

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265911758>

Debtholders' Demand for Conservatism: Evidence from Changes in Directors' Fiduciary Duties

Article in *Journal of Accounting Research* · September 2014

DOI: 10.1111/1475-679X.12062

CITATIONS

3

READS

96

3 authors, including:



[Long Chen](#)

George Mason University

13 PUBLICATIONS 40 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Mikhail Pevzner](#)

University of Baltimore

40 PUBLICATIONS 236 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Crowdfunding [View project](#)



GOODWILL IMPAIRMENT-Usage of goodwill impairment by investors [View project](#)

All content following this page was uploaded by [Long Chen](#) on 08 December 2015.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file. All in-text references [underlined in blue](#) are added to the original document and are linked to publications on ResearchGate, letting you access and read them immediately.

Debtholders' Demand for Conservatism: Evidence from Changes in Directors' Fiduciary Duties

Jagadison K Aier
School of Business
George Mason University

Long Chen*
School of Business
George Mason University

Mikhail Pevzner
Merrick School of Business
University of Baltimore

August 31, 2014

Forthcoming at *Journal of Accounting Research*

*** Corresponding author: Long Chen. Tel: +1 703 993 4532. E-mail: lchenk@gmu.edu.**

Accepted by Christian Leuz. We appreciate helpful comments from an anonymous referee, Ron Allen, Bill Baber, Augustine Duru, Keith Jones, Gopal Krishnan, Tao Ma, Xiumin Martin, Sarah Nutter, Sugata Roychowdhury, Partha Sengupta, Phil Shane, Min Shen, Anup Srivastava, Gnanakumar Visvanathan, Regina Wittenberg-Moerman, Fei Xie, and workshop participants at American University, George Mason University, University of Illinois at Chicago, Suffolk University, and 2012 Virginia Accounting Research Conference. Long Chen acknowledges the summer research grants from George Mason University's Provost Office and School of Business. Mikhail Pevzner acknowledges the assistance of EY Chair in Accounting at the University of Baltimore. We thank Larry Friedman and Hui Zhang for their insights on corporate law. An Online Appendix to this paper can be downloaded at <http://research.chicagobooth.edu/arc/journal-of-accounting-research/online-supplements>.

Debtholders' Demand for Conservatism: Evidence from Changes in Directors' Fiduciary Duties

ABSTRACT

Debtholders' demand has been widely discussed as a key determinant of conservatism but clear causal evidence is not yet established. Using a natural experiment setting, wherein a Delaware court ruled that the fiduciary duties of directors in near insolvent Delaware companies extend to creditors, we predict and find that firms subject to the ruling significantly increased their accounting conservatism. Additionally, our results suggest that the increase in conservatism is more pronounced in near insolvent Delaware firms with stronger boards, confirming that the court ruling takes effect through the channel of board of directors. Our results are robust to using alternative measures of conservatism and near insolvency status, and controlling for potential confounding factors and other stakeholders' demand for conservatism. Overall, our study provides empirical evidence to support the causal relation between debtholders' demand and accounting conservatism previously suggested in the literature, and offers some insights into the role of board of directors in financial reporting.

Keywords: Conservatism, fiduciary duties, near insolvency, board governance

JEL Classification: M40, M41

Data availability: All data are available from commercial sources identified in the text.

Debtholders' Demand for Conservatism: Evidence from Changes in Directors' Fiduciary Duties

1. Introduction

Research on accounting conservatism posits that demand from lenders is the main reason why firms adopt conservative accounting policies (Watts [2003]). Supporting evidence for this conjecture is primarily based on documented associations between conservatism and various characteristics of debt contracting (e.g. Ahmed et al. [2002], Ball and Shivakumar [2005], Beatty, Weber and Yu [2008], Zhang [2008]), but most of them are not of a causal nature, raising the question whether conservatism is indeed demanded by debtholders. Moreover, conservatism could also be excessive and thus inefficient for firms and even detrimental to debtholders, which appears to conflict with the presumption that debtholders would always demand conservatism. For instance, too much conservatism may result in tighter debt covenants leading to premature transfer of decision rights to debtholders, which might unduly constrain a firm's investment and financing policies (Leuz [2001]). Also, excessive conservatism may allow managers to create hidden reserves which may be reversed in the future at the discretion of shareholders (Leuz [1998]). To help resolve this ambiguity on debtholder preferences, we exploit an important legal event to identify a causal link between debtholders' demand and accounting conservatism.

A 1991 Delaware court in the ruling of *Credit Lyonnais Bank v. Pathe Communications* (hereafter "the court ruling") expanded the scope of directors' fiduciary duties to include creditors when a Delaware incorporated firm is in the "vicinity of insolvency". The fact that the court ruling had no judgment on financial reporting per se, combined with the natural event setting which helps mitigate the issue of confounding factors, makes it possible to attribute any

post-ruling change in conservatism by near insolvent Delaware companies to debtholders' demand for conservatism.¹

We use a difference-in-differences research design to capture the differential post-ruling changes in financial reporting conservatism between firms near insolvency and away from insolvency and between firms incorporated in and outside the State of Delaware. We employ a firm-year specific composite score as our main measure of conservatism and supplement it with the asymmetric timeliness models of Basu [1997] and Ball and Shivakumar [2006]. Overall, we find that in the immediate period following the court ruling in 1991, financial reporting conservatism significantly increased for near insolvent Delaware firms. The results indicate that, in response to their increased fiduciary obligations to creditors, directors of firms subject to the court ruling influence managers to adopt more conservative financial reporting.

We further examine the role of board characteristics on the effect of the court ruling since this legal event increased the fiduciary duties of individual directors, thereby establishing a firm's board as the primary channel through which any response to the ruling should occur. Our finding of a more pronounced increase in conservatism for near insolvent Delaware firms with stronger boards provides additional support to our argument that the observed changes in conservatism are driven by the court ruling.

We conduct a number of additional analyses to test the robustness of our findings. Our results hold after controlling for confounding factors like real actions that firms can take as they become distressed, large negative write-offs, covenant violations and bankruptcies, and other stakeholders' demand for conservatism. To account for the effect of fluctuating firm

¹The idea is that the court ruling provides an exogenous change in fiduciary duties, which in turn should affect firms' supply of conservative accounting. This exogenous variation allows us to identify debtholders' demand for conservatism. If the shift in supply leads to no change in conservatism, this suggests that the demand for conservatism is either fully inelastic (which is implausible) or absent, which is the null for our tests.

performance, we re-run our main test on a performance-matched sample, a sub-sample that holds a firm's near insolvency status constant, and a shortened sample period during which firms are less likely to change their near insolvency status. We also address possible selection biases on account of State of incorporation choice and the level of default risk. Our main results remain significant and consistent across all supplemental tests.

Our study makes a number of contributions. First, it establishes a clear causal link between debtholders' demand and accounting conservatism. Prior studies have struggled to provide causal evidence on debtholders' demand for conservatism due to potential confounding factors that may also contribute to a firm's decision to adopt more accounting conservatism.² We use an exogenous shock of a legal event, which expanded fiduciary duties of directors to include creditors, as a mechanism to examine whether debtholders indeed demand conservatism. This natural setting significantly mitigates endogeneity concerns and makes it easier to attribute changes in conservatism around the event to debtholders' demand. Second, our findings of a more pronounced increase in conservatism for firms with stronger boards suggest that the effect of the court ruling on accounting conservatism comes through the channel of board of directors. These results also add to our understanding of the role of directors in corporate financial reporting. Last, consistent with Bushman and Piotroski [2006], our study provides additional support to the premise that, judicial decisions and the associated litigation risk can have a significant impact on a company's financial reporting decisions.

This paper is subject to two limitations. First, any variable that purports to capture "vicinity of insolvency" will be noisy due to lack of a precise legal definition of the concept. We attempt to mitigate this possible measurement error by using multiple proxies for near insolvency status.

² Gormley, Kim and Martin [2012] exploit an exogenous regulatory change in Indian banking industry. They document that foreign bank entry is associated with more timely loss recognition, and this change appears to be driven by a shift in firms' incentives to supply additional information to lenders.

Second, our sample may include firms that either have violated certain debt covenants or are severely distressed. In such situations, debtholders may have already been actively engaged in business decisions and pushing for more conservatism. To rule out the confounding effects of covenant violations, we control for debt covenant violations in a subsample of firms with available hand-collected data on covenant violations and find robust results. Additionally, in our main analyses, we also constrain the sample to near insolvent firms and find a significantly larger increase in conservatism for such firms that are incorporated in Delaware, thus ruling out financial distress as an alternative explanation for the observed results.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We develop hypotheses in section 2 and present regression models in section 3. In sections 4 and 5, we discuss sample data and elaborate on the empirical results respectively. Section 6 presents sensitivity analyses and section 7 concludes.

2. Motivation and Hypotheses

2.1 EXOGENOUS SHOCK TO FIDUCIARY DUTIES OF DIRECTORS

Delaware is a popular state of incorporation, as evidenced by the fact that more than fifty percent of publicly traded companies in the U.S. have opted to register in that State under the Delaware General Incorporation Law (corp.delaware.gov). As a result of choosing to incorporate in Delaware, businesses are subject to the jurisdiction of Delaware courts and are bound by their rulings and legal interpretations.³ Under common law, directors have fiduciary responsibilities to exercise due care, to demonstrate loyalty, and to act in good faith. It is commonly accepted that

³ For example, see *McDermott, Inc. v. Lewis*, 531 A.2d 206, 215-17, Del. 1987 and reaffirmed again in *Examen, Inc. v. Vantageport Venture Partners*, 873 A.2d 318, 320, Del. Ch. 2005.

the fiduciary duties of directors are owed primarily to shareholders in financially healthy firms, and a number of Delaware court rulings have supported this common law belief.⁴

But the circumstances changed for near insolvent Delaware firms as a result of a court ruling in one landmark case, *Credit Lyonnais Bank Nederland, N.V. v. Pathe Communications Corp.* (C.A. No. 12150, 1991 WL 277613). The dispute involved the actions of the CEO and executive committee of directors appointed at the behest of a major creditor of MGM Corporation, Credit Lyonnais Bank Nederland, as part of a corporate governance agreement. MGM's controlling stockholder, Pathe Communications sued the board for breach of fiduciary duties to shareholders and favoring creditors' interests when the executive committee rejected Pathe's request to sell certain assets. The court ruled that the board had acted in the interests of the company and observed, "Where a corporation is operating in the vicinity of insolvency, a board of directors is not merely the agent of the residual risk-bearers, but owes its duty to the corporate enterprise."

The judge further elaborated by way of an example in a separate annotation (footnote 55) that:

"The possibility of insolvency can do curious things to incentives, exposing creditors to risks of opportunistic behavior and creating complexities for directors.....Such directors will recognize that in managing the business affairs of a solvent corporation in the vicinity of insolvency, circumstances may arise when the right (both the efficient and the fair) course to follow for the corporation may diverge from the choice that the stockholders (or the creditors, or the employees, or any single group interested in the corporation) would make if given the opportunity to act."

The footnote gained a fair amount of attention in the business press and among corporate law scholars.⁵ The consensus was that, as a result of the court ruling, the scope of fiduciary duties of directors of Delaware firms was expanded to include creditors when a firm approached

⁴ For example, see *Reylon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc.*, 506 A.2d 173, Del. 1986; *Katz v. Ak Industries*, 508 A.2d 873, 880, Del. Ch. 1986. More recently, in the case of *North American Catholic Educational Programming Foundation, Inc. v. Gheewalla*, 930 A.2d 92, 99 (Del. 2007), the Delaware Supreme Court stated that "it is well established that the directors owe their fiduciary obligations to the corporation and its shareholders".

⁵ Becker and Stromberg [2012] find that in just three months after the court ruling (November 1991 to January 1992), the *Credit Lyonnais* case was covered 62 times in mainstream press and newswires. It also received extensive attention in the legal community with over 150 law review citations through mid-2006 (Hu and Westbrook [2007]).

insolvency (Varallo and Finkelstein [1992], Barondes [1998], Dionne [2007]).⁶ While the phrase “vicinity of insolvency” does not refer to an insolvency or bankruptcy status, there is no legal definition of the term.⁷ Nevertheless, the newly introduced firm status brought an additional dimension to directors’ fiduciary obligations and increased their legal exposure. Therefore, directors in near insolvent firms would be more likely to consider debtholder interests after the court ruling became effective.

