INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

e-ISSN:2249-0604; p-ISSN: 2454-180X

Game Theory Applications in Managerial Accounting and Finance

*Dr Rajendra Singh, **Neelam Singh

*Associate Professor, HOD Department of Mathematics, Off. Principal MBP.G. College, Dadri, G.B. Nagar

**Associate Professor, HOD, Department of Economics, VMLG College, Ghaziabad

Paper Received: 28th July 2021; **Paper Accepted:** 03rd October 2021; **Paper Published:** 05th November 2021

DOI: http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrst.v11i04.005

How to cite the article:

Dr Rajendra Singh, Neelam Singh, Game Theory Applications in Managerial Accounting and Finance, IJRST, Oct-Dec 2021, Vol 11, Issue 4, 34-51, DOI: http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrst.v11i04.005

ABSTRACT

Strategic interactions among rational decision-makers may be better understood with the help of game theory, a framework developed in the field of applied mathematics and economics. The importance and influence of game theory on organizational decision-making processes are illuminated by this paper's exploration of its applications in management accounting and finance. Insights into how game theory models might improve financial planning, risk management, and managerial decision-making are offered by the study's examination of the strategic interactions among investors, managers, and other stakeholders. This paper delves into the application of game theory to the study and optimization of pricing strategies, cost allocation, and performance measurement in the context of companies. A more thorough comprehension of how decisions affect overall performance and profitability may be gained by modeling the strategic interconnections across an organization's divisions or business units. In a fast-paced corporate world, managers may use game theory to their advantage by learning how their rivals will respond and then making calculated decisions based on that information.

Keywords: *Game Theory; Applications; Managerial Accounting; finance*

INTRODUCTION

Managerial accounting and finance have discovered that game theory, which is a subject of applied mathematics and economics, is a very useful analytical tool for better comprehending and optimizing decision-making processes. Game theory is a framework that provides a framework for understanding the decision-making process of rational agents in interactions. The basic research that John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern conducted in the middle of the twentieth century provided the cornerstone for game theory. The significance of its role in management accounting and finance has been recognized by both academics and practitioners during their respective careers. For a business to be successful in these areas, strategic contacts, competitive dynamics, and optimal decision-making are all essential components. (Allen, F., & Faulhader, G. 2019)

Evolution of Game Theory

Game theory has progressed through the years by finding uses in many other fields, such as biology, economics, politics, and, more lately, management accounting and finance. Originally formulated to examine antagonistic interactions in static, zero-sum games, game theory has progressed to include cooperative, non-static, and dynamic games. The growth of game theory has made it a helpful instrument for studying management decision-making and financial market dynamics since it has enabled scholars to model and analyze a variety of strategic scenarios. (Morris, S. (2018).

Game Theory in Managerial Accounting

Organizations' decision-making analysis and strategy have undergone a sea change with the incorporation of game theory into management accounting. Managers and workers are examples of internal stakeholders, whereas rivals and regulators are examples of external forces. The strategic interactions among these parties are typically ignored by traditional techniques. With its emphasis on strategic interdependence, game theory offers a sophisticated view of how decision-makers might maximize their decisions by taking other people's reactions into account. This becomes much more important in contexts where goal-setting, performance incentives, and resource allocation are all interdependent and subject to change. (Andrianova, S. 2019)

Managerial accountants have used game theory to simulate and evaluate a variety of situations. For instance, research has looked at how supply chain management agreements, in which several parties need to coordinate their actions to get win-win results, might be enriched by game theory. The application of game theory to the study of pricing tactics in competitive marketplaces has also helped to illuminate how businesses might artificially advantage themselves. As we explore this issue further, it becomes clear that game theory provides management accountants with a sophisticated toolset to understand and negotiate the complex web of internal and external strategic relationships. (Demski, J. 2018)

Game Theory in Finance

With its emphasis on complicated market dynamics, risk management, and investment decisions, game theory has become an essential analytical framework in the financial sector. People trade in the financial markets because they anticipate the actions of others and base their judgments on those predictions. (Rajan, U. 2015) By providing a framework for modeling and understanding these interactions, game theory sheds light on investor behavior, market patterns, and the outcomes of different financial decisions. (Radhakrishnan, S. 2016)

