After completing this course students should be able to explain how to gather and interpret data to test theory-based hypotheses about auditor judgment. The course is delivered in a seminar format. Students complete advance preparation assignments to be discussed during weekly class meetings from 2:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday in the School of Accountancy conference room (Rehn 236A). Advance reading assignments and discussion questions are provided below.

**Wednesday, 8-21-13**

No class meeting (work on literature review paper)

**Wednesday, 8-28-13**

Discuss progress on and strategy for literature review paper.

**Wednesday, 9-4-13**

Discuss progress on and strategy for literature review paper.

**Wednesday, 9-11-13**

No class meeting (work on literature review paper)

**Wednesday, 9-18-13**

No class meeting (work on literature review paper)

**Wednesday, 9-25-13**

By the end of the day on Friday, 9-20-13 provide O’Donnell with a Word document that includes the write-ups for all constructs, the references list, and the annotated bibliography.

Divide the constructs from the paper into three groups. Each student will prepare a presentation for class on his or her assigned constructs that

a) explains the construct and how it influences human judgment, and
b) describes evidence that indicates how and when the construct could influence auditor judgment.

After describing what we have learned about each construct, lead a discussion about what we would still like to know about the construct, that is, what other research
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questions about the construct could be investigated and might contribute to audit practice. In other words, we will brainstorm about suggestions for future research.

**Wednesday, 10-2-13**

Use information provided in the Contrasting Fraud Risk assignment file to address the following issues with regard to experiment one:

1. Explain the importance of information provided in the Instructions section of the instrument.
2. What purposes are served by the Questions about Client Information section of the instrument?
3. What purposes are served by asking participants to explain their conclusions about misstatement risk for service revenues and service delivery costs?
4. Why do you think the instrument was delivered in two phases?
5. Why are questions about experience asked at the start of phase two rather than at the start of phase one?
6. What could be learned by responses to question four?
7. What could be learned by responses to questions six and nine?
8. How would you check the contrast manipulation?
9. How would you check the presentation order manipulation?
10. Would you eliminate any of the observations in the data set before you analyzed findings to test your hypotheses, and if so why?

Use information provided in the Contrasting Fraud Risk assignment file to address the following issues with regard to experiment one:

1. Did the experimental manipulations have any influence on misstatement risk assessments for service revenue above and beyond the influence, if any, of audit experience?
2. Did contrasting fraud risks influence the correlation between misstatement risk assessments for revenue and cost?
3. Did the order of presentation manipulation influence the extent to which participants relied on evidence about fluctuations in accounts when they assessed misstatement risk for service delivery costs?
4. Did participants increase misstatement risk assessments for costs in the presence of the seeded inconsistency?

Use information provided in the Contrasting Fraud Risk assignment file to address the following issues with regard to experiment two:
1. Would you eliminate any of the observations in the data set before you analyzed findings to test your hypotheses, and if so why?

2. Did the inconsistent fluctuation manipulation work?

3. Did contrast effects alter the way that the presence of seeded inconsistencies influenced participants’ perceptions about the risk of misstatement in service delivery costs?

4. Do results support the hypothesis that contrast effects will influence misstatement risk assessments for revenue by changing risk assessments for the occurrence assertion?

5. Do results support the hypotheses that increased fraud risk for revenue will change the extent to which perceptions of control risk for revenue influence auditor judgment about misstatement risk for revenue?

**Wednesday, 10-9-13**

To be announced

**Wednesday, 10-16-13**

To be announced

**Wednesday, 10-23-13**

To be announced

**Wednesday, 10-30-13**

To be announced

**Wednesday, 11-6-13**

To be announced

**Wednesday, 11-13-13**

To be announced
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Wednesday, 11-20-13

To be announced

Wednesday, 11-27-13

No class meeting

Wednesday, 12-4-13

Final exam