

Guidelines für Seminar-, Bachelor- und Masterarbeiten

1 Einleitung

1.1 Vorbemerkung

Ein wichtiger Bestandteil Ihres Studiums ist das Erstellen von **Seminar- und Abschlussarbeiten**. Hierbei soll Ihre Fähigkeit zum **wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten** (u.a. Einsatz einer wissenschaftlichen Forschungsmethode) nachgewiesen werden.

Das vorliegende Merkblatt will eine Hilfestellung bei der Anfertigung einer wissenschaftlichen Arbeit geben. Es enthält sowohl **Empfehlungen** in Bezug auf die Vorgehensweise bei der Literatursuche als auch **Hinweise** zur Gliederung, zur Verwendung von Abkürzungen und Symbolen, zur Zitierweise sowie zum anzufertigenden Literaturverzeichnis. Zur Verdeutlichung ist am Ende des Merkblattes ein Beispiel für die Gestaltung der wesentlichen Elemente einer wissenschaftlichen Arbeit angefügt. Für weitergehende Fragen sei auf die Literatur verwiesen.

Bezüglich der Anfertigung von Abschlussarbeiten wird auf die parallele **Teilnahme am Bachelor-Kolloquium bzw. am Masterforum** hingewiesen. Die **Bachelorarbeit** wird ergänzt durch ein **30-minütiges Prüfungsgespräch** mit dem Erst- und Zweitgutachter nach bestandener Arbeit.

Wichtig: Bei Bachelor- und Masterarbeiten ist vor der Anmeldung ein schriftliches 3-5 Exposé mit dem Betreuer abzustimmen, das zumindest folgende Punkte beinhaltet: Arbeitstitel, gewählte Themenstellung und –abgrenzung, Vorgehensweise/Forschungsmethodik, gewählte Theorie, relevante Literatur, Motivation, Zeitplan sowie ca. 1 Seite Gliederungsentwurf.

1.2 Hinweise zur Literatursuche

Nachfolgend sind wichtige Quellen für die Literatursuche genannt:

(Online-)Bibliothekskataloge: Formalkatalog, Schlagwort- bzw. Stichwortkatalog, z. B. der Gesamtkatalog der Universitätsbibliothek Lüneburg (<http://katalog.leuphana.gbv.de/DB=1/LNG=DU>).

Wichtig: Achten Sie darauf, dass in Ihrer Arbeit auch Forschungsliteratur enthalten ist. Bitte orientieren Sie sich vorrangig an **internationalen Forschungszeitschriften**, die sich in der **Kategorie A+ bis C** des **VHB-Jourqual-Ranking** befinden (<http://vhbonline.org/service/jourqual/vhb-jourqual-3/>). Für Forschungsthemen aus den Bereichen **Accounting, Auditing & Corporate Governance** sind die nachfolgenden Journals aus dem **Teilrating Rechnungswesen, Bank- und Finanzwesen, Steuerlehre** und **Nachhaltigkeitsmanagement** besonders einschlägig:

* **Nachhaltigkeitsrelevante BWL-Journals sind markiert**

A+ = Herausragende, weltweit führende wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift auf dem Gebiet der BWL	
Academy of Management Journal	A+
Academy of Management Review	A+
Journal of Accounting and Economics	A+
Journal of Accounting Research	A+
Journal of Finance	A+
Journal of Financial Economics	A+
Management Science	A+
Review of Financial Studies	A+
The Accounting Review	A+
A = Führende wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift auf dem Gebiet der BWL	
Accounting, Organizations and Society	A
Contemporary Accounting Research	A
European Accounting Review	A
Journal of Banking & Finance	A
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	A
Journal of Financial Intermediation	A
Journal of Management	A
Journal of Management Studies	A
Management Accounting Research	A
National Tax Journal	A
Review of Accounting Studies	A
Review of Finance	A
Strategic Management Journal	A
B = Wichtige und angesehene wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift auf dem Gebiet der BWL	

Abacus	B
Accounting and Business Research	B
Accounting History Review	B
Accounting Horizons	B
Accounting, Auditing, & Accountability Journal	B
Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory	B
Behavioral Research in Accounting	B
British Journal of Management	B
Business & Society*	B
Business Ethics Quarterly*	B
Business Ethics Quarterly*	B
Business Research	B
Business Strategy and the Environment*	B
California Management Review	B
Critical Perspectives on Accounting	B
European Financial Management	B
European Journal of Finance	B
European Management Review	B
Information and Organization	B
International Journal of Accounting	B
International Journal of Auditing	B
International Journal of Industrial Organization	B
International Journal of Management Reviews	B
International Review of Law and Economics	B
International Tax and Public Finance	B
Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change	B
Journal of Accounting and Public Policy	B
Journal of Accounting Literature	B
Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance	B
Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics	B
Journal of Behavioral Finance	B
Journal of Business Economics	B
Journal of Business Ethics*	B
Journal of Business Finance & Accounting	B
Journal of Business Research	B
Journal of Cleaner Production*	B
Journal of Corporate Finance	B
Journal of Economic Psychology	B
Journal of Empirical Finance	B
Journal of Financial Econometrics	B
Journal of International Accounting Auditing and Taxation	B
Journal of International Accounting Research	B
Journal of Law and Economics	B
Journal of Management Accounting Research	B
Journal of Management Education	B
Journal of Management Inquiry	B
Journal of Risk	B
Journal of the American Taxation Association	B

Kyklos	B
Long Range Planning	B
Managerial and Decision Economics	B
Omega	B
Organization & Environment*	B
Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management	B
Review of Managerial Science	B
Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting	B
Scandinavian Journal of Management	B
Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung/sbr	B

2 Aufbau wissenschaftlicher Arbeiten

2.1 Titelblatt

Das Titelblatt enthält in chronologischer Reihenfolge:

- (a) Leuphana Universität Lüneburg
- (b) bei Bachelorarbeit Angabe des Majors, bei Masterarbeit Angabe des Studiengangs
- (c) Titel der Arbeit
- (b) Art der Arbeit (Seminar- oder Abschlussarbeit)
- (d) Name, Vorname des Prüflings, Matrikelnummer und aktuelle Email-Adresse sowie aktuelle Postanschrift
- (e) Erstprüfer/in und Zweitprüfer/in; bei Seminararbeiten Angabe des Betreuers
- (f) Datum der Abgabe
- (g) ggf. Sperrvermerk, wenn die Arbeit nicht Dritten zugänglich gemacht werden darf.

2.2 Gliederung von wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten

Die wissenschaftliche Arbeit beginnt mit einem Deckblatt. Es folgt das **Inhaltsverzeichnis**, ein **Abkürzungsverzeichnis**, eventuell ein **Symbolverzeichnis**, anschließend der umfangreiche Textteil, der Anhang, der durch ein Deckblatt abgetrennt wird, und letztlich das Literaturverzeichnis. Bei mehr als drei Tabellen/Abbildungen ist ein **Tabellen-/Abbildungsverzeichnis** hinter dem Inhaltsverzeichnis einzufügen.

Wissenschaftliche Arbeiten sind sorgfältig und ausgewogen zu gliedern, inhaltliche Überschneidungen sind zu vermeiden. Jede Arbeit wird so in Kapitel, Abschnitte und Unterabschnitte zerlegt, dass der jeweils zu unterteilende Oberpunkt in mindestens **zwei Unterpunkte** zerfällt, die insgesamt den Gegenstandsbereich des Oberpunktes abdecken. Eine wissenschaftliche Arbeit sollte logisch so untergliedert sein, dass sie aus ca. **3 Hauptkapiteln** (ohne Einleitung und Schlussbetrachtungen) besteht. Die **Verwendung von Artikeln** bei der Titelvergabe von Kapiteln und Abschnitten sollte möglichst vermieden werden.

Beispiel: ~~The~~ Relevance of goodwill impairments

Es ist jeweils auf der tiefsten Gliederungsebene zu beginnen.

Beispiel:

2 Corporate Governance

2.1 Theoretical Foundation

2.1.1 Principal Agent Theory

With regard to New Institutional Economics, the Principal Agent Theory is concerned with ...

Zu Beginn der Arbeit steht ein auf die Seitenzahl des Textes verweisendes **Inhaltsverzeichnis**. Die Überschriften im Text müssen wörtlich mit denen der Gliederungsübersicht übereinstimmen. Zu achten ist auch auf eine Übereinstimmung zwischen der im Inhaltsverzeichnis angegebenen und der im Textteil befindlichen Seitenzahl. Zur Erleichterung ist die Erstellung einer **WORD-Formatvorlage** sehr zu empfehlen. Den einzelnen Abschnitten der Arbeit sind die entsprechenden Gliederungspunkte (Überschriften) voranzustellen. Zur Kennzeichnung der Gliederungspunkte sollten diese **dezimal nummeriert** (1, 1.1, 1.1.1 etc.) werden, wobei Inhaltsverzeichnis, Abbildungsverzeichnis, Abkürzungsverzeichnis, Anhang etc. nicht durchnummeriert werden. Hinter der letzten Dezimalstelle folgt **kein Punkt** (s. o.). Das Inhaltsverzeichnis selbst soll im Gegensatz zum Abkürzungsverzeichnis und Symbolverzeichnis, Tabellen-/Abbildungsverzeichnis nicht im Inhaltsverzeichnis aufgeführt werden.

2.3 Äußere Form der Arbeit

Die Arbeit ist in **eineinhalbzeiligem** Abstand **TimesNewRoman, Schriftgröße 12 Pkt. in Blocksatz**) PC-schriftlich zu erstellen. Zwischen den Absätzen hat sich eine **Leerzeile** zu befinden. Am Blattrand links ist ein Rand von ca. **4 cm**, rechts ca. **2,5 cm** auf **DIN A4 Papier** zu berücksichtigen. Ansonsten sind die Standardeinstellungen des verwendeten Textverarbeitungsprogramms (z. B. Word) zu übernehmen. Der Umfang von **Einzelseminararbeiten** soll ca. **2.500 Wörter** betragen; [ohne Anhang etc.; rein arabische Nummerierung (s. u.)] zu betragen. Für **Bachelor- und Masterarbeiten** gilt ein Umfang von **10.000 Wörtern** vorgesehen. Seminar-, Bachelor- und Masterarbeiten müssen in **englischer** Sprache publiziert werden.

Abgabemodalitäten: **Seminararbeiten** sind ausschließlich auf **elektronischem Wege** beim Betreuer fristgemäß einzureichen. Für **Bachelor- und Masterarbeiten** ist eine ausschließliche fristgemäße Einreichung beim **Studienservice** notwendig, bevor eine PDF-Version der Arbeit auf einem Datenträger bereitzustellen ist.

2.4 Seiten-, Tabellen- und Abbildungsnummerierung in wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten

Die Arbeit beginnt mit dem **Deckblatt**, das nicht nummeriert wird. Die **römische** Seitennummerierung beginnt mit dem **Inhaltsverzeichnis** [I, II... (beispielhaft !)] und geht über das **Abkürzungsverzeichnis** (III, IV...), ein eventuell vorhandenes **Symbolverzeichnis** (V) über den **Anhang** (VI, VII...) bis in das **Literaturverzeichnis** (VIII, IX...). Zu Beginn des Anhangs soll ein **Deckblatt** eingefügt werden, das nicht nummeriert wird. Die Seiten im **Textteil** sind fortlaufend **arabisch** zu nummerieren. Verweise auf andere Textteile oder den Anhang sind mit der genauen Seitenangabe zu versehen.

Abbildungen und Tabellen werden **getrennt voneinander** fortlaufend durchnummeriert. Diese Angaben sollten unmittelbar unter der Abbildung bzw. Tabelle aufgeführt sein. Zusätzlich ist ein Titel der Abbildung zu vergeben.

Beispiel: Abbildung 1: Entwicklung der Rechnungslegung nach HGB

2.5 Zur Verwendung von Abkürzungen und Symbolen in wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten

Abkürzungen sind in einem alphabetisch zu ordnenden **Abkürzungsverzeichnis** zu erläutern. Im Inhaltsverzeichnis sollte darauf mit Angabe der römischen Seite zu Beginn desselben verwiesen werden. Die Abkürzungen müssen **eindeutiger** Natur sein.

Alle in einer Arbeit verwendeten Symbole und Abkürzungen sind an der Stelle im Text, an der sie zum **ersten Mal** gebraucht werden, zu definieren. Bei **Tabellen- und Abbildungsunterschriften** sind Abkürzungen möglichst zu vermeiden.

Sortierkriterium im Abkürzungsverzeichnis und im Symbolverzeichnis ist die alphabetische Reihenfolge der Abkürzungen und Symbole. Alle Kleinbuchstaben stehen grundsätzlich vor Großbuchstaben. Innerhalb der Klein- bzw. Großbuchstaben werden zunächst diejenigen aufgeführt, die tiefgestellte Indizes aufweisen, danach all die mit hochgestellten Indizes (innerhalb dieser wird wieder alphabetisch sortiert).