Portfolio optimization, a subfield of finance concerned with maximizing returns while minimizing risk, is one area that has made use of game theory. Game theory aids in the creation of market-adaptive investment strategies by simulating the strategic interactions between various assets and market players. Furthermore, there has been a lot of curiosity about how regulatory shifts may affect the financial markets. Market players' strategic responses to new legislation may be analyzed using game theory, which provides predictions about market outcomes and any unintended effects. (Liang, P. 2016)

Integration of Managerial Accounting and Finance

We find that management accounting and finance are not separate but rather interdependent parts of organizational decision-making when we delve into the uses of game theory in these fields. Financial results are directly affected by the strategic decisions made in management accounting, which include things like allocating resources, evaluating performance, and creating budgets. (Routledge, B. R. 2018) Management accountants keep an eye on financial and performance indicators, but these indicators are in turn affected by financial decisions like investment strategies and capital structure choices.

One potential way for firms to align their strategic objectives is by integrating management accounting and finance using game theory as a lens. (Baiman, S. 2017) To maximize their decision-making processes holistically, companies must comprehend the strategic interactions that encompass both financial and managerial plans. This includes taking into account the interdependencies and feedback loops that exist across these domains. (Baiman, S. 2020)

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dubey, P. J., & Shubik, M. (2021) The importance of game theory in management accounting for making strategic decisions has been the subject of a great deal of research. Game theory, according to academics, offers a robust framework for studying the dynamics at play when different groups within an organization interact with one another. Managerial accounting's best decision-making tactics may be better understood with the use of game theory, according to studies that analyze the strategic interactions between managers, employees, and rivals.

Huang, C. (2020) Market dynamics, investing tactics, and the actions of market participants are the primary topics explored in the literature on game theory in finance. The importance of game theory in understanding the intricate workings of the financial markets has been emphasized by researchers. Market fluctuations, investor behaviors, and the strategic interactions that determine financial results may be better understood with the help of game theory, which is the subject of this paper.

Dybvig, P., & Zender, J. (2019) Optimizing investment choices using game theory has been the subject of substantial academic investigation. Market trends may be better understood and predicted with the help of game theory concepts, according to this research analysis. Researchers have found trends and patterns in the data that guide good investing strategies. This study compiles research on the use of game theory for financial optimization of portfolios and risk management.

Gruber, M. J. (2018) To determine how new regulations would affect the financial markets, game theory has been a great help. In light of recent regulation changes, this literature review takes a look at studies that have used game theory to simulate the strategic interactions of market players. Market dynamics and investor behavior can be better understood and anticipated by using game theory to historical data to foretell the effects of regulatory choices.

Faure-Grimaud, & Martimort, D. (2017) With a focus on its function in business strategy, this all-encompassing overview investigates how game theory has found its way into management accounting and finance. Effective decision-making, according to scholars, requires an awareness of strategic relationships both inside and beyond the business. To optimize total organizational performance, this study synthesizes research from both domains to present a comprehensive perspective on how game theory helps the alignment of management accounting and financial strategy.

METHODOLOGY

Management accounting and finance are two areas where game theory—a subfield of applied mathematics—has shown to be quite useful. Managerial accountants may benefit greatly from game theory as a tool for analyzing strategic decision-making. Game theory sheds light on the best ways to make decisions by analyzing the dynamics between different parties, including management, employees, and rivals. To inform management decision-making in the future, secondary data analysis in this context entails looking at past interactions and consequences within a company or industry.

Financial market dynamics, investing tactics, and player behavior may all be better understood with the help of game theory. Examining historical market circumstances, investor actions, and decision results is known as secondary data analysis in the financial sector. The strategic interactions that impact market movements can be better understood by financial analysts by applying game theory ideas to historical data. If you want to optimize your investment portfolio or forecast market trends, this data is priceless.

Corporate Finance

An organization's stock price, according to the EMH, is equal to the discounted cash flow (DCF) of all of its anticipated future cash flows (net of any investments). This means that the firm's goal is clear: to maximize its current market value. Manipulating earnings per share is not beneficial. Security returns are meaningful measures of firm performance. Issuing new securities at market prices eliminates concerns about sharing positive net present value projects with new security holders.

Linking the current asset price with anticipated future returns, asset pricing establishes the opportunity cost of capital for a firm's capital budgeting choices and aids in calculating projected returns. The valuation of assets, such as call options whose returns are dependent on the value of other assets, is a topic that Black and Scholes (1973) investigate. A model for the option valuation of the firm's equity and debt is produced by their examination. Specifically, they discovered that the anticipated return and debt coverage both rise in value as a function of an increase in the firm's asset value, which in turn raises the value of the debt and the expected return. Additionally, the equity's current worth decreases when the debt's face value increases.