2.2 THE COURT RULING AND ACCOUNTING CONSERVATISM

Conservative accounting constrains upward valuations of net assets and cumulative earnings, and consequently it helps mitigate wealth appropriations by lower order claimants (Watts [2003]). Basu [1997] and Ball and Shivakumar [2005] further suggest that external parties, such as debtholders, are likely to demand more timely disclosure of bad news to offset managers’ incentive to disclose good news early. Prior research has relied on this accounting principle to conjecture that conservatism is mainly driven by debtholders’ demand. While this conjecture is plausible, the extant empirical findings are in general not of a causal nature and thus make it hard to rule out the possibility that conservatism is driven by factors other than debtholders’ demand. Additionally, potential negative effects of excessive conservatism cast further doubt on whether

⁶ Our reading of many subsequent court cases that referred to the Credit Lyonnais case suggests that the focus was almost always on creditors’ claims (for example, see *Geyer v. Ingersoll Publications*, Delaware 1992). Hence, even though the Credit Lyonnais case technically referred to all stakeholders (such as employees, etc.), the interpretation of the court ruling anchored on creditors. For example see, *Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors v. Reliance Capital Group, Inc.*, 1994; *Weaver v. Kellogg*, 1997; *Medlin v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 2007.

⁷ Judicial courts and legal scholars have not provided a precise definition of the phrase “vicinity of insolvency”. It is also uncertain as to when or how a firm enters the indeterminate zone of insolvency. Throughout this paper, we use the term “near insolvent” or “near insolvency” to capture the underlying principle in the Credit Lyonnais court ruling.

conservatism indeed benefits debtholders.⁸ Therefore, it is empirically challenging to identify a setting where a causal link can be established between debtholder preferences and conservatism.

A Delaware court in 1991 introduced a new “vicinity of insolvency” status wherein the fiduciary obligations of directors were expanded to include creditors. This natural event allows us to identify a clear causal link between debtholder preferences and conservatism. The court ruling gave creditors the ability to sue directors of near insolvent companies for breach of fiduciary obligations if actions taken by board members were viewed as either too risky or too shareholder friendly. Creditors, especially those lending to near insolvent Delaware firms, should favor conservative accounting as it induces timely recognition of losses while imposing a higher level of verifiability requirement for gains (Ryan [2006]).⁹ Consequently, given the expanded fiduciary duties to creditors after the court ruling, directors of near insolvent Delaware firms could influence management to adopt more accounting conservatism to meet the preference of debtholders and thus mitigate the increased litigation risk on account of directors’ new fiduciary duties to creditors.

Under Delaware laws, directors are usually protected by the business judgment rule for actions taken in the best interests of the corporation, and companies are required to indemnify directors for expenses arising out of third party legal proceedings brought against the directors as long as they act in good faith; also, Directors’ and Officers’ (D&O) liability insurance provides additional protection. However, as firms approach insolvency, directors’ litigation concerns increase because struggling companies may not be able to provide indemnification, thus

⁸ For instance, future reversals of current period accruals on account of conservatism may be used at the discretion of managers and shareholders to transfer wealth, such as distributing debt- and liquidation-financed dividends, particularly when the firm is struggling (Leuz [1998], Leuz [2001]).

⁹ Early recognition of losses would constrain managers from engaging in over-investments during acquisitions (Francis and Martin [2010]), encourage early abandonment of loss making projects (Srivastava, Tse and Sunder [2010]), and prevent value expropriation during unfavorable economic periods (Nikolaev [2010]).

exposing directors to personal liabilities in the event of lawsuits. Moreover, if directors fail in their fiduciary duties, companies cannot indemnify directors and D&O insurance may not pay for damages either (Dickey and Van Loben Sels [2003]).¹⁰

A recent study by Becker and Stromberg [2012] offers a possible contradicting view. The authors find that the court ruling led to a reduction in risk-taking in near insolvent Delaware firms as well as their greater willingness to invest in projects that likely benefit both shareholders and debtholders. In other words, the Becker and Stromberg [2012] study suggests that the increased fiduciary duties of directors in near insolvent Delaware firms significantly mitigated shareholder-debtholder conflicts. Following this line of reasoning, with new claims arising from fiduciary duties of directors, creditors may no longer need to rely on financial reporting conservatism to protect their interests and this could result in a lower demand for accounting conservatism from lenders. Consequently, it is possible that near insolvent Delaware firms may exhibit no change (or even a reduction) in financial reporting conservatism following the court ruling.

However, based on the discussions above, the reasons to expect higher conservatism after the Delaware court ruling are more persuasive and hence we propose the following hypothesis (stated in alternative form):

H1: Near insolvent Delaware firms increase accounting conservatism after the 1991 Delaware court ruling.

2.3 ROLE OF BOARD CHARACTERISTICS IN THE EFFECT OF COURT RULING ON ACCOUNTING CONSERVATISM

¹⁰ Judicial courts have held directors personally liable for providing misleading information and gross negligence (For example, see *Escott v. Barchris Constr. Corp.* 283 F. Supp. 643, S.D.N.Y. 1968 and *Smith v. Van Gorkom* 488 A.2d 858, 3 EXC 112, Del. 1985). More recently, directors of Enron and Worldcom paid out of their pockets as part of the settlement (see *In re Enron Corp., Sec., Derivative & ERISA Litig.*, 391 F. Supp. 2d 541, S.D. Tex. 2005 and *In re WorldCom, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 388 F. Supp. 2d 319, S.D. N.Y. 2005).

The court ruling directly impacts the fiduciary obligations of directors and therefore the board of directors serves as a channel through which the court ruling should take effect. Prior literature documents that board characteristics like the presence of outsiders or specialists strengthen board governance, because those directors have higher reputational concerns, are less likely to be controlled by shareholders and are more effective in monitoring financial reporting decisions (Ahmed and Duellman [2007], Krishnan and Visvanathan [2008], Cohen et al. [2014]).¹¹ Therefore, if the observed changes in conservatism in near insolvent Delaware firms are due to the effects of the court ruling, we expect firms with stronger boards to be more likely to respond to the expanded fiduciary obligations implied by the court ruling and pay more attention to debtholder interests, which would result in a more pronounced change in conservatism among near insolvent Delaware firms with stronger boards.

3. Research Design

This section presents the discussion on variable measurement, empirical model specifications, and estimation methods. Detailed definitions of all key variables are given in the Appendix.

3.1 EFFECT OF THE COURT RULING ON ACCOUNTING CONSERVATISM

We follow a difference-in-differences approach across three dimensions, namely, state of incorporation, near insolvency status, and court ruling period to capture the differential post-ruling changes in conservatism across treatment and control groups. Specifically, we first examine (i) the pre-post difference in conservatism for near insolvency firms in Delaware vs. in other states and (ii) the pre-post difference in conservatism for Delaware near insolvent vs.

¹¹ Ahmed and Duellman [2007] state that “Because stronger boards are likely to be more proficient at efficient contracting and understand the benefits of conservatism they are likely to demand more conservative accounting” (page 415).

Delaware non-near insolvent firms; and we then (iii) combine the two approaches (both of which are imperfect due to non-randomness of treatment/control group assignment) and perform a double difference-in-differences test, whereby we allow for cross-sectional variations in both a firm's Delaware incorporation status and its near insolvency status. This empirical design is equivalent to teasing out the effect of the court ruling in two steps: isolating the effect of the ruling on conservatism attributable to state of incorporation and to near insolvency status, and comparing this effect in pre- and post-court-ruling periods.

Our primary dependent variable is an estimate of firm-year-level conservatism score similar to that of Beatty, Weber and Yu [2008] and Zhang [2008]. We focus on a composite measure since accounting conservatism is multifaceted (Ryan [2006]) and litigation risk induces both conditional and unconditional conservatism (Beaver and Ryan [2005], Qiang [2007]). A composite measure also helps avoid generalizability and estimation problems associated with any single measure of conservatism.

To test our hypothesis, we estimate the following regression model using the firm-year-specific conservatism score:

$$\begin{aligned}
 CRANK_ALL = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 DEL + \beta_2 HEDF93 + \beta_3 DEL \times HEDF93 \\
 & + \beta_4 POST + \beta_5 POST \times DEL + \beta_6 POST \times HEDF93 + \beta_7 POST \times DEL \times HEDF93 \\
 & + \beta_{8-13} Control\ Variables + Industry\ Dummies + Year\ Dummies + e \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $CRANK_ALL$ is a composite conservatism measure equal to the average decile ranks of three conservatism proxies identified in prior studies: (i) C_ACCR , i.e. negative non-operating accruals, calculated as $(-1) \times$ the average of non-operating accruals scaled by total assets over a 5-year window (with a minimum of 2 years) centered in the observation year t , (ii) C_SKEW , which is relative skewness of earnings vs. cash flows, calculated as $(-1) \times$ skewness of earnings scaled by skewness of cash flows over a 20-quarter window (with a minimum of 5 quarters)

centered in the observation year t ,^{12 13} and (iii) C_PZ for the unrecorded reserves on the balance sheet at the end of the observation year based on Penman and Zhang [2002].¹⁴ $CRANK_ALL$ incorporates different aspects of conservatism: conditional conservatism proxied by negative non-operating accruals and relative skewness measure, as well as adoption of unconditional accounting conservatism through unrecorded reserves which result in lower reported net income (PZ score).¹⁵

The court ruling applies only to Delaware-incorporated firms near insolvency. Since there is no legal definition of the term “near insolvency”, we follow Becker and Stromberg [2012] in using Estimated Default Frequency (EDF) based on the probability transformation of “distance-to-default” developed by Merton [1974] to develop our measure of near insolvency.¹⁶ We construct the near insolvency indicator $HEDF93$ based on the 1993 EDF score, because 1993 is

¹² Conservatism results in persistently negative accruals, while the rate of accumulation of negative non-operating accruals indicates the degree of conservatism (Givoly and Hayn [2000]). Averaging over a number of periods mitigates the impact of any temporary large accruals on conservatism measurement, as accruals tend to reverse within 2 years (Richardson et al. [2005]). In addition, measuring over a 5-year window centered in year t , i.e. $[t-2, t+2]$, ensures that the transitory component in year t 's non-operating accruals is reversed by year $t+2$, while the noise with reversal of temporary large accruals from $t-2$ through $t-1$ can also be removed. Last, choosing the measurement window centered in year t (as in Ahmed and Duellman [2007], Krishnan and Visvanathan [2008]) instead of up to year t (as in Zhang [2008], Beatty, Weber and Yu [2008]), facilitates the appropriate lead-lag model specification since we measure the determinants of conservatism at year $t-1$.

¹³ In additional analyses, we measure C_ACCR and C_SKEW over either a 5-year window centered in year $t+1$ or a 3-year window centered in year t , and still find a positive effect of the court ruling on conservatism when conservatism is measured as negative non-operating accruals, relative earnings skewness, and the composite conservatism measure (see Online Appendix Table A1).

¹⁴ Specifically, C_PZ is calculated as the sum of (i) LIFO reserve as reported in the observation year t 's financial statement, (ii) R&D reserve that would have been on the balance sheet at the end of the observation year t if R&D expenditures had been capitalized and amortized using the industry coefficients estimated by Lev and Sougiannis [1996], and (iii) advertising reserves that would have been on the balance sheet at the end of the observation year t if advertising expenditures had been capitalized and amortized using a sum-of-the-year's digits method over two years, deflated by net operating assets. We include PZ score to capture the variations in unconditional conservatism, as firms have discretion to change their inventory accounting method, to capitalize direct response advertising, and to capitalize costs of internally developed software that reached technological feasibility state, i.e. R&D expenditure. We also test the robustness of our results by dropping PZ score from the composite conservatism measure and the inferences remain the same (see Online Appendix Table A2).

¹⁵ We do not include C-score in our composite measure because C-score would capture changes in firm characteristics following the regime change, which need not have anything to do with conservatism in our setting. We thank the anonymous referee for pointing this out.

¹⁶ We thank Tyler Shumway for sharing the SAS program to calculate EDF scores (http://www-personal.umich.edu/~shumway/papers.dir/nuiter99_print.sas).

the first post-transition full year in our analysis when the ruling became effective.¹⁷ *HEDF93* is a dichotomous variable equal to one if a firm's 1993 EDF score is in the top quartile of its distribution, and zero otherwise. Consistent with Becker and Stromberg [2012], *HEDF93* only varies cross-sectionally in our models, as we need to fix the status of near insolvency at 1993 level in order to conduct the difference-in-differences analyses.¹⁸

Other variables in the model are defined as follows. *DEL* is a dichotomous variable equal to one if the firm is incorporated in the State of Delaware, and zero otherwise. *POST* is a dichotomous variable equal to one for post-ruling period defined as 1993-1996 and zero for pre-ruling period of 1988-1991.¹⁹ We include natural log of market value of equity (*LNMVE*) in our regression model to control for the effect of firm size on financial reporting conservatism as the literature provides arguments for a either positive or negative association of firm size with conservatism.²⁰ The control for firms' leverage (ratio of total liabilities to total assets, *LEV*) captures creditors' overall demand for conservatism (Ahmed et al. [2002]). In addition, we include book-to-market ratio (*BTM*) and asset growth (*GROWTH*) to control for the effects of firms' growth prospects on their financial reporting conservatism. High growth firms could prefer less conservative accounting because of greater pressures to present better accounting and stock performance (Ahmed and Duellman [2013]). To capture the effect of a greater demand for conservatism from firms in more litigious industries, we include a dichotomous variable for high

¹⁷The judge passed his ruling on November 6, 1991 and the case was finally decided on December 30, 1991.

