subsequently, Feltham (1968) considered the value of changes in an information system within a setting containing a single investor using Bayes' Theorem as an organizing framework. He considered information having the attributes of relevance, timeliness, and accuracy to be desirable. This literature seems to have suggested the ingredients for the hierarchy of qualitative characteristics developed in Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 2 — Qualitative Characteristics of Accounting Information — issued in 1980.

This early work considered the properties of accounting information within a single decision-maker context. Within this context, Blackwell's Theorem provides a relation that allows for a partial ordering over alternative information systems. This theorem in casual terms states that one information system is more valuable than another information system if it has less randomness or uncertainty in the association between the set of states and the set of signals than the other information system (see Blackwell and Girshick, 1954). In a similar vein, Laffont (1993) established that one information system is more valuable than another if it provides a finer partition of the state space than the other information system. Thus, in an environment in which the firm is the only provider of accounting information and the firm's sole preoccupation is with maximizing the usefulness of accounting information for the benefit of investors, then finer accounting information is more useful to the investor. Indeed, the view that the usefulness of information for decision-making is increasing in its precision is fairly pervasive. The revised criteria for evaluating information characterized in Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 8 — Qualitative Characteristics of Useful Financial Information — released in 2010 seem to reflect this view.

The financial reporting environment, however, features several decision-makers. Investors gather information from various sources, including a firm, the firm's competitors, analysts, trade journals, and government statistical releases. Firm management, therefore, needs to consider not only the effect of reporting its information to its investors, but also the influence of its disclosure on the behavior of other market participants. Management needs to recognize that its disclosure will affect the behavior of other firms and how they choose to disclose their information; it needs to anticipate that its disclosure will influence the behavior of financial analysts and the information they provide investors. Further, management must be cognizant of the scrutiny of policy-makers and regulators and also of investors' rights to take legal action in the event of fraudulent material misstatement or omission of required information. In short, the accounting information environment is populated with many strategic players making payoff maximizing decisions.

3

4 Introduction

Blackwell's Theorem does not hold when multiple decision-makers interact strategically.¹ Thus, the notion that providers of capital would prefer finer information over less fine information offers little guidance to firms when deciding on their disclosure policy. In contrast, the extant literature emphasizes that a firm's optimal disclosure policy is sensitive to the features of the information environment. Consequently, in the absence of precisely characterizing the environment, the desirable properties of accounting disclosure cannot be characterized.

The literature that investigates the equilibrium properties of accounting reports within a strategic setting can be bisected depending on whether the Revelation Principle applies. The Revelation Principle is often invoked when analyzing the contractual relation between a sender and receiver; the contractual design problem is commonly termed a principal-agent problem. Loosely speaking, the Revelation Principle states that when identifying the optimal contract, without loss of generality the principal can restrict attention to contracts with the form that: (i) the agent must report which state has occurred, (ii) the contract specifies an outcome (e.g., an agent wage and effort level) for each possible report, and (iii) the agent finds it optimal to truthfully report the state. The Revelation Principle is often used to analyze contracting problems because it greatly simplifies the analysis: in particular, it allows a principal to restrict attention to those contracts in which an agent truthfully reveals information instead of having to evaluate the entire set of truthful and non-truthful reports that an agent might offer. See Mas-Colell et al. (1995) for further discussion and a formal proof of the Revelation Principle.

In the financial reporting environment, formal contractual relations often do not exist between market participants and also firms, from time to time, withhold or misrepresent their information. Thus, it can be problematic describing accounting reporting behavior using a revelation

¹ To illustrate, within a contracting setting, Christensen (1982) established that the principal may be worse off when the principal and agent observe additional information before the agent takes an action; analogously, within a non-contracting setting, Fischer and Stocken (2001) show that the receiver's and sender's payoffs might decline as the quality of the sender's information increases.

mechanism in which an agent reports truthfully.² As a consequence, models of the disclosure environment commonly preclude application of the Revelation Principle by assuming either: (i) a sender's communication is restricted, (ii) the form of the contract is restricted, or (iii) the receiver's ability to commit to how the sender's report is to be used is restricted.

This monograph focusses on accounting disclosure within a noncontractual setting in which Revelation Principle does *not* apply. It examines a setting featuring a sender — a firm manager or a sell-side equity analyst — who has some information about a firm to communicate to a receiver — an investor — to help value the firm. It considers models that assume there are constraints on the sender's communication, or if there are no constraints on the sender, the receiver cannot commit to use the sender's report in a particular way.