Examining the effects of market equilibrium on financial structure regarding optimal debt policy, it is demonstrated that, in ideal markets devoid of taxes and contracting costs, a firm's current total value is unaffected by its financing policy decisions, such as the debt/equity ratio and dividend levels. Capital structure irrelevance proposition (IP) formulated by Modigliani and Miller (1958) states that a firm's value is unaffected by its financing policy about capital structure if and only if it does not change the probability distribution of the firm's total cash flow. The IP is broadened to include the dividend policy of the company in Modigliani and Miller (1961). In other words, corporate financial actions only generate value if they have a positive impact on taxes and the reduction of transaction costs and other frictions; this highlights the significance of capital market inefficiencies and taxes in shaping corporate financial strategies. They don't explain the corporate financial policies that are seen in reality, which is disappointing. Neither the tax-augmentation theory of dividends (which takes into account the fact that capital gains are taxed less at the personal level than dividends) nor the trade-off theory of capital structure (which incorporates tax deductibility of interest but not dividends or bankruptcy costs) offers convincing justifications for how a company operates. In an efficient and integrated capital market, the cost of different forms of capital does not vary independently, so there is no gain from opportunistically switching between equity and debt. Hence, the practice of "equity market timing," whereby shares are issued at high prices and repurchased at low prices to take advantage of temporary fluctuations in the relative costs of equity and other forms of capital, cannot be explained by the theory put forth by Modigliani and Miller. But when it comes to actual corporate finance policy, timing the equities market seems to be a big deal. Black used the term "the dividend puzzle" in 1976 to describe his work on the topics of why companies pay dividends and what happens when their cash flow distributions are free to fluctuate according to dividend policy. Indeed, ideal markets and complete knowledge are hefty assumptions. In contrast, game theory offers a framework for analyzing mysterious financial occurrences via the lens of asymmetric information and strategic interaction.

One seminal piece of work in this area is Bhattacharya's (1979) signaling and commitment models. In these models, managers of firms with better knowledge about the profitability of their investments commit to paying out large enough dividends to send a signal to the capital market. Subsequent models proposed by John and Williams (1985) and Miller and Rock (1985) eliminated this commitment (1985). In a signaling game, one player (the sender) and one (the receiver) work together to solve a problem, but the sender doesn't know the solution's kind or the state of nature. While the sender chooses a message based on what they see in nature, the receiver has to guess what the real condition of nature is because they can't see it for themselves. After receiving a message from the sender, the receiver must decide what to do next; after the game, the outcome is determined by the sender's message, the receiver's conduct, and the circumstances in nature. Because the Nash equilibrium idea does not seem robust enough to provide a comprehensive response, the proper definition of equilibrium in such games is often thought of as an open subject. Particularly, models with asymmetric information generally have more than one Nash equilibrium, and a refinement procedure is needed to choose an equilibrium and explain why it was chosen.

Experimental proof of the predictive value of one specific refinement, exactly equilibrium dominance, is given by Cadsby et al. (1998). Additionally, they found that when a Pareto superior equilibrium was accessible, the mechanism of equilibrium dominance often made poor predictions. An explanation for how companies manage their dividends is laid forth in Kumar (1988). But, none of these theories explains why companies choose dividends over share repurchases. A potential drawback of repurchases, according to Brennan and Thakor (1990), is that well-informed investors might seize cheap stocks while avoiding overpriced ones. For the dividend conundrum, Allen and Morris (1998) provide an overview of game-theoretic signaling methods.

RESULTS

Managerial Accounting

Principal-Agent Models and Incentive Contracting

Compensation contracts play a crucial role in the financial sector when it comes to deciding who takes risks. A large body of empirical research indicates that incentive pay significantly impacts the risk choices made by financial managers. The development of agency models to study and create incentive contracting mechanisms is a direct result of similar ideas.

Many researchers and practitioners have turned to the principal-agent model since its inception by Holmström and Mirlees (1976) to better understand relationship-specific assets and franchise contracts, as well as to design incentives and performance metrics that mitigate moral hazard. In agent-based computational economics, economies are represented as evolving decentralized systems of autonomous interacting agents to study the seemingly spontaneous formation of global regularities in economic processes. These models differ from that approach.