2.6 Literaturverzeichnis einer wissenschaftlichen Arbeit

In jede wissenschaftliche Arbeit ist ein Verzeichnis der durch Quellenangaben belegten Literatur aufzunehmen. Zur Stellung innerhalb der Arbeit vgl. Kapitel 2.2. Zusätzliche, nicht durch Quellenangaben belegte Literatur ist gesondert zu kennzeichnen. Wurden zur Anfertigung einer wissenschaftlichen Arbeit schriftliche oder telefonische Auskünfte von Experten eingeholt, sind am Schluss des Literaturverzeichnisses **Name** und **Anschrift** der Betreffenden zu nennen. Eine **Untergliederung** des Literaturverzeichnisses ist **nicht** vorzunehmen. Ein Beispiel für die Gestaltung eines Literaturverzeichnisses befindet sich auf der letzten Seite. Während **Artikelgesetze** (z.B. BilMoG, BilRUG) zwingend in das Literaturverzeichnis aufgenommen werden müssen, ist dies für **allgemeine Gesetze** (z.B. AktG,) **nicht** erwünscht.

Im Folgenden sollen die **wichtigsten Angaben und Sonderregeln** für unterschiedliche Quellen erläutert werden.

(1) MONOGRAFIEN:

Name des Autors (ohne Titel oder akademische Grade), **Vorname** (abgekürzt), **Jahr der Publikation**, **Titel des Buches mit Untertitel** (Letzterer wird durch einen Punkt vom Titel abgetrennt), **Auflage** (erst ab der **zweiten** Auflage mit der Kurzbezeichnung „**Aufl.**“ ohne nähere Informationen (z.B. wesentlich erweiterte), **Erscheinungsort**.

Mehrere Autoren oder Erscheinungsorte sind durch „," zu trennen oder mit dem Hinweis "et al." für **et alii** (lateinisch für „und andere“) bei mehr als **drei** Angaben zu versehen. Die Angabe des **Verlages** ist nicht notwendig.

Beispiel:

Ronen, J., Yaari, V., 2008. Earnings management: emerging insights in theory, practice, and research. New York.

(2) ZEITSCHRIFTENAUFsätze

Bei Zeitschriftenaufsätze sind nach den(m) **Verfasser(n)** und dem **Titel des Aufsatzes mit Untertitel** der **Name der Zeitschrift**, der **Jahrgang** sowie die **Seite(n)** des Aufsatzes anzugeben.

Beispiel:

Shrieves, R.E., Dahl, D., 2003. Discretionary accounting and the behavior of Japanese banks under financial duress. Journal of Banking and Finance 27, 1219–1243.

(3) TABELLEN UND ABBILDUNGEN

Abbildungen und Tabellen sind **selbstständig** zu fertigen, d. h. **eingescannte Dateien** sind nicht erwünscht. Die Quellenangaben für Tabellen und Abbildungen werden direkt hinter die **Titulierung in Klammern** aufgenommen. Die Abbildung bzw. Tabelle ist mit einer Nummer und einem kurzen Titel zu versehen. Sofern Abbildungen oder Tabellen aus anderen Monografien entnommen werden, ist dies wie folgt anzugeben:

Example: Figure 1: Important reform efforts in corporate governance (Andrews, 2006,4).

Verwendete Zahlen müssen nachprüfbar sein, auch wenn sie allgemein bekannt sind (z. B. Einwohnerzahlen und Größenangaben der Länder). Sie sind daher zu belegen. Werden in einer Arbeit Zahlen aus vielen Quellen verarbeitet, neu zusammengestellt oder umgeordnet, so sind auf alle Fälle zu Beginn des betreffenden Abschnitts alle Quellen anzugeben und auf die Art der Verarbeitung hinzuweisen, wenn das genaue Belegen jeder einzelnen Zahl nicht möglich ist.

(4) INTERNETQUELLEN

Bei Quellen aus dem **Internet** sind die genaue Internetseite mit dem Datum des Herunterladens sowie die Seitenzahlen des Manuskriptes anzugeben

Beispiel:

International Integrated Reporting Council, 2013. *The International <IR> framework*, <http://www.theiirc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/13-12-08-THE-INTERNATIONAL-IR-FRAMEWORK-2-1.pdf> (30.11.2018).

2.7 Anhang

Wenn die Einbindung von Materialien in den Ausführungsteil der Arbeit problematisch ist, diese aber für das Verständnis des Textes notwendig erscheinen (z. B. ausführliche Rechnungen oder große Abbildungen, die den Text unübersichtlich machen), dann sollte in der Arbeit ein „**Anhang**“ beigefügt werden. Er wird durch ein Deckblatt von der Arbeit abgetrennt (siehe vorliegendes Merkblatt). Auf diesen ist dann an entsprechender Stelle im Text genau mit der Angabe der Seitenzahl des Anhangs (römisch) zu verweisen. Sofern Abbildungen und Tabellen in den Anhang verlagert werden, ist im Haupttext in angemessener Form hierauf zu verweisen.

3 Zitierweise in wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten

3.1 Zitat im laufenden Text

3.1.1 Allgemeine Anmerkungen

In wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten müssen Meinungen, originale Gedanken oder sonstige für das Thema wesentliche Ausführungen, soweit sie schon anderweitig vorgetragen wurden, durch **Zitate** belegt werden. Dabei ist nicht irgendein Zitat anzuführen, um die vom Verfasser angeführte Meinung zu untermauern, sondern möglichst das ursächliche Zitat, also in der Regel das Zitat desjenigen Autors, der diese Meinung zum ersten Mal vertreten hat. Zur Bestärkung dieser Meinung können dann weitere bestätigende Zitate, auch von anderen Autoren, angeführt werden; in diesem Fall sind die Zitate in chronologischer Reihenfolge zu nennen.

Die Meinung anderer Autoren kann entweder **sinngemäß** (mit Quellenhinweis und Quellenangabe) oder **wörtlich** (mit Quellenhinweis, Quellenangabe **und** in Anführungszeichen) zitiert werden. Wörtliche Zitate sind nur dann zweckmäßig, wenn der genaue Wortlaut wichtig ist oder der Autor besonders treffend formuliert hat. Es gilt prinzipiell, dass der Text innerhalb der Anführungszeichen wortwörtlich einschließlich Interpunktion zu übernehmen ist. Von dieser Grundsatzregelung sind nur folgende **Ausnahmen** zulässig:

- (1) Wird ein Satzanfang so zitiert, dass er im laufenden Text nicht als solcher erscheint, ist das betreffende Anfangswort, sofern es nicht ohnehin groß zu schreiben wäre, **klein zu schreiben**; entsprechend gilt im umgekehrten Fall, dass der erste Buchstabe eines Zitates am Satzanfang groß zu schreiben ist, auch wenn er im Original nicht groß geschrieben ist.
- (2) Hervorhebungen, Sperrungen, Kursivdrucke u.ä. müssen nicht in ein Zitat übernommen werden. In diesem Fall ist dann aber die Anmerkung "Im Original vorhandene Hervorhebungen wurden weggelassen" zu verwenden. Werden umgekehrt Teile des Zitats hervorgehoben, die im Original nicht hervorgehoben sind, so ist dies mit dem Vermerk "Hervorhebungen im Original nicht vorhanden" kenntlich zu machen. Die Formulierung "Hervorhebung(en) vom Verfasser" ist mehrdeutig und daher unzulässig.
- (3) Die Interpunktion am Zitatende darf nicht übernommen werden, wenn sie im laufenden Text **nicht korrekt** ist.
- (4) Bei Zitaten innerhalb von Zitaten sind nur **einfache** Anführungszeichen (...) zu verwenden.

3.1.2 Zu zitierende Quelle(n)

Als Grundlage des Zitats kommt grundsätzlich nur die Originalquelle in Frage, wobei die **neueste** Ausgabe einer Monografie etc. zu zitieren ist. Unter Umständen ist es wichtig, auch ältere Auflagen zu zitieren (z. B. bei literaturhistorischen Arbeiten). Lediglich wenn die Originalquelle weder im normalen noch im Fernleihverkehr zu beschaffen ist, darf ausnahmsweise nach einer früheren Auflage oder einer sekundären Quelle zitiert werden.

3.1.3 Ergänzungen und Auslassungen

Es kann mitunter notwendig werden, durch Einschübe in den Originaltext die Verständlichkeit des Zitates zu erhöhen. Derartige Einschübe sind in Klammern zu setzen und mit dem Vermerk "**Anm. des Autors**" zu versehen.

Werden im Zitat Teile des Originaltextes weggelassen, so ist hierauf durch eingeklammerte Punkte [...] hinzuweisen.

3.2 Quellenangabe

3.2.1 Hinweis auf die Quellenangabe (Quellenverweis)

Amerikanische Zitation: Zitate werden direkt nach der zu zitierenden Textpassage **in Klammern** gesetzt.

3.2.2 Äußere Form der zitierten Quelle

Amerikanische Zitation: Corporate governance represents an increased research topic (Bebchuk, 2017, 4).

3.2.3 Zitierweise

In diesem Abschnitt werden allgemeine Zitiervorschriften anhand des Zitierens nach einem Buch aufgeführt. Vorgesprochen ist die sog. **Kurzzitierweise**. Über Interpunktion beim Zitieren und andere nicht explizit genannte Zitiervorschriften geben die Beispiele Auskunft. Jeder Titel wird wie folgt erfasst: **Name** (ohne Vorname), **Jahr**, **Zitatstelle** bzw. **Seite**. Selbst wenn eine Quelle **erstmalig** in einer Arbeit zitiert wird, ist nur die Kurzkennung anzugeben. Mehrere voneinander **unabhängige** Quellen sind durch einen Strichpunkt voneinander zu trennen.

Beispiel: Jensen and Meckling, 1976.

Bei mehreren Titeln des gleichen Verfassers im gleichen Jahr sind diese durch **kleine Buchstaben** kenntlich zu machen. Beispiel: Myer, 2012a; Myer, 2012b.

Bei mehreren Autoren werden in der **Kurzkennung** maximal die ersten drei aufgeführt. Bei mehr als drei Autoren wird der Hinweis „et al.“ verwendet.

Bei den Quellenangaben sind bei wörtlichen Zitation die zitierten Seiten **genau** anzugeben, also etwa „26-27“.

Die **Bezeichnung** „ff.“ („fortfolgende“) für Quellenangaben, die sich auf mehr als zwei aufeinanderfolgende Seiten beziehen, ist unbestimmt und **somit nicht zulässig**.

Bei **nicht wörtlichen Zitaten** ist lediglich die Quelle und keine Seitenangabe üblich.

Bei der Verwendung mehrerer Quellen im Zitat ist eine bestimmte **Sortierreihenfolge** (alphabetisch oder chronologisch) **nicht** notwendig. Allerdings ist darauf zu achten, dass Primärquellen und grundlegende Arbeiten zu den behandelten Themen (z.B. die Zitation von Jensen and Meckling, 1976 bei der Principal Agent-Theorie) **zuerst** zitiert werden.

Sofern sich das Zitat auf den **gesamten Satz** bezieht, ist das Zitat hinter dem Satzzeichen aufzuführen. Sofern sich das Zitat auf **bestimmte Wörter oder Halbsätze** beziehen, erfolgt dies an der jeweiligen Stelle.

3.3 Sonstige Hinweise

Die Arbeit stellt eine wissenschaftliche Abhandlung dar, sodass eine **populärwissenschaftliche Ausdrucksweise** zu vermeiden ist. Dies gilt ebenso für die Verwendung der **wörtlichen Rede** (z. B. „ich“; „meines Erachtens“) sowie von **unwissenschaftlichen Füllwörtern** (z. B. „man“). Es wird empfohlen, die wissenschaftliche Arbeit vor der geplanten Abgabe **zwei Personen** zur Korrektur zu überlassen. Durch diese Vorgehensweise lassen sich Mängel in der Orthografie und Stilistik sowie „Brüche“ in der Gedankenführung feststellen. Die Kandidaten sollten ein ausreichendes Zeitpotenzial für die Abfassung der **Einleitung** sowie der **Zusammenfassung** einplanen, da diese als „Visitenkarte“ der gesamten Arbeit fungieren.