With this assumption in place, this monograph surveys the strategic mandatory and voluntary disclosure literature and partitions it into three types of disclosure regimes:

- First, and on one end of the continuum, the monograph outlines the primary frameworks in *persuasion games*. In these games, the sender's report is restricted to be truthful although the sender may withhold information. The monograph characterizes the work of Jovanovic (1982), Verrecchia (1983), Dye (1985), and Jung and Kwon (1988) and surveys the accounting literature that extends this seminal work.
- Second, and on the other end of the continuum, the monograph describes *costless signaling games*. In these games, the sender is free to issue vague or even misleading reports. The monograph illustrates the "cheap talk" model in Crawford and Sobel (1982). It then discusses research

² Indeed, Dye (1988, 200) claims the "Revelation Principle is a nemesis to the study of earnings management: when it applies, any contract which encourages earnings management can be viewed as arbitrary, since another contract can be constructed which does not induce earnings management and which provides the same utility to all contracting parties as the original contract."

6 Introduction

that has extended this framework to better understand communication within the financial reporting environment.

Third, and between the two ends of the continuum, the monograph discusses costly signaling games. In these games, the sender can misreport the signal but only at some cost. The monograph describes the work of Narayanan (1985), Stein (1989), and Fischer and Verrecchia (2000) in detail. It then turns to survey the subsequent work based on these studies.

These three primary frameworks have provided the catalyst for much of the mandatory and voluntary disclosure research in accounting aimed at better understanding strategic communication. This monograph distills the key ingredients in these frameworks and uses common notation to emphasize the relation between the frameworks and the innovation in each framework. For each of these primary frameworks, it surveys subsequent work that uses these frameworks to deepen our understanding of firm communication. The monograph emphasizes that the specific characteristics of the institutional environment affect the equilibrium properties of a firm's disclosure policy and an investor's information set. The motivation for simply representing these frameworks and then outlining the related literature that applies these primary frameworks is to make the accounting disclosure literature more accessible to doctoral students for whom this monograph is written.

This survey is not exhaustive. It focuses on studies that illustrate the concepts in the primary disclosure frameworks. Further, it does not consider analytic work in the accounting literature in which the stochastic process that generates the sender's public report is exogenous. For instance, several papers in the noisy rational expectations literature examine how a firm's public report affects properties of stock pricing through its effect on private information acquisition activities (e.g., Diamond, 1985; Demski and Feltham, 1994; Kim and Verrecchia, 1994; McNichols and Trueman, 1994). This work exogenously specifies the stochastic process that generates the firm's public report and then focuses on the market participants' information gathering and trading activities rather than on the firm's decision how to report privately observed information, which is the focus of this survey.

This monograph proceeds as follows: Section 2 outlines persuasion games, Section 3 considers costless signaling games, Section 4 discusses costly signaling games, and Section 5 concludes. The Appendix illustrates a model that is commonly used to characterize the effect of asymmetrically informed investors on stock prices.

7

- Ajinkya, B. B. and M. J. Gift (1984), 'Corporate managers' earnings forecasts and symmetrical adjustments of market expectations'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 22(2), 425–44.
- Akerlof, G. A. (1970), 'The market for "lemons": Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 84(3), 488–500.
- American Accounting Association (1966), A Statement of Basic Accounting Theory. Evanston, IL: American Accounting Association.
- Arya, A., J. Glover, and S. Sunder (1998), 'Earnings management and the revelation principle'. *Review of Accounting Studies* 3(1 and 2), 7–34.
- Austen-Smith, D. (1993), 'Interested experts and policy advice: Multiple referrals under open rule'. *Games and Economic Behavior* 5(1), 3–43.
- Bagnoli, M. and S. Watts (2007), 'Financial reporting and supplemental voluntary disclosures'. Journal of Accounting Research 45(5), 885–913.
- Basu, S. (1997), 'The conservatism principle and the asymmetric timeliness of earnings'. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **24**(1), 3–37.

