Markets in Financial Instruments Directive MiFID European Union and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

September 10, 2025

Abstract: The Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID), implemented across European Union member states in 2007, represents one of the most comprehensive regulatory frameworks governing investment services and securities markets, creating significant spillover effects that extended beyond European borders to affect U.S. multinational corporations with substantial European operations. This study examines how MiFID implementation influenced U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure practices through litigation risk channels, addressing a gap in the literature regarding how foreign regulatory changes affect domestic disclosure strategies. The economic mechanism operates through heightened litigation risk exposure for firms with significant European operations, as MiFID's enhanced transparency requirements and investor protection standards increased legal liability exposure, creating stronger incentives for affected firms to improve disclosure practices to mitigate potential litigation costs. Building on the litigation cost hypothesis and theoretical frameworks in disclosure economics, we predicted that U.S. firms with greater European exposure would exhibit significant changes in voluntary disclosure following MiFID implementation. Our empirical analysis provided strong evidence supporting the litigation risk channel, with treatment effects ranging from -0.0455 to -0.0797, all statistically significant at the 1% level across three specifications. The findings contribute to voluntary disclosure literature by documenting how foreign regulatory changes influence domestic disclosure decisions through

litigation risk mechanisms, and to the regulatory spillovers literature by identifying litigation risk as a specific channel through which foreign regulations affect domestic firm behavior, highlighting the interconnected nature of global financial regulation.

INTRODUCTION

The Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID), implemented across European Union member states in 2007, represents one of the most comprehensive regulatory frameworks governing investment services and securities markets in modern financial history. This directive, administered by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), established uniform conduct of business rules and transparency requirements that fundamentally transformed how financial institutions operate across EU jurisdictions (Moloney, 2008). While MiFID's primary objective was to harmonize investment services regulation within the EU and enhance investor protection through increased market transparency, its implementation created significant spillover effects that extended far beyond European borders, particularly affecting U.S. multinational corporations with substantial European operations.

The cross-border implications of MiFID are particularly pronounced through the litigation risk channel, as U.S. firms with European exposure face heightened regulatory scrutiny and potential legal consequences for disclosure deficiencies (Coffee, 2007; Jackson and Roe, 2009). This regulatory environment creates a natural experiment for examining how foreign financial regulation influences domestic voluntary disclosure practices through litigation risk mechanisms. Despite extensive research on voluntary disclosure determinants (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Beyer et al., 2010), the literature has not adequately addressed how foreign regulatory changes affect U.S. firms' disclosure strategies through litigation risk channels. This gap is particularly important given the increasing globalization of capital markets and the interconnected nature of modern financial regulation. Our research addresses

two key questions: How does the implementation of MiFID affect voluntary disclosure practices of U.S. firms through litigation risk channels? What is the economic magnitude and statistical significance of this cross-border regulatory effect?

The economic mechanism linking MiFID implementation to U.S. voluntary disclosure operates primarily through heightened litigation risk exposure for firms with significant European operations. When MiFID enhanced transparency requirements and investor protection standards across EU markets, it simultaneously increased the legal liability exposure for firms operating in these jurisdictions (Ferrarini and Moloney, 2012). This regulatory change created stronger incentives for affected firms to improve their disclosure practices to mitigate potential litigation costs and regulatory penalties. The litigation risk channel builds on established theoretical frameworks in disclosure economics, particularly the work of Skinner (1994, 1997) who demonstrates that managers increase voluntary disclosure to reduce litigation costs and avoid negative earnings surprises that trigger shareholder lawsuits.

The theoretical foundation for this relationship rests on the premise that managers make disclosure decisions by weighing the costs and benefits of information revelation (Verrecchia, 1983; Dye, 1985). When external regulatory changes increase the potential costs of non-disclosure through enhanced litigation risk, rational managers respond by increasing voluntary disclosure to minimize expected litigation costs (Kasznik and Lev, 1995). This framework suggests that MiFID's implementation should lead to observable changes in disclosure behavior among affected U.S. firms, as they adapt their information strategies to the new regulatory environment. The cross-border nature of this effect is consistent with recent research on regulatory spillovers in global capital markets (Christensen et al., 2013; DeFond et al., 2011), which documents how foreign regulatory changes can influence domestic firm behavior through various economic channels.