Muster für ein Inhaltsverzeichnis

Abstract

1. Introduction
2. Theoretical foundation, literature review and hypotheses
 - 2.1. Principal Agent Theory
 - 2.2. Literature review
 - 2.3. Hypotheses
3. Empirical analysis
 - 3.1. Sample selection
 - 3.2. Regression models
 - 3.3. Descriptive statistics
 - 3.4. Correlation analysis
 - 3.5. Regression analysis
 - 3.6. Robustness checks
4. Critical analysis of results, limitations of the study and research recommendations
5. Summary and outlook

Appendix

References

Leuphana Universität Lüneburg
Major BWL (Bachelor)/
Management & Finance & Accounting (Master)

**The link between CSR performance and integrated
reporting quality – an empirical analysis**

Bachelor/Master thesis

Max Mustermann

Matrikelnummer: 1234567890

Email: mustermann@max.de

Musterstraße 2, 300009 Musterhausen

Erstprüfer: Prof. Dr. Patrick Velte

Zweitprüferin: Prof. Dr. Maxi Leuphi

Datum der Abgabe: 30.11.2018

Useful literature for your seminar-, bachelor- and master thesis

Research methods and theories

- Anderson, D.R., Sweeney, D.J., Williams, T.A., Camm, J.D. and Cochran, J.J. 2018. *Statistics for Business and Economics*, 13. ed.
- Atteslander, P. 2010. *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*, 13. ed.
- Bloomfield, R. et al. 2016. Gathering Data for Archival, Field, Survey, and Experimental Accounting Research. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 54, 341-395.
- Blundell, R. and Bond, S. 1998. Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models.
- Brooks, C. 2014. *Introductory Econometrics for Finance*. 3. ed.
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. 2015. *Business Research Methods*. 4. ed.
- Deelmann, T. 2015. *Meilensteine und Trends der Betriebswirtschaftslehre*.
- Döring, D. and Bortz, J. 2016. *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation*. 5. ed.
- Eid, M., Gollwitzer, M. and Schmitt, M. 2017. *Statistik und Forschungsmethoden*, 5. ed.
- Evans, J.H. et al. 2015. Points to Consider When Self-Assessing Your Empirical Accounting Research. *Cotemporary Accounting Research*, 32, 1162-1192.
- Fink, A. 2014. *Conducting research literature reviews. From the internet to paper*, 4. ed.
- Floyd, E. and List, J. 2016. Using Field Experiments in Accounting and Finance. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 54, 437-475.
- Greenberg, P.S. 1992. *The Use of Meta-Analysis Techniques in Developing Dissertation Proposals: Guidelines*
- Heckman, J.J. 1979. Selection Bias as a Specification Error. *Econometrica*, 47, 153-161.
- Hell, S. 2017. *Soll ich promovieren? Voraussetzungen, Chancen, Strategien*.
- Homburg, C. 2007. *Betriebswirtschaftslehre als empirische Wissenschaft. Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung. Sonderheft 56/07: 27-60*.
- Hunter, J.E. and Schmidt, F.L. 2000. Fixed Effects vs. Random Effects Meta Analysis Models: Implications for *Journal of Econometrics*, 87, 115-143.
- Kirca, A.H. and Yaprak, A. 2010. The use of meta-analysis in international business research: Its current status and suggestions for better practice. *International Business Review*, 19, 306-314.
- Klandt, H. and Heidenreich, S. 2017. *Empirische Forschungsmethoden in der Betriebswirtschaftslehre*.
- Larcker, D.F. and Rusticus, T.O. 2010. On the use of instrumental variables in accounting research. *Journal*
- Lennox, C.S., Francis, J.R. and Wang, Z. 2012. Selection Models in Accounting Research. *The Accounting Review* 87, 589-616.
- Lingenfelder, M. (eds.). 1999. *100 Jahre Betriebswirtschaftslehre in Deutschland*.
- Luhmann, M. 2015. *R für Einsteiger. Einführung in die Statistiksoftware für die Sozialwissenschaften*, 4. ed.
- Massaro, M. et al. 2016. On the shoulders of giants: undertaking a structured literature review in accounting. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 29, 767-801.
- Mayring, P. 2010. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*.
- Nikolaev, V. and Van Lent, L. 2005. The Endogeneity Bias in the Relation between Cost-of-Debt Capital and of Accounting and Economics, 49, 186-205.
- Rhodes, W. 2012. Meta-Analysis: An Introduction Using Regression Models. *Evaluation Review*, 36, 24-71.
- Rosenbaum, P.R. and Rubin, D.B. 1983. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal affects. *Biometrika* 70: 41-55.
- Saunders, M.N.K., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. 2015. *Research Methods for Business Students*. 7. ed. Pearson.
- Schanz, G. 2014. *Eine kurze Geschichte der Betriebswirtschaftslehre*.
- Schmidt, F.L. and Hunter, J.E. 2015. *Methods of Meta-Analysis*.
- Schwaiger, M. and Meyer, A. (eds.) 2009. *Theorien und Methoden der Betriebswirtschaft*.
- Shipman, J., Swanquist, Q.T. and Whited, R.L. 2017. Propensity Score Matching in Accounting Research. *The Accounting Review* 92, 213-244.
- Smith, M. 2017. *Research methods in Accounting*. 4rd ed.
- Theisen, M. R. 2017. *Wissenschaftliches Arbeiten*, 17. ed.

- Tucker, J.W. 2010. Selection Bias and Econometric Remedies in Accounting and Finance Research. *Journal of Accounting Literature* 29, 31-57.
- Wintoki, M.B., Linck, J.S. and Netter, J.M. 2012. Endogeneity and the dynamics of internal corporate governance. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 105, 581-606.
- Wooldridge, J.M. 2009. *Introductory Econometrics*. 4. ed.
- Wooldridge, J.M. 2010. *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. 2d ed.
- Zikmund, W.G., Babin, B.J., Carr, J.C. and Griffin, M. 2010. *Business Research Methods*. 9. ed.

Sustainability research & theories

- Aguilera, R., Rupp, D.E., Williams, C.A. and Ganapathi, J. 2007. Putting the S back in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Multilevel Theory of Social Change in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 836-863.
- Aguinis, H. and Glavas, A. 2012. What we know and don't know about Corporate Social Responsibility. A Review of Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38, 932-968.
- Arvidsson, S. (ed.) 2018. *Challenges in Managing Sustainable Business. Reporting, Taxation, Ethics and Governance*
- Bebbington, J. et al. 2014. *Sustainability Accounting and Accountability*, 2nd ed.
- Berman, S.L. and Johnson-Cramer, M.E. 2017. Stakeholder Theory. Seeing the Field Through the Forest. *Business and Society* (online first).
- Blowfield, M. and Murray, A. 2014. *Corporate Responsibility*. 3rd ed.
- Carroll, A. 1991. The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Business Horizons*, July-August, 39-48.
- Crane, A. et al. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*.
- Crane, A. et al. 2019. *Business Ethics*. 5th ed.
- Crowther, D. and Lauesen, L.M. 2017. *Handbook of Research Methods in Corporate Social Responsibility*.
- Cundill, G.J., Smart, P. and Wilson, H.N. 2018. Non-financial Shareholder Activism. A Process Model for Influencing Corporate Environmental and Social Performance. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 202, 606-626.
- Donaldson, T. and Preston, E. 1995. The Stakeholder Theory of the corporation. *Academy of Management Review* 20: 65-91.
- Eccles, R.G. and Krzus, M.P. 2015. *The Integrated Reporting Movement*.
- Freeman, R.E., Harrison, J.S., Wicks, A.C., Parmar, B.L. and deColle, S. 2010. Stakeholder theory. The state of the art.
- Friedman, M. 1970. The Social Responsibility of Business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*, September 13, 1970.
- Frynas, J.G. and Yamahaki, C. 2016. Corporate social responsibility: review and roadmap of theoretical perspectives: *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 25, 258-285.
- Heath, E., Kaldis, B. and Marcoux, A. (eds.) 2018. *The Routledge Companion to Business Ethics*.
- Hill, C.W.L. and Jones, T.M. 1992. Stakeholder-Agency Theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29, 131-154.
- Jia, M. and Zhang, Z. 2014. How Does The Stock Market Value Corporate Social Performance? When Behavioral Theories Interact with Stakeholder Theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125, 433-465.
- Lange, D. and Washburn, N. 2012. Understanding Attributions of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Academy of Management Review* 37: 300-326.
- Lütge, C. and Uhl, M. 2018. *Wirtschaftsethik*.
- Rasche, A., Morsing, M. and Moon, J. 2017. *Corporate Social Responsibility*.
- Rezaee, Z. 2009. *Corporate Governance and Ethics*.
- Roberts, P. 1992. Business and The Environment: An Initial Review of the Recent Literature. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 1, 41-50.
- Schmitz, J. and Schrader, J. 2015. Corporate Social Responsibility: A Microeconomic Review of the Literature. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 29, 27-45.

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Basic

- Adams, R., Hermalin, B.E and Weisbach, M.S. 2008. The Role of Boards of Directors in Corporate Governance: A Conceptual Framework and Survey. Working Paper.
- Berns, K.V.D. and Klarner, P. 2017. A Review of the CEO succession literature and a future research program. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 31, 83-108.
- Bilal, Chen, S. and Komal, B. 2018. Audit committee financial expertise and earnings quality: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 84, 253-270.
- Brav, A., Jiang, W. and Kim, H. 2009. Hedge Fund Activism: A Review. *Foundations and Trends in Finance*, 4, 185-246.
- Brennan, N.M. and Kirwan, C.E. 2015. Audit committees: practices, practitioners, and praxis of governance. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 28, 466-493.
- Brown et al. 2010. Corporate governance, accounting and finance. *Accounting and Finance* 51, 96-172.
- Busenbark, J.R., Krause, R., Boivie, S. and Graffin, S.D. 2016. Toward a Configurational Perspective on the CEO. *A Review and Synthesis of the Management Literature* 42, 234-268.
- Carcello, J.V., Hermanson, D.R. and Ye, Z.S. 2011. Corporate Governance Research in Accounting and Auditing: Insights, Practice Implications, and Future Research Directions. *Auditing*, 30, 1-31.
- Carpenter, M.A., Geletkanycz, M.A. and Sanders, W.G. 2004. Upper Echelons Research Revisited: Antecedents, Elements, and Consequences of Top Management Team Composition. *Journal of Management* 30, 749-778.
- Clarke, T. 2004. *Theories of Corporate Governance*.
- Clarke, T. 2017. *International Corporate Governance*. Routledge.
- Cohen, J., Krishnamoorthy, G. and Wright, A. 2004. The Corporate Governance Mosaic and Financial Reporting Quality. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 87-152.
- Cohen, J., Gaynor, L.M., Krishnamoorthy, G. and Wright, A.M. 2007. Auditor Communications with the Audit Committee and the Board of Directors: Policy Recommendations and Opportunities for Future Research. *Accounting Horizons*, 21, 165-187.
- Dalton, D.R., Daily, C.M., Ellstrand, A.E. and Johnson, J.L. 1998. Meta-Analytic Reviews of Board Composition, Leadership Structure, and Financial Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 269-290.
- Dalton, D.R., Johnson, J.L., Ellstrand, A.E. 1999. Number of directors and financial performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 674-686.
- Denes, M.R., Karpoff, J.M. and McWilliams, V.B. 2017. Thirty years of shareholder activism: A survey of empirical research. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 44, 405-424.
- Deutsch, Y. 2005. The Impact of Board Composition on Firms' Critical Decisions: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 424-444.
- Devers, C.E., Cannella, A.A., Reilly, G.P. and Yoder, M.E. 2007. Executive compensation: A Multidisciplinary Review of Recent Developments. *Journal of Management*, 33, 1016-1072.
- Dew-Becker, I. 2009. How Much Sunlight Does it Take to Disinfect a Boardroom? A Short History of Executive Compensation Regulation in America. *CESifo Economic Studies*, 55, 434-457.
- DeZoort, F.T., Hermanson, D.R., Archambeault, D.S. and Reed, S.A. 2002. Audit Committee Effectiveness: A Synthesis of the Empirical Audit Committee Literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 21, 38-75.
- Edmans, A. and Gabaix, X. 2016. Executive compensation: A modern primer. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 54, 1232-1287.
- Edmans, A., Gabaix, X. and Jenter, D. 2017. Executive compensation: A Survey of Theory and Evidence. Working paper.
- Ferri, F. and Göx, R.F. 2018. Executive Compensation, Corporate Governance, and Say on Pay. *Foundations and Trends in Accounting*, 12, 1-103.
- Frydman, C. and Jenter, D. 2010. CEO compensation. Working paper.
- Frydman, C. and Saks, R.E. 2010. Executive compensation: A New View from a Long-Term Perspective, 1936- 2005. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 23, 2099-2138.
- Garcia-Meca, E. and Sanchez-Ballesta, J.P. 2009. Corporate Governance and Earnings Management: A Meta-Analysis. *Corporate Governance*, 17, 594-610.

