Published: 2016-06-11

Accounting Regulation Enforcement and Corporate Compliance Incentives

Leah Morris

Leo Stewart

Lillian Adams

Abstract

This research investigates the underexplored relationship between the qualitative dimensions of accounting regulation enforcement and the formation of corporate compliance incentives, moving beyond traditional economic deterrence models. While prior literature predominantly focuses on penalty severity and detection probability, this study introduces a novel framework that integrates institutional legitimacy, procedural fairness, and regulatory signaling as primary drivers of voluntary compliance. We propose that corporations respond not merely to coercive threats but to the perceived legitimacy of regulatory institutions and the fairness of enforcement processes. Through a mixed-methods approach combining archival analysis of enforcement actions from 1995 to 2004 and a unique survey of chief financial officers, we examine how variations in enforcement transparency, consistency, and communicative practices influence internal compliance investments and ethical climate. Our findings reveal that firms are significantly more likely to develop robust, proactive compliance programs when regulators employ transparent, dialogic enforcement strategies that emphasize corrective guidance over punitive sanctions. Conversely, opaque and inconsistently applied enforcement, even when backed by severe penalties, correlates with minimal, reactive compliance efforts aimed solely at avoiding detection. The study further identifies a "compliance threshold" effect, whereby beyond a baseline level of deterrence, enhancements in procedural fairness yield greater marginal increases in compliance quality than equivalent increases in penalty severity. These results challenge the prevailing enforcement paradigm in accounting regulation and suggest that regulatory agencies can amplify their effectiveness by strategically cultivating legitimacy and fairness. The paper contributes to accounting, regulatory theory, and organizational behavior by providing a more nuanced, socio-institutional model of compliance motivation, with direct implications for the design of enforcement regimes and corporate governance practices.

Keywords: accounting regulation, enforcement, compliance incentives, procedural fairness, institutional legitimacy, regulatory signaling

1 Introduction

The enforcement of accounting regulations represents a critical mechanism for ensuring the integrity of financial markets and protecting stakeholder interests. Traditional economic models of regulatory compliance, rooted in Becker's seminal work on crime and punishment, posit that firms comply primarily due to the calculus of expected costs, weighing the probability of detection against the severity of potential sanctions. Within accounting literature, this perspective has dominated, leading to an enforcement focus on increasing audit scrutiny and escalating monetary penalties. However, a persistent puzzle remains: despite significant enhancements in detection capabilities and sanction severity following major accounting scandals of the late 1990s and early 2000s, compliance outcomes exhibit considerable variance, and instances of significant non-compliance persist. This suggests that the deterrence model provides an incomplete explanation of corporate behavior.

This paper argues that a fundamental limitation of the prevailing approach is its neglect of the qualitative character of enforcement interactions. We contend that corporations are not merely amoral calculators but complex social entities embedded within institutional environments. Their decision to invest in genuine compliance—moving beyond mere technical adherence to embrace the underlying principles of transparency and accountability—is shaped profoundly by their perceptions of the regulatory authority itself. Specifically, we introduce a novel theoretical framework that positions institutional legitimacy and procedural fairness as central, yet largely overlooked, determinants of compliance incentives in the accounting domain.

Our research questions are deliberately formulated to explore this unconventional terrain. First, how do variations in the perceived procedural fairness of accounting regulators (e.g., the Securities and Exchange Commission) influence the quality and proactivity of corporate compliance programs? Second, to what extent does the perceived legitimacy of the regulatory institution moderate the relationship between traditional deterrence factors (penalties, detection risk) and compliance behavior? Third, what specific enforcement practices (e.g., transparency of processes, consistency of application, nature of regulatory communication) are most predictive of fostering an internal corporate ethical climate conducive to voluntary compliance? By addressing these questions, we seek to shift the scholarly and policy discourse from a narrow focus on "sticks" to a broader understanding of how the enforcement process itself can cultivate a culture of compliance.

The contribution of this work is threefold. Theoretically, it synthesizes insights from institutional theory, organizational justice, and regulatory studies to construct a more holistic model of compliance motivation applicable to the technical and high-stakes realm of accounting. Empirically, it employs a novel mixed-methods design to capture both objective enforcement characteristics and subjective managerial perceptions, offering a richer evidence base than prior studies reliant solely on archival data. Practically, it provides actionable guidance for regulatory agencies on designing enforcement strategies that are not only effective but also efficiency-enhancing, potentially reducing the need for resource-intensive monitoring and litigation by fostering cooperative relationships with regulated entities.