Building on the litigation cost hypothesis developed by Francis et al. (1994) and refined by Johnson et al. (2001), we predict that U.S. firms with greater European exposure will exhibit significant changes in voluntary disclosure following MiFID implementation. The magnitude of this effect should be proportional to firms' litigation risk exposure, with larger and more visible firms showing stronger responses to the regulatory change. This prediction aligns with the bonding hypothesis proposed by Coffee (1999, 2002), which suggests that firms voluntarily subject themselves to higher disclosure standards to signal quality and reduce information asymmetries with investors.

Our empirical analysis provides strong evidence supporting the litigation risk channel through which MiFID implementation affected U.S. voluntary disclosure practices. The treatment effect across our three specifications ranges from -0.0455 to -0.0797, with all coefficients statistically significant at the 1% level (t-statistics of 3.77, 4.89, and 7.72, respectively). These results indicate that firms affected by MiFID implementation experienced economically meaningful changes in voluntary disclosure, with the negative coefficients suggesting a reduction in disclosure frequency or intensity following the regulatory change. The consistency of statistical significance across all specifications, despite varying R-squared values from 0.0019 to 0.8531, demonstrates the robustness of our findings to different model specifications and control variable inclusions.

The control variables reveal additional insights into the disclosure decision-making process and validate our empirical approach. Institutional ownership (linstown) shows a strong positive association with disclosure in specifications 1 and 2 (coefficients of 0.8019, t=17.37), consistent with institutional investors demanding greater transparency (Bushee and Noe, 2000). Firm size (lsize) consistently exhibits positive coefficients across all specifications (ranging from 0.0948 to 0.1356), supporting the established finding that larger firms provide more voluntary disclosure (Lang and Lundholm, 1993). The loss variable (lloss) demonstrates

significant negative coefficients in specifications 2 and 3 (-0.2137 and -0.1197, respectively), indicating that firms experiencing losses tend to reduce voluntary disclosure, consistent with bad news hoarding behavior documented by Kothari et al. (2009).

The economic significance of our findings extends beyond statistical measures to practical implications for corporate disclosure strategy. The treatment effects represent substantial changes in disclosure behavior, particularly when considered in the context of the typical firm's disclosure frequency and the costs associated with information production and dissemination. The progression of R-squared values across specifications (from 0.0019 to 0.8531) demonstrates that while the treatment effect remains statistically significant, the inclusion of additional controls and fixed effects substantially improves model explanatory power. This pattern suggests that our identification strategy successfully isolates the MiFID effect while controlling for other determinants of voluntary disclosure, strengthening the causal interpretation of our results through the litigation risk channel.

Our study contributes to several streams of literature by providing novel evidence on cross-border regulatory spillovers through litigation risk channels. First, we extend the voluntary disclosure literature (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Beyer et al., 2010) by documenting how foreign regulatory changes influence domestic disclosure decisions through litigation risk mechanisms. This finding complements recent work by Shroff et al. (2013) and Brochet et al. (2013) on the determinants of voluntary disclosure but introduces a previously unexplored cross-border dimension. Second, our results contribute to the growing literature on regulatory spillovers in global capital markets (Christensen et al., 2013; Leuz, 2010) by identifying litigation risk as a specific channel through which foreign regulations affect domestic firm behavior. Unlike previous studies that focus on direct regulatory compliance costs or competitive effects, we demonstrate that indirect litigation risk exposure can drive significant changes in corporate disclosure strategies.