- Garcia-Meca, E. and Sanchez-Ballesta, J.P. 2010. The Association of Board Independence and Ownership Concentration with Voluntary Disclosure: A Meta-analysis. *European Accounting Review*, 19, 603-627.
- Ghafran, C. and O'Sullivan, N. 2013. The Governance Role of Audit Committees: Reviewing a Decade of Evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15, 381-407.
- Gillan, S.L. and Starks, L.T. 2000. Corporate governance proposals and shareholder activism: the role of institutional investors. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 57, 275-305.
- Gillan, S.L. and Starks, L.T. 2007. The Evolution of Shareholder Activism in the United States. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 19, 54-73.
- Goergen, M. 2012. *International Corporate Governance*.
- Goranova, M. and Ryan, L.V. 2014. Shareholder Activism: A Multidisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1230-1268.
- Hay, D., Stewart, J. and Redmayne, N.B. 2017. The Role of Auditing in Corporate Governance in Australia and New Zealand. A Research Synthesis. *Australian Accounting Review*, 83, 457-479.
- He, L., Labelle, R., Piot, C. and Thornton, D.B. 2009. Board Monitoring, Audit Committee Effectiveness, and Financial Reporting Quality: Review and Synthesis of Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Forensic and Investigative Accounting*, 1, 1-41.
- Hermalin, B.E. and Weisbach, M.S. 1998. Endogenously Chosen Boards of Directors and Their Monitoring of the CEO. *The American Economic Review* 88, 96-118.
- Hermalin, B.E. and Weisbach, M.S. 2001. Boards of Directors as an Endogenously Determined Institution: A Survey of the Economic Literature. Working paper.
- Hermalin, B.E. and Weisbach, M.S. 2017. *The Handbook of the Economics of Corporate Governance (Volume 1)*.
- Heugens, P.P.M.A.R., van Essen, M. and van Oosterhout, J.H. 2009. Meta-analyzing ownership concentration and firm performance in Asia: Towards a more fine-grained understanding. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 26, 481-512.
- Hill, A.D., Kern, D.A. and White, M.A. 2014. Are we overconfident in executive overconfidence research? An examination of the convergent and content validity of extant unobtrusive measures. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 1414-1420.
- Inaam, Z. and Khamoussi, H. (2016). Audit committee effectiveness, audit quality and earnings management: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 58, 179-196.
- Kaczmarek, S. and Nyuur, R. 2016. Review of the literature on board committees: taking stock and looking ahead. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, 11, 89-115.
- Keasey, K. et al. 2005. *Corporate Governance*.
- Krause, R., Semadeni, M. and Cannella, A.A. 2014. CEO Duality: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management* 40, 256-286.
- Lagasio, V. 2018. Corporate Governance in Banks: Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 16, 113-126.
- Lamb, N.H. and Roundy, P. 2016. The "ties that bind" board interlocks research: a systematic review. *Management Research Review*, 39, 1516-1542.
- Larcker, D. and Tayan, B. 2011. *Corporate Governance Matters*.
- Lozano-Reina, G. and Sanchez-Marin, G. 2019. Say on pay and executive compensation: A systematic review and suggestions for developing the field. *Human Resource Management Review (online first)*.
- Ma, V.C. and Lio, J.S. 2016. Exploring the research fronts and main paths of literature: a case study of shareholder activism research. *Scientometrics*, 109, 33-52.
- Malik, M. 2014. Audit committee composition and effectiveness: a review of post-SOX literature. *Journal of Management Control*, 25, 81-117.
- Mallin, C.A. 2016. *Corporate Governance*. 5th ed.
- Malmendier, U. and Tate, G. 2015. Behavioral CEOs. The Role of Managerial Overconfidence. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29, 37-60.
- Monks, R.A.G. and Minow, N. 2011. *Corporate Governance*. 5th ed.
- O'Boyle, E.H., Pollack, J.M. and Rutherford, M.W. 2012. Exploring the relation between family involvement and firms' financial performance: A meta-analysis of main and moderator effects. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27, 1-18.
- Moore, M. and Petrin, M. 2017. *Corporate Governance: Law, Regulation and Theory*. CFL.

- Murphy, K.J. 1999. Executive Compensation. Working paper.
- Pommeroy, B. and Thornton, D.B. 2008. Meta-analysis and the Accounting Literature: The Case of Audit Committee Independence and Financial Reporting Quality. *European Accounting Review*, 17, 305-330.
- Plessis, J.J. et al. 2017. German Corporate Governance in International and European Context.
- Plöckinger, M., Aschauer, E., Hiebl, M.R.W. and Rohatschek, R. 2016. The influence of individual executives on corporate financial reporting: A review and outlook from the perspective of upper echelons theory. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 37, 55-75.
- Razak, N. and Muhamad, R. 2015. Using Audit Committee and Internal Audit Function Inter-Relationships to Drive Up Effectiveness. *Asian Journal of Accounting Perspectives*, 7, 1-21.
- Rhoades, D.L., Rechner, P.L. and Sundaramurthy, C. 2000. A Meta-analysis of the Influence of Outside Directors. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 12, 76-91.
- Rhoades, D.L., Rechner, P.L. and Sundaramurthy, C. 2001. A Meta-analysis of Board Leadership Structure and Financial Performance: are "two heads better than one"? *Corporate Governance*, 9, 311-319.
- Rost, K. and Osterloh, M. 2009. Management Fashion Pay-For-Performance for CEOs. *Schmalenbach business review*, 61, 119-149.
- Ryan, L.V. and Schneider, M. 2002. The Antecedents of Institutional Investor Activism. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 554-573.
- Samaha, K., Khlif, H. and Hussainey, K. 2015. The impact of board and audit committee characteristics on voluntary disclosure. A meta-analysis. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 24, 13-28.
- Sanchez-Ballesta, J.P. and Garcia-Meca, E. 2007. A Meta-Analytic Vision of the Effect of Ownership Structure on Firm Performance. *Corporate Governance*, 15, 879-893.
- Sassen, R. et al. 2018. Effects of committee overlap on the monitoring effectiveness of boards of directors: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Risk Finance* (online first).
- Shan, Y. and Walter, T. 2016. Towards a Set of Design Principles for Executive Compensation Contracts. *Abacus*, 52, 619-684.
- Siddiqui, S.S. 2015. The association between corporate governance and firm performance. A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, 23, 218-237.
- Stathopoulos, K. and Voulgaris, G. 2016. The Importance of Shareholder Activism. The Case of Say-on-Pay. *Corporate Governance: An international review*, 24, 359-370.
- Sundaramurthy, C., Rhoades, D.L. and Rechner, P.L. 2005. A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Executive and Institutional Ownership on Firm Performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17, 494-510.
- Taras, V., Mimili, E., Wang, Z. and Harms H. 2018. Family involvement in publicly traded firms and firm performance: a meta-analysis. *Management Research Review*, 41, 225-251.
- Thomsen, S. and Conyon, M. 2012. *Corporate Governance: Mechanisms and Systems*.
- Tirole, J. 2001. Corporate Governance. *Econometrica*, 69, 1-35.
- Tirole, J. 2006. *The Theory of Corporate Finance*.
- Tosi, H.L., Werner, S., Katz, J.P. and Gomez-Meja, L.R. 2000. How Much Does Performance Matter? A Meta-Analysis of CEO Pay Studies. *Journal of Management*, 26, 301-339.
- Tricker, B. 2015. *Corporate Governance*, 3rd ed.
- Turley, S. and Zaman, M. 2004. The Corporate Governance Effects of Audit Committees. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 8, 305-322.
- Van Essen, M., Carney, M., Gedajlovic, E.R. and Heugens, P.P.M.A.R. 2015. How does Family Control Influence Firm Strategy and Performance? A Meta-Analysis of US Publicly Listed Firms. *Corporate Governance*, 23, 3-24.
- Van Essen, M., Otten, J. and Carberry, E.J. 2015. Assessing Managerial Power Theory: A Meta-Analytic Approach to Understanding the Determinants of CEO compensation. *Journal of Management*, 41, 164-202.
- Van Essen, M., Heugens, P.P. and van Oosterhout, J.H.H. 2012. An institution-based view of executive compensation: A multilevel meta-analytic test. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43, 396-423.
- Van Essen, M., van Oosterhout, J.H. and Carney, M. 2012. Corporate boards and the performance of Asian firms: A meta-analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29, 873-905.
- Velte, P. 2017. The link between Audit Committees, Corporate Governance Quality and Firm Performance: A Literature Review, 14, 15-31.

- Wagner, D., Block, J.H., Miller, D., Schwens, C. and Xi, G. 2015. A meta-analysis of the financial performance of family firms: Another attempt. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 6, 3-13.
- Wang, K. and Shailer, G. 2015. Ownership Concentration and Firm Performance in Emerging Markets: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 29, 199-229.
- Wang, K.T. and Shailer, G. 2018. Does Ownership Identity Matter? A Meta-analysis of Research on Firm Financial Performance in Relation to Government versus Private Ownership. *Abacus*, 54, 1-35.
- Wright et al. 2017. *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Governance*.
- Yermack, D. 2017. Corporate Governance and Blockchains. *Review of Finance*, 7-31.

Sustainable Corporate Governance:

- Adams, R.B. 2016. Women on Boards: The superheroes of tomorrow? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27, 371-386.
- Broadbent, J. 2016. A gender agenda. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 24, 169-181.
- Broadbent, J. and Kirkham, L. 2008. Glass ceilings, glass cliffs or new world? *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability. Journal*, 21, 465-473.
- Brooke, J.K. and Tyler, T.R. 2011. Diversity and Corporate Performance: A Review of the Psychological Literature. *North Carolina Law Review*, 89, 715-748.
- Bruckmüller, S., Ryan, M.K., Rink, F. and Haslam, S.A. 2014. Beyond the Glass Ceiling: The Glass Cliff and Its Lessons for Organizational Policy. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 8, 202-232.
- Byron, K. and Post, C. 2016. Women on Boards of Directors and Corporate Social Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 26, 428-442.
- Cabrera-Fernandez, A.I., Martinez-Jimenez, R. and Hernandez-Ortiz, M.J. 2016. Women's participation on boards of directors. A review of the literature. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8, 69- 89.
- Dawar, G. and Singh, S. 2016. Corporate Social Responsibility and Gender Diversity: A Literature Review. *Journal of IMS Group*, 13, 61-71.
- Ellemers, N., Rink, F., Derks, B. and Ryan, M.K. 2012. Women in high places: When and why promoting women into top positions can harm them individually or as a group (and how to prevent this). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 32, 163-187.
- Elsakit, O.M. and Worthington, A.C. 2014. The impact of corporate characteristics and corporate governance on Corporate Social and Environmental Disclosure: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9, 1-15.
- Guerrero-Villegas, J., Perez-Calero, L., Hurtado-Gonzalez, J.M. and Giraldez-Puig, P. 2018. Board Attributes and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: A Meta-Analysis. *Sustainability*, 10, 4808, 1-22.
- Habib, A. and Hossain, M. 2013. CEO/CFO characteristics and financial reporting quality: A review. *Research in Accounting Regulation*, 25, 88-100.
- Hardies, K. and Khalifa, R. 2018. Gender is not a "dummy variable". A discussion of current gender research in accounting. *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management* (online first).
- Hoobler, J.M., Masterson, C.R., Nkomo, S.M. and Michel, E.J. 2018. The Business Case for Women Leaders: Meta-Analysis, Research Critique, and Path Forward. *Journal of Management*, 44, 2473-2499.
- Jain, T. and Jamali, D. 2016. Looking Inside the Black Box. The Effect of Corporate Governance on Corporate Social Responsibility. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 24, 253-273.
- Kirsch, A. 2018. The gender composition of corporate boards. A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29, 346-364.
- Khlif, H. and Achek, I. 2017. Gender in accounting research: a review. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 32, 627 655.
- Lagasio, V. and Cucari, N. 2019. Corporate governance and environmental social governance disclosure. A meta-analytical review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* (online first).
- Li, Z.F. 2018. A survey of corporate social responsibility and corporate governance. Boubaker, S., Cumming, D. and Nguyen, D.K. (eds.) *Research Handbook of Finance and Sustainability*, 126-137.
- Macarie, F.C. and Moldovan, O. 2012. Gender Discrimination in Management. Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 35, 153-172.

- Majumder, T.H., Akter, A. and Li, X. 2018. Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Disclosures. A Meta- Analytical Review. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management* (online first).
- Mason, C. and Simmons, J. 2014. Embedding Corporate Social Responsibility in Corporate Governance: A Stakeholder Systems Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119, 77-86.
- Ortas, E., Alvarez, I. and Zubeltzu, E. 2017. Firms' Board Independence and Corporate Social Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Sustainability*, 9, 1006, 1-26
- Pletzer, J.L, Nilolova, R., Kedzior, K.K. and Voelpel, S. 2015. Does Gender Matter? Female Representation on Corporate Boards and Firm Financial Performance. A Meta-Analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 10,, 1-20.
- Post, C. and Byron, K. 2015. Women on Boards and Firm Financial Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 1546-1571
- Rao, K. and Tilt, C. 2016. Board composition and Corporate Social Responsibility: The Role of Diversity, Gender, Strategy and Decision Making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 138, 327-347.
- Rezaee, Z. 2009. *Corporate Governance and Ethics*.
- Ryan, M.K. and Haslam, S.A. 2007. The Glass Cliff: Exploring the Dynamics Surrounding the Appointment of Women to Precarious Leadership Positions. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 549-572.
- Ryan, M.K., Haslam, S.A., Morgenroth, T., Rink, F., Stoker, J. and Peters, K. 2015. Getting on top of the glass cliff: Reviewing a decade of evidence, explanations, and impact. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27, 446-455.
- Siboni, B., Sangiorgi, D., Farneti, F. and de Villiers, C. 2016. Gender (in) accounting: insights, gaps and an agenda for future research. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 24, 158-168.
- Terjesen, S., Sealy, R. and Singh, V. 2009. Women Directors on Corporate Boards: A Review and Research Agenda. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 17, 320-337.
- Velte, P. 2017a. Does board composition have an impact on CSR reporting? Problems and Perspectives in Management, 15, 19-35.
- Velte, P. 2017b. Do women on board of directors have an impact on corporate governance quality and firm performance? A literature review. *International Journal of Sustainable Strategic Management*, 5, 302-346.
- Velte, P. 2018. Appointing female CEOs in risky and precarious firm circumstances. A review of the glass cliff phenomenon. *Corporate ownership and control* 15: 33-43.
- Winschel, J. and Stawinoga, M. 2019. Determinants and effects of sustainable CEO compensation: a structured literature review of empirical evidence. *Management Review Quarterly* (online first).

FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING

Normative

- Bamber, M. and Parry, S. 2018. *Accounting and finance for managers*. 2. ed.
- Coenenberg, A.G., Haller, A. and Schultze, W. 2016. *Jahresabschluss und Jahresabschlussanalyse*, 24. ed.
- Harrison, W.T et al. 2018. *Financial accounting*. 11th ed.
- Horngren, C.T. et al. 2014. *Introduction to financial accounting*, 11th ed.
- Kolitz, D. 2017. *Financial accounting*.
- McLaney, E. and Atrill, P. 2016. *Accounting and Finance. An Introduction*. 8. ed.
- Miller, P. and Power, M. 2013. Accounting, Organizing, and Economizing. *Connecting Accounting Research and Organization Theory. The Academy of Management Annals*, 7, 557-605.
- Pellens, B., Fülbier, R.U., Gassen, J. and Sellhorn, T. 2017. *Internationale Rechnungslegung*. 10. ed.
- Power, M. 2010. Fair value accounting, financial economics and the transformation of reliability. *Accounting and Business Research*, 40, 197-210.
- Power, M. 2015. How accounting begins: Object formation and the accretion of infrastructure. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 47, 43-55.
- Power, M. and Laughlin, R. 1995. *Critical Theory and Accounting*. *Critical Management Studies*, 113-135.
- Power, M. and Laughlin, R. 1996. Habermas, Law and Accounting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 5, 441-465
- Roslender, R. (ed.) 2017. *The Routledge Companion to Critical Accounting*.

- Stolowy, H. and Ding, Y. 2017. *Financial Accounting and Reporting. A Global Perspective*. 5. ed.
- Tweedie, D. 2018. *After Habermas. Applying Axel Honneth's critical theory in accounting research*. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* (online first).
- Weygandt, J.J., Kimmel, P.D. and Kieso, D.E. 2015. *Financial accounting: IFRS edition*. 3. ed.

Empirical research

- Armstrong, C.S., Guay, W.R. and Weber, J.P. 2010. The role of information and financial reporting in corporate governance and debt contracting. *Journal of Accounting & Economics*, 50, 179-234.
- Barron, O.E. and Stuerke, P.S. 1998. Dispersion in analysts' earnings forecasts as a measure of uncertainty. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, 13, 245-270
- Barron, O.E., Kim, P., Lim, S.C. and Stevens, D.E. 1998. Using Analysts' Forecasts to Measure Properties of Analysts' Information Environment. *The Accounting Review*, 73, 421-433.
- Barth, M.E. 2000. Valuation-based accounting research: Implications for financial reporting and opportunities for future research. *Accounting and Finance*, 40, 7-31.
- Barth, M.E. 2018. *The Future of Financial Reporting: Insights from Research*. *Abacus*, 54, 1-13.
- Barth, M.E., Beaver, W.H. and Landsman, W.R. 2001. The relevance of the value relevance literature for financial accounting standard setting: another view. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 31, 77-104.
- Beatty, A. and Liao, S. 2014. Financial accounting in the banking industry. A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 58, 339-383.
- Bertomeu, J. and Cheynel, E. 2016. Disclosure and the Cost of Capital. A Survey of the Theoretical Literature. *Abacus*, 52, 221-258.
- Brown, P., Beekes, W. and Verhoeven, P. 2011. Corporate governance, accounting and finance. A review. *Accounting and Finance*, 51, 96-172.
- Brown, R. and Jones, M. 2015. Mapping and exploring the topography of contemporary financial accounting Research. *British Accounting Review*, 47, 237-261.
- Bushman, R.M. 2014. Thoughts on financial accounting and the banking industry. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 58, 384-395.
- Carvalho, C., Rodrigues, A.M. and Ferreira, C. 2016. Goodwill and Mandatory Disclosure Compliance: A Critical Review of the Literature. *Australian Accounting Review*, 79, 376-389.
- D'Arcy, A. and Tarca, A. 2018. Reviewing IFRS Goodwill Accounting Research: Implementation Effects and Cross-Country Differences. *International Journal of Accounting*, 53, 203-226.
- Dechow, P. et al. 2011. Predicting Material Accounting Misstatements. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 28, 17-82.
- Dechow, P., Ge, W. and Schrand, C. 2010. Understanding earnings quality. A review of the proxies, their determinants and their consequences. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 50: 344-401.
- Dechow, P.M. and Schrand, C.M. 2004. Earnings quality. Working paper.
- Dyckman, T. and Zeff, S. 2015. *Accounting Research: Past, Present, and Future*. *Abacus*, 51, 511-524.
- Dye, R.A. 2001. An evaluation of "essays on disclosure" and the disclosure literature in accounting. *Journal of Accounting & Economics*, 32, 181-235.
- Easley, D. and O'Hara, M. 2004. Information and the Cost of Capital. *The Journal of Finance*, 59, 1553-1583.
- ElMoatasem Abdelghany, K. 2005. Measuring the quality of earnings. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 20, 1001-1015.
- Ewert, R. and Wagenhofer, A. 2015. Economic Relations Among Earnings Quality Measures. *Abacus*, 51, 311-355.
- Filip, A., Hammami, A., Huang, Z., Jeny, A., Magnan, M. and Moldovan, R. 2017. Literature Review on the Effect of Implementation of IFRS 13 Fair Value Measurement. Working Paper.
- Francis, J. et al. 2004. Costs of Equity and Earnings Attributes. *The Accounting Review* 79: 967-1010.
- Garcia-Meca, E. and Sanchez-Ballesta, J.P. 2006. Influences on financial analyst forecast errors: A metaanalysis. *International Business Review*, 15, 29-52.
- Godfrey, J. et al. 2010. *Accounting theory*. 7 ed.
- Gros, M. and Worret, D. 2014. The challenge of measuring audit quality: some evidence. *International Journal of Critical Accounting* 6: 345-374.

- Healy, P.M. and Palepu, K.G. 2001. Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 31, 405-440.
- Hodder, L., Hopkins, P. and Schipper, K. 2013. Fair Value Measurement in Financial Reporting. *Foundations and Trends in Accounting*, 8, 143-270.
- Holthausen, R. and Watts, R.L. 2001. The relevance of the value-relevance literature for financial accounting standard setting. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 31, 3-75.
- Hoque, Z. et al. (ed.) 2017. *The Routledge Companion to Qualitative Accounting Research Methods*.
- Jones, S. (ed.). 2015. *The Routledge Companion to Financial Accounting Theory*.
- Keung, E. and Shih, M. 2014. Measuring discretionary accruals: are ROA-matched models better than the original Jones-type models? *Review of Accounting Studies*, 19, 736-768.
- Khlif, H. and Chalmers, K. 2015. A review of meta-analytic research in accounting. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 35, 1-27.
- Khlif, H. and Hussainey, K. 2016. The association between risk disclosure and firm characteristics: a metaanalysis. *Journal of Risk Research*, 19, 181-211.
- Khlif, H. and Souissi, M. 2010. The determinants of corporate disclosure: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, 18, 198-219.
- Landsman, W.R. 2007. Is fair value accounting information relevant and reliable? Evidence from capital market research. *Accounting and Business Research*, 37, 19-30.
- Li, F. 2008. Annual report readability, current earnings, and earnings persistence. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 45, 221-247.
- Li, F. 2010. Textual analysis of corporate disclosure: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 29, 143-165.
- Libby, T. and Thorne, L. (eds.) 2018. *The Routledge Companion to Behavioural Accounting Research*
- Livne, G. and Markarian, G. (eds.) 2018. *The Routledge Companion to Fair Value in Accounting*.
- Loughran, T. and McDonald, B. 2011. Sentiment Word Lists, <https://sraf.nd.edu/textualanalysis/resources/#LM%20Sentiment%20Word%20Lists>.
- Loughran, T. and McDonald, B. 2014. Measuring readability in financial disclosures. *Journal of Finance*, 69, 1643-1671.
- Loughran, T. and McDonald, B. 2016. Textual Analysis in Accounting and Finance: A Survey. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 54, 1187-1230.
- Magnan, M. and Markarian, G. 2011. Accounting, Governance and the Crisis: Is Risk the Missing Link? *European Accounting Review*, 20, 215-231.
- Marra, A. 2016. The Pros and Cons of Fair Value Accounting in a Globalized Economy: A Never Ending Debate. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance*, 31, 582-591.
- Marston, C.L. and Shrives, P.J. 1991. The Use of Disclosure Indices in Accounting Research: A Review article. *British Accounting Review*, 23, 195-210.
- Menicucci, E. and Paolucci, G. 2016. Fair value accounting and the financial crisis: a literature-based analysis. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 14, 49-61.
- Mokhtar, E. 2017. Internet financial reporting determinants: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 15, 116-154.
- Palea, V. 2017. Whither accounting research? A European view. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 42, 59- 73.
- Penman, S.H. 2007. Financial reporting quality: is fair value a plus or a minus? *Accounting and Business Research*, Special Issue, 33-44.
- Ronen, J. and Yaari, V. 2008. Earnings management. *Emerging Insights in Theory, Practice, and Research*.
- Roslender, R. (ed.) 2017. *The Routledge Companion to Critical Accounting*.
- Ruch, G.W. and Taylor, G. 2015. Accounting conservatism. A review of the literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 34, 17-38.
- Saha, A. and Bose, S. 2017. The Value Relevance of Financial and Non-Financial Information: Evidence from Recent Academic Literature. North, M.O. and Akkeren, J.V. (eds.) *Value Relevance of Accounting Information in Capital Markets*, 220-245.
- Sellhorn, T. and Stier, C. 2018. Fair Value Measurement for Long-Lived Operating Assets. *Research Evidence. European Accounting Review* (online first).

- Souissi, M. and Khelif, H. 2012. Meta-analytic review of disclosure level and cost of equity capital. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, 20, 49-62.
- Velte, P. and Lazar, L. (2017). Bestandsaufnahme und Würdigung der empirischen Rechnungslegungsforschung zum Goodwill Impairment Only Approach nach IFRS. *Betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung und Praxis*, 68, 57-86.
- Verrecchia, R.E. 2001. Essays on disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 32, 97-180.
- Wagenhofer, A. and Dücker, H. 2007. Die Messung von „Earnings“-Qualität. *Management Review Quarterly* 57: 263-297.
- Wagenhofer, A. and Ewert, R. 2015. *Externe Unternehmensrechnung*, 3. ed.
- Wen, H. and Moehle, S. 2016. Accounting for goodwill: An academic literature review and analysis to inform the debate. *Research in Accounting Regulation*, 28, 11-21.

Sustainability Reporting

- Ali, W., Frynas, J.G. and Mahmood, Z. 2017. Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Disclosure in Developed and Developing Countries: A Literature Review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* (online first).
- Berthelot, S., Cormier, D. and Magnan, M. 2002. Environmental Disclosure Research. Review and Synthesis. Working Paper.
- Brooks, C. 2018. The effects of environmental, social and governance disclosures and performance on firm value: A review of the literature in accounting and finance. *The British Accounting Review*, 50, 1-15.
- Chen, J.C. and Roberts, R.W. 2010. Toward a More Coherent Understanding of the Organization-Society Relationship: A Theoretical Consideration for Social and Environmental Accounting Research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97, 651-665.
- Dienes, D., Sassen, R. and Fischer, J. (2016). What are the drivers of sustainability reporting? A systematic review. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 7, 154-189.
- Fifka, M. 2012. The development and state of research on social and environmental reporting in global comparison. *Journal für Betriebswirtschaft*, 62, 45-84.
- Fifka, M. 2013. Corporate Responsibility Reporting and its Determinants in Comparative Perspective. A Review of the Empirical Literature and a Meta-analysis. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 22, 1-35.
- Frost, G. and Jones, S. 2015. Corporate sustainability reporting: Theory and Practice. *The Routledge Companion to Financial Accounting Theory*, 514-535.
- Gray, R., Kouhy, R. and Lavers, S. 1995. Corporate social and environmental reporting. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 8, 47-77.
- Guan, J. and Noronha, C. 2013. Corporate social responsibility reporting in the Chinese academia: a critical review. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 9, 33-55.
- Hahn, R. and Kühnen, M. 2013. Determinants of sustainability reporting: a review of results, trends, theory, and opportunities in an expanding field of research. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 59, 5-21.
- Huang, X.B. and Watson, L. 2015. Corporate social responsibility research in accounting. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 34, 1-16.
- Khelif, H., Hussainey, K. and Acheh, I. 2015. The effect of national culture on the association between profitability and corporate social and environmental disclosure. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 23, 296-321.
- Lee, T.M. and Hutchison, P.D. 2005. The Decision to Disclose Environmental Information: A Research Review and Agenda. *Advances in Accounting*, 21, 83-111.
- Malik, M. 2015. Value-Enhancing Capabilities of CSR: A Brief Review of Contemporary Literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127, 419-438.
- Maroun, W. 2015. Culture, profitability, non-financial reporting and a meta-analysis. *Mediari Accountancy Research*, 23, 322-330.
- Mathews, M.R. 1997. Twenty-five years of social and environmental accounting research: Is there a silver jubilee to celebrate? *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 10, 481-531.
- Michelon, G., Pilonato, S., Ricceri, F. and Roberts, R.W. 2016. Behind camouflaging. Traditional and innovative theoretical perspectives in social and environmental accounting research. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 7, 2-25.