¹⁸ A fundamental assumption with the definition of *HEDF93* is that the sample firms' status of near insolvency does not change throughout the sample period. In supplemental analyses, we test the validity of this assumption by constraining our sample to firms that are near insolvent throughout the whole sample period and by shortening the pre and post-ruling periods so that the near insolvency status is less likely to change (Online Appendix A15).

¹⁹ Our pre-ruling period begins in 1988 because 1988 is the first year in which operating cash flows data become widely available in Compustat, and this variable is required to estimate two dimensional conservatism measures, i.e. negative non-operating accruals (*C_ACCR*) and relative earnings skewness (*C_SKEW*). We exclude year 1992 from our analysis because the ruling was passed at the end of 1991, and it is unlikely to be fully implemented during the transition year of 1992.

²⁰ Political costs hypothesis suggests a positive association, while income aggregation and information asymmetries hypothesis suggests a negative association between conservatism and firm size (LaFond and Watts [2008]).

litigation industries, *LITIG* (Watts [2003], Khan and Watts [2009]). Finally, we also control for institutional ownership *INSTOWN* since prior research shows that institutional investors demand a higher level of accounting conservatism to ensure more efficient investment allocation (Ahmed and Duellman [2007], Ramalingagowda and Yu [2012]). Consistent with prior literature, we measure all control variables at the beginning of the year with all continuous variables winsorized at 1% and 99%. We cluster standard errors in all models by firm and year.²¹ The primary focus of our analysis is β_7 , which is predicted to be positive, i.e. we expect near insolvent Delaware firms to experience an increase in conservatism in the post-ruling period.

3.2 ROLE OF BOARD CHARACTERISTICS IN THE EFFECT OF COURT RULING ON ACCOUNTING CONSERVATISM

To corroborate our findings in Section 3.1, we explore board characteristics identified in prior literature to examine the role of board characteristics in the adoption of accounting conservatism. We create a composite measure of board governance, *BSCORE* that is equal to the sum of the four dichotomous variables, namely: board size (*D_SMBRD*), board independence (*D_MAJIND*), board accounting expertise (*D_ACCEXP*), and board industry expertise (*D_INDEXP*). *D_SMBRD* is a dichotomous variable equal to one if total count of directors on the board is smaller than the sample median of eight members and zero otherwise. Similar to Ajinkya, Bhojraj and Sengupta [2005] we measure board independence (*D_MAJIND*) as a dichotomous variable equal to one if more than 50% of directors on the board are independent, and zero otherwise. *D_ACCEXP* is measured as a dichotomous variable equal to one if at least

²¹ In an additional analysis, we also cluster standard errors of the main model by firm and find the effect of ruling on the composite conservatism measure, *CRANK_ALL*, is still positive and significant (the coefficient on $POST \times DEL \times HEDF93 = 0.489$, t -stat = 3.10). We present this result in Online Appendix Table A3.

one independent director on the board has accounting expertise, and zero otherwise.²² We define *D_INDEXP* as a dichotomous variable equal to one if at least one independent director on the board has industry expertise, defined as any prior experience in another firm that operates in the same two-digit primary SIC industry, and zero otherwise (Faleye, Hoitash and Hoitash [2012]). To examine how board of directors could serve as a channel for the court ruling, we estimate the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} CRANK_ALL = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 DEL + \beta_2 \times HEDF93 + \beta_3 DEL \times HEDF93 \\ & + \beta_4 BSCORE + \beta_5 BSCORE \times DEL + \beta_6 BSCORE \times HEDF93 + \beta_7 BSCORE \times DEL \times HEDF93 \\ & + \beta_{8-13} Control\ Variables + Industry\ Dummies + Year\ Dummies + e \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

3.3 MEASURING ACCOUNTING CONSERVATISM USING ASYMMETRIC TIMELINESS MODELS

3.3.1. Asymmetric Timeliness of Earnings. In addition to our primary year-specific conservatism measure, we estimate cross-sectional conditional conservatism (asymmetric timeliness) models modified to capture the effects of the court ruling on near insolvent Delaware firms. First, we estimate the following regression based on Basu [1997] asymmetric timeliness of earnings model:²³

$$\begin{aligned} X/P = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 RET + \beta_2 D + \beta_3 D \times RET + \beta_4 POST + \beta_5 POST \times RET + \beta_6 POST \times D + \beta_7 POST \times D \times RET \\ & + [\beta_8 HEDF93 + \beta_9 HEDF93 \times RET + \beta_{10} HEDF93 \times D + \beta_{11} HEDF93 \times D \times RET + \\ & \beta_{12} HEDF93 \times POST + \beta_{13} HEDF93 \times POST \times RET + \beta_{14} HEDF93 \times POST \times D + \\ & \beta_{15} HEDF93 \times POST \times D \times RET] \\ & + [\beta_{16} DEL + \beta_{17} DEL \times RET + \beta_{18} DEL \times D + \beta_{19} DEL \times D \times RET + \beta_{20} DEL \times POST + \\ & \beta_{21} DEL \times POST \times RET + \beta_{22} DEL \times POST \times D + \beta_{23} DEL \times POST \times D \times RET] \\ & + [\beta_{24} HEDF93 \times DEL + \beta_{25} HEDF93 \times DEL \times RET + \beta_{26} HEDF93 \times DEL \times D + \\ & \beta_{27} HEDF93 \times DEL \times D \times RET + \beta_{28} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST + \beta_{29} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times RET + \\ & \beta_{30} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times D + \beta_{31} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times D \times RET] \\ & + ControlVariables + ControlVariables \times RET + ControlVariables \times D + ControlVariables \times D \times RET \\ & + Industry\ Dummies + Year\ Dummies + e \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where *X/P* is a firm's earnings per share deflated by the beginning of the year price, *RET* is a firm's buy-and-hold annual stock return, and *D* is a dichotomous variable equal to one if *RET* is

²² Following Defond, Hann and Hu [2005], we define accounting financial experts as directors with experience as a certified public accountant, auditor, principal/chief financial officer, controller, or principal/chief accounting officer.

²³ One caveat with using asymmetric timeliness of earnings as a conservatism measure in our setting is that its construction uses market returns, while market prices possibly respond to the court ruling and may embed an expectation of what the firm will do in response to the ruling. This is the primary reason why we rely on several conservatism proxies in our study.

negative and zero otherwise. In addition to the six control variables used in model (1), i.e. size (*LNMVE*), leverage (*LEV*), book-to-market (*BTM*), growth (*GROWTH*), litigation risk (*LITIG*), and institutional ownership (*INSTOWN*), we also control for stock return volatility (*STDRET*) and natural log of stock price (*LNPRC*) because these variables have been shown to mitigate biases in the Basu [1997] model (Ball, Kothari and Nikolaev [2013]). We measure all control variables at the beginning of the year. To control for possible confounding effects of these control variables on the cross-sectional variation in asymmetric timeliness, we include a full set of interaction terms of these control variables with *D*, *RET*, and our primary variable of interest *D*×*RET*.²⁴ Our hypothesis predicts that β_{3I} is positive and significant, i.e. near insolvent Delaware firms experience a large increase in asymmetric timeliness of earnings in the post-ruling period.

3.3.2. *Asymmetric Timeliness of Accruals*. Following Ball and Shivakumar [2006], we also run an accrual-based conditional conservatism model as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
ACCR = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 CF + \beta_2 DCF + \beta_3 DCF \times CF + \beta_4 POST + \beta_5 POST \times CF + \beta_6 POST \times DCF + \beta_7 POST \times DCF \times CF \\
& + [\beta_8 HEDF93 + \beta_9 HEDF93 \times CF + \beta_{10} HEDF93 \times DCF + \beta_{11} HEDF93 \times DCF \times CF + \\
& \beta_{12} HEDF93 \times POST + \beta_{13} HEDF93 \times POST \times CF + \beta_{14} HEDF93 \times POST \times DCF + \\
& \beta_{15} HEDF93 \times POST \times DCF \times CF] \\
& + [\beta_{16} DEL + \beta_{17} DEL \times CF + \beta_{18} DEL \times DCF + \beta_{19} DEL \times DCF \times CF + \beta_{20} DEL \times POST + \\
& \beta_{21} DEL \times POST \times CF + \beta_{22} DEL \times POST \times DCF + \beta_{23} DEL \times POST \times DCF \times CF] \\
& + [\beta_{24} HEDF93 \times DEL + \beta_{25} HEDF93 \times DEL \times CF + \beta_{26} HEDF93 \times DEL \times DCF + \\
& \beta_{27} HEDF93 \times DEL \times DCF \times CF + \beta_{28} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST + \beta_{29} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times CF + \\
& \beta_{30} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times DCF + \beta_{31} HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times DCF \times CF] \\
& + ControlVariables + ControlVariables \times CF + ControlVariables \times DCF + \\
& ControlVariables \times DCF \times CF \\
& + Industry Dummies + Year Dummies + e
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where *ACCR* is a firm's accruals (defined as the difference between income from continuing operations and operating cash flows) scaled by beginning of the year total assets, *CF* is a firm's operating cash flows scaled by beginning of the year total assets, and *DCF* is a dichotomous

²⁴ To alleviate multi-collinearity concerns due to a very large number of interaction terms, we demean all continuous variables in this model.

variable equal to one if CF is negative and zero otherwise. We include the same set of control variables as in model (1). Similar to model (3), to control for possible confounding effects of control variables on asymmetric timeliness of accruals, we include a full set of interaction terms of control variables with DCF , CF , and $DCF \times CF$.

4. Sample Selection and Descriptive Statistics

Panel A of Table 1 describes construction of the sample used to test our main hypothesis. We begin with 86,672 firm-year observations from Compustat for 1988-1991 and 1993-1996. We first drop 11,092 firm years with missing state of incorporation data in Compustat and another 17,148 observations of financial firms. We lose additional 8,131 observations because of missing data needed to estimate the three conservatism measures, i.e. C_ACCR , C_SKEW , and C_PZ . We also drop 22,389 observations with missing data to compute 1993 EDF scores to measure near insolvency, and another 5,256 observations with negative market value equity or missing financial statement data or institutional ownership information. Finally, after requiring each firm in our sample to have at least one observation in each of the pre- and post-ruling periods, our final sample has 18,827 firm-year observations (2,705 unique firms). Panel B of Table 1 shows annual distribution of sample firms partitioned by DEL and $HEDF93$.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

We present the descriptive statistics of our sample in Table 2. Conservatism rank in our main sample has a mean of 4.500 and a median of 4.333 on a 0-9 scale. Mean (median) C_ACCR (i.e. negative non-operating accruals) is 0.017 (0.009) and mean (median) C_SKEW (i.e. the ratio of earnings skewness to cash flows skewness) is 0.820 (0.191), generally consistent with prior literature (e.g. Givoly and Hayn [2000], Ahmed and Duellman [2007], Beatty, Weber and Yu [2008], and Zhang [2008]). Similar to Penman and Zhang [2002], our sample has a mean

(median) *C_PZ* of 0.356 (0.100). About half of our sample is in the post-ruling period (mean of *POST*, 0.516). Consistent with prior findings (e.g. Daines [2001]), approximately 51% of firm-years in our sample correspond to firms incorporated in Delaware (mean of *DEL*, 0.507). Mean (median) *EDF93* of 5.4% (0.002%) implies that the 1993 EDF distribution is right skewed, i.e. our sample includes some firms that were highly distressed in 1993.²⁵ The mean value of *HEDF93* (0.186), indicates that about 19% of sample firm-year observations have 1993 EDF score in the top quartile of its distribution. Mean (median) *MVE* of our sample is \$852.401 (94.500) million, suggesting that our sample is somewhat skewed towards larger firms. Descriptive statistics on other control variables are in general consistent with expectations.²⁶

Table 3 presents Spearman correlations among variables in our main sample. *CRANK_ALL* is negatively correlated with firm size, supporting the income aggregation and information asymmetries hypothesis by LaFond and Watts [2008] and consistent with prior literature (Ramalingegowda and Yu [2012], LaFond and Roychowhury [2008]); and is positively correlated with litigation risk and institutional ownership (e.g. Beatty, Weber and Yu [2008] and Ramalingegowda and Yu [2012]). The negative correlation between our conservatism measure and leverage appears to contradict prior studies (e.g. Khan and Watts [2009]), but multivariate analyses confirm the documented positive association of leverage with conservatism. The negative association of book-to-market ratio with conservatism is consistent with the expected

²⁵ In Section 6, we run several robustness tests to disentangle the effect of including firms that may be practically insolvent or extremely distressed.