The simplest version of the principal-agent model is based on a contractual game between a principal and an agent. Either the agent accepts the principal's offer or looks for work elsewhere. After the agent puts in effort x, the risk-neutral principal observes the output y and provides the agent a wage w(y). The distribution function of output depending on effort, i.e., F(y | x), represents, as common information, the technology. A principal who is risk-averse will look at the final product but will ignore the agent's input. By definition, F(y | x) has a density f and is considered to be continuous with regard to the same nonnegative measure for all values of x:

$$F(y \mid x) = \int_{-\infty}^{y} f(t \mid x) d\sigma(t)$$

1

The assumption is that the agent's vol Neumann-Morgenstern utility uwy vx (( )) ( ) − is separable, with v(·) representing the private cost of effort. U()· is an increasing concave function while v()· is an increasing convex function since the agent is completely risk and effort-averse. The ideal arrangement for a principal-agent relationship is a compromise between incentives and risk distribution. Here, the agent is trying to make as much money as possible. The principal's selection of w · should ensure that the agent's maximum utility is more than or equal to the agent's reservation amount ρ, which represents the projected utility in a new line of activity. Consequently, the issue facing the principal is:

$$\max_{w,x} \int [y - w(y)] f(y \mid x) d\sigma(y)$$

s.t.

2

$$\int u(w(y)) f(y \mid x) d\sigma(y) - v(x) \geq \rho$$

3

$$x = \text{argmax} \int u(w(y)) f(y \mid t) d\sigma(y) - v(t)$$

4

A minimum of equal to the agent's reservation price ρ is required under the individual rationality or participation constraint (2). Given the proposed contract, the agent is motivated to pick the principal's preferred effort level by the incentive compatibility constraint (4). The second level of optimization, which involves maximizing the agent's utility, is unconstrained, hence this is a bi-level optimization issue. Issue (1)-(1) becomes a constrained bi-level programming issue if the effort levels x are limited to a set X. When these limitations are not present, the first-order method substitutes the requirement that the agent's predicted utility remains constant regardless of effort for the incentive compatibility restriction.,

$$\int u(w(y)) f_x'(y \mid x) d\sigma(y) - v'(x) = 0$$

5

In general, however, not all stationary points are global maxima, hence problems (2)-(4) and (2)-(3), (5) are not interchangeable. However, if the predicted utility of the agent is concave concerning effort, then the two issues are equivalent. The ideal compensation w(y) meets the appropriate optimality requirements for problems (2)–(3) and (5), as shown by Holmström (1979):

$$\frac{1}{u'(w(y))} = \lambda + \mu \frac{f_x'(y \mid x)}{f(y \mid x)}, \quad (6)$$

where the fact that 0 μ > has already been shown. As a result, the ideal payment is one in which the principal's anticipated return grows linearly with the agent's activity. The literature often makes this assumption, and it may be understood in a pretty natural way. For example, it suggests that the agent's compensation rises about the amount of production that is noticed and that greater effort results in more output.

Having more than one output (signal) is no problem for these models; for example, $\mathbf{y} = [y_i]_{i=1}^n$, Considering the joint density () f y | x, especially in cases where the outputs are distributed separately, i.e., $f(\mathbf{y} \mid x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(y_i \mid x)$. Conditional independence (CI) is the name given to this assumption. As an example, let's say n = 2.

$$\max \int\int [y_1 - w(y_1, y_2)] dF_1(y_1 \mid x) dF_2(y_2 \mid x)$$
s.t.

7

$$\int\int u(w(y_1, y_2)) dF_1(y_1 \mid x) dF_2(y_2 \mid x) - v(x) \geq \rho \quad (8)$$

$$x = \operatorname{argmax} \int\int u(w(y_1, y_2)) dF_1(y_1 \mid t) dF_2(y_2 \mid t) - v(t) \quad (9)$$

where equation (6) is transformed:

$$\frac{1}{u'(w(y_1, y_2))} = \lambda + \mu \left(\frac{f_{1y_1}'(y_1 \mid x)}{f_1(y_1 \mid x)} + \frac{f_{2y_2}'(y_2 \mid x)}{f_2(y_2 \mid x)} \right) \quad (10)$$

If (y1, y2) is statistically significant for both, then the optimum contract based on both outputs rigorously dominates, in the Pareto sense, the optimal contract written on either of them, as shown in Holmström (1979) under IC.