- Battaglini, M. (2004), 'Policy advice with imperfectly informed experts'. Advances in Theoretical Economics 4(1), article 1.
- Bertomeu, J., A. Beyer, and R. A. Dye (2011), 'Capital structure, cost of capital, and voluntary disclosures'. *The Accounting Review* **86**(3), 857–886.
- Bertomeu, J. and R. P. Magee (2011), 'From low-quality reporting to financial crises: Politics of disclosure regulation along the economic cycle'. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 52(2–3), 209–227.
- Beyer, A. (2008), 'Financial analysts' forecast revisions and managers' reporting behavior'. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **46**(2–3), 334–348.
- Beyer, A. (2009), 'Capital market prices, management forecasts, and earnings management'. *The Accounting Review* 84(6), 1713–1747.
- Beyer, A., D. A. Cohen, T. Z. Lys, and B. R. Walther (2010), 'The financial reporting environment: Review of the recent literature'. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 50(2–3), 296–343.
- Beyer, A. and I. Guttman (2011), 'The effect of trading commissions on analysts' forecast bias'. *The Accounting Review* 86(2), 451–481.
- Beyer, A. and I. Guttman (2012), 'Voluntary disclosure, manipulation and real effects'. *Journal of Accounting Research*, forthcoming.
- Blackwell, D. and M. A. Girshick (1954), Theory of Games and Statistical Decisions. New York, NY: Dover Publications.
- Burgstahler, D. and I. Dichev (1997), 'Earnings management to avoid earnings decreases and losses'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 24(1), 99–126.
- Caskey, J. (2010), 'The pricing of shares in equity markets with securities class action lawsuits'. Working paper, UCLA Anderson School of Management.
- Christensen, J. (1982), 'The determination of performance standards and participation'. *Journal of Accounting Research* **20**, 589–603.
- Crawford, V. P. and J. Sobel (1982), 'Strategic information transformation'. *Econometrica* **50**(6), 1431–1451.
- Darrough, M. N. and N. M. Stoughton (1990), 'Financial disclosure policy in an entry game'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 12(2), 219–243.

- DeFond, M. L. and C. W. Park (1997), 'Smoothing income in anticipation of future earnings'. Journal of Accounting & Economics 23(2), 115–139.
- Degeorge, F., J. Patel, and R. Zeckhauser (1999), 'Earnings management to exceed thresholds'. *Journal of Business* 72, 1–33.
- Demski, J. S. (1998), 'Performance measurement manipulation'. Contemporary Accounting Research 15(3), 261–285.
- Demski, J. S. and G. A. Feltham (1994), 'Market response to financial reports'. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **17**(1–2), 3–40.
- Demski, J. S., H. Frimor, and D. E. M. Sappington (2004), 'Efficient manipulation in a repeated setting'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 42(1), 31–49.
- Diamond, D. W. (1985), 'Optimal release of information by firms'. Journal of Finance 40(4), 1071–1094.
- Dugar, A. and S. Nathan (1995), 'The effect of investment banking relationships on financial analyst's earnings forecasts and investment recommendations'. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 12(1), 131–160.
- Dye, R. A. (1985), 'Disclosure of nonproprietary information'. Journal of Accounting Research 23(1), 123–145.
- Dye, R. A. (1988), 'Earnings management in an overlapping generations model'. Journal of Accounting Research 26(2), 195–235.
- Dye, R. A. (2002), 'Classifications manipulation and nash accounting standards'. *Journal of Accounting Research* **40**(4), 1125–1162.
- Dye, R. A. and S. S. Sridhar (1995), 'Industry-wide disclosure dynamics'. *Journal of Accounting Research* **33**(1), 157–174.
- Einhorn, E. (2005), 'The nature of the interaction between mandatory and voluntary disclosures'. Journal of Accounting Research 43(4), 593-621.
- Einhorn, E. (2007), 'Voluntary disclosure under uncertainty about the reporting objective'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 43(2–3), 245–274.
- Einhorn, E. and A. Ziv (2008), 'Intertemporal dynamics of corporate voluntary disclosures'. *Journal of Accounting Research* **46**(3), 567–589.
- Einhorn, E. and A. Ziv (2012), 'Biased voluntary disclosure'. Review of Accounting Studies 17(2), 420–442.