²⁶ We collect the measures of board characteristics from Compact Disclosure disks only for the post-period between 1993 and 1996 because data for the pre-ruling period was not available to us. In this smaller sample of 6,584 observations (i.e. in post-ruling period with available governance data), the average *BRDSIZE* is 8.226, indicating that a typical corporate board in our sample has about eight directors (similar to Anderson, Mansi and Reeb [2004]). The average *PCT_INDDIR* is 0.675, suggesting that on average about 68% of directors on board are independent, similar to data reported in Ahmed and Duellman [2007]. The mean *D_MAJIND* is 0.873, implying that about 87% of firms in our sample have majority independent boards. In addition, consistent with the perceived lack of accounting expertise on board prior to the passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in 2002 and with the findings in Krishnan and Visvanathan [2008], we find that only 22.1 % of our sample observations have at least one director with accounting expertise. Finally, we find at least one director with industry expertise on 28.2% of firm-years in our sample.

positive association between conservatism and market-to-book (e.g. Roychowdhury and Watts [2007]). *HEDF93* is positively correlated with *CRANK_ALL*, i.e. firms approaching near insolvency in 1993 are on average more conservative during the sample period. Predictably, firm size (natural log of market value of equity) and default risk in 1993 are also negatively correlated, as near insolvent firms are more likely to be under-capitalized. Other significant correlations are generally in line with expectations.

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

5. Empirical Results

5.1 MAIN RESULTS ON THE COURT RULING AND ACCOUNTING CONSERVATISM

Panel A of Table 4 presents three types of difference-in-differences tests: (i) holding a firm's Delaware incorporation constant; (ii) holding a firm's near insolvency status constant, and (iii) allowing both Delaware incorporation status and near insolvency status to vary. We first constrain the sample to Delaware firms (i.e. *DEL*=1) and compare the increase in conservatism for firms near insolvency and those that are not. We find that after the court ruling, near insolvent Delaware firms increase conservatism significantly more than not near insolvent Delaware firms (Column (i): coefficient on $POST \times HEDF93 = 0.393$, t -stat = 4.48). Next, we focus on a subsample of near insolvent firms (i.e. *HEDF93*=1) and find that the change in conservatism around the court ruling is significantly larger for near insolvent firms incorporated in Delaware than those incorporated elsewhere (Column (ii): coefficient on $POST \times DEL = 0.497$, t -stat = 4.26).

We estimate the full model (1) on the entire sample and present the result in Column (iii) in Panel A. As predicted by our hypothesis, we find that the coefficient on $POST \times DEL \times HEDF93$ is positive and significant ($\beta_7 = 0.489$, t -stat = 3.82), which suggests that near insolvent Delaware

firms exhibit a larger increase in conservatism around the court ruling. Focusing on the full specification in Column (iii), we find that *CRANK_ALL* is positively associated with litigation risk and institutional ownership, and negatively with firm size, book-to-market and asset growth, consistent with prior literature (e.g. Roychowdhury and Watts [2007], Beatty, Weber and Yu [2008], Ramalingegowda and Yu [2012]).

We also estimate model (1) using dimensional conservatism ranks (i.e. negative non-operating accruals, relative earnings skewness, and unrecorded reserves on the balance sheet) as the dependent variable. Dimensional results in Panel B of Table 4 also provide similar evidence to those in Column (iii) of Panel A, suggesting that our result on the composite conservatism measure is not driven by a particular measure of conservatism. Overall the results in Table 4 are consistent with the notion that near insolvent Delaware firms increased conservatism as a response to the 1991 court ruling.²⁷

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

In additional analyses presented in Online Appendix Table A6, we examine whether our main finding in Column iii of Table 4, Panel A is robust to alternative definitions of near insolvency. This test is important because it is possible that since the EDF measure we employ to identify near insolvent firms is based on accounting and stock performance, it could already capture effects of conservatism, potentially biasing our results. To corroborate our findings, we construct three alternative measures of near insolvency: (i) *HMLEV93*, an indicator variable equal to 1 if the firm is in the top quartile of 1993 market leverage distribution and 0 otherwise,

²⁷ To test robustness of our main findings to the confounding effects of firm-level characteristics, we run the following sensitivity tests: (1) as presented in Online Appendix Table A4, we include a full set of interaction terms of control variables with *DEL*, *HEDF93*, *DEL*×*HEDF93*, *POST*, *POST*×*DEL*, *POST*×*HEDF93*, and *POST*×*DEL*×*HEDF93*, respectively. Our results remain qualitatively similar to those reported in Table 4 (β_7 for *CRANK_ALL*= 0.794, *t*-stat = 3.59). (2) In Online Appendix Table A5, we add controls for a firm's business process, i.e. operating cycle and cash flow volatility, with or without their interaction terms with the seven ruling-related variables. The results of these estimations are all consistent with those reported in Table 4.

where market leverage is measured as the ratio of short- and long-term debt to short- and long-term debt plus market value of equity; (ii) *HBLEV93*, an indicator variable equal to 1 if the firm is in the top quartile of 1993 book leverage distribution and 0 otherwise, where book leverage is measured as the ratio of short- and long-term debt to total assets; and (iii) *LALT93*, an indicator variable that equals 1 if the firm falls in the bottom quartile of distribution of Altman's Z-score in 1993 and 0 otherwise. Results using alternative near insolvency measures remain generally consistent with those reported in Table 4 except the one using *LALT93*, which is significant at one-tailed test ($\beta_7 = 0.153$, $t\text{-stat} = 1.44$).

5.2 RESULTS ON THE ROLE OF BOARD CHARACTERISTICS

We use a single board governance measure *BSCORE* which combines four dimensional board characteristics to explore the effect of board characteristics on conservatism in the post-ruling period because biographical information on directors is available to us only for years 1993-1996 (results reported in Table 5). We start our analysis in this sub-sample with the baseline regression without board measures, and the result in Column (i) suggests that in the post-ruling period, the difference in conservatism between near insolvent and not near insolvent firms is larger for firms incorporated in Delaware than those incorporated elsewhere. Column (ii) in Table 5 presents the main result of model (2), and Column (iii) further includes the interaction terms of firms characteristics with the ruling-related variables, i.e. *DEL*, *HEDF93*, and *DEL* \times *HEDF93*. The positive and significant coefficient on *BSCORE* \times *DEL* \times *HEDF93* in Column (iii) ($\beta_7 = 0.397$, $t\text{-stat} = 2.39$) combined with the insignificant coefficient on *DEL* \times *HEDF93* indicates that the higher post-ruling conservatism level in near insolvent Delaware firms is driven by firms with stronger boards. In a supplemental analysis tabulated in Online Appendix Table A7, we provide evidence on dimensional measures of board strength and

find that β_7 is similarly positive and significant at conventional levels for all board measures except industry expertise, the result of which is marginally significant in a one tailed test ($\beta_7 = 0.407$, t -stat = 1.41). Taken together, the evidence on the effect of court ruling on firms with stronger boards provides further support to the main hypothesis that near insolvent Delaware firms increase their conservatism in the post-ruling period, and the effect of the court ruling is achieved through the board of directors' channel.

[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

5.3 RESULTS USING ASYMMETRIC TIMELINESS MODELS OF CONSERVATISM

5.3.1. Asymmetric Timeliness of Earnings. Results of model (3) are shown in Table 6. In Column (i), we first constrain our sample to Delaware firms and vary their near insolvency status. Consistent with prior literature, β_3 , the coefficient on timeliness of bad news recognition ($D \times RET$) is positive and significant (0.223, t -stat = 3.59). Moreover, consistent with our hypothesis, the post-ruling increase in asymmetric timeliness of earnings for near insolvent Delaware firms is significantly larger than that of non-near insolvent Delaware firms (coefficient on $HEDF93 \times POST \times D \times RET$: $\beta_{15} = 0.143$, t -stat = 2.49). In Column (ii), we constrain our sample to near insolvent firms only and allow Delaware incorporation status to vary. We find that the post-ruling increase in conservatism is significantly larger for near insolvent Delaware firms than for near insolvent non-Delaware firms (coefficient on $DEL \times POST \times D \times RET$: $\beta_{23} = 0.214$, t -stat = 2.92). Finally, we allow both Delaware and near insolvency status of a firm to vary in the full sample and present a complete version of model (3) in Column (iii). β_{31} , the coefficient on our main variable of interest ($HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times D \times RET$), is positive and significant (0.172, t -stat = 2.22), suggesting that the post-ruling increase in asymmetric timeliness of earnings is stronger for near insolvent Delaware firms. Our results similarly hold

when we omit control variables and their interaction terms from model (3). These results are shown in Online Appendix Table A8.

[INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE]

5.3.2. Asymmetric Timeliness of Accruals. We present results of model (4) in Table 7. In Column (i), we first constrain our sample to Delaware firms and vary their near insolvency status. Consistent with our expectations, near insolvent Delaware firms exhibit a higher increase in asymmetric timeliness of accruals after the ruling than non-near insolvent Delaware firms (coefficient on $HEDF93 \times POST \times DCF \times CF$: $\beta_{15} = 0.448$, t -stat = 3.47). Similarly in Column (ii), near insolvent Delaware firms increase asymmetric timeliness of accruals significantly more than near insolvent non-Delaware firms (coefficient on $DEL \times POST \times DCF \times CF$: $\beta_{23} = 0.343$, t -stat = 2.17). Finally, when allowing both Delaware incorporation and near insolvency status to vary (see Column (iii)), we find that near insolvent Delaware firms exhibit significantly more asymmetric timeliness of accruals (coefficient on $HEDF93 \times DEL \times POST \times DCF \times CF$: $\beta_{31} = 0.444$, t -stat = 2.31). Our results continue to hold when we omit control variables and their interaction terms from model (4) (see Online Appendix Table A9).

[INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE]

Overall, results on asymmetric timeliness of earnings (Table 6) and asymmetric timeliness of accruals (Table 7) supplement our main results on year-specific conservatism ranks in Table 4, and provide further support to our main hypothesis that near insolvent Delaware firms respond to the 1991 court ruling by increasing financial reporting conservatism.

6. Additional Analyses

We conduct a number of supplemental analyses to test the robustness of the empirical models and rule out alternative explanations for our results.

6.1 OTHER CORPORATE DECISIONS

The natural experiment setting helps us attribute the change in conservatism around the court ruling to debtholders' demand. However, it is still possible that other corporate decisions that accompanied the ruling may drive the change in conservatism. For example, near insolvent firms may undertake a number of operational changes, such as writing off assets and reducing capital expenditure, to improve profitability and/or increase liquidity, which could manifest themselves in the form of more conservative accounting policies. Because creditors could demand these actions as a near insolvent firm approaches default and in particular, if debt covenants are violated,²⁸ such one-time actions could disproportionately affect near insolvent Delaware firms in the post-ruling period. We therefore identify a number of control variables for operating and real changes to isolate the effect of the court ruling on conservatism.

6.1.1. Real Actions. Asquith, Gertner, and Scharfstein [1994] show that as firms approach distress, they engage in asset sales, or improve their operating efficiency through optimizing the inventory and discretionary expenditure policies. The authors also suggest that better performing distressed firms are more likely to avoid insolvency. To mitigate the concern that our observed change in conservatism could be driven by real actions taken by firms, we augment our model (1) with additional controls for the following real actions: (i) *DEC_CAPEX*, a dichotomous variable equal to one if a firm's capital expenditure decreases when compared to prior year and zero otherwise; (ii) *INC_SPPE*, a dichotomous variable equal to one if a firm's sale of PP&E increases from prior year and zero otherwise; (iii) *DEC_NSEG*, a dichotomous variable equal to one if a firm decreases the number of its business or geographic segments during the year and zero otherwise; (iv) *NABN_DISEXP*, $(-1) \times$ abnormal discretionary expenses (Roychowdhury

²⁸ For instance, Chava and Roberts [2008] show that capital expenditures decrease following violations of debt covenants. Tan [2013] further elaborates on the mechanism of how creditors can impose restructuring changes on defaulting borrowers.

[2006]), and (v) *NABN_PROD*, $(-1) \times$ abnormal production costs (Roychowdhury [2006]). As reported in Table 8, we continue to find the coefficient on *POST* \times *DEL* \times *HEDF93* to be positive and significant when either controlling for the five real actions variables themselves (Column (i): $\beta_7 = 0.472$, t -stat = 3.67), or controlling for both these variables and their interactions with all the seven ruling-related variables (Column (ii): $\beta_7 = 0.326$, t -stat = 1.70). In sum, the robust results after controlling for real actions corroborate the main findings in Table 4 and lend stronger support to our hypothesis.

[INSERT TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE]

6.1.2. Special Items. Negative special items could be one mechanism through which firms adopt more accounting conservatism (Callen, Segal and Hope [2010]). To the extent that negative special items, e.g. one-time write-offs, could be more prevalent among near insolvent firms, the presence of negative special items could confound our results. We control for the presence of negative special items by including sales-deflated negative special items *SI*, which is equal to $(-1) \times \text{SPI}/\text{SALES}$ if $\text{SPI} < 0$ and 0 otherwise, and its interactions with all the seven ruling-related variables in addition to other control variables in model (1). The results (Online Appendix Table A10) show that controlling for the effect of negative special items on conservatism as well as their possible variations along the court ruling does not change the tenor of our main inferences (coefficient on *POST* \times *DEL* \times *HEDF93* = 0.447, t -stat = 3.26).