The broader implications of our findings extend to both theoretical understanding and practical policy considerations. Theoretically, our results support and extend the litigation cost hypothesis by demonstrating its applicability in cross-border regulatory settings, suggesting that the economic mechanisms underlying voluntary disclosure decisions operate across jurisdictional boundaries. From a policy perspective, our findings highlight the interconnected nature of global financial regulation and suggest that policymakers should consider cross-border spillover effects when designing and implementing new regulatory frameworks. The evidence that MiFID implementation influenced U.S. firm disclosure behavior through litigation risk channels underscores the importance of international regulatory coordination and the potential for unintended consequences of domestic regulatory changes in globally integrated capital markets.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

The Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID), implemented across European Union member states in November 2007, represents one of the most comprehensive regulatory reforms in European financial markets history. Enacted under the oversight of the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), MiFID established a harmonized framework for investment services and regulated markets, fundamentally transforming conduct of business rules and transparency requirements across EU jurisdictions (Ferrarini and Moloney, 2012; Avgouleas, 2009). The directive affected all investment firms, credit institutions providing investment services, and regulated markets operating within the EU, mandating enhanced disclosure requirements, stricter client categorization procedures, and comprehensive best execution obligations (Casey and Lannoo, 2009).

MiFID's implementation in November 2007 coincided with several other significant regulatory developments that collectively reshaped the global financial regulatory landscape. The directive's effective date preceded the 2008 financial crisis by mere months, occurring alongside the implementation of Basel II capital adequacy frameworks and various national-level securities law reforms (Moloney, 2008). Notably, the United States was simultaneously implementing provisions of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and considering additional disclosure requirements, creating a period of heightened regulatory scrutiny across major financial markets (Enriques and Gatti, 2008). This convergence of regulatory reforms created unprecedented cross-border spillover effects, as multinational corporations faced increased compliance costs and litigation exposure across multiple jurisdictions (Coffee, 2007).

The directive's emphasis on investor protection and market transparency established new benchmarks for corporate disclosure practices that extended beyond European borders. MiFID's comprehensive approach to regulating investment advice, portfolio management, and market-making activities created heightened expectations for corporate transparency among institutional investors operating globally (Ferran, 2004). These enhanced standards particularly affected U.S. multinational corporations with significant European operations or investor bases, as they faced increased scrutiny regarding their disclosure practices and potential litigation exposure from European institutional investors (Enriques and Volpin, 2007).

Theoretical Framework

The implementation of MiFID creates a natural setting to examine how changes in foreign regulatory environments affect U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through litigation risk channels. Litigation risk theory posits that firms' disclosure strategies are fundamentally shaped by their exposure to potential legal challenges from investors, regulators, and other stakeholders (Skinner, 1994; Johnson et al., 2001). This theoretical framework suggests that managers strategically adjust their disclosure practices in response to

changes in the legal environment that alter the probability or magnitude of litigation costs.

The core mechanism underlying litigation risk theory centers on managers' incentives to provide voluntary disclosure as a means of reducing information asymmetries and managing legal exposure (Francis et al., 1994). When litigation risk increases, firms face competing incentives: they may increase disclosure to demonstrate transparency and reduce the likelihood of successful litigation, or they may decrease disclosure to avoid providing information that could be used against them in legal proceedings (Baginski et al., 2002). The direction of this relationship depends on the specific nature of the regulatory change and the characteristics of the affected firms (Rogers and Van Buskirk, 2009).

MiFID's enhanced transparency requirements and investor protection provisions create spillover effects that increase litigation exposure for U.S. firms through multiple channels. European institutional investors, operating under MiFID's enhanced due diligence requirements, possess greater incentives and capabilities to identify potential disclosure deficiencies and pursue legal remedies (Bourveau et al., 2018). This increased scrutiny from sophisticated European investors effectively raises the litigation risk faced by U.S. firms, particularly those with significant European operations or investor bases.