2 Methodology

To investigate our research questions, we employed a sequential mixed-methods design, recognizing the need to capture both the objective attributes of enforcement actions and the subjective interpretations of those subject to regulation. This approach allows for triangulation, strengthening the validity of our findings by overcoming the limitations inherent in any single methodological tradition.

The first phase involved a comprehensive archival analysis of publicly disclosed accounting and auditing enforcement releases (AAERs) issued by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission between January 1995 and December 2004. This decade-long window captures a period of significant regulatory evolution, culminating in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. We constructed a unique dataset of 320 enforcement actions. For each action, we coded not only standard variables such as firm size, penalty amount, and violation type but also novel qualitative dimensions of the enforcement process. These included: (1) *Procedural Transparency*: the clarity and public accessibility of the SEC's investigative process and rationale for the final action; (2) *Consistency*: the alignment of the sanction with precedents for similar violations; (3) *Communicative Approach*: whether the agency's public statements and orders emphasized punitive, deterrent messaging or corrective, guidance-oriented messaging; and (4) *Remedial Focus*: the degree to which the settlement required the firm to implement specific, forward-looking compliance improvements versus solely paying a penalty. Coding was performed independently by two researchers, with inter-coder reliability exceeding 90% for all qualitative dimensions.

The second phase consisted of an original survey instrument administered to a sample of 450 Chief Financial Officers (CFOs) and heads of internal audit at U.S. publicly traded companies in 2004. The survey was designed to elicit perceptions of the SEC's enforcement regime. Key constructs measured using multi-item, Likert-type scales included: *Perceived Procedural Fairness* (e.g., "The SEC applies its rules consistently across firms"), *Institutional Legitimacy* (e.g., "The SEC's authority to regulate accounting is proper and justified"), *Perceived Detection Probability*, and *Perceived Sanction Severity*. Crucially, the survey also measured dependent variables related to compliance incentives: *Compliance Program Investment* (percentage of budget, staffing levels), *Compliance Proactivity* (emphasis on prevention vs. detection, frequency of internal ethics training), and *Ethical Climate* (perceived tone at the top regarding financial reporting). The survey achieved a response rate of 38%, yielding 171 usable responses. We conducted tests for non-response bias and found no significant differences between early and late respondents on key firm characteristics.

The final analytical phase integrated the two datasets. For firms that were subjects of an AAER in our archival sample, we matched the objective enforcement characteristics with the perceptual survey data from comparable firms (matched by size and industry) that had not recently been subject to enforcement. This allowed us to model the relationship between objective enforcement attributes, managerial perceptions, and reported compliance behaviors. We employed multivariate regression analysis and structural equation modeling to test our hypotheses, controlling for firm size, industry, profitability, and leverage.

3 Results

The analysis yielded findings that substantially challenge the primacy of the traditional deterrence model in accounting regulation. Our results present a compelling case for the significant, and often superior, role of socio-institutional factors in shaping corporate compliance incentives.

First, the archival analysis revealed substantial variation in the qualitative dimensions of SEC enforcement actions over the study period. While penalty amounts generally increased post-2002, the consistency of their application and the transparency of the process showed high variance. A significant subset of actions (approximately 30%) were characterized by what we coded as "dialogic" enforcement—public documents that detailed not just the violation but also the SEC's engagement with the firm to understand root causes and that prescribed specific, tailored remedial measures. Another subset (approximately 25%) exhibited "opaque-punitive" characteristics, with high penalties but limited public explanation or remedial focus.

Second, and most critically, the survey and integrated analysis demonstrated a strong, statistically significant relationship between perceptions of procedural fairness/legitimacy and compliance outcomes. Firms whose CFOs perceived the SEC as higher in procedural fairness and legitimacy reported allocating 15-20% more resources to their compliance and internal audit functions, holding firm size constant. These firms were also 40% more likely to describe their compliance approach as "proactive and values-based" rather than "reactive and rule-based." The perceived probability of detection and severity of sanctions, while statistically significant predictors, had a markedly smaller effect size on compliance investment and a non-significant effect on the proactivity measure.

Third, the integrated modeling uncovered the hypothesized "compliance threshold" effect. The relationship between penalty severity and compliance investment was positive but exhibited strongly diminishing returns. Beyond a moderate level of perceived sanction severity, further increases did not correlate with meaningful improvements in compliance quality. In contrast, the relationship between procedural fairness and compliance proactivity was linear and showed no such plateau within the observed range. This suggests that for firms already facing a credible threat of meaningful sanctions, enhancements to the fairness and legitimacy of the regulatory process are more potent tools for encouraging genuine, internalized compliance than simply ratcheting up penalties.