6.2 DEMAND FOR CONSERVATISM

Alternatively, our findings could be driven by the demand for conservatism from stakeholders other than creditors, who may influence the extent of conservatism in financial reporting. Moreover, a shift of control rights to creditors or recorded losses in prior years may

also explain debtholders' reduced demand for conservatism. To rule out these alternative explanations, we conduct additional tests as explained below.

6.2.1. Recorded Losses. Recorded losses are mechanically correlated with increases in conservatism and thus could confound our results. We rule out this concern by excluding firms most likely to have recorded large losses, i.e. (i) firms that experience most negative earnings changes (i.e. in the lowest decile of the distribution of earnings change), (ii) firms with negative operating cash flows yet positive net income, (iii) firms whose total liabilities exceed total assets, and (iv) firms whose current liabilities exceed current assets. After dropping 5,737 observations that meet at least one of these criteria, we continue to find a post-ruling increase in conservatism among near insolvent Delaware firms in this non-losses subsample ($\beta_7 = 0.329$, t -stat = 2.01). These results are summarized in Online Appendix Table A11.

6.2.2. Covenant Violations and Bankruptcies. Covenant violations may confound our findings in two ways. On one hand, distressed firms are more likely to violate debt covenants (Dichev and Skinner [2002]), and any consequent revisions to loan agreements could give lenders more influence in firms' financial reporting decisions (Nini, Smith and Sufi [2012]). On the other hand, once covenants are actually violated, additional conservatism may provide little incremental benefit to creditors because control rights shift to creditors anyway, and creditors can monitor borrowers directly.²⁹ However, there is no a priori reason to believe that the likelihood of covenant violations is systematically higher or lower for Delaware than non-Delaware firms. Since the covenant violations data provided by Nini, Smith and Sufi [2012] start from 1996 only, we manually collect covenant violations from Mergent/Moody's Manuals for a

²⁹ Recent research, however, disputes that notion and shows that even after covenants are violated firms adopt more accounting conservatism (Wang, Xie and Xin [2011], Tan [2013]).

random sub-sample about 10% of our main sample size.³⁰ On this sub-sample, we first run a logit regression model where we use an indicator variable for covenant violations as the dependent variable and keep all the right-hand-side variables specified in model (1). The results presented in Panel A of Online Appendix Table A12 suggest that the post-ruling increase in the likelihood of violating covenant is not significantly higher for near insolvent Delaware firms ($\beta_7 = -0.915$, t -stat = -0.83), i.e. the court ruling does not seem to exert an effect on covenant violations similar to its effect on conservatism. In our analyses of this hand-collected sub-sample, summarized in Panel B of Online Appendix Table A12, the results still hold either including a control variable for covenant violations (Column (i): $\beta_7 = 0.778$, t -stat = 2.19) or dropping the covenant violation observations (Column (ii): $\beta_7 = 0.691$, t -stat = 1.82).

In addition, while near insolvency does not necessarily lead to bankruptcy, voluntary filings for bankruptcy (chapters 7 or 11) or court initiated bankruptcy proceedings could require firms to follow liquidation basis of accounting, which may be correlated with our conservatism measure. Following Shumway [1997], we identify 6 firms (26 firm-year observations) that were delisted due to bankruptcy (CRSP delisting code 574) at any time during the period 1988-1996. We still obtain results in line with our hypothesis when we exclude these 26 bankruptcy observations from our sample ($\beta_7 = 0.483$, t -stat = 3.77). These results are summarized in Column (iii) of Panel B in Online Appendix Table A12.

6.2.3. Other Stakeholders. Our results could be driven by the influence of auditors, as opposed to directors, on accounting conservatism. Prior studies show that firms audited by Big N auditors have higher reporting conservatism and better earnings quality (Francis and Krishnan

³⁰ To keep the hand collection effort reasonable and representative, we randomly select 10% of both treatment and control samples to obtain 271 firms (30 treatment and 241 control firms), which represent 1,807 firm-year observations across all sample years. Our hand collection yields a total of 116 covenant violations in 72 out of the 271 firms. The firm-level violation occurrence rate of 26.6% in our sample is higher than the 10%-20% in Nini, Smith and Sufi [2012], possibly due to the presentation of near insolvent firms and earlier years in our sample.

[1999], Francis, Maydew and Sparks [1999]). To rule out this confounding factor, we regress conservatism ranks on a dichotomous variable *BIGN* (equal to one if the firm is audited by a Big-N auditor and zero otherwise) and its interaction with the seven ruling-related variables in addition to the other controls. The coefficient on *POST*×*DEL*×*HEDF93* remains positive and significant ($\beta_7 = 0.322$, t -stat = 1.69) after controlling for Big N auditors effect, while the sign on *BIGN*×*POST*×*DEL*×*HEDF93* is not significant (see Online Appendix Table A13, Panel A).

Furthermore, our results could be driven by CEO/CFOs' influence on accounting quality since higher managerial ownership mitigates the severity of the agency problems and thus reduces the demand for conservatism (LaFond and Roychowdhury [2008]). To address this concern, we conduct a post-ruling analysis (since Execucomp data is unavailable for the pre-ruling period) similar to model (2) with *BSCORE* replaced by CEO/CFO ownership percentage, *EXEOWN*. As presented in Panel B of Online Appendix Table A13, after controlling for the effect of CEO/CFO ownership, the main variable of interest *DEL*×*HEDF93* remains significantly positive ($\beta_3 = 1.282$, t -stat = 2.86) in the full model.

6.2.4. Tax Related Incentives. Firms may adopt conservatism to reduce present value of tax payments (Watts [2003]). Similar to Beatty, Weber and Yu [2008], in Online Appendix Table A14, we control for the tax status of the firm by incorporating the simulated corporate marginal tax rate of the prior year based on income after interest expense has been deducted.³¹ We follow Graham and Mills [2008] to fill in missing values. Our main results remain similar to those reported in Table 4 (coefficient on *POST*×*DEL*×*HEDF93*: 0.829, t -stat = 4.64) after controlling for the tax related incentives.

³¹ We thank John Graham for providing us this data (<https://faculty.fuqua.duke.edu/~jgraham/taxform.html>).

6.3 CONTROLLING FOR FIRM PERFORMANCE

To rule out the concern that the differential change in conservatism between treatment and control groups may be driven by the confounding changes in firm performance, as opposed to the court ruling, we conduct the following tests.

6.3.1. Sample Matched on Accounting Performance. An alternative explanation for our results could be that near insolvent Delaware firms in the sample have experienced stronger performance deteriorations than near insolvent non-Delaware firms. To rule out this concern, we perform a matched sample analysis, whereby we match every Delaware firm with a non-Delaware firm with either the closest ROA or the closest change in ROA in the same year and the same 2-digit SIC industry. We continue to find that near insolvent Delaware firms exhibit higher conservatism in post-ruling period (e.g. in the sample matched by ROA, coefficient on $POST \times DEL \times HEDF93 = 0.347$, t -stat = 2.00). These results are reported in Columns (i) and (ii) of Panel A in Online Appendix Table A15.

6.3.2. Holding Firms' Near Insolvency Status Constant. It is possible that throughout our sample period, Delaware firms moved out of near insolvency status, thereby taking themselves out of the scope of the court ruling. To address this concern, we restrict our sample to those Delaware and non-Delaware firms that consistently appear to be near insolvent, i.e. annual EDF scores consistently in highest quartile (693 observations) or consistently above median (3,774 observations) throughout the sample period. As our results in Columns (iii) and (iv) in Panel A of Online Appendix Table A15 indicate, the effect of the court ruling on conservatism for near insolvent Delaware firms remains positive and significant (Column (iii): $\beta_7 = 1.584$, t -stat = 1.88; Column (iv): $\beta_7 = 0.624$, t -stat = 2.75) when firms' near insolvency status is held constant. Thus,

our findings do not appear to be confounded by Delaware firms moving out of the near insolvency zone.

6.3.3. Shorter pre- and post-ruling periods. As we discuss in Section 3.1, a fundamental assumption in our paper is that a firm's near insolvency status does not change throughout the whole sample period. In order to minimize concerns about the fixed near insolvency measure across years, we re-run model (1) using shorter pre- and post-ruling sample periods and summarize the results in Panel B of Online Appendix Table A15. Specifically, we find that the estimated effect of the ruling on conservatism for near insolvent Delaware firms is consistently positive and significant for two-year ($\beta_7 = 0.369$, $t\text{-stat} = 1.45$), four-year ($\beta_7 = 0.428$, $t\text{-stat} = 2.42$) and six-year ($\beta_7 = 0.513$, $t\text{-stat} = 3.54$) event windows.³² The robustness of results on shortened event windows further supports our main findings by not only validating our definition of *HEDF93* but also ruling out the possible confounding events during a longer period.

6.4 CONTROLLING FOR POSSIBLE SELECTION BIASES

A firm's state of incorporation and near insolvency status may not be random; rather, they can be driven by factors that also affect financial reporting choices. We address such selection biases using Propensity Score Matching methodology.

6.4.1. Possible Selection Bias of Near Insolvent Firms. Deteriorating performance and/or financial constraints systematically drive firms to be near insolvent. We control for such variables by implementing propensity score matching on firms' near insolvency status. In the first stage, we estimate a logit regression model following Jones and Hensher [2004], where the explanatory variables for the probability of *HEDF93* = 1 include a new economy indicator, cash

³² The marginal significance for the 2-year event window is probably due to two reasons: 1) conservatism measures are estimated over multiple years (e.g. *C_ACCR* and *C_SKEW*) to mitigate the impact of any temporary large accruals, and thus the change in conservatism over a short period may be small; 2) the effect of the ruling may also need more than one year to take hold.

resources deflated by total assets, operating cash flow deflated by total assets, debt-equity ratio, cash flow interest coverage ratio (i.e. operating cash flow deflated by net interest expense), and industry and year dummies as tabulated in Panel A of Online Appendix Table A16. We then use the predicted propensity of being near insolvent obtained from this model to match non-near insolvent firms ($HEDF93 = 0$) with near insolvent firms ($HEDF93 = 1$). In this matched sample we again find that the post-ruling increase in conservatism is larger for near insolvent Delaware firms ($\beta_7=0.385$, $t\text{-stat}=2.15$) – see Panel B of Online Appendix Table A16.

6.4.2. Possible Selection Bias of State of Incorporation. Prior studies suggest that firms strategically choose to incorporate in certain states like Delaware, and that this decision can improve firm value (Daines [2001], Bebchuk and Cohen [2003]). More recently, Litwak [2011] provides evidence that the results of increased firm value and performance among Delaware incorporated firms disappear after controlling for general choice of out-of-state incorporation. Although the literature is in disagreement over the influence of Delaware incorporation choice on firm behaviors, we still conduct an additional analysis by matching Delaware and non-Delaware companies based on firms' propensity to incorporate in Delaware to rule out the concern that the observed post-ruling increase in conservatism in near insolvent Delaware firms is related to factors that have driven the firm's decision to incorporate in Delaware. We first estimate the probability of being incorporated in Delaware using firm characteristics identified by Bebchuk and Cohen [2003], i.e. log of sales, Tobin's Q, ROA, number of employees, firm age, indicator variables for the state of business, and two-digit SIC industry dummies (see Panel A of Online Appendix Table A17). In the sample matched on the propensity score of being incorporated in Delaware, our main result on the larger post-ruling increase in conservatism for

near insolvent Delaware firms ($\beta_7 = 0.394$, t -stat = 1.82) remains consistent with those reported in Table 4 (see Panel B of Online Appendix Table A17).

6.5 OTHER CONFOUNDING EVENTS

Last, our finding may be confounded by events that were concurrent to the court ruling in 1991. For example, a number of state anti-takeover laws came into effect in the late 1980s–early 1990s and the passage of some of these laws coincided with our sample period. Armstrong, Balakrishnan and Cohen [2012] document that Delaware adopted a stronger version of these laws in 1988, and further find that the adoption of state anti-takeover laws led to increased financial statement informativeness. Their results suggest that the adoption of anti-takeover provisions could confound our finding of increased accounting conservatism after the 1991 court ruling (Jayaraman and Shivakumar [2013]). To mitigate this concern, we extend sample period to include the years 1998-2001, when adoptions of anti-takeover laws would have been completed across all state jurisdictions and their possible effects on conservatism should be stable. We re-run our analysis on the extended period (i.e. 1988-1991 as pre-ruling period and 1993-2001 as post-ruling period) and still find a positive and significant sign on $POST \times DEL \times HEDF93$ (0.414, t -stat = 3.93) as reported in Online Appendix Table A18. Therefore, the adoption of the state anti-takeover laws is ruled out as an alternative explanation for our main results.