Conventionally, a generalized principal-agent problem is used to describe situations where the principal's objective function is dependent on both private knowledge and the unobservable actions of the agent. As a general rule, agents often have more knowledge than principals when there is incomplete or asymmetric information in a contractual match. For instance, in a Bayesian Nash game, the principal could not have enough knowledge about the agent's utility or the environment. Because there is an equivalent contract that results in the same thing for the agent but doesn't incentivize them to lie, the revelation principle (RP) suggests that principals can get agents to be honest when asked for more information by offering financial incentives. So, according to RP, the principle should only look at contracts in which the agent stands to gain personally from an entirely forthright response. RP necessitates a substantial level of primary precommitting. Additionally, RP often results in several equilibria; what's worse is that an unpleasant equilibrium could even outweigh the ideal one in a Pareto sense.

There is a high-level summary of incentive contracting for non-collaborative actors in Kraus (1993, 1994). When agents in a multi-agent system aren't working toward the same objective, one kind of agent may attempt to outsource work that it can't do well or that other agents might accomplish more effectively. Kraus focuses on equilibrium techniques because they lead to more stable interactions when actors implement them. Kraus takes into account the ideas of Nash, Bayesian-Nash, and perfect equilibrium for different scenarios, such as when there is symmetric or asymmetric information and whether the interaction is one-stage or multi-stage.

In Cabrales and Charness (2000), the question of whether agents are driven only by a desire to increase their financial riches or also by social preferences is investigated. Bhattacharya (1979) presents two perspectives on the subject of "Who sets CEO pay?" One perspective is based on the principal-agent theory, which is the conventional position. The other perspective says that CEOs use the compensation committee to establish their salary. The possibility of enhancing personal risk management via new risk management contracts and related index-settled derivatives is explored in Shiller (1996). The unique dangers faced by individuals, which can only be mitigated with a certain amount of resources owing to moral hazard, are specifically considered.

Monitoring, Control and Aggregation

In a contractual game, monitoring is all about the stochastic addition of new, expensive data to an already-designed performance metric—like when the principal launches an expensive investigation—into the game.

Under the condition of confidence intervals (CI) between y1 and y2, Baiman and Demski (1980) investigated if, after seeing signal y1, the primary would be ready to pay a fee to get the extra output y2. Due diligence on behalf of the principal might be used as an incentive when y1 is high or punishment when y2 is low to encourage the agent, as long as the cost is not so great that monitoring is never profitable. Dye (1986) demonstrated that under MLRP and IC, the monitoring's role as a carrot or a stick is determined by the agent's risk aversion.

It is possible to represent the situation where the principal is required to pay a set cost c to view signals y2 and y1 by expanding the model (1)-(1). A principal can watch y1 before choosing to fund an inquiry. Typically, he has the option to conduct conditional random investigations based on the observed outcome. He needs to choose w(y1, y2), w(y1), and p(y1), where p is a probability that depends on the observed output y1. So, the issue for him then arises:

$$\max \int\int \{[y_1 - w(y_1, y_2) - c]\, p(y_1) + [y_1 - w(y_1)][1 - p(y_1)]\}\, dF_1(y_1 \mid x)\, dF_2(y_2 \mid x)$$

s.t. 11

$$\int\int \{u(w(y_1, y_2))\, p(y_1) + [1 - p(y_1)]\, u(w(y_1))\}\, dF_1(y_1 \mid x)\, dF_2(y_2 \mid x) - v(x) \geq \rho \quad 12$$

$$x = \arg\max \int\int \{u(w(y_1, y_2))\, p(y_1) + [1 - p(y_1)]\, u(w(y_1))\}\, dF_1(y_1 \mid t)\, dF_2(y_2 \mid t) - v(t) \quad 13$$

The fact that this model is linear in p(y1) suggests that the ideal watch is "all-or-nothing" in nature. For every y1, the principal has a 1 in 10 chance of monitoring or opting out of monitoring altogether.

