ERRATUM

The publisher, American Accounting Association, regrets an error in “Malleable Standards of Care Required by Jurors When Assessing Auditor Negligence” by Eldar M. Maksymov and Mark W. Nelson in the January 2017 issue (Volume 92, Number 1, pp. 165–181; doi: 10.2308/accr-51427) of The Accounting Review. Some text in Figure 2, Panel B was inadvertently omitted. The correct Figure 2, Panel B appears below.

The online version of the article has been corrected. The error only exists in the printed version.

FIGURE 2
Mediation Path Analyses for Experiment 1

Panel A: Mediation Path Analysis for Late SOC Assessment Conditions (Jurors Knew Audit Quality at the Time They Assessed SOC)

Bootstrap mediation test—significant at 99 percent confidence level.

Panel B: Mediation Path Analysis for Early SOC Assessment Conditions (Jurors Did Not Know Audit Quality at the Time They Assessed SOC)

*Path C represents the effect of audit quality on negligence judgments, and Path C’ represents the incremental effect of audit quality on negligence judgments after accounting for the effect of standard of care.

This figure presents path analyses for Experiment 1, with audit quality as the predictor (varying the number of sites tested by auditors), standard of care (SOC) as mediator (the smallest number of sites auditors should test), and yes/no negligence verdicts as the response variable. Figure 2, Panel A (B) includes the 63 (62) observations from the condition where participants knew (did not know) the level of audit quality at the time they assessed SOC. Path analyses, including the bootstrap mediation, are performed by using the “process” macro for SPSS (model 4) downloaded from Andrew Hayes’ website (see: http://afhayes.com/spss-sas-and-mplus-macros-and-code.html) and described in Hayes (2013).