7. Conclusion

A 1991 Delaware court ruling expanded the scope of director fiduciary duties to include creditors for near insolvent Delaware firms. We exploit this natural event setting to establish a causal relation between accounting conservatism and debtholders' demand. We find that near insolvent Delaware firms increased their conservatism in the period following the court ruling

and this effect is more pronounced in near insolvent Delaware companies with stronger boards. The results are robust to alternative measures of conservatism and near insolvency status, controlling for operational changes, covenant violations, declines in firm performance, selection bias of the near insolvency status and the state of incorporation, other stakeholders' demand for conservatism, and confounding events like adoption of state anti-takeover laws. Our findings provide evidence to support the casual link between debtholders' demand and accounting conservatism as suggested in the literature. The study also offers some insights into the role of boards in financial reporting and suggests that litigation risk arising from fiduciary obligations is one reason why boards may influence financial reporting decisions.

APPENDIX
Definitions of Variables

Conservatism measures

- CRANK_ACCR* = Deciles rank of *C_ACCR*, where *C_ACCR* is a measure of negative non-operating accruals and calculated as $(-1) \times$ the average of non-operating accruals ($NI + DP - OANCF + RECCH + INVCH + APALCH + TXACH$) scaled by total assets (*AT*) over a 5-year window (with a minimum of 2 years) centered in the observation year.
- CRANK_SKEW* = Deciles rank of *C_SKEW*, where *C_SKEW* is a measure of earnings skewness and calculated as $(-1) \times$ the skewness of earnings (*IBQ*) scaled by the skewness of cash flows (*OANCFY*) over a 20-quarter window (with a minimum of 5 quarters) centered in the observation year.
- CRANK_PZ* = Deciles rank of *C_PZ*, where *C_PZ* is a measure of unrecorded reserves on the firm's balance sheet at the end of the observation year and calculated as the sum of (i) LIFO reserve as reported in the financial statement, *LIFR*, (ii) R&D reserve that would have been on the balance sheet if R&D expenditures, *XRD*, had been capitalized and amortized using the industry coefficients estimated by Lev and Sougiannis [1996] and (iii) advertising reserve that would have been on the balance sheet if advertising expenditures, *XAD*, had been capitalized and amortized using a sum-of-the-year's digits method over two years, deflated by net operating assets ($CEQ - DVPA + DLC + DLTT + PSTK + DVPA - CHE - IVAO + MIB$) (Penman and Zhang [2002]).
- CRANK_ALL* = A composite conservatism measure calculated as the simple average of the three dimensional conservatism ranks for the observation year, i.e. $(CRANK_ACCR + CRANK_SKEW + CRANK_PZ) / 3$.

Case ruling related measures

- POST* = A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if the calendar year is in the post-rule period of 1993-1996, and 0 if in 1988-1991.
- DEL* = A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if the firm is incorporated in the state of Delaware and 0 otherwise.
- HEDF93* = A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if *EDF93*, i.e. the EDF score in year 1993 when the case ruling became effective, is ranked in top quartile of its distribution and 0 otherwise, where EDF score is Estimated Default Frequency for a firm to measure the bankruptcy probability in a year implied in the stock price and based on Merton model.

Control variables for firm characteristics

- LN MVE* = Nature log of MVE, where MVE is measured as market value of equity at the beginning of the observation year ($PRCC_F \times CSHO$).
- LEV* = Total liabilities (*LT*) divided by total assets (*AT*), both measured at the beginning of the observation year.
- BTM* = The ratio of book value equity (*CEQ*) to market value equity ($PRCC_F \times CSHO$), both measured at the beginning of the observation year.
- GROWTH* = Change in total assets (*AT*) from the prior year divided by year-beginning total assets.

- LITIG* = A dichotomous variable equal to 1 if the firm is in a high litigation risk industry (SIC codes 2833-2836, 3570-3577, 3600-3674, 5200-5961, 7370-7374) and 0 otherwise.
- INSTOWN* = The average percentage of institutional ownership over the 4 quarters of the prior year, using Spectrum 13F institutional holdings data.

Measures of board characteristics

- BSCORE* = A composite measure of board governance that is equal to the sum of the following four dichotomous variables: *D_SMBRD*, *D_MAJIND*, *D_ACCEXP*, and *D_INDEXP*.
- (i) *D_SMBRD* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if the total count of directors on the board is smaller than the sample median (8) and 0 otherwise;
 - (ii) *D_MAJIND* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if the percentage of independent directors is 50% or above and 0 otherwise;
 - (iii) *D_ACCEXP* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if at least one independent director on the board has accounting expertise and 0 otherwise, where accounting expertise is defined as having any prior experience as being a CFO, a CPA, an accountant, or an auditor;
 - (iv) *D_INDEXP* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if at least one independent director on the board has industry expertise and 0 otherwise, where industry expertise is defined as having any prior experience in another firm that operates in the same two-digit primary SIC industry as the focal firm. All board characteristics variables are calculated using Compact Disclosure data.
-

REFERENCES

- AHMED, A., B. BILLINGS, R. MORTON, AND M. STANFORD-HARRIS. "The Role of Accounting Conservatism in Mitigating Bondholder-Shareholder Conflicts over Dividend Policy and in Reducing Debt Costs." *The Accounting Review* 77 (2002): 867-90.
- AHMED, A., AND S. DUELLMAN. "Accounting Conservatism and Board of Director Characteristics: An Empirical Analysis." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 43 (2007): 411-37.
- AHMED, A., AND S. DUELLMAN. "Managerial Overconfidence and Accounting Conservatism." *Journal of Accounting Research* 51 (2013): 1-30.
- AJINKYA, B., S. BHOJRAJ, AND P. SENGUPTA. "The Association between Outside Directors, Institutional Investors and the Properties of Management Earnings Forecasts." *Journal of Accounting Research* 43(2005): 343-76.
- ALTMAN, E. I. "Financial Ratios, Discriminant Analysis and the Prediction of Corporate Bankruptcy." *The Journal of Finance* 23 (1968): 589-609.
- ANDERSON, R., S. MANSI, AND D. REEB. "Board Characteristics, Accounting Report Integrity, and the Cost of Debt." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 37 (2004): 315-42.
- ARMSTRONG, C., K. BALAKRISHNAN, AND D. COHEN. "Corporate Governance and the Information Environment: Evidence from State Anti-Takeover Laws." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 53 (2012): 185-204.
- ASQUITH, P., R. GERTNER, AND D. SCHARFSTEIN. "Anatomy of Financial Distress: An Examination of Junk-bond Issuers." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109 (1994): 625-58.
- BALL, R., S.P. KOTHARI, AND V. NIKOLAEV. "On Estimating Conditional Conservatism." *The Accounting Review* 88 (2013): 755-87.
- BALL, R., AND L. SHIVAKUMAR. "Earnings Quality in UK Private Firms: Comparative Loss Recognition Timeliness." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 39 (2005): 83-128.
- BALL, R., AND L. SHIVAKUMAR. "The Role of Accruals in Asymmetrically Timely Gain and Loss Recognition." *Journal of Accounting Research* 44 (2006): 207-42.
- BARONDES, R. "Fiduciary Duties of Officers and Directors of Distressed Corporations." *George Mason Law Review* 7 (1998): 45-104.
- BASU, S. "The Conservatism Principle and the Asymmetric Timeliness of Earnings." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 24 (1997): 3-37.
- BEATTY, A., J. WEBER, AND J. YU. "Conservatism and Debt." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 45 (2008): 154-74.
- BEAVER, W., AND S. RYAN. "Conditional and Unconditional Conservatism: Concepts and Modeling." *Review of Accounting Studies* 10 (2005): 269-309.
- BEBCHUK, L., AND A. COHEN. "Firms' Decisions Where to Incorporate." *Journal of Law and Economics* 46 (2003): 383-425.
- BECKER, B., AND P. STROMBERG. "Fiduciary Duties and Equity-debtholder Conflicts." *Review of Financial Studies* 25 (2012): 1931-69.
- BUSHMAN, R. M., AND J. PIOTROSKI. "Financial Reporting Incentives for Conservative Accounting: The Influence of Legal and Political Institutions." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 42 (2006): 107-48.
- CALLEN, J., D. SEGAL, AND O. HOPE. "The Pricing of Conservative Accounting and the Measurement of Conservatism at the Firm-Year Level." *Review of Accounting Studies* 15 (2010): 145-78.

- CHAVA, S., AND M. ROBERTS. “How Does Financing Impact Investment? The Role of Debt Covenants.” *Journal of Finance* 63 (2008): 2085-2121.
- COHEN, J., U. HOITASH, G. KRISHNAMOORTHY, AND A. WRIGHT. “The Effect of Audit Committee Industry Expertise on Monitoring the Financial Reporting Process.” *The Accounting Review* (2014): 89(1), 243-273.
- CREDIT LYONNAIS BANK NEDERLAND N.V. V. PATHE COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION. Civ. A. No. 12150. 1991. Court of Chancery of Delaware, New Castle County.
- DAINES, R. “Does Delaware Law Improve Firm Value?” *Journal of Financial Economics* 62 (2001): 525–58.
- DEFOND, M. L., R. N. HANN, AND X. HU. “Does the Market Value Financial Expertise on Audit Committees of Boards of Directors?” *Journal of Accounting Research* 43 (2005): 153–93.
- DICHEV, I., AND D. SKINNER. “Large-Sample Evidence on the Debt Covenant Hypothesis.” *Journal of Accounting Research* 40 (2002): 1091-1123.
- DICKEY, J., AND J. VAN LOBEN SELS. “Indemnification and Insurance for Directors and Officers of Public Companies: What Directors and Officers Need to Know in the Post-Sarbanes-Oxley World.” Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, Stanford Directors College, 2003.
- DIONNE, A. “Living on the Edge: Fiduciary Duties, Business Judgment and Expensive Uncertainty in the Zone of Insolvency.” *Stanford Journal of Law, Business and Finance* 13 (2007): 188-224.
- FALEYE, O., R. HOITASH, AND U. HOITASH. “Industry Expertise on Corporate Boards.” Working paper, Northeastern University, 2012. Available at <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2117104>.
- FRANCIS, J., AND J. KRISHNAN. “Accounting accruals and auditor reporting conservatism.” *Contemporary Accounting Research* 16 (1999): 135-66.
- FRANCIS, J., AND X.MARTIN. “Acquisition profitability and timely loss recognition.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 49 (2010): 161-178
- FRANCIS, J., E. MAYDEW, AND H. SPARKS. “The Role of Big 6 Auditors in the Credible Reporting of Accruals.” *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory* 18 (1999): 17-34.
- GIVOLY, D., AND C. HAYN. “The Changing Time-series Properties of Earnings, Cash Flows and Accruals: Has Financial Reporting Become More Conservative?” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 29 (2000): 287-320.
- GORMLEY, T. A., B. H. KIM, AND X. MARTIN. “Do Firms Adjust Their Timely Loss Recognition in Response to Changes in the Banking Industry?” *Journal of Accounting Research* 50 (2012): 159–196.
- GRAHAM, J. R., AND L. MILLS. “Using Tax Return Data to Simulate Corporate Marginal Tax Rates.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 46 (2008): 366-88.
- HU, H., AND J. WESTBROOK. “Abolition of the Corporate Duty to Creditors.” *Columbia Law Review* 107 (2007): 1321-1403.
- JAYARAMAN, S., AND L. SHIVAKUMAR. “Agency-based Demand for Conservatism: Evidence from State Adoption of Antitakeover Laws.” *Review of Accounting Studies* 18 (2013): 95-134.
- JONES, S., AND D. A. HENSHER. “Predicting Firm Financial Distress: A Mixed Logit Model.” *The Accounting Review* 79 (2004): 1011–38.
- KHAN, M., AND R. WATTS. “Estimation and Empirical Properties of a Firm-year Measure of Accounting Conservatism.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 48 (2009): 132-50.
- KRISHNAN, G., AND G. VISVANATHAN. “Does the SOX Definition of an Accounting Expert Matter? The Association between Audit Committee Directors’ Accounting Expertise and Accounting Conservatism.” *Contemporary Accounting Research* 25 (2008): 827-57.

