## Economic consequences of SFAS 142 goodwill write-offs

#### Henry Jarva

First published: 01 August 2012 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-629X.2012.00495.x Citations: 15

I appreciate the helpful comments from Peter Clarkson, Seppo Ikäheimo, Juha Joenväärä, Juha-Pekka Kallunki, Petri Kyröläinen, Petri Sahlström, Richard Sloan, Mikko Zerni, the anonymous referees and seminar participants at the University of Oulu and the University of Eastern Finland. I gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Tauno Tönning Foundation, the Foundation for Economic Education and the Jenny and Antti Wihuri Foundation. All errors are my own.

# Abstract

This paper examines the economic consequences of goodwill write-offs under Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 142 (SFAS 142). Although write-off firms have performed poorly, it is evident that deteriorating economic performance explains only a small proportion of write-offs. After controlling for endogeneity of write-off choice, I fail to find evidence that investors and analysts fixate on SFAS 142 goodwill write-offs. I also provide evidence that write-off firms pay higher audit fees, suggesting that auditors charge higher fees in response to extra audit effort. These results are consistent with the principles of market efficiency, analyst-forecast rationality and efficient audit pricing.

#### References

Basu, S., 1997, The conservatism principle and the asymmetric timeliness of earnings, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **24**, 3–37.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Beatty, A., and J. Weber, 2006, Accounting discretion in fair value estimates: an examination of SFAS 142 goodwill impairments, *Journal of Accounting Research* 44, 257–288.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Bens, D. A., W. Heltzer, and B. Segal, 2011, The information content of goodwill impairments and SFAS 142, *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance* **26**, 527–555.

<u>Google Scholar</u>

Bradshaw, M. T., S. A. Richardson, and R. G. Sloan, 2001, Do analysts and auditors use information in accruals? *Journal of Accounting Research* **39**, 45–74.

Web of Science®Google Scholar

Caliendo, M., and S. Kopeinig, 2008, Some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity score matching, *Journal of Economic Surveys* **22**, 31–72.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Dechow, P. M., and W. Ge, 2006, The persistence of earnings and cash flows and the role of special items: implications for the accrual anomaly, *Review of Accounting Studies* **11**, 297–303.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Dehejia, R. H., and S. Wahba, 2002, Propensity score-matching methods for nonexperimental causal studies, *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 84, 151–161.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Dichev, I. D., 2008, On the balance sheet-based model of financial reporting, *Accounting Horizons* **22**, 453–470.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Easton, P., 2004, PE ratios, PEG ratios, and estimating the implied expected rate of return on equity capital, *The Accounting Review* **79**, 73–95.

Web of Science®Google Scholar

Financial Accounting Standards Board, 2001, *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 142: Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets* (FASB, Norwalk, CT).

**Google Scholar** 

Francis, J., J. D. Hanna, and L. Vincent, 1996, Causes and effects of discretionary asset write-offs, *Journal of Accounting Research* 34, 117–134.

 Web of Science®
 Google Scholar

Godfrey, J. M., and P. S. Koh, 2009, Goodwill impairment as a reflection of investment opportunities, *Accounting and Finance* **49**, 117–140.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Gu, Z., and T. Chen, 2004, Analysts' treatment of nonrecurring items in street earnings, *Journal of Accounting* and *Economics* **38**, 129–170.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Gul, F. A., C. J. P. Chen, and J. S. L. Tsui, 2003, Discretionary accounting accruals, managers' incentives, and audit fees, *Contemporary Accounting Research* 20, 441–464.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Hayn, C., and P. J. Hughes, 2006, Leading indicators of goodwill impairment, *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance* **21**, 223–265.

**Google Scholar** 

Holthausen, R. W., and R. L. Watts, 2001, The relevance of the value-relevance literature for financial accounting standard setting, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **31**, 3–75.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Jarva, H., 2009, Do firms manage fair value estimates? An examination of SFAS 142 goodwill impairments, *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* **36**, 1059–1086.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Kothari, S. P., K. Ramanna, and D. J. Skinner, 2010, Implications for GAAP from an analysis of positive research in accounting, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **50**, 246–286.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Lee, C., 2011, The effect of SFAS 142 on the ability of goodwill to predict future cash flows, *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy* **30**, 236–255.

Web of Science® Google Scholar

Li, K. K., and R. G. Sloan, 2011, Has goodwill accounting gove bad? Working paper (University of California at Berkeley).

**Google Scholar** 

Li, Z., P. K. Shroff, R. Venkataraman, and I. X. Zhang, 2011, Causes and consequences of goodwill impairment losses, *Review of Accounting Studies* 16, 745–778.

Web of Science® Google Scholar



### **Citing Literature**

Download PDF

 $\sim$ 

#### ABOUT WILEY ONLINE LIBRARY

Privacy Policy Terms of Use About Cookies Manage Cookies Accessibility Wiley Research DE&I Statement and Publishing Policies Developing World Access

#### **HELP & SUPPORT**

Contact Us Training and Support DMCA & Reporting Piracy

#### **OPPORTUNITIES**

Subscription Agents Advertisers & Corporate Partners

#### **CONNECT WITH WILEY**

The Wiley Network Wiley Press Room

Copyright © 1999-2025 John Wiley & Sons, Inc or related companies. All rights reserved, including rights for text and data mining and training of artificial intelligence technologies or similar technologies.

# WILEY