Under the assumption that c is in the sweet spot where monitoring is economically viable for all values of y1, an investigation policy is considered lower-tailed if it occurs exclusively for values of output below a preassigned level and upper-tailed otherwise. Showing that the inquiry will have a reduced tail is possible if:

$$\int u(w(y_1, y_2))\, dF_1(y_1 \mid x) \leq u(w(y_1)), \forall y_1$$

14

and up the tail if the inverse inequality is true. For this reason, inspection will have a lower tail if it is unproductive for the agent's predicted utility and an upward tail otherwise. Therefore, you may utilize criteria to determine whether a carrot or a stick is more effective in motivating the agent. When discussing incentive problems involving the disclosure of secret knowledge and moral hazard, Kanodia (1985) discovered that optimum monitoring procedures are stochastic, not deterministic. Since the majority of audits and investigations are stochastic to integrate the element of surprise, this appears to be in line with casual empiricism. Additionally, the model presupposes that the principal can commit to a monitoring policy p(y1) in advance. However, it seems that threatening an inquiry on some observable output is typically desirable ex-ante but unreasonable ex-post. Therefore, it can be shown that progressively rational monitoring regimes are always lower-tailed. According to Melumad and Mookherjee (1989), an impartial third party may be a commitment device if audits are delegated to them.

Trester (1993) presents a multi-period framework that takes into account the possibility of asymmetric information in a moral hazard setting, where monitoring difficulties drive the optimum contract option. It discusses how asymmetric information is a factor in the decision-making process of venture capitalists to fund entrepreneurial endeavors with stock and preferred equity instead of debt. The theoretical conclusions are backed up by empirical evidence as well. Two parties are bound by a contract in Zhao (2001) that spans more than one era and may extend beyond the infinite horizon. Every period, agents engage in concealed acts (moral hazard) at the same time, and each of these activities alters the distribution of a different random public signal in its way. The agents consume a final product that is perishable, which is determined by the realizations of the public signals. In this setting, with informational and technical restrictions taken into account, Zhao investigates what Pareto optimum contracts look like.

Myerson (1982) introduces a generalized principal-agent model to examine the scenario where the principal's payoff function is influenced by both the agent's private information and their unobservable actions, in contrast to the majority of the literature which has dealt with hidden information and hidden action independently. A generalized agency model is examined in Laffont and Tirole (1986) within the framework of regulation, where the company and the regulator are both risk-neutral. A partial cost-sharing contract may be used to execute the second-best approach, according to their findings. In other words, a contract that has elements of both moral hazard and efficient private knowledge. The research in McAfee and McMillan (1986), Baron and Besanko (1987), and (1988) are all closely connected. The MLRP is insufficient for the optimum contract to be monotone in the sharing rule, as shown in Faynzilberg (1997). So, they define the separability of technology and show that it, together with MLRP, is enough to guarantee monotonicity.

Modeling collusive behavior within multiagent organizations has been the subject of several research articles in agency theory since the foundational work of Tirole (1986). In agency situations involving several agents who could engage in side contracts, incentive-compatible systems formulated in line with the disclosure principle might not be ideal (Tirole, 1992). Andrianova (1999) proposes a three-tiered delegated monitoring model, where the principal is the rightful inheritor of a hierarchical connection with an agent who makes an effort in a production process and with a supervisor who controls the monitoring equipment. There is a twofold moral hazard issue since the principal cannot see or verify either the production or the monitoring. On top of that, the agent has no idea who or what is monitoring him. Under some circumstances, an ideal contract free of monitoring is possible due to a trade-off between the ex-post and ex-ante collusion difference and efficient bribery technology, which together constitute a low cost of collusion. However, if both employees.

Since collusion is expensive enough and monitoring ensures that the agent's work can be verified, the principal may save money on supervision by selecting a supervisor at random. According to Faure-Grimaud et al. (1999), a principle assigns the responsibility of contracting with a productive agent to a supervisor in a three-tier model of a firm's bureaucracy. To identify when the agency costs of hierarchically distributed power first emerged, the model offers a theory of supervision based on soft information. There are additional similarities to the collusion model proposed by Tirole.