- LAFOND, R., AND S. ROYCHOWDHURY. “Managerial Ownership and Accounting Conservatism.” *Journal of Accounting Research* 46 (2008): 101-35.
- LAFOND, R., AND R. WATTS. “The Information Role of Conservatism.” *The Accounting Review* 83 (2008): 447-78.
- LEUZ, C. “The Role of Accrual Accounting in Restricting Dividends to Shareholders.” *European Accounting Review* 7 (1998): 579-604.
- LEUZ, C. “Comment on Infrastructure Requirements for an Economically Efficient System of Public Financial Reporting and Disclosure.” *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Financial Services*, R. Litan and R. Herring (eds.), Washington: Brookings Institution Press (2001): 170-178.
- LEV, B., AND T. SOUGIANNIS. “The Capitalization, Amortization, and Value Relevance of R&D.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 21 (1996): 107-138.
- LITWAK, K. “How Much We Learn by Regressing Corporate Characteristics against the State of Incorporation.” Unpublished Paper. Northwestern University, 2011. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1884709
- MERTON, R. “On the Pricing of Corporate Debt: The Risk Structure of Interest Rates.” *Journal of Finance* 29 (1974): 449-70.
- NIKOLAEV, V. “Debt Covenants and Accounting Conservatism.” *Journal of Accounting Research* 48 (2010): 51-89.
- NINI, G., D. SMITH, AND A. SUFI. “Creditor Control Rights, Corporate Governance, and Firm Value.” *Review of Financial Studies* 25 (2012): 1713-61.
- PENMAN, S. H., AND X. ZHANG. “Accounting Conservatism, the Quality of Earnings, and Stock Returns.” *The Accounting Review* 77 (2002): 237-64.
- QIANG, X. “The Effects of Contracting, Litigation, Regulation, and Tax Costs on Conditional and Unconditional Conservatism: Cross-Sectional Evidence at the Firm Level.” *The Accounting Review* 82 (2007): 759-96.
- RAMALINGEGOWDA, S., AND Y. YU. “Institutional Ownership and Conservatism.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 53 (2012): 98–114.
- RICHARDSON, S.A., SLOAN, R.G., SOLIMAN, M.T., TUNA, I.A. “Accrual reliability, earnings persistence and stock prices.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 39 (2005): 437–485.
- ROYCHOWDHURY, S. “Earnings Management Through Real Activities Manipulation.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 42 (2006): 335–70.
- ROYCHOWDHURY, S., AND R. WATTS. “Asymmetric Timeliness of Earnings, Market-to-book and Conservatism in Financial Reporting.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 44 (2007), 2-31.
- RYAN, S. “Identifying Conditional Conservatism.” *European Accounting Review* 15 (2006): 511-25.
- SHUMWAY, T. “The Delisting Bias in CRSP Data.” *Journal of Finance* 52 (1997): 327-40.
- SRIVASTAVA, A., S. TSE, AND S. SUNDER. “Timely Loss Recognition and the Early Termination of Unprofitable Projects”. Unpublished paper, Northwestern University, 2010. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1465980
- TAN, L. “Creditor Control Rights, State of Nature Verification, and Financial Reporting Conservatism.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 55 (2013): 1-22.
- VARALLO, G., AND J. FINKELSTEIN. “Fiduciary Obligations of Directors of the Financially Troubled Company.” *The Business Lawyer* 48 (1992): 239-255.
- WANG, C., F. XIE, AND X. XIN. “Creditor Control Rights and Financial Reporting Conservatism.” Unpublished paper, Clemson University, 2011. Available at <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2038363>.

WATTS, R. "Conservatism in Accounting Part I: Explanations and Implications." *Accounting Horizons* 17 (2003): 207-21.

ZHANG, J. "The Contracting Benefits of Accounting Conservatism to Lenders and Borrowers." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 45 (2008): 27-54.

TABLE 1
Sample Description

Panel A: Sample Selection Procedure

All Compustat observations from calendar years 1988-1991 & 1993-1996	86,672
less observations with missing incorporation data	11,092
less observations in financial industries	17,148
less observations with missing data to compute conservatism measures (i.e. <i>C_ACCR</i> , <i>C_SKEW</i> and <i>C_PZ</i>)	8,131
less observations with missing data on near insolvency measure, i.e. 1993 Estimated Default Frequency (EDF).	22,389
less observations with negative market value equity or missing data on firm size, book leverage, book-to-market, asset growth, and institutional ownership, etc.	5,256
less firms without at least one observation in both pre- and post-rule periods	3,829
Final sample of firm observations in 1988-1991 & 1993-1996	18,827
(Number of firms in the final sample)	2,705

Panel B: Sample Distribution (Pre- and Post-Ruling)

Year	<i>DEL</i>		<i>HEDF93</i>		Total	
	=1	=0	=1	=0		
1988	867	902	301	1,468	1,769	<i>POST=0</i> 9,112
1989	1,147	1,174	446	1,875	2,321	
1990	1,230	1,207	447	1,966	2,437	
1991	1,320	1,265	510	2,075	2,585	
1993	1,346	1,279	519	2,106	2,625	<i>POST=1</i> 9,715
1994	1,281	1,220	461	2,040	2,501	
1995	1,207	1,147	412	1,942	2,354	
1996	1,145	1,090	386	1,849	2,235	
Total	9,543	9,284	3,482	15,321	18,827	

TABLE 2
Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Lower Quartile	Median	Upper Quartile
<i>CRANK_ALL</i>	18,827	4.500	1.756	3.333	4.333	5.667
<i>C_ACCR</i>	18,827	0.017	0.041	-0.002	0.009	0.026
<i>C_SKEW</i>	18,827	0.820	10.478	-1.145	0.191	2.533
<i>C_PZ</i>	18,827	0.356	1.113	0.034	0.100	0.246
<i>POST</i>	18,827	0.516	0.500	0	1	1
<i>DEL</i>	18,827	0.507	0.500	0	1	1
<i>EDF93</i>	18,827	0.054	0.144	0.00	0.00	0.016
<i>HEDF93</i>	18,827	0.186	0.389	0	0	0
<i>MVE (\$M)</i>	18,827	852.401	2371.80	23.638	94.500	492.618
<i>LN MVE</i>	18,827	4.724	2.069	3.163	4.549	6.200
<i>LEV</i>	18,827	0.508	0.193	0.368	0.526	0.650
<i>BTM</i>	18,827	0.720	0.530	0.371	0.598	0.897
<i>GROWTH</i>	18,827	0.161	0.434	-0.009	0.073	0.196
<i>LITIG</i>	18,827	0.247	0.431	0	0	0
<i>INSTOWN</i>	18,827	0.276	0.211	0.090	0.238	0.435
<i>BSCORE</i>	6,584	1.951	0.740	1	2	2

This table provides the summary statistics of the primary test variables. All variables are defined in the Appendix. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles.

TABLE 3
Correlation Matrix

	<i>1_</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>2_POST</i>	0.065 <i>0.00</i>								
<i>3_DEL</i>	0.054 <i>0.00</i>	0.012 <i>0.11</i>							
<i>4_HEDF93</i>	0.031 <i>0.00</i>	-0.009 <i>0.24</i>	0.012 <i>0.10</i>						
<i>5_LNMVE</i>	-0.057 <i>0.00</i>	0.102 <i>0.00</i>	0.058 <i>0.00</i>	-0.412 <i>0.00</i>					
<i>6_LEV</i>	-0.102 <i>0.00</i>	0.003 <i>0.65</i>	0.025 <i>0.00</i>	0.111 <i>0.00</i>	0.120 <i>0.00</i>				
<i>7_BTM</i>	-0.083 <i>0.00</i>	-0.102 <i>0.00</i>	-0.072 <i>0.00</i>	0.153 <i>0.00</i>	-0.347 <i>0.00</i>	-0.002 <i>0.77</i>			
<i>8_GROWTH</i>	-0.072 <i>0.00</i>	-0.064 <i>0.00</i>	0.028 <i>0.00</i>	-0.098 <i>0.00</i>	0.152 <i>0.00</i>	-0.071 <i>0.00</i>	-0.309 <i>0.00</i>		
<i>9_LITIG</i>	0.173 <i>0.00</i>	0.013 <i>0.07</i>	0.064 <i>0.00</i>	-0.010 <i>0.17</i>	-0.052 <i>0.00</i>	-0.165 <i>0.00</i>	-0.106 <i>0.00</i>	0.055 <i>0.00</i>	
<i>10_INSTOWN</i>	0.055 <i>0.00</i>	0.126 <i>0.00</i>	0.052 <i>0.00</i>	-0.344 <i>0.00</i>	0.699 <i>0.00</i>	0.052 <i>0.00</i>	-0.06 <i>0.00</i>	0.021 <i>0.00</i>	-0.014 <i>0.05</i>

This table provides the Spearman correlation coefficients for the main variables in the main tests. Italicized rows are p -values. Significant correlations are indicated in bold ($p < 0.10$, two-tailed test). All variables are calculated as defined in the Appendix. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles.

TABLE 4
Effect of the 1991 Delaware Court Ruling on Conservatism Rank

Panel A: Court Ruling and Composite Conservatism Rank

Dep. Var.=CRANK_ALL Independent Var.		(i) DEL = 1		(ii) HEDF93 = 1		(iii) Full sample	
		Coef.	t-stat	Coef.	t-stat	Coef.	t-stat
<i>Intercept</i>	β_0	4.625***	33.10	5.295***	23.16	4.637***	42.25
<i>DEL</i>	β_1			-0.368***	-4.33	-0.021	-0.58
<i>HEDF93</i>	β_2	-0.135**	-2.07			0.207***	3.05
<i>DEL</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_3					-0.320***	-3.53
<i>POST</i>	β_4	-0.005	-0.07	-0.382***	-2.89	-0.045	-0.84
<i>POST</i> × <i>DEL</i>	β_5			0.497***	4.26	0.027	0.54
<i>POST</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_6	0.393***	4.48			-0.084	-0.89
<i>POST</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_7					0.489***	3.82
<i>LN MVE</i>	β_8	-0.051***	-3.92	0.032	1.04	-0.030***	-3.21
<i>LEV</i>	β_9	0.144	1.52	-0.342**	-2.13	0.095	1.37
<i>BTM</i>	β_{10}	-0.107***	-2.81	-0.126**	-2.41	-0.092***	-3.17
<i>GROWTH</i>	β_{11}	-0.203***	-4.49	-0.217***	-3.18	-0.203***	-5.78
<i>LITIG</i>	β_{12}	0.871***	10.93	0.489***	3.29	0.686***	11.64
<i>INSTOWN</i>	β_{13}	0.835***	7.54	0.634**	2.42	0.810***	9.77
Industries dummies		Included		Included		Included	
Year dummies		Included		Included		Included	
No. observations		9,543		3,506		18,827	
Adj. R-square		15.4%		12.1%		17.2%	

This table presents regression estimates to test the effect of 1991 Delaware court ruling on the composite conservatism rank. The full sample includes 18,827 observations for 2,705 firms spanning calendar years 1988-1991 and 1993-1996. All variables are calculated as defined in Appendix A. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles. Reported *t*-statistics are adjusted for clustering by both firm and year. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10 levels, respectively for a two-tailed test.

TABLE 4 - Continued

Panel B: Court Ruling and Dimensional Conservatism Rank

Independent Var.		(i)		(ii)		(iii)	
		Dep. Var.= <i>CRANK_ACCR</i>		Dep. Var.= <i>CRANK_SKEW</i>		Dep. Var.= <i>CRANK_PZ</i>	
		Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat
<i>Intercept</i>	β_0	4.764***	25.89	3.596***	19.56	5.551***	32.00
<i>DEL</i>	β_1	-0.068	-1.07	-0.046	-0.70	0.051	0.96
<i>HEDF93</i>	β_2	0.364***	3.12	0.153	1.32	0.105	1.13
<i>DEL</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_3	-0.125	-0.77	-0.057	-0.36	-0.777***	-6.10
<i>POST</i>	β_4	-0.029	-0.31	-0.037	-0.38	-0.070	-0.92
<i>POST</i> × <i>DEL</i>	β_5	0.204**	2.33	-0.094	-1.04	-0.027	-0.37
<i>POST</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_6	-0.260	-1.56	-0.145	-0.91	0.155	1.18
<i>POST</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_7	0.587**	2.54	0.424*	1.91	0.456**	2.50
<i>LN MVE</i>	β_8	0.005	0.28	0.113***	6.76	-0.208***	-15.71
<i>LEV</i>	β_9	0.404***	3.29	0.590***	4.99	-0.709***	-6.81
<i>BTM</i>	β_{10}	-0.093*	-1.85	0.334***	6.98	-0.515***	-12.74
<i>GROWTH</i>	β_{11}	-0.055	-0.99	-0.213***	-4.71	-0.340***	-6.04
<i>LITIG</i>	β_{12}	1.224***	12.16	0.153	1.58	0.681***	8.35
<i>INSTOWN</i>	β_{13}	0.553***	3.94	0.888***	6.12	0.990***	8.38
Industries dummies		Included		Included		Included	
Year dummies		Included		Included		Included	
No. observations		18,827		18,827		18,827	
Adj. R-square		5.4%		2.6%		37.7%	

This table presents regression estimates to test the effect of 1991 Delaware court ruling on dimensional conservatism ranks. The sample includes 18,827 observations for 2,705 firms spanning calendar years 1988-1991 and 1993-1996. All variables are calculated as defined in Appendix A. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles. Reported *t*-statistics are adjusted for clustering by both firm and year. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10 levels, respectively for a two-tailed test.