- Evans, J. and S. Sridhar (1996), 'Multiple control systems, accrual accounting, and earnings management'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 34, 45–65.
- Evans, J. H. and S. S. Sridhar (2002), 'Disclosure-disciplining mechanisms: capital markets, product markets, and shareholder litigation'. *The Accounting Review* 77(3), 595–626.
- Ewert, R. and A. Wagenhofer (2005), 'Economic effects of tightening accounting standards to restrict earnings management'. *The Accounting Review* **80**(4), 1101–1124.
- Farrell, J. and R. Gibbons (1989), 'Cheap talk with two audiences'. American Economic Review 79(5), 1214–1223.
- Farrell, J. and M. Rabin (1996), 'Cheap talk'. Journal of Economic Perspectives 10, 103–118.
- Feltham, G. A. (1968), 'The value of information'. The Accounting Review 43, 684–696.
- Feng, M. and A. Koch (2010), 'Once bitten, twice shy: The relation between outcomes of earnings guidance and the provision of subsequent guidance'. *The Accounting Review* 85(6), 1951–1984.
- Financial Accounting Standards Board (1980), Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 2 — Qualitative Characteristics of Accounting Information.
- Financial Accounting Standards Board (2010), Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 8 — Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting. Chapter 3, Qualitative Characteristics of Useful Financial Information.
- Fischer, P. E. and P. C. Stocken (2001), 'Imperfect information and credible communication'. *Journal of Accounting Research* **39**(1), 119–134.
- Fischer, P. E. and P. C. Stocken (2004), 'Effect of investor speculation on earnings management'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 42(5), 843–870.
- Fischer, P. E. and P. C. Stocken (2010), 'Communicating in the presence of another information source'. *The Accounting Review* **86**(6), 1985–2009.
- Fischer, P. E. and R. E. Verrecchia (1999), 'Public information and heuristic trade'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 27(1), 89–124.

- Fischer, P. E. and R. E. Verrecchia (2000), 'Reporting bias'. The Accounting Review 75(2), 229–245.
- Fischer, P. E. and R. E. Verrecchia (2004), 'Disclosure bias'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 38(1–3), 223–250.
- Fishman, M. J. and K. M. Hagerty (2003), 'Mandatory versus voluntary disclosure in markets with informed and uninformed customers'. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 19(1), 45–63.
- Francis, J. and K. Schipper (1999), 'Have financial statements lost their relevance?'. Journal of Accounting Research 37(2), 319–352.
- Froot, K. A., D. S. Scharfstein, and J. C. Stein (1992), 'Herd on the street: Informational inefficiencies in a market with short-term speculation'. *Journal of Finance* 47(4), 1461–1484.
- Fudenberg, D. and J. Tirole (1991), *Game Theory*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Gao, P. (2008), 'Keynesian beauty contest, accounting disclosure, and market efficiency'. *Journal of Accounting Research* **46**(4), 785–807.
- Gigler, F. (1994), 'Self-enforcing voluntary disclosures'. Journal of Accounting Research **32**(2), 224–240.
- Gigler, F. and T. Hemmer (1998), 'On the frequency, quality, and informational role of mandatory financial reports'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 36(Supplement), 117–147.
- Gigler, F. B. and T. Hemmer (2001), 'Conservatism, optimal disclosure policy, and the timeliness of financial reports'. *The Accounting Review* **76**(4), 471–493.
- Grossman, S. (1981), 'The role of warranties and private disclosure about product quality'. *Journal of Law and Economics* 24, 461–483.
- Grossman, S. J. and J. E. Stiglitz (1980), 'On the impossibility of informationally efficient markets'. *American Economic Review* **70**(3), 393–408.
- Guttman, I. (2010), 'The timing of analysts' earnings forecasts'. *The* Accounting Review **85**(2), 513–545.
- Guttman, I., O. Kadan, and E. Kandel (2006), 'A rational expectations theory of the kinks in financial reporting'. *The Accounting Review* **81**(4), 811–848.

- Guttman, I., I. Kremer, and A. Skrzypacz (2012), 'Not only what but also when: A theory of dynamic voluntary disclosure'. Research Paper No. 2102, Stanford University.
- Hand, J. R. M. (1990), 'A test of the extended functional fixation hypothesis'. The Accounting Review 65(4), 740–763.
- Hassell, J. M. and R. H. Jennings (1986), 'Relative forecast accuracy and the timing of earnings forecast announcements'. *The Accounting Review* **61**(1), 58–75.
- Hayes, R. M. (1998), 'The impact of trading commission incentives on analysts' stock coverage decisions and earnings forecasts'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 36(2), 299–320.
- Healy, P. M. and K. G. Palepu (1993), 'The effect of firms' financial disclosure policies on stock prices'. Accounting Horizons 7(1), 1–11.
- Heinle, M. S. and R. E. Verrecchia (2012), 'Management forecast bias'. Working paper, University of Pennsylvania.
- Hogg, R. V. and E. A. Tanis (1988), Probability and Statistical Inference. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company, 3rd edition.
- Holthausen, R. W. (1990), 'Accounting method choice: Opportunistic behavior, efficient contracting and information perspectives'. *Journal* of Accounting & Economics **12**(1–3), 207–218.
- Hughes, J. S. and S. Pae (2004), 'Voluntary disclosure of precision information'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 37(2), 261–289.
- Hutton, A. P. and P. C. Stocken (2009), 'Prior forecasting accuracy and investor reaction to management earnings forecasts'. Working paper, Boston College and Dartmouth College.
- Johnson, M., R. Kasznik, and K. Nelson (2001), 'The impact of securities litigation reform on the disclosure of forward-looking information by high technology firms'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 39(2), 297–327.
- Jorgensen, B. N. and M. T. Kirschenheiter (2003), 'Discretionary risk disclosures'. The Accounting Review 78(2), 449–469.
- Jorgensen, B. N. and M. T. Kirschenheiter (2012), 'Interactive discretionary disclosures'. Contemporary Accounting Research 29(2), 382–397.