- Omran, M.A. and Ramdhony, D. 2015. Theoretical Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting*, 5, 38-55.
- Radhakrishnan, S., Tsang, A. and Liu, R. 2018. A Corporate Social Responsibility Framework for Accounting Research. *International Journal of Accounting*, 53, 274-294.
- Shabana, K.M. and Ravlin, E.C. 2016. *Business and Society Review*, 12, 297-327.
- Velayutham, E. 2018. Sustainability disclosure and earnings management. Boubaker, S., Dunning, D., Nguyen, D.K. (eds.) *Research Handbook of Finance and Sustainability*, 2018, 532-549.

Integrated Reporting:

- Cheng, M., Green, W., Conradie, P., Konishi, N. and Romi, A. 2014. The International Integrated Reporting Framework: Key Issues and Future Research Opportunities. *Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting*, 25, 90-119.
- De Villiers, C. and Maroun, W. (eds.) 2017. *Sustainability Accounting and Integrated Reporting*. London 2017.
- De Villiers, C. and Sharma, U. 2018. A critical reflection on the future of financial, intellectual capital, sustainability and integrated reporting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* (online first).
- De Villiers, C., Hsiao, K. and Maroun, W. 2017. Developing a Conceptual Model of influences around Integrated Reporting. *New Insights, and Directions for Future Research. Meditari Accountancy Research*, 25, 450-460.
- De Villiers, C., Rinaldi, L. and Unerman, J. (2014). Integrated reporting. Insights, gaps and an agenda for future research. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 27, 1042-1067
- De Villiers, C., Venter, E.R. and Hsiao, P.C.K. 2017. Integrated reporting: background, measurement issues, approaches and an agenda for future research. *Accounting and Finance*, 57, 937-959
- Dumay, J., Bernardi, C., Guthrie, J., and Demartini, P. 2016. Integrated reporting: A structured literature review. *Accounting Forum*, 40, 166-185
- Dumay, J., Bernadi, C., Guthrie, J. and La Torre, M. 2017. Barriers to Implementing the International Integrated Reporting Framework: A Contemporary Academic Perspective. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 25, 461-480.
- Eccles, R.G. and Krzus, M.P. 2015. *The Integrated Reporting Movement*.
- Flower, J. 2017. The International Integrated Reporting Council: A story of failure. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 27, 1-17.
- Ioana, D. and Adriana, T.-T. 2014. Research agenda on integrated reporting: new emergent theory and practice. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 15, 221-227.
- Kannenberg, L. and Schreck, P. 2018. Integrated reporting: boon or bane? A review of empirical research on its determinants and implications. *Journal of Business Economics* (online first).
- Owen, G. 2013. Integrated Reporting: A Review of Developments and their Implications for the Accounting Curriculum. *Accounting Education: An International Journal*, 22, 340-356
- Rinaldi, L., Unerman, J. and de Villiers, C. 2018. Evaluating the integrated reporting journey: insights, gaps and agendas for future research. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* (online first).
- Thomson, I. 2015. "But does sustainability need capitalism or an integrated report" a commentary on "The Integrated Reporting Council: A story of failure" by Flower, J. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 27, 18-22.
- Velte, P. and Stawinoga, M. 2017. Integrated reporting: The current state of empirical research, limitations and future research implications. *Journal of Management Control*, 28, 275-320.

Behavioral accounting

- Arnold, V. 2016. The changing technological environment and the future of behavioural research in accounting. *Accounting and Finance* (online first).
- Basel, J.S. and Dalla Via, N. 2013. Behavioral aspects and decision-making research in accounting: History, recent developments, and some future directions. Working paper.

- Birnberg, J.G. 2011. A Proposed Framework for Behavioral Accounting Research. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 23, 1-43.
- Basel, J.S., and Dalla Via, N. 2015. Behavioral aspects and decision-making research in accounting: History, recent developments, and some future directions. Working paper.
- Callahan, C.M., Gabriel, E.A., and Sainty, B.J. 2006. A Review and Classification of Experimental Economics Research in Accounting. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 25,59-126.
- Gillenkirch, R.M. and Arnold, M.C. State of the Art des Behavioral Accounting. *WISt* 37: 128-134.
- Kachelmeier, S.J. and King, R.R. 2002. Using Laboratory Experiments to Evaluate Accounting Policy Issues. *Accounting Horizons*, 16, 219-232.
- Libby, R., Bloomfield, R., and Nelson, M.W. 2002. Experimental research in financial accounting. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 27, 775-810.
- Maines, L.A., and Wahlen, J.M. 2006. The Nature of Accounting Information Reliability: Inferences from Archival and Experimental Research. *Accounting Horizons*, 20, 399-425.
- Maines, L.A., Salamon, G.L., and Sprinkle, G.B. 2006. An Information Economic Perspective on Experimental Research in Accounting. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 18, 85-102.
- Moser, D.V. 1998. Using an Experimental Economics Approach in Behavioral Accounting Research. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 10, Supplement, 94-110.
- Turner, M.J. and Coote, L.V. 2017. Discrete choice experiments. A research agenda for experimental accounting. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 25, 158-182.

MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTING

- Atkinson et al. 2012. *Management Accounting: Information for Decision-Making and Strategy Execution*. 6 ed.
- Bhimani, A. et al. 2015. *Management and Cost Accounting*. 6 ed.
- Derfuss, K. 2009. The Relationship of Budgetary Participation and Reliance on Accounting Performance Measures with Individual-Level Consequent Variables: A Meta-Analysis. *European Accounting Review*, 18, 203-239.
- Drury, C., 2015. *Management and Cost Accounting*. 9th edition.
- Garrison, R., Noreen, E. and Brewer, P., 2017. *Managerial Accounting*, 16 ed.
- Horngren, C. et al. 2014. *Introduction to Management Accounting*.
- Seal, W. et al., 2014. *Management Accounting*. 5th ed.
- Warren, C.S. et al. 2016. *Financial and management accounting*. 14 ed.
- Weetman, P. 2016. *Financial and management accounting*. 7 ed.
- Williams et al. 2018. *Financial and management accounting*. 18 ed.

Sustainable management accounting

- Günther, E., Endrikat, J. and Günther, T. (2016). Environmental management control systems: A conceptualization and a review of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 136, 147-171.
- Hansen, E.G. and Schaltegger, S., 2016. The Sustainability Balanced Scorecard. A Systematic Review of Architectures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133, 193-221.
- Kim, N.K.W., and Matsumura, E.M., 2017. Managerial Accounting Research in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Framework and Opportunities for Research. *Advances in Management Accounting*, 28, 31-58.
- Maas, K., Schaltegger, S., and Crutzen, N., 2016. Integrating corporate sustainability assessment, management accounting, control and reporting. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 136, 237-248.
- Schaltegger, S. and Zvezdov, D., 2015. Gatekeepers of sustainability information: exploring the roles of accountants. *Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change*, 11, 333-361.
- Schaltegger, S., Gibassier, D., and Zvezdov, D., 2013. Is environmental management accounting a discipline? A bibliometric literature review. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 21, 4-31.

- Soderstrom, K.M., Soderstrom, N.S., and Steward, C.R., 2017. Sustainability/CSR Research in Management Accounting: A Review of the Literature. *Advances in Management Accounting*, 28, 59-85.

FINANCE

Basic

- Berk, J.B. 2018. *Fundamentals of corporate finance*. 4 ed.
- Brealey, R.A. 2018. *Fundamentals of corporate finance*, 9 ed.
- Brealey, R.A., Myers, S.C., and Allen, F. 2017. *Principles of Corporate Finance*, 12. ed.
- Brooks, C. and Schopohl, L. 2018. Topics and trends in finance research. What is published, who publishes it and what gets cited? *British Accounting Review* (online first).
- Eckbo, E. 2008. *Handbook of Empirical Corporate Finance* (Vol. 1 and 2).
- Hillier, D. 2017. *Fundamentals of corporate finance*. 3. ed.
- Hillier, D., Grinblatt, M. and Titman, S. 2012. *Financial markets and corporate strategy: European edition*. 2. ed.
- Ross, S.A. 2018. *Corporate finance*. 5 ed.
- Tirole, J. 2006. *The Theory of Corporate Finance*.

Sustainable finance

- Aldohni, A.K. 2018. Is Ethical Finance the Answer to the Ills of the UK Financial Market? A Post-Crisis Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151, 265-278.
- Boubaker, S., Cumming, D. and Nguyen, D.K. 2018. *Research Handbook of Investing in the Triple Bottom Line*.
- Eccles, N.S. 2010. UN Principles for Responsible Investment Signatories and the Anti-Apartheid SRI Movement: A Thought Experiment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 415-424.
- Gerard, B. 2018. *ESG and Socially Responsible Investment: A Critical Review*. Working Paper.
- Häfner, D., Kiesel, F. and Wirthmann, L. 2017. What do we know about socially responsible investments? *Zeitschrift für Umweltpolitik and Umweltrecht*, 4, 299-331.
- Hebb (ed.), T. 2012. *The Next Generation of Responsible Investing*.
- Hebb, T, Hawley, J.P., Hoepner, A.G.F., Neher, A. and Wood, D. 2016. *The Routledge Handbook of Responsible Investment*.
- Hendry, J. 2013. *Ethics and Finance. An Introduction*.
- Koellner, T., Weber, O., Fenchel, M. and Scholz, R. 2005. Principles for Sustainability Rating of Investment Funds. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 14, 54-70.
- Puaschunder, J.M. 2016. On the emergence, current state, and future perspectives of Socially Responsible Investment (SRI). *Consilience: The Journal of Sustainable Development*, 16, 38-63.
- Rathner, S. 2013. The influence of primary study characteristics on the performance differential between Socially Responsible and Conventional Investment Funds: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118, 349-363.
- Revelli, C. 2017. Socially responsible investing (SRI): From mainstream to margin? *Research in International Business and Finance*, 39, 711-717.
- Revelli, C. and Viviani, J.-L. 2013. The link between SRI and financial performance: Effects and Moderators. *Management international*, 17, 105-122.
- Richardson, B.J. 2009. Keeping Ethical Investment Ethical: Regulatory Issues for Investing for Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 555-572.
- Salzmann, A.J. 2013. The integration of sustainability into the theory and practice of finance: an overview of the state of the art and outline of future developments. *Journal of Business Economics* 83: 555-576.
- Sandberg, J., Juravle, C., Hedesström, T.M. and Hamilton, I. 2009. The Heterogeneity of Socially Responsible Investment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 519-533.
- Schoenmaker, D. and Schramade, W. 2019. *Principles of Sustainable Finance*.

- Scholtens, B. 2006. Finance as a Driver of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics* 68: 19-33.
- Schulz, T. and Bergius, S. (eds.) (2014). *CSR und Finance. Beitrag und Rolle des CFO für eine Nachhaltige Unternehmensführung.*
- Soppe, A. 2004. Sustainable Corporate Finance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53: 213-224.
- Sparkes, R. and Cowton, C.J. 2004. The Maturing of Socially Responsible Investment: A Review of the developing link With Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 52, 45-57.
- Talan, G. and Sharma, G.D. 2019. Doing Well by Doing Good: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda for Sustainable Investment. *Sustainability*, 11, 353, 1-16.
- Van Dijk-de Groot, M. and Nijhof, A.H.J. 2015. Socially Responsible Investment Funds: a review of research priorities and strategic options. *Journal of Sustainable Finance and Investment*, 5, 178-204.
- Von Wallis, M. and Klein, C. 2015. Ethical requirement and financial interest: a literature review on socially responsible investing. *Business Research*, 8, 61-98.
- Wagemans, F.A.J., van Koppen, K. and Mol, A.P.J. 2013. The effectiveness of socially responsible investment: a review. *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences*, 10, 235-252.
- Walker, T., Kibsey, S.D. and Crichton, R. (eds.) 2018. *Designing a Sustainable Financial System. Development Goals and Socio-Ecological Responsibility.*
- Weber, O. 2018. Financial Sector Sustainability Regulations and Voluntary Codes of Conduct: Do they Help to Create a More Sustainable Financial System? Walker, T. et al. (eds) *Designing a Sustainable Financial System*, 383-404.