TABLE 5

Conservatism Rank after the 1991 Delaware Court Ruling: Effect of Corporate Governance

Dep. Var.= CRANK ALL Independent Var.		(i)		(ii)		(iii)	
		Coef.	t-stat	Coef.	t-stat	Coef.	t-stat
<i>Intercept</i>	β_0	4.584***	20.90	4.777***	20.37	4.791***	18.02
<i>DEL</i>	β_1	-0.054	-1.23	0.236**	2.01	0.064	0.25
<i>HEDF93</i>	β_2	0.059	0.64	0.232	0.92	0.745	1.37
<i>DEL×HEDF93</i>	β_3	0.213*	1.86	-0.532	-1.53	-0.881	-1.26
<i>BSCORE</i>	β_4			0.025	0.64	0.035	0.88
<i>BSCORE×DEL</i>	β_5			-0.124**	-2.17	-0.137**	-2.35
<i>BSCORE×HEDF93</i>	β_6			-0.078	-0.65	-0.113	-0.91
<i>BSCORE×DEL×HEDF93</i>	β_7			0.353**	2.16	0.397**	2.39
<i>LNME</i>	β_8	-0.012	-0.74	-0.040**	-2.52	-0.040*	-1.68
<i>LEV</i>	β_9	0.498***	4.16	0.447***	3.77	0.445**	2.49
<i>BTM</i>	β_{10}	-0.260***	-4.69	-0.286***	-5.10	-0.243**	-2.41
<i>GROWTH</i>	β_{11}	-0.639***	-7.39	-0.604***	-7.08	-0.569***	-4.11
<i>LITIG</i>	β_{12}	0.726***	7.24	0.756***	7.50	0.624***	5.34
<i>INSTOWN</i>	β_{13}	0.921***	6.95	0.950***	7.21	0.894***	4.53
<i>Controls×DEL</i>						Included	
<i>Controls×HEDF93</i>						Included	
<i>Controls×DEL×HEDF93</i>						Included	
Industries dummies		Included		Included		Included	
Year dummies		Included		Included		Included	
No. observations		6,584		6,584		6,584	
Adj. R-square		18.6%		18.9%		18.9%	

This table presents regression estimates to test the combined effect of board characteristics on conservatism Rank post the 1991 Delaware court ruling (model 2). The sample in this test includes 6,584 observations for 1,968 firms spanning calendar years 1993-1996 with available data on the board of directors from Compact Disclosure. All variables are defined in the Appendix. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles. Reported t-statistics are adjusted for clustering by both firm and year. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10 levels, respectively, for a two-tailed test.

TABLE 6

Effect of the 1991 Delaware Court Ruling on Asymmetric Timeliness of Earnings

Dep. Var.= <i>X/P</i>	Independent Var.	(i) <i>DEL = 1</i>		(ii) <i>HEDF93 = 1</i>		(iii) Full sample		
		Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	
	<i>Intercept</i>	β_0	-0.002	-0.16	-0.040	-1.32	-0.001	-0.11
	<i>RET</i>	β_1	0.040**	2.12	0.052	1.37	0.031**	2.28
	<i>D</i>	β_2	-0.005	-0.21	0.048	1.17	0.002	0.11
	<i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_3	0.223***	3.59	0.235**	2.35	0.186***	4.24
	<i>POST</i>	β_4	0.010**	2.42	0.049***	3.64	0.007**	2.10
	<i>POST</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_5	-0.010*	-1.73	-0.027	-1.46	-0.010	-1.55
	<i>POST</i> × <i>D</i>	β_6	0.007	1.34	-0.039*	-1.91	0.014***	2.92
	<i>POST</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_7	0.047**	2.31	-0.010	-0.18	0.050**	2.52
	<i>HEDF93</i>	β_8	-0.007	-0.81			-0.024***	-2.89
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_9	0.003	0.31			0.016	1.08
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>D</i>	β_{10}	-0.014	-0.97			0.018	1.48
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{11}	-0.030	-0.89			0.040	1.27
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i>	β_{12}	0.010	0.86			0.022**	2.01
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{13}	-0.014	-0.81			-0.014	-0.71
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>D</i>	β_{14}	0.028	1.34			-0.047**	-2.38
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{15}	0.143**	2.49			-0.039	-0.71
	<i>DEL</i>	β_{16}			0.012	0.96	-0.007**	-2.56
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{17}			-0.007	-0.40	0.006	1.06
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>D</i>	β_{18}			-0.033*	-1.78	0.004	0.77
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{19}			-0.083*	-1.91	0.008	0.43
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i>	β_{20}			-0.018	-1.13	0.003	0.67
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{21}			0.010	0.41	-0.001	-0.16
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>D</i>	β_{22}			0.087***	3.12	-0.007	-0.99
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{23}			0.214***	2.92	0.000	-0.01
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i>	β_{24}					0.016	1.34
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{25}					-0.011	-0.64
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>D</i>	β_{26}					-0.031*	-1.67
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{27}					-0.069	-1.53
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i>	β_{28}					-0.018	-1.08
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{29}					0.006	0.22
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>D</i>	β_{30}					0.080***	2.81
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>	β_{31}					0.172**	2.22
	<i>Controls</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	<i>Controls</i> × <i>RET</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	<i>Controls</i> × <i>D</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	<i>Controls</i> × <i>D</i> × <i>RET</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	Industries dummies		Included		Included		Included	
	Year dummies		Included		Included		Included	
	No. observations		8,857		2,937		17,533	
	Adj. R-square		28.9%		31.0%		30.4%	

This table presents regression estimates to test the effect of 1991 Delaware court ruling on conditional conservatism as measured by asymmetric timeliness of earnings per Basu [1997]. The sample includes 17,533 observations for 2,460 firms spanning calendar years 1988-1991 and 1993-1996. *X/P* is earnings per share scaled by year beginning price. *RET* is buy-and-hold stock returns for the year. *D* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if *RET*<0 and 0 otherwise. Controls include *LNME*, *LEV*, *BTM*, *GROWTH*, *LITIG*, *INSTOWN*, *STDRET* (which is the daily stock return volatility during the prior year) and *LNPRC* (which is log of year-beginning stock price). All other variables are calculated as defined in Appendix. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles. Reported *t*-statistics are adjusted for clustering by both firm and year. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10 levels, respectively for a two-tailed test.

TABLE 7
Effect of the 1991 Delaware Court Ruling on Asymmetric Timeliness of Accruals

Dep. Var.= <i>ACCR</i>	Independent Var.	(i) <i>DEL = 1</i>		(ii) <i>HEDF93 = 1</i>		(iii) Full sample		
		Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	
	<i>Intercept</i>	β_0	0.013	1.37	-0.025*	-1.73	0.030***	4.47
	<i>CF</i>	β_1	-0.400***	-7.28	-0.395***	-3.94	-0.428***	-9.79
	<i>DCF</i>	β_2	-0.015	-0.81	0.006	0.31	-0.025*	-1.90
	<i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_3	0.578***	4.11	0.197	0.99	0.344***	2.89
	<i>POST</i>	β_4	0.002	0.50	0.014	1.62	0.003	0.96
	<i>POST</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_5	-0.015	-0.60	0.115**	2.03	-0.018	-0.69
	<i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i>	β_6	-0.007	-0.80	0.008	0.65	0.006	0.71
	<i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_7	0.137**	2.02	0.250**	2.22	0.242***	2.68
	<i>HEDF93</i>	β_8	-0.018***	-3.48			-0.028***	-5.90
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_9	0.072	1.64			0.068*	1.76
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DCF</i>	β_{10}	-0.012	-1.13			0.021**	1.99
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{11}	-0.430***	-4.41			0.017	0.17
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i>	β_{12}	0.020***	2.85			0.001	0.17
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{13}	-0.116*	-1.90			0.117*	1.89
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i>	β_{14}	-0.003	-0.22			-0.003	-0.17
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{15}	0.448***	3.47			0.014	0.09
	<i>DEL</i>	β_{16}			0.010*	1.65	-0.005*	-1.76
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{17}			0.041	0.79	0.037	1.60
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>DCF</i>	β_{18}			-0.017	-1.45	0.011	1.32
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{19}			-0.155	-1.39	0.255***	3.29
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i>	β_{20}			0.018*	1.93	-0.002	-0.56
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{21}			-0.246***	-3.10	0.005	0.15
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i>	β_{22}			-0.016	-0.94	-0.014	-1.17
	<i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{23}			0.343**	2.17	-0.110	-1.02
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i>	β_{24}					0.012*	1.75
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{25}					-0.001	-0.02
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>DCF</i>	β_{26}					-0.031**	-2.14
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{27}					-0.424***	-3.04
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i>	β_{28}					0.018*	1.72
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{29}					-0.221**	-2.57
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i>	β_{30}					0.003	0.14
	<i>HEDF93</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>	β_{31}					0.444**	2.31
	<i>Controls</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	<i>Controls</i> × <i>CF</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	<i>Controls</i> × <i>DCF</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	<i>Controls</i> × <i>DCF</i> × <i>CF</i>		Included		Included		Included	
	Industries dummies		Included		Included		Included	
	Year dummies		Included		Included		Included	
	No. observations		9,289		3,300		18,261	
	Adj. R-square		33.7%		35.1%		36.5%	

This table presents regression estimates to test the effect of 1991 Delaware court ruling on conditional conservatism as measured by asymmetric timeliness of accruals per Ball and Shivakumar [2006]. The sample includes 18,261 observations for 2,460 firms spanning calendar years 1988-1991 and 1993-1996. *ACCR* is accruals (IBC-OANCF) scaled by year-beginning total assets (AT). *CF* is cash flow from operations in a year (OANCF) scaled by year-beginning total assets (AT). *DCF* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if *CF*<0 and 0 otherwise. Controls include *LNMVE*, *LEV*, *BTM*, *GROWTH*, *LITIG*, and *INSTOWN*. All other variables are calculated as defined in Appendix. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles. Reported t-statistics are adjusted for clustering by both firm and year. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10 levels, respectively for a two-tailed test.

TABLE 8
Controlling for Real Actions

Dep. Var.= <i>CRANK_ALL</i>		(i)		(ii)	
Independent Var.		Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat	Coef.	<i>t</i> -stat
<i>Intercept</i>	β_0	4.482***	39.81	4.517***	39.07
<i>DEL</i>	β_1	-0.042	-1.14	-0.077	-1.43
<i>HEDF93</i>	β_2	0.163**	2.42	0.170	1.63
<i>DEL</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_3	-0.319***	-3.52	-0.286**	-2.05
<i>POST</i>	β_4	0.011	0.21	-0.043	-0.64
<i>POST</i> × <i>DEL</i>	β_5	0.044	0.86	0.083	1.11
<i>POST</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>	β_6	-0.038	-0.41	-0.010	-0.07
<i>POST</i>×<i>DEL</i>×<i>HEDF93</i>	β_7	0.472***	3.67	0.326*	1.70
<i>LMVE</i>	β_8	-0.025***	-2.59	-0.024**	-2.56
<i>LEV</i>	β_9	0.226***	3.19	0.224***	3.14
<i>BTM</i>	β_{10}	-0.039	-1.33	-0.043	-1.46
<i>GROWTH</i>	β_{11}	-0.227***	-6.19	-0.229***	-6.20
<i>LITIG</i>	β_{12}	0.642***	10.95	0.638***	10.88
<i>INSTOWN</i>	β_{13}	0.804***	9.60	0.809***	9.64
<i>Real Action Controls:</i>					
<i>DEC_CAPEX</i>	β_{14}	0.115***	4.77	0.045	0.88
<i>INC_SPPE</i>	β_{15}	-0.019	-0.69	-0.024	-0.43
<i>DEC_NSEG</i>	β_{16}	-0.018	-0.31	-0.108	-0.81
<i>NABN_DISEXP</i>	β_{17}	-0.680***	-10.25	-0.529***	-3.18
<i>NABN_PROD</i>	β_{18}	0.116	1.58	0.197	1.13
<i>Real Action Controls</i> × <i>DEL</i>				included	
<i>Real Action Controls</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>				included	
<i>Real Action Controls</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>				included	
<i>Real Action Controls</i> × <i>POST</i>				included	
<i>Real Action Controls</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DEL</i>				included	
<i>Real Action Controls</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>				included	
<i>Real Action Controls</i> × <i>POST</i> × <i>DEL</i> × <i>HEDF93</i>				included	
Industries dummies		Included		Included	
Year dummies		Included		Included	
No. observations		18,402		18,402	
Adj. R-square		18.1%		18.2%	

This table presents regression estimates to test the effect of 1991 Delaware court ruling on conservatism rank after controlling for effects of real actions. The sample includes 18,402 observations for 2,676 firms spanning calendar years 1988-1991 and 1993-1996. *DEC_CAPEX* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if the capital expenditure (CAPX) decreases from prior year and 0 otherwise. *INC_SPPE* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if the sale of PPE (SPEE) increases from prior year and 0 otherwise. *DEC_NSEG* is a dichotomous variable equal to 1 if either the number of business segments or number of geographic segments decreases from prior year and 0 otherwise. *NABN_DISEXP* is $(-1) \times$ abnormal discretionary expenditures (the sum of XRD, XAD, XSGA) per Roychowdhury [2006]. *NABN_PROD* is $(-1) \times$ abnormal production costs (COGS+change in INVT) per Roychowdhury [2006]. All other variables are defined in the Appendix. All continuous variables are winsorized at 1st and 99th percentiles. Reported *t*-statistics are adjusted for clustering by both firm and year. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10 levels, respectively for a two-tailed test.