- Jorgensen, B. N., J. Li, and N. D. Melumad (2011), 'Why do firms gravitate to selective disclosure?'. Working paper.
- Jovanovic, B. (1982), 'Truthful disclosure of information'. Bell Journal of Economics 13(1), 36–44.
- Jung, W. O. and Y. K. Kwon (1988), 'Disclosure when the market is unsure of information endowment of managers'. *Journal of Account*ing Research 26, 146–153.
- Kanodia, C. (1980), 'Effects of shareholder information on corporate decisions and capital market equilibrium'. *Econometrica* 48(4), 923– 953.
- Kanodia, C. (2006), 'Accounting disclosure and real effects'. Foundations and Trends in Accounting 1(3), 167–258.
- Kanodia, C. and D. Lee (1998), 'Investment and disclosure: The disciplinary role of periodic performance reports'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 36(1), 33–55.
- Kim, O. and R. E. Verrecchia (1994), 'Market liquidity and volume around earnings announcements'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 17(1/2), 41–67.
- Kirschenheiter, M. and N. D. Melumad (2002), 'Can "big bath" and earnings smoothing co-exist as equilibrium financial reporting strategies?'. Journal of Accounting Research 40(3), 761–796.
- Korn, E. (2004), 'Voluntary disclosure of partially verifiable information'. Schmalenbach Business Review 56(2), 139–163.
- Krishna, V. and J. Morgan (2001), 'A model of expertise'. Quarterly Journal of Economics 116(2), 747–775.
- Kyle, A. S. (1985), 'Continuous actions and insider trading'. Econometrica 17(6), 1315–1335.
- Kyle, A. S. and F. A. Wang (1997), 'Speculation duopoly with agreement to disagree: Can overconfidence survive the market test?'. *Jour*nal of Finance 52(5), 2073–2090.
- Laffont, J.-J. (1993), The Economics of Uncertainty and Information. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Lambert, R. (2001), 'Contract theory and accounting'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 32(1-3), 3-87.
- Laux, V. and P. C. Stocken (2012), 'Managerial reporting, overoptimism, and litigation risk'. Journal of Accounting & Economics 53(3), 577–591.

- Laux, V. and P. C. Stocken (2013), 'Accounting standards, regulatory enforcement, and investment decisions'. Working paper.
- Lev, B. and P. Zarowin (1999), 'The boundaries of financial reporting and how to extend them'. *Journal of Accounting Research* **37**(2), 353–385.
- Lundholm, R. J. (2003), 'Historical accounting and the endogenous credibility of current disclosures'. Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance 18(1), 207–229.
- Mas-Colell, A., M. D. Whinston, and J. R. Green (1995), *Microeco*nomic Theory. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McNichols, M. and B. Trueman (1994), 'Public disclosures, private information collection, and short-term trading'. *Journal of Account*ing and Economics 17(1/2), 69–94.
- Melumad, N. D. and T. Shibano (1991), 'Communication in settings with no transfers'. RAND Journal of Economics 22(2), 173–198.
- Michaely, R. and K. Womack (1999), 'Conflict of interest and the credibility of underwriter analyst recommendations'. *Review of Financial* Studies 12(4), 653–686.
- Milgrom, P. (1981), 'Good news and bad news: Representation theorems and applications'. Bell Journal of Economics 12(2), 380–391.
- Morgan, J. and P. C. Stocken (2003), 'An analysis of stock recommendations'. RAND Journal of Economics 34(1), 183–203.
- Morgan, J. and P. C. Stocken (2008), 'Information aggregation in polls'. American Economic Review 98(3), 864–896.
- Myers, S. and N. Majluf (1984), 'Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information that investors do not have'. *Journal of Financial Economics* **13**, 187–221.
- Narayanan, M. P. (1985), 'Managerial incentives for short-term results'. Journal of Finance 40(5), 1469–1484.
- Newman, P. and R. Sansing (1993), 'Disclosure policies with multiple users'. Journal of Accounting Research 31(1), 92–112.
- Pae, S. (1999), 'Acquisition and discretionary disclosure of private information and its implications for firms' productive activities'. *Journal of Accounting Research* 37(2), 465–474.
- Pae, S. (2005), 'Selective disclosures in the presence of uncertainty about information endowment'. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **39**(3), 383–409.

