







Q

Home ▶ All Journals ▶ Economics, Finance & Business ▶ European Accounting Review ▶ List of Issues ▶ Volume 24, Issue 1 ▶ R&D Cuts and Subsequent Reversals: Meeti

European Accounting Review > Volume 24, 2015 - Issue 1

649 14

Views CrossRef citations to date Altmetric

Other Articles

R&D Cuts and Subsequent Reversals: Meeting or Beating Quarterly Analyst **Forecasts**

John Shon & Meng Yan

Pages 147-166 | Received 23 May 2013, Accepted 14 Feb 2014, Published online: 30 Apr 2014

66 Cite this article

A https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2014.899919



Sample our **Business & Industry Journals** to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Supplemental

66 Citations

Metrics

ndeed, our

outlays.

Repri

ABSTRA

Among

spendin

with the

mana

we fi

econom in other

(rather t

prevaler

findings

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 880 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting I Accept enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under we and our partners process data to provide. Selecting Reject All or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the Show Purposes link on the bottom of the webpage . Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. Here

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device

I Accept Reject All R&D Show Purpose consistent ngs mportantly, t follow cuts rterly level ing the

Acknowledgements

This paper has benefited from the comments of the editor, Laurence van Lent and two anonymous referees. We also received helpful comments and suggestions from Larry Brown, Myojung Cho, Daniel Cohen, Melissa Lewis, Krishnagopal Menon, Emma Peng, Marc Picconi, Stanley Veliotis, and participants at the 2008 American Accounting Association Annual Meeting, 2009 AAA Financial Accounting & Reporting Section Midyear Conference, and at Fordham University. All errors remain ours.

Notes

¹It is important to note that to the extent that such R&D cut reversals occur, such reversals are not a necessary, mechanical reversal arising from (or dictated by) the accrual accounting system, but rather, the result of deliberate operational/strategic decisions made by management. Such decisions are not subject to auditor scrutiny, and therefore are relatively less costly to implement in the fourth quarter.

²The standard example of this type of activity in the literature is captured by the Jones (1991) model of discretionary accruals, where the proxy for accruals-based

and other manage X paramet ent. ³We cho compared to naller R&D ma vertising as econom for some an exam ate decline firms trimming in sal R&D exp ecause return to) spending are less educing R&D Sougian spending

⁴There is no consensus on which forecast managers regard as the benchmark during the accounting period. When documenting annual real-activities management, Roychowdhury (2006) looks at the last consensus forecast before the annual earnings announcement, assuming it is an ex post proxy for what managers expect the final consensus to be when they make the real-activities decision in the year. Bhojraj et al. (2009) use the consensus forecasts as of the second month of the last quarter in each year to allow one month for real-activities management to occur. In unreported tests, we re-estimate the main regressions with two alternative benchmarks; one is the most recent analyst forecast up to three days before the current-quarter earnings announcement, and the other is the most recent analyst forecast made before the end of the quarter. Unreported results and inferences remain qualitatively unchanged.

⁵Information on quarterly R&D expenses became available in Compustat as of the first quarter of 1989.

⁶If a firm reports annual R&D expenses in quarter four and leave the interim R&D missing, we drop the observation.

Brown and Pinello (2007) suggest that because annual financial reports are subject to more scrutiny, firms are slightly less likely to beat forecasts in Q4 than in interim quarters. Untabulated tests show that once we control for other relevant variables that explain the likelihood of heating forecasts, firms in our sample are also less likely to beat fore X ⁸Followi ssion at the top and ⁹It is not losts, 1974) whether rting, as other d, managers cern is if may allocate quarterl R&D cos uarterly R&D exp t that such discretio nat are :h quarter's correcte

However, we do not examine all noise/biases that potentially arise from the integral

ccruals.

R&D is r

reporting method, so the reader should exercise caution in making inferences. Further examination of this phenomenon is left for future research.



People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by 14

X

Information for

Authors

R&D professionals

Editors

Librarians

Societies

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

Help and information

Newsroom

Corporat

Keep up

Register t by email









Copyright

Registered 5 Howick P

or & Francis Group