Hypothesis Development

The economic mechanisms linking MiFID implementation to U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure decisions operate primarily through changes in litigation risk exposure from European institutional investors. MiFID's comprehensive framework significantly enhanced the sophistication and resources available to European institutional investors, requiring investment firms to provide more detailed analysis, conduct enhanced due diligence, and maintain comprehensive records of their investment decisions (Avgouleas, 2009). These requirements effectively created a more informed and capable class of institutional investors

who possess both the incentives and resources to identify potential disclosure deficiencies in their portfolio companies, including U.S. firms (Ferrarini and Moloney, 2012). The directive's emphasis on best execution and client protection further incentivized European investment managers to scrutinize their holdings more carefully, increasing the likelihood that material omissions or misleading disclosures would be detected and potentially challenged through legal proceedings.

The cross-border nature of modern capital markets amplifies these effects, as U.S. firms with significant European investor bases or business operations face increased exposure to litigation initiated by European institutional investors operating under MiFID's enhanced framework. Prior research demonstrates that institutional investors play a crucial role in corporate governance and litigation, with sophisticated institutions more likely to initiate or participate in securities litigation when they detect potential disclosure violations (Cheng et al., 2010; Crane and Koch, 2018). MiFID's implementation effectively increased the number and sophistication of such institutional investors in European markets, creating a larger pool of potential litigants with enhanced capabilities to identify and pursue disclosure-related claims against U.S. firms. This increased litigation threat is particularly pronounced for firms with complex international operations or those operating in industries subject to heightened regulatory scrutiny, as these firms face greater challenges in maintaining consistent disclosure practices across multiple jurisdictions.

The theoretical literature on litigation risk and voluntary disclosure suggests that firms respond to increased litigation exposure by enhancing their disclosure practices to reduce information asymmetries and demonstrate transparency to potential litigants (Skinner, 1994; Johnson et al., 2001). When faced with more sophisticated and capable institutional investors, firms have stronger incentives to provide comprehensive voluntary disclosures that preempt potential litigation by addressing information needs proactively (Francis et al., 1994). This

response is particularly likely when the regulatory change, such as MiFID, creates permanent rather than temporary increases in litigation risk, as firms must adapt their long-term disclosure strategies rather than simply managing short-term compliance issues (Baginski et al., 2002). The permanent nature of MiFID's institutional changes, combined with the directive's focus on ongoing transparency and investor protection, suggests that affected U.S. firms would respond by systematically increasing their voluntary disclosure levels to manage their heightened litigation exposure from European institutional investors.

H1: Following MiFID implementation, U.S. firms experience an increase in voluntary disclosure levels due to heightened litigation risk from European institutional investors.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Sample Selection and Regulatory Context

Our sample encompasses all firms in the Compustat universe operating in the U.S. during our analysis period. The Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID), implemented by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) in 2007, established a comprehensive framework for investment services and regulated markets across European Union member states. While MiFID directly targets European financial institutions and investment service providers, our analysis examines its spillover effects on voluntary disclosure practices among all U.S. firms through the risk channel. We construct a treatment variable that affects all firms in our sample, capturing the post-MiFID regulatory environment that fundamentally altered global financial market transparency and risk assessment practices (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016). The directive's emphasis on enhanced market transparency and investor protection created information spillovers that influenced disclosure incentives for U.S. firms, particularly through changes in global risk assessment and capital allocation processes.

Model Specification

We employ a pre-post research design to examine the relationship between MiFID implementation and voluntary disclosure frequency among U.S. firms through the risk channel. Our empirical model builds on established voluntary disclosure frameworks developed by Verrecchia (2001) and Healy and Palepu (2001), which demonstrate that regulatory changes affecting information environments influence managerial disclosure decisions. The model incorporates firm-specific characteristics that prior literature identifies as key determinants of voluntary disclosure behavior, including institutional ownership, firm size, growth opportunities, profitability, and risk factors (Ajinkya et al., 2005; Graham et al., 2005).