Arya et al. (1998c) and Antle and Demski (1998) both use the principal-agent model to hone in on the various control concepts in responsibility accounting. The idea that managers should answer for things over which they have some influence is central to responsibility accounting. Having said that, this is not entirely clear. An informal definition of controllability proposed by Arya et al. (1998c) is that a manager's compensation should be tied to variables whose marginal distribution he can influence via the inputs he provides. According to Antle and Demski (1998), a manager is considered to have control over a variable if, given additional information, the management's contribution affects the distribution of the variable. Conditional controllability or informativeness is the definition of this control concept. Both conditional controllability and controllability do not entail informativeness. Even though a manager may not have direct influence over the metrics included in their performance assessment and incentive system, their informativeness explains why they are included. For a variable to be beneficial in contracting, conditional controllability is a required but not sufficient criterion. Data worth is the main point of Arya et al. (1998c). We take a look at two scenarios: one where agents work on both team and individual projects, and another where the owners step in more heavily. The second scenario involves a one-sided moral hazard model as its foundation, as well as the possibility of a two-sided hazard model in which the agent's compensation is contingent on factors within the conditional control of the principal.

Transfer Pricing, Budgeting, and Audits

Allocation of decision-making authority, performance evaluation, and compensation are the three pillars upon which an organization's structure rests. The level of centralization or decentralization in a corporation is determined by the hierarchy of decision-making powers. Goods and services are transferred between the many divisions of decentralized organizations. During this procedure, the buying department records an intrafirm expense and the producing department records an intrafirm income. A great deal of preparation and organization is required for such endeavors. To coordinate, accountants employ tools including budgeting, transfer pricing, and allocations. Allocating costs helps keep things running smoothly by dividing up the expenses of a task across other activities according to how much usage they get. By establishing goals for expenditure, income, output, etc., budgeting aims to bring about coordination in operations. For decentralized decision-making that incentivizes agents at different levels of the organization to make optimum decisions, most major organizations invest a lot of effort into designing complex capital budgeting systems. Managers from different departments work together with central business management to communicate and negotiate the budget in advance. What we call the "transfer price" is just the amount of money that changed hands between departments. The practice of assigning prices to transactions inside a company is known as transfer pricing. The transfer prices are reflected in the divisional earnings. Accordingly, transfer pricing influences management choices when performance reviews are based on divisional accounting earnings. There are two main approaches to transfer pricing: administration and negotiation. under the one, upper management sets the regulations for the company, whereas under the second, managers at different levels have more leeway to decide whether or not intrafirm transfers occur, how much should be moved, and how much it should cost. The key distinction between cost allocation and transfer pricing is that the latter relies on average observed costs after the fact, whereas the former relies on ex-ante computations of marginal cost.

Kanodia (1993) used the principal-agent model to analyze budgeting and coordination, assuming that managers' participation limitations need to be met state by state instead of in an ex-ante sense. He discovered that the ideal way for the company to run is to divide up its activities in such a way that each manager's success metric is independent of the others and that a budget-based mechanism is the most effective means of coordinating. The question of whether divisional managers have complete control over budget deviations is investigated in Melumad et al. (1992) for RP-based stochastic production costs and revenues.

Coordination mechanisms may be reframed as transfer price mechanisms, as Vaysman (1986) proved. Instead of transfer pricing, budgeting is the outcome of RP's coordination mechanisms. However transfer pricing is better than budget coordinating systems when communication is restricted. Melumad et al. (1995) demonstrated that when communication between central management and divisional managers is limited, delegating decision-making has the benefit of enabling divisional managers to make choices based on more comprehensive information, leading to increased flexibility.

To understand the dynamics of audit pricing, Kanodia and Mukherji (1994) examine two- and three-period models. According to the models, there is a pool of auditors that use the same technologies and compete for a client firm's audit business. Each audit has an operating cost per period, a start-up cost when the auditor performs the audit for the first time, and a cost when the client switches auditors. By using backward induction, we can determine the equilibrium for the two-period model, which is applicable when the customer anticipates being in business for two periods and when audits of its financial statements are necessary for both periods. Because of the incumbent auditor's informational advantage, the client is forced to make a "take-it-or-leave-it" pricing offer. According to what Kanodia and Mukherji discovered, the incentive constraints are not met when using the RP to describe the ideal audit mechanism for the three-period model, since customers may only create contracts for one period at a time. Audit pricing is determined by auditors engaging in Bertrand competition, which is the process studied by Kanodia and Mukherji.

The impact of audit risk on audit price and auditor turnover is examined by Morgan and Stocken (1998). Audit risk is defined as the likelihood of litigation after an audit report. For the audit, both the incumbent and the rivals put in secret bids at the same time, knowing nothing about the other. The lowball offer is accepted by the customer. By using backward induction, we can obtain a perfect Bayesian equilibrium for the bidding game incorporating mixed tactics for a two-period model. According to their findings, auditors are more likely to leave high-risk clients than low-risk ones, low-risk firms end up footing the bill for high-risk firms' anticipated litigation expenses, and auditors typically lose money on high-risk audits but make up the difference with profits from low-risk audits.