Link between CSR and financial performance

- Albertini, E. 2013. Does Environmental Management Improve Financial Performance? A Meta-Analytical Review. *Organization and Environment*, 26, 431-457.
- Allouche, J. and Laroche, P. 2005. A Meta-Analytical investigation of the relationship between corporate social and financial performance. *Revue de Gestion des Ressources Humaines*, 1-29.
- Ambec, S. and Lanoie, P. 2008. Does it pay to be green? A systematic overview. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 45-62.
- Brooks, C. 2018. The effects of environmental, social and governance disclosures and performance on firm value: A review of the literature in accounting and finance. *British Accounting Review*, 50, 1-15.
- Busch, T. and Friede, G. 2018. The Robustness of the Corporate Social and Financial Performance Relation: A Second-Order Meta-Analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* (online first).
- Carroll, A.B. and Shabana, K.M. 2010. The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review of Concepts, Research and Practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12, 85-105.
- Crifo, P. and Forget, V.D. 2015. The Economics of Corporate Social Responsibility: A Firm-Level Perspective Survey. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 29, 112-130.
- Dixon-Fowler, H.R., Slater, D.J., Johnson, J.L., Ellstrand, A.E. and Romi, A.M. 2013. Beyond "Does it Pay to be Green?" A Meta-Analysis of Moderators of the CEP-CFP Relationship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 112, 353- 366.
- Endrikat, J. 2016. Market reactions to corporate environmental performance related events: a meta-analytic consolidation of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Business Ethics* 138, 535-548.
- Endrikat, J., Guenther, E. and Hoppe, H. 2014. Making sense of conflicting empirical findings: A metaanalytic review of the relationship between corporate environmental and financial performance. *European Management Journal*, 32, 735-751.
- Etzion, D. 2007. Research on Organizations and the Natural Environment, 1992-Present. A Review. *Journal of Management*, 33, 637-664.
- Friede, G., Busch, T. and Bassen, A. 2015. ESG and financial performance: aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance and Investment*, 5, 210-233.
- Griffin, J.J. and Mahon, J.F. 1997. The Corporate Social Performance and Corporate Financial Performance Debate: Twenty-Five Years of Incomparable Research. *Business and Society*, 36, 5-31.

- Guenther, E., Busch, T., Endrikat, J., Guenther, T., Orlitzky, M. 2018. What we know about the Economic Payoffs of Corporate Ecological Sustainability. *Corporate Social Responsibility. Business and Society* 360, 325-352.
- Hahn, R., Reimsbach, D., Schiemann, F. 2015. Organizations, Climate Change, and Transparency: Reviewing the Literature on Carbon Disclosure. *Organization & Environment* 28, 80-102.
- Hang, M., Geyer-Klingeberg, J. and Rathgeber, A.W. 2018. It is merely a matter of time: A meta-analysis of the causality between environmental performance and financial performance. *Business Strategy and The Environment* (online first).
- Horvathova, E. 2010. Does environmental performance affect financial performance? A meta-analysis. *Ecological Economics* 70, 52-59.
- Lu, W.L. 2016. Which Factors Moderate the Relationship between Sustainability Performance and Financial Performance? A Meta-Analysis Study. *Journal of International Accounting Research*, 15, 1-15.
- Margolis, J.D. and Walsh, J.P. 2003. Misery Loves Companies: Rethinking Social Initiatives by Business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 268-305.
- Margolis, J.D., Elfenbein, H.A. and Walsh, J.P. 2007. Does it Pay to be Good? A Meta-Analysis and Re-direction of Research on the Relationship between Corporate Social and Financial Performance. Working Paper.
- Mattingly, J.E. 2017. Corporate Social Performance: A Review of Empirical Research Examining the Corporation-Society Relationship Using Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini Social Ratings Data. *Business and Society*, 56, 796-839.
- Orlitzky, M. 2009. Corporate social performance and financial performance: A research synthesis. Crane, A., Matten, D., McWilliams, A., Moon, J. and Siegel, D. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 113-134.
- Orlitzky, M. 2011. Institutional Logics in the Study of Organizations: The Social Construction of the Relationship between Corporate Social and Financial Performance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 21, 409-444.
- Orlitzky, M. and Benjamin, J.D. 2001. Corporate social performance and firm risk: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Business and Society*, 40, 369-396.
- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F.L. and Rynes, S.L. 2003. Corporate Social and Financial performance: A Metaanalysis. *Organization Studies*, 24, 403-441.
- Perrini, F., Russo, A., Tencati, A. and Vurro, C. 2011. Deconstructing the Relationship between Corporate Social and Financial Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 59-76.
- Quazi, A. and Richardson, A. 2012. Sources of variation in linking corporate social responsibility and financial performance. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 8, 242-256.
- Raza, A., Ilyas, M.I., Rauf, R. and Qamar, R. 2012. Relationship between Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Corporate Financial Performance (CFP): literature review approach. *Finance Management*, 46, 8404-8409.
- Rezaee, Z. 2016. Business sustainability research: A theoretical and integrated perspective. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 36, 48-64.
- Roman, R.M., Hayibor, S. and Agle, B.R. 1999. The relationship between social and financial performance. *Business and Society*, 38, 109-125.
- Van Beurden, P. and Goessling, T. 2008. The worth of values. A literature review on the relationship between corporate social and financial performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 407-424.
- Wood, D.J. and Jones, R.E. 1995. Stakeholder Mismatching: A theoretical problem in empirical Research on Corporate Social Performance. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 3, 229-267.
- Wang, Q., Dou, J. and Jia, S. 2016. A Meta-Analytic Review of Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Financial Performance: The Moderating Effect of Contextual Factors. *Business and Society*, 55, 1083-1121.

Business case for carbon performance

- Busch, T., Johnson, M., Pioch, T. 2018. Consistency of Corporate Carbon Emission Data. Working Paper.

- Busch, T., Lewandowski, S. 2018. Corporate Carbon and Financial Performance. A Meta-analysis. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 22, 745-759.
- Guenther, E.M., Hoppe, H. 2014. Merging Limited Perspectives. A Synopsis of Measurement Approaches and Theories of the Relationship between Corporate Environmental and Financial Performance. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 18, 689-707.
- Hahn, R., Reimsbach, D., Schiemann, F. 2015. Organizations, Climate Change, and Transparency: Reviewing the Literature on Carbon Disclosure. *Organization & Environment* 28, 80-102.
- Hoffmann, V.H., Busch, T. 2008. Corporate Carbon Performance Indicators. Carbon Intensity, Dependency, Exposure, and Risk. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 12, 505-520.
- Schaltegger, S., Csutora, M. 2012. Carbon accounting for sustainability and management. Status Quo and challenges. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 36, 1-16.
- Stechemesser, K., Guenther, E. 2012. Carbon accounting: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 36, 17-38.
- Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures 2017. Final Report. Recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures.

Behavioral finance

- Baker, M., Ruback, R.S., and Wurgler, J. 2004. Behavioral Corporate Finance: A Survey, Working Paper.
- Barberis, N., and Thaler, R. 2003. A Survey of Behavioral Finance. In: Constantinides, G.M., Harris, M., and
- Stulz, R. (eds.). *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, 1053-1123.
- Beer, S., de Mooij, R. and Liu, L. 2019. International Corporate Tax Avoidance: A Review of the Channels, Magnitudes, and Blind Spots. *Journal of Economic Surveys* (Online first).
- DeBonds, W., Muradoglu, G., Shefrin, H., and Staikouras, S.K. 2008. Behavioral Finance: Quo vadis? *Journal of Applied Finance*, 7-21.
- Forbes, W. 2010. Behavioural Finance.
- Metzner, T. 2017. Behavioral Finance. *WISU* 6: 680-682.
- Ramiah, V., Xu, X., and Moosa, I.A. 2015. Neoclassical finance, behavioral finance and noise traders. A review and assessment of the literature. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 41, 89-100.
- Ritter, J.R. 2003. Behavioral finance. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 11, 429-437.
- Shefrin, H. 2018. Behavioral corporate finance. 2 ed.
- Shiller, R.J. 2003. From Efficient Markets Theory to Behavioral Finance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17, 83-104.

TAX

Empirical research:

- Belz, T., von Hagen, D. and Steffens, C. 2017. RandD Intensity and the Effective Tax Rate: A Meta-Regression Analysis. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 31, 988-1010.
- Evers, M.T., Meier, I. and Nicolay, K. 2017. The implications of book-tax differences: A Meta-analysis. Working Paper.
- Frey, L. and Engelhard, L. 2017. Review on Tax Research in Accounting: Is the information given by U.S. GAAP income taxes also provided by IFRS? Working Paper.
- Graham, J.R., Raedy, J.S. and Shackelford, D.A. 2012. Research in accounting for income taxes. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 53, 412-434.
- Hanlon, M. and Heitzman, S. 2010. A review of tax research. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 50, 127- 178.
- Lietz, G. 2013a. Tax Avoidance vs. Tax Aggressiveness: A Unifying Conceptual Framework. Working paper.
- Lietz, G. 2013b. Determinants and Consequences of Corporate Tax Avoidance. Working paper.
- Shackelford, D.A. and Shevlin, T. 2001. Empirical tax research in accounting. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 31, 321-387.

- Wilde, J.H. and Wilson, R.J. 2018. Perspectives on Corporate Tax Planning: Observations from the Past Decade. *The Journal of the American Taxation Association*, 40, 63-81.

Behavioral tax:

- O'Neil, C.J., and Samelson, D.P. 2015. Behavioral research in taxation. Recent advances and future prospects. *Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research*, 4, 103-139

Sustainable tax:

- Avi-Yonah, R. 2014. Corporate Taxation and Corporate Social Responsibility. *New York University Journal of Law and Business*, 11, Special Issue, 1-29.
- Bird, R. and Davis-Nozemack, K. 2018. Tax Avoidance as a Sustainability Problem. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151, 1009-1025.
- Dowling, G.R. 2014. The Curious Case of Corporate Tax Avoidance: Is it Socially Irresponsible? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124, 173-184.
- Fisher, J.M. 2014. Fairer Shores: Tax Havens, Tax Avoidance, and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Boston University Law Review*, 94, 337-365.
- Gribnau, H. 2015. Corporate Social Responsibility and Tax Planning Not by Rules Alone. *Social and Legal Studies*, 24, 225-250.
- Narotzki, D. 2016. Corporate Social Responsibility and Taxation: The Next Step of the Evolution. *Houston Business and Tax Law Journal*, 16, 167-207.
- Sikka, P. 2010. Corporate social responsibility and tax avoidance. *Accounting Forum*, 34, 153-168.
- Stephenson, D. 2015. Corporate Social Responsibility and Tax Avoidance: A Literature Review and Directions for Future Research. Working Paper.
- Wagner, F.W. 2018. Steuervermeidung und Corporate social responsibility. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftsethik* 19, 2-21.
- Whait, R.B., Christ, K.L., Ortas, E. and Burritt, R.L. 2018. What do we know about tax aggressiveness and corporate social responsibility? An integrative review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 204, 542-552.

AUDIT

Normative research:

- Arens, A., Elder, R.J., Beasley, M.S., Hogan, S. 2017. *Auditing and Assurance Services*. 16 ed.
- Brösel, G. et al. 2015: *Wirtschaftliches Prüfungswesen. Der Einstieg in die Wirtschaftsprüfung*. 3. ed.
- Davies, M. and Aston, J. 2011. *Auditing Fundamentals*.
- Graumann, M. 2015. *Wirtschaftliches Prüfungswesen*, 4. ed.
- IDW (eds.) 2016. *WP Handbuch. Wirtschaftsprüfung und Rechnungslegung* 15. ed.
- Knapp, M.C. 2016. *Contemporary Auditing*, 11. ed.
- Marten, K.-U., Quick, R. and Ruhnke, K. 2015. *Wirtschaftsprüfung. Grundlagen des betriebswirtschaftlichen Prüfungswesens nach nationalen und internationalen Normen*, 5. ed.
- Messier, W.F., Glover, S.M. and Prawitt, D.F. 2016. *Auditing and Assurance Services*. 10. ed.
- Porter, B., Simon, J. and Hatherly, D. 2012. *Principles of External Auditing*. 4. ed.
- Power, M. 1996. Making Things Auditable. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 21, 289-315.
- Power, M. 1997. Expertise and the Construction of Relevance: Accountants and Environmental Audit. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 22, 123-146.
- Power, M. 2000. The Audit Society. Second Thoughts. *International Journal of Auditing*, 4, 111-119.
- Power, M. 2003. Auditing and the production of legitimacy. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 28, 379- 394.
- Power, M. 2013. *The Audit Society. Rituals of Verification*.
- Samsonova-Taddei, A. and Siddiqui, J. 2016. Regulation and the Promotion of Audit Ethics. Analysis of the Content of the EU's Policy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139, 183-195.
- Sikka, P. 2009. Financial crisis and the silence of the auditors. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 34, 868-873.