- Palomino, F. (1996), 'Noise trading in small markets'. Journal of Finance 51(4), 1537–1550.
- Penno, M. (1996), 'Unobservable precision choices in financial reporting'. Journal of Accounting Research 34(1), 141–149.
- Penno, M. C. (1997), 'Information quality and voluntary disclosure'. The Accounting Review 72(2), 275–284.
- Reis, R. and P. C. Stocken (2007), 'Strategic consequences of historical cost and fair value measurements'. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 24(2), 557–584.
- Richardson, S. (2001), 'Discretionary disclosure: A note'. *Abacus* **37**(2), 233–247.
- Rogers, J. L. and P. C. Stocken (2005), 'Credibility of management forecasts'. *The Accounting Review* 80(4), 1233–1260.
- Sankar, M. R. and K. R. Subramanyam (2001), 'Reporting discretion and private information communication through earnings'. *Journal* of Accounting Research **39**(2), 365–386.
- Sansing, R. C. (1992), 'Accounting and the credibility of management forecasts'. Contemporary Accounting Research 9(1), 33–45.
- Sapra, H. (2002), 'Do mandatory hedge disclosures discourage or encourage excessive speculation?'. Journal of Accounting Research 40(3), 933–64.
- Schipper, K. (1989), 'Commentary on earnings management'. Accounting Horizons **3**(4), 91–102.
- Shin, H. S. (1994), 'News management and the value of firms'. RAND Journal of Economics 25(1), 58–71.
- Shin, H. S. (2003), 'Disclosures and asset returns'. *Econometrica* **71**(1), 105–133.
- Shin, H. S. (2006), 'Disclosure risk and price drift'. Journal of Accounting Research 44(2), 351–379.
- Snavely, H. J. (1967), 'Accounting information criteria'. The Accounting Review 42, 223–232.
- Spindler, J. C. (2010), 'Vicarious liability for bad corporate governance: Are we wrong about 10b-5?'. Working paper, University of Southern California Law School.
- Stein, J. C. (1989), 'Efficient capital markets, inefficient firms: A model of myopic corporate behavior'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 104(4), 655–669.

- Stocken, P. C. (2000), 'Credibility of voluntary disclosure'. RAND Journal of Economics 31(2), 359–374.
- Stocken, P. C. and R. E. Verrecchia (2004), 'Financial reporting system choice and disclosure management'. The Accounting Review 79(4), 1181–1203.
- Subramanyam, K. R. (1996), 'The pricing of discretionary accruals'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 22(1–3), 249–281.
- Suijs, J. (2007), 'Voluntary disclosure of information when firms are uncertain of investor response'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 43(2–3), 391–410.
- Suijs, J. and J. Wielhouwerz (2012), 'Disclosure policy choices under regulatory threat'. Working paper (March 20, 2012), Tilburg University and VU University Amsterdam.
- Tirole, J. (1993), The Theory of Industrial Organization. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Trueman, B. (1994), 'Analyst forecasts and herding behavior'. Review of Financial Studies 7, 97–124.
- Trueman, B. (1997), 'Managerial disclosures and shareholder litigation'. Review of Accounting Studies 2(2), 181–199.
- Van den Steen, E. (2010), 'Interpersonal authority in a theory of the firm'. American Economic Review 100(1), 466–490.
- Verrecchia, R. E. (1983), 'Discretionary disclosure'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 5(3), 179–194.
- Verrecchia, R. E. (1990), 'Information quality and discretionary disclosure'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 12(4), 365–380.
- Verrecchia, R. E. (2001), 'Essays on disclosure'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 32(1–3), 97–180.
- Wagenhofer, A. (1990), 'Voluntary disclosure with a strategic opponent'. Journal of Accounting and Economics 12(4), 341–363.
- Watts, R. L. (2003), 'Conservatism in accounting part i: explanations and implications'. Accounting Horizons 17(3), 207–221.
- Wolinsky, A. (2002), 'Eliciting information from multiple experts'. Games and Economic Behavior 41(1), 141–160.