Fourth, the analysis of matched pairs provided nuanced insights. Firms that had been subject to a "dialogic" enforcement action subsequently reported higher perceptions of SEC fairness and, in turn, greater compliance investment than matched control firms. Conversely, firms subject to "opaque-punitive" actions reported lower perceptions of fairness and showed no significant increase in compliance investment compared to controls, despite having incurred substantial direct costs. This indicates that the manner of enforcement can either repair or damage the regulatory relationship, with long-lasting effects on compliance attitudes.

Finally, the structural equation model confirmed that institutional legitimacy acts as a key mediator. The effect of objective enforcement characteristics (like consistency and transparency) on compliance behavior was largely indirect, flowing through their impact on the perceived legitimacy of the regulator. A legitimate regulator's rules and guidance are more likely to be internalized as morally obligatory, reducing the need for constant coercive surveillance.

4 Conclusion

This study has ventured beyond the conventional economic framework to explore the socio-institutional underpinnings of compliance in accounting regulation. Our findings robustly demonstrate that the quality of corporate compliance is not solely, or even primarily, a function of coercive deterrence. Instead, it is significantly influenced by the perceived fairness and legitimacy of the regulatory enforcement process. Corporations are more inclined to invest in sincere, principled compliance when they view the regulator as a legitimate authority that exercises its power consistently, transparently, and with a focus on correction rather than mere punishment.

The originality of this contribution lies in its application of institutional and procedural justice theories to the specific, technical domain of accounting enforcement—a context often assumed to be dominated by cold economic calculus. By showing that even in this high-stakes arena, social and perceptual factors powerfully shape behavior, we challenge regulators to reconsider their strategic toolkit. The pursuit of ever-larger fines and more intrusive audits, while perhaps necessary, may be a suboptimal strategy if it comes at the cost of perceived arbitrariness or opacity, which our evidence suggests can erode legitimacy and foster cynical, minimalistic compliance.

These insights have direct implications for policy and practice. Regulatory agencies like the SEC should consider codifying principles of procedural fairness into their enforcement manuals, emphasizing consistent application of rules, transparent communication of enforcement rationales, and the use of settlements as opportunities to mandate and monitor improved internal controls. Training for enforcement staff should include modules on the long-term behavioral impact of different enforcement styles. For corporate boards and audit committees, the findings underscore that a strong ethical climate and a proactive compliance program are not just moral imperatives but strategic responses to a regulatory environment where legitimacy matters. Firms that cultivate such an environment may experience more cooperative and less adversarial interactions with regulators.

Limitations of the present study include its focus on a single national regulator (the SEC) and its reliance on self-reported survey data for behavioral measures, though the archival component mitigates this concern. Future research could extend this framework to international regulatory contexts, examine the role of industry self-regulatory bodies, or employ longitudinal designs to track changes in perceptions and behavior within firms following specific enforcement events. Furthermore, experimental methods could be used to isolate the causal impact of specific enforcement communication strategies.

In conclusion, effective accounting regulation requires more than just formidable enforcement powers; it requires wise and legitimate wielding of those powers. By integrating the "stick" of deterrence with the "carrot" of perceived fairness, regulators can more effectively incentivize the corporate sector to become a genuine partner in upholding the integrity of financial reporting, ultimately creating a more robust and trustworthy market system for all stakeholders.

References

.25in1 Ayres, I., & Braithwaite, J. (1992). *Responsive regulation: Transcending the deregulation debate*. Oxford University Press.

Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and punishment: An economic approach. *Journal of Political Economy, 76*(2), 169–217.

Braithwaite, J. (2002). Rules and principles: A theory of legal certainty. *Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy, 27*, 47–82.

Heimer, C. A. (1999). Competing institutions: Law, medicine, and family in neonatal intensive care. *Law & Society Review, 33*(1), 17–66.

Kagan, R. A., & Scholz, J. T. (1984). The "criminology of the corporation" and regulatory enforcement strategies. In K. Hawkins & J. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Enforcing regulation* (pp. 67–95). Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice.* Plenum Press.

Parker, C. (2002). *The open corporation: Effective self-regulation and democracy.* Cambridge University Press.

Scholz, J. T. (1984). Cooperation, deterrence, and the ecology of regulatory enforcement. *Law & Society Review, 18*(2), 179–224.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610.

Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law.* Yale University Press.