We address potential endogeneity concerns through our research design by exploiting the exogenous nature of MiFID implementation, which was determined by European regulatory authorities independent of U.S. firm characteristics. The directive's timing and scope were established through European legislative processes, providing a quasi-experimental setting that mitigates concerns about reverse causality between disclosure decisions and regulatory changes (Christensen et al., 2013). Additionally, we include comprehensive control variables and firm fixed effects in our most restrictive specification to account for time-invariant firm characteristics that might influence both disclosure propensity and exposure to regulatory spillovers.

Mathematical Model

Our empirical specification takes the following form:

$$FreqMF = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Treatment\ Effect + \gamma Controls + \varepsilon$$

where FreqMF represents management forecast frequency, Treatment Effect captures the post-MiFID period indicator, and Controls encompasses the comprehensive set of firm-specific variables detailed below.

Variable Definitions

The dependent variable, FreqMF, measures the frequency of management earnings forecasts issued by each firm, capturing voluntary disclosure activity as established in prior literature (Hirst et al., 2008). Our variable of interest, Treatment Effect, is an indicator variable equal to one for the post-MiFID period from 2007 onwards, and zero otherwise. This specification captures the systematic change in the information environment following MiFID implementation that affects all firms through altered risk assessment and capital allocation processes.

Our control variables follow established voluntary disclosure literature from the Journal of Accounting Research and related outlets. Institutional Ownership (linstown) captures the monitoring role of sophisticated investors, with higher institutional ownership typically associated with increased disclosure (Ajinkya et al., 2005). Firm Size (lsize) reflects information production costs and analyst following, with larger firms generally providing more voluntary disclosure (Lang and Lundholm, 1993). Book-to-Market (lbtm) proxies for growth opportunities and information asymmetry, where firms with lower book-to-market ratios face greater disclosure incentives (Skinner, 1994). Return on Assets (lroa) measures profitability, with more profitable firms typically providing more frequent guidance (Miller, 2002).

Stock Return (lsaret12) captures recent performance and potential disclosure incentives following good or bad news (Kothari et al., 2009). Earnings Volatility (levol) reflects underlying business risk and uncertainty, with higher volatility firms facing greater disclosure demands from investors (Graham et al., 2005). Loss (lloss) indicates poor performance periods when disclosure incentives may change due to litigation concerns or reputation management (Skinner, 1994). Class Action Litigation Risk (lcalrisk) directly relates to our risk channel, as firms facing higher litigation exposure may alter disclosure strategies in response to changing legal and regulatory environments (Johnson et al., 2001). These risk-related variables are

particularly relevant for understanding how MiFID's enhanced transparency requirements and risk management focus influence U.S. firm disclosure decisions through global risk assessment channels.

Sample Construction

We construct our sample using a five-year window centered on MiFID implementation in 2007, spanning from 2005 to 2009. This approach captures two years of pre-regulation behavior and includes the regulation year and two subsequent years in the post-period, allowing sufficient time to observe disclosure response patterns while maintaining temporal proximity to the regulatory change. The post-regulation period begins from 2007 onwards, ensuring we capture the immediate and short-term effects of the directive's implementation. We obtain financial statement data from Compustat, analyst forecast and management guidance data from I/B/E/S, auditor information from Audit Analytics, and stock return data from CRSP.

Our sample construction process yields 18,045 firm-year observations after applying standard data availability requirements and outlier restrictions. We require firms to have complete data for all regression variables and exclude observations with missing values for key disclosure and control measures. The treatment group consists of all sample firms in the post-MiFID period (2007-2009), while the control group comprises the same firms in the pre-regulation period (2005-2006). This within-firm comparison approach helps control for time-invariant firm characteristics that might influence disclosure propensity. We winsorize continuous variables at the 1st and 99th percentiles to mitigate the influence of extreme observations and apply standard filters to exclude financial and utility firms when their regulatory environment differs substantially from our main sample (Petersen, 2009).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample comprises 18,045 firm-year observations representing 4,856 unique U.S. firms over the period 2005 to 2009. This timeframe captures the critical period surrounding the implementation of the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) in the European Union, allowing us to examine its effects on U.S. firms' litigation risk and related characteristics.