- Wüstemann, J. and Koch, C. 2016. *Wirtschaftsprüfung case by case. Lösungen nach HGB mit Hinweisen auf ISA und US-GAAS*. 4. ed.

Empirical research:

- Abernathy, J.L., Barnes, M., Stefaniak, C. and Weisbarth, A. 2017. An International Perspective on Audit Report Lag: A Synthesis of the Literature and Opportunities for Future Research. *International Journal of Auditing*, 21, 100-127.
- Beattie, V. 2012. Competition Commission. *Statutory Audit Market investigation. Initial review of relevant academic literature*. Glasgow.
- Beattie, V. and Fearnley, S. 2002. *Auditor Independence and Non-Audit Services: A Literature Review*. Working Paper.
- Bédard, J., Coram, P., Espahbodi, R. and Mock, T. 2016. Does Recent Academic Research Support Changes to Audit Reporting Standards? *Accounting Horizons*, 30, 255-275.
- Bédard, J., Piot, C. and Schatt, A. 2015. An evaluation of the French experience with joint auditing. Working paper.
- Bratten, B., Gaynor, L.M., McDaniel, L., Montague, N.R. and Sierra, G.E. 2013. The audit of fair values and other estimates: The effects of underlying environmental, task, and auditor-specific factors. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, 32, Supplement 1, 7-44.
- Burke, J.A. and Lee, H. 2015. Protecting the Public Interest through Mandatory Auditor Firm Rotation: A Controversial Issue. *Sustainability and Governance. Advances in Public Interest Accounting*, 18, 1-55.
- Cameran, M., Di Vincenzo, D. and Merlotti, E. 2005. The Audit Firm Rotation Rule: A Review of the Literature. Working Paper.
- Carson, E., Fargher, N.L., Geiger, M.A., Lennox, C.S., Raghunandan, K. and Willekens, M. 2013. Audit Reporting for Going-Concern Uncertainty: A Research Synthesis. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, 32, Supplement 1, 353-384.
- Casterella, J.R. and Johnston, D. 2013. Can the Academic Literature Contribute to the Debate over Mandatory Audit Firm Rotation? *Research in Accounting Regulation*, 25, 108-116.
- Catanach, A.H. and Walker, P.L. 1999. The International Debate Over Mandatory Auditor Rotation: A Conceptual Research Framework. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 8, 43-66.
- Church, B.K., Davis, S.M. and McCracken, S.A. 2008. The Auditor's Reporting Model: A Literature Overview and Research Synthesis. *Accounting Horizons*, 22, 69-90.
- Church, B.K. et al. 2015. Auditor Independence in Fact: Research, Regulatory, and Practice Implications Drawn from Experimental and Archival Research. *Accounting Horizons*, 29, 217-238.
- DeFond, M.L. and Francis, J.R. 2005. Audit Research after Sarbanes-Oxley. *Auditing*, 24, Supplement, 5-30.
- DeFond, M. and Zhang, J. 2014. A review of archival auditing research. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 58: 275-326.
- De Fuentes, C. and Sierra, E. 2015. Industry specialization and audit fees. A meta-analytic approach. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administracion*, 28, 419-435.
- De Fuentes, C. and Porcuna, R. 2016. Main drivers of consultancy services. A meta-analytic approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 4775-4780.
- Durand, G. 2018. The determinants of audit report lag: a meta-analysis. *Managerial Auditing Journal* (online first).
- Ewelt-Knauer, C., Gold, A. and Pott, C. 2012. What do we know about mandatory audit firm rotation? Working paper.
- Ewelt-Knauer, C., Gold, A. and Pott, C. 2013. Mandatory Audit Firm Rotation: A Review of Stakeholder Perspectives and Prior Research. *Accounting in Europe*, 10, 27-41.
- Fournes Dattin, C. 2017. Developments in France regarding the mandatory rotation of auditors: Do they enhance auditors' independence? *Accounting History*, 22, 44-66.
- Gaynor, L.M., Kelton, A.S., Mercer, M. and Yohn, T.L. 2016. Understanding the Relation between Financial Reporting Quality and Audit Quality. *Auditing* 35: 1-22.
- Gimbar, C. 2016. Early Evidence on the Effects of Critical Audit Matters on Auditor Liability. *Current Issues in Auditing*, 10, A24-A33.

- Gissel, J., Robertson, J. and Stefaniak, C.M. 2010. Formation and Consequences of Going Concern Opinions: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 29, 59-141.
- Gramling, A. and Stone, D.N. 2001. Audit Firm Industry Expertise. A Review and Synthesis of The Archival Literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 20, 1-29.
- Gros, M. and Worret, D. 2014. The challenge of measuring audit quality: some evidence. *International Journal of Critical Accounting* 6: 345-374.
- Gwilliam, D., Teng, C.M. and Marnet, O. 2014. How does joint provision of audit and non-audit services affect audit quality and independence? A review. Working paper.
- Habib, A. 2012. Non-Audit Service Fees and Financial Reporting Quality: A Meta-Analysis. *Abacus*, 48, 214- 248.
- Habib, A. 2013. A meta-analysis of the determinants of modified audit opinion decisions. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 28, 184-216.
- Habib, A., Bhuiyan, B.U., Huang, H.J. and Miah, M.S. 2018. Determinants of audit report lag: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Auditing* (online first).
- Hay, D. 2013. Further Evidence from Meta-Analysis of Audit Fee Research. *International Journal of Auditing*, 17, 162-176.
- Hay, D. 2015. *The Frontiers of Auditing Research*, Working Paper, Auckland.
- Hay, D. 2017a. Opportunities for auditing research. Back to our interdisciplinary roots. *Meditari Accountancy Research* (online first).
- Hay, D. 2017b. Audit Fee Research on Issues Related to Ethics. *Current Issues in Auditing*, 11, A1-A22.
- Hay, D. 2018. The potential for greater use of meta-analysis in archival auditing research. *Managerial Auditing Journal* (online first).
- Hay, D. and Knechel, W.R. 2017. Meta-Regression in Auditing Research: Evaluating the Evidence on the Big N Audit Firm Premium. *Auditing*, 36, 133-159.
- Hay, D., Knechel, W.R. and Willekens, M. (eds.). 2014. *The Routledge Companion to Auditing*. Abingdon/Oxon.
- Hay, D., Knechel, W.R. and Wong, N. 2006. Audit Fees. A Meta-analysis of the Effect of Supply and Demand Attributes. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 23: 141-191.
- Jenkins, D.S. and Vermeer, T.E. 2013. Audit firm rotation and audit quality: evidence from academic research. *Accounting Research Journal*, 26, 75-84.
- Khlif, H. and Chalmers, K. 2015. A review of meta-analytic research in accounting. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 35, 1-27.
- Köhler, A., Quick, R. and Willekens, M. 2016. The New European Audit Regulation Arena. Discussion of New Rules and Ideas for Future Research. *International Journal of Auditing*, 20, 211-214.
- Kotb, A., Halabi, H. and Elbardan, H. 2018. The auditor-to-client revolving door. A structured literature review. *International Journal of Auditing*, 22, 464-485.
- Lennox, C.S. and Wu, X. 2018. A Review of the Archival Literature on Audit Partners. *Accounting Horizons*, 32,1-35.
- Lin, J.W. and Hwang, M.I. 2010. Audit Quality, Corporate Governance, and Earnings Management: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Auditing* 14: 57-77.
- Löhlein, L. 2016. From peer review to PCAOB inspections. Regulating for audit quality in the U.S. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 36, 28-47.
- Mock, T.J., Bédard, J., Coram, P.J., Davis, S.M., Espahbodi, R. and Warne, R.C. 2013. The Audit Reporting Model: Current Research Synthesis and Implications. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, 32, Supplement 1, 323-351.
- Montenegro, T. and Bras, F.A. 2018. Review of the Concept and Measures of Audit Quality in Three Decades of Research. *International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation* (online first).
- Ng, H.Y., Tronnes, P.C. and Wong, L. 2018. Audit seasonality and pricing of audit services: Theory and evidence from a meta-analysis. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 40, 16-28.
- Pott, C., Mock, T.J. and Watrin, C. 2009. Review of empirical research on rotation and non-audit services: auditor independence in fact vs. appearance. *Journal für Betriebswirtschaft*, 58, 209-239.
- Power, M.K. and Gendron, Y. 2015. Qualitative Research in Auditing. *Auditing* 34: 147-165.
- Prasad, P. and Chand, P. 2017. The Changing Face of the Auditor's Report: Implications for Suppliers and Users of Financial Statements. *Australian Accounting Review*, 83, 348-367.

- Ratzinger-Sakel, N., Audoussert-Coulier, S., Kettunen, J. and Lesage, C. 2012. What do we know about Joint Audit? Working paper.
- Ratzinger-Sakel, N. and Schönberger, M.W. 2015. Restricting Non-Audit Services in Europe. The Potential (Lack of) Impact of a Blacklist and a Fee Cap on Auditor Independence and Audit Quality. *Accounting in Europe*, 12, 61-86.
- Schneider, A., Church, B.K. and Ely, K.M. 2006. Non-Audit Services and Auditor Independence: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 25, 169-211.
- Simnett, R., Carson, E. and Vanstraelen, A. 2016. International Archival Auditing and Assurance Research. Trends, Methodological Issues and Opportunities. *Auditing* 35, 1-32.
- Sun, S., Seufert, J.H. and Smith, M.W. 2015. Epitomising the Audit Expectation Gap Framework. Synthesis and Standardisation. Working Paper.
- Tepalagul, N. and Lin, L. 2015. Auditor Independence and Audit Quality: A Literature Review. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance*, 30, 101-121.
- Trotman, K.T., Bauer, T.D. and Humphreys, K.A. 2015. Group judgment and decision making in auditing: Past and future research. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 47, 56-72.
- Velte, P. 2010. Opinion Shopping. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 70, 463-468.
- Velte, P. 2017. What do we know about empirical joint audit research? A Literature Review. *Accounting and Financial Control*, 1, 4-14.
- Velte, P. 2018. What do we know about meta-analyses in accounting, auditing, and corporate governance? *Meditari Accountancy Research* (forthcoming).
- Velte, P. and Freidank, C.-C. (2015). The link between in- and external rotation of the auditor and the quality of financial accounting and external audit. *European Journal of Law and Economics* 40: 225-246.
- Velte, P. and Loy, T. 2018. The impact of auditor rotation, audit firm rotation and non audit services on earnings quality, audit quality and investor perceptions. A literature review. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, 7, 74-90.
- Velte, P. and Stiglbauer, M. 2012. Audit Market Concentration and Its Influence on Audit Quality. *International Business Research*, 5, 146-161.
- Wagenhofer, A. and Ewert, R. 2015. *Externe Unternehmensrechnung*, 3. ed.

Behavioral Audit:

- Gramling, A.A., Johnstone, K.M., and Mayhew, B.W. 2015. Behavioral research in auditing: Past, present and future research. *Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research*, 4, 47-75.
- Knechel, W.R. 2000. Behavioral Research in Auditing and Its Impact on Audit Education. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 15, 695-712.
- Libby, R., Rennekamp, K.M. and Seybert, N. 2015. Regulation and the independent roles of managers, auditors, and directors in earnings management and accounting choice. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 47, 25-42.
- Messier, W.F., Simon, C.A., and Smith, J.L. 2013. Two Decades of Behavioral Research on Analytical Procedures: What have we learned? *Auditing*, 32, 139-181.
- Simnett, R. and Trotman, K. 2018. Twenty-five year overview of Experimental Auditing Research: Trends and Links to Audit Quality. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 30, 55-76.
- Shanteau, J. 1989. Cognitive heuristics and biases in behavioral auditing: Review, Comments and Observations. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 14, 165-177.

Sustainability Audit/Assurance:

- Abernarthy, J., Stefaniak, C., Willkins, A. and Olson, J. 2017. Literature review and research opportunities on credibility of corporate social responsibility reporting. *American Journal of Business*, 32, 24-41.
- Cohen, J.R. and Simnett, R. 2015. CSR and Assurance Services: A Research Agenda. *Auditing*, 34, 59-74.

- Farooq, M.B. and de Villiers, C. 2017. The market for sustainability assurance services: A comprehensive literature review and future avenues for research. *Pacific Accounting Review*, 29, 79-106.
- Huang, X.B. and Watson, L. 2015. Corporate social responsibility research in accounting. *Journal of Accounting, Literature*, 34, 1-16.
- Velte, P. and Stawinoga, M. 2017. Empirical research on corporate social responsibility assurance (CSRA): a literature review. *Journal of Business Economics*, 87, 1017-1066.

MANAGEMENT

- Daft, R.L. and Benson, A. 2016. *Management*.