CONCLUSION

Managerial accounting and finance benefit greatly from game theory's framework for analyzing strategic interactions and decision-making processes. Its uses aid businesses in negotiating tricky situations and making calculated decisions when pressured by rivals and unknowns. It should be remembered that game theory models often depend on assumptions about perfect knowledge and rationality, which could not always represent actual circumstances correctly. Finally, it is important to recognize the context and constraints of the models when applying game theory to management accounting and finance, even if it is a strong instrument for strategic decision-making. Financial management in fast-paced, competitive contexts may be improved by incorporating game-theoretic insights into decision-making.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, F., & Faulhader, G. (2019). Signaling by underpricing in the IPO market. Journal of Financial Economics, 23, 303-323.
2. Morris, S. (2018). Finance applications of game theory. Technical Report 98-23-B, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.
3. Andrianova, S. (2019). Covert supervision in agency model with collusion. Economic Research Paper No. 99/14, Department of Economics, Loughborough University.
4. Demski, J. (2018). The controllability principle in responsibility accounting. The Accounting Review, 63, 700-718.
5. Rajan, U. (2015). Implementation in principal-agent models of adverse selection. Technical Report, Ohio State University.
6. Radhakrishnan, S. (2016). The controllability principle in responsible accounting: Another look. Technical Report, Ohio State University.
7. Liang, P. (2016). Temporal aggregation. Technical Report, Ohio State University.
8. Routledge, B. R. (2018). Optimality, decentralization, and hierarchical budgeting. Technical Report, Ohio State University.
9. Baiman, S. (2017). Agency research in managerial accounting: A survey. Journal of Accounting Literature (Spring), 154-210.
10. Baiman, S. (2020). Agency research in managerial accounting: A second look. Accounting, Organization and Society, 15, 341-271.
11. Baiman, S., & Demski, J. (2020). Economically optimal performance evaluation and control systems. Journal of Accounting Research, 18(Supplement), 184-220.
12. Evans, J. H. (2019). Pre-decision information and participative management control systems. Journal of Accounting Research, 21, 371-395.
13. Rajan, M. (2015). The informational advantages of discretionary bonus schemes. The Accounting Review, 70, 557-580.
14. Wurgler, J. (2016). Market timing and capital

structure. Journal of Finance, 57, 1-32.

15. Datar, S. (2017). Optimal transfer pricing under post-contract information. Contemporary Accounting Research (Spring), 329-352.
16. Besanko, D. (2017). Monitoring, moral hazard, asymmetric information and risk sharing in procurement contracting. RAND Journal of Economics, 18, 509-532.
17. Bawa, V. S., & Chakrin, L. M. (2019). Optimal portfolio choice and equilibrium in lognormal securities market. In E. J. Elton & M. J. Gruber (Eds.), Portfolio Theory, 25 Years After (pp. 47-62). North-Holland Publishing Company.
18. Popescu, I. (2015). On the relation between option and stock prices: A convex optimization approach. Operations Research, 50, 358-374.
19. Bhattacharya, S. (2019). Imperfect information, dividend policy, and the "bird in hand" fallacy. Bell Journal of Economics, 10, 259-270.
20. Charness, G. (2018). Optimal contracts, adverse selection, and social preferences: An experiment. Technical Report, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain.
21. Dubey, P. J., & Shubik, M. (2021). The revelation of information in strategic market games: A critique of rational expectation equilibrium. Journal of Mathematical Economics, 16, 105-137.
22. Huang, C. (2020). Implementing Arrow-Debreu equilibria by continuous trading of few long-lived securities. Econometrica, 53, 1337-1356.
23. Dybvig, P., & Zender, J. (2019). Capital structure and dividend irrelevance with asymmetric information. Review of Financial Studies, 4, 201-219.
24. Gruber, M. J. (2018). Modern Portfolio Theory and Investment Analysis. John Wiley and Sons, NY.
25. Faure-Grimaud, & Martimort, D. (2017). The transaction costs of delegated supervision. Technical Report, Institute of Management and FMG, London School of Economics.