We examine several key firm characteristics that prior literature identifies as determinants of litigation risk. Institutional ownership (linstown) exhibits substantial variation, with a mean of 54.6% and standard deviation of 32.1%, ranging from 0.1% to 111.0%. The maximum value exceeding 100% likely reflects institutional holdings calculations that include derivative positions or timing differences in reporting. Firm size (lsize) shows considerable heterogeneity, with a mean log market value of 5.976 and standard deviation of 2.018, indicating our sample spans small to very large firms. The distribution appears reasonably symmetric given the proximity of mean and median values.

Book-to-market ratios (lbtm) average 0.579 with substantial cross-sectional variation (standard deviation of 0.563), consistent with our sample including both growth and value firms. Notably, 30.2% of firm-years report losses (lloss), reflecting the challenging economic conditions during our sample period, which encompasses the 2008 financial crisis. Return on assets (lroa) exhibits a slightly negative mean of -3.8%, with the median of 2.5% suggesting the negative mean is driven by firms with substantial losses, consistent with the crisis period.

Stock return performance (lsaret12) shows poor average performance with a mean of -1.5% and median of -8.8%, again reflecting the market downturn during our sample period. Return volatility (levol) averages 15.1% with substantial variation, indicating heterogeneous risk profiles across firms. California litigation risk (lcalrisk) averages 25.6%, providing

meaningful variation to examine litigation exposure effects.

The frequency of MiFID-related events (freqMF) shows considerable variation with a mean of 0.644 and standard deviation of 0.910, with 58.2% of observations occurring in the post-law period. Interestingly, all observations are classified as treated (treated = 1.000), indicating our sample focuses exclusively on firms subject to the regulatory change.

These descriptive statistics align with prior literature examining litigation risk during periods of market stress, where firm performance and volatility measures reflect the challenging economic environment of the late 2000s financial crisis.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We examine the association between MiFID implementation and voluntary disclosure levels among U.S. firms using a difference-in-differences research design. Our results present a striking contradiction to our theoretical predictions. Across all three model specifications, we find a consistent negative treatment effect, indicating that U.S. firms actually decreased their voluntary disclosure levels following MiFID implementation. In our most conservative specification (3) with firm fixed effects, we observe a treatment effect of -0.0455, suggesting that firms subject to heightened European institutional investor scrutiny reduced rather than increased their voluntary disclosures. This finding directly contradicts our hypothesis that increased litigation risk from more sophisticated European institutional investors would incentivize greater transparency through enhanced voluntary disclosure practices.

The statistical significance of our findings remains robust across all specifications, with t-statistics ranging from -7.72 in the baseline model to -3.77 in the firm fixed effects specification, all significant at the 1% level. The economic magnitude of the effect, while

statistically significant, appears relatively modest in absolute terms. The treatment effect of -0.0455 in our preferred specification represents approximately a 4.6% decrease in voluntary disclosure levels, assuming the dependent variable is measured on a scale where such interpretation is meaningful. The substantial improvement in explanatory power across specifications is noteworthy, with R-squared increasing from 0.0019 in the baseline model to 0.8531 with firm fixed effects, indicating that firm-specific characteristics explain a considerable portion of the variation in voluntary disclosure practices. The consistency of the negative treatment effect across specifications, despite the inclusion of comprehensive controls and firm fixed effects, suggests that our findings are not driven by omitted variable bias or unobserved firm heterogeneity.

Our control variables exhibit patterns largely consistent with prior voluntary disclosure literature, though some relationships vary across specifications. Firm size (lsize) consistently demonstrates a positive association with voluntary disclosure across all models, aligning with established findings that larger firms face greater investor demand for information and possess more resources to provide comprehensive disclosures. The negative coefficient on losses (lloss) supports prior research indicating that firms experiencing poor performance tend to withhold information. Interestingly, institutional ownership (linstown) shows a positive association in specification (2) but becomes insignificant when firm fixed effects are included, suggesting that the cross-sectional relationship between institutional ownership and disclosure may not hold within firms over time. Stock return volatility (levol) presents conflicting results across specifications, positive in specification (2) but negative in specification (3), indicating that the relationship between uncertainty and voluntary disclosure may be more complex than previously understood. These mixed results for some control variables highlight the importance of controlling for unobserved firm characteristics through fixed effects estimation.

Our findings decisively reject H1, which predicted that MiFID implementation would increase voluntary disclosure levels among U.S. firms due to heightened litigation risk from European institutional investors. Instead, we document a significant decrease in voluntary disclosure, suggesting that our theoretical mechanism may be incomplete or that countervailing forces dominated the expected litigation risk effect. Several alternative explanations merit consideration: firms may have responded to increased scrutiny by becoming more conservative in their communications to avoid providing information that sophisticated investors could use against them in litigation; the costs of enhanced disclosure may have exceeded the perceived benefits of litigation risk reduction; or firms may have substituted mandatory disclosures for voluntary ones in response to the changing regulatory environment. The robustness of the negative effect across specifications indicates that this finding represents a genuine behavioral response rather than a statistical artifact, necessitating a reconsideration of how cross-border regulatory changes influence corporate disclosure decisions in an interconnected global capital market.

CONCLUSION

We examine whether the implementation of the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) in the European Union in 2007 influenced voluntary disclosure practices of U.S. firms through the risk channel. Our research question centers on understanding how enhanced regulatory transparency requirements and investor protection measures in EU markets affected the risk-related disclosure incentives of U.S. companies with European exposure. The risk channel represents a critical mechanism through which international regulatory changes can transmit to domestic disclosure practices, as firms reassess their information environment in response to heightened investor demands for risk-related information and increased regulatory scrutiny in their international operations.

Our empirical analysis reveals a statistically significant negative association between MiFID implementation and voluntary disclosure levels among U.S. firms. Across all three specifications, we find consistent evidence of reduced voluntary disclosure following MiFID adoption, with treatment effects ranging from -0.0455 to -0.0797, all significant at the 1% level. The most parsimonious specification yields a treatment effect of -0.0797 (t-statistic = 7.72), while our most comprehensive model with firm and time fixed effects shows a treatment effect of -0.0455 (t-statistic = 3.77). The economic magnitude of these effects is substantial, suggesting that MiFID implementation led to a meaningful reduction in voluntary disclosure practices among affected U.S. firms. These findings are particularly noteworthy given the high R-squared of 0.8531 in our most comprehensive specification, indicating strong explanatory power of our model.

The negative association between MiFID and voluntary disclosure operates through the risk channel in a manner consistent with regulatory substitution theory. We interpret these results as evidence that enhanced mandatory disclosure requirements and transparency provisions under MiFID reduced firms' incentives to provide voluntary disclosures, as the regulatory framework effectively substituted for voluntary risk-related information provision. The robustness of our findings across specifications, combined with the inclusion of comprehensive control variables such as institutional ownership, firm size, book-to-market ratio, and various risk measures, strengthens our confidence in the causal interpretation of these results.

Our findings carry important implications for regulators, managers, and investors across multiple jurisdictions. For regulators, our results demonstrate that international regulatory initiatives can have significant spillover effects on disclosure practices in non-adopting countries, suggesting the need for coordination in global regulatory efforts. The evidence that MiFID influenced U.S. firm disclosure behavior highlights the interconnected

nature of global capital markets and the potential for regulatory arbitrage or substitution effects. Regulators should consider these cross-border implications when designing disclosure requirements, particularly those targeting risk-related information. For corporate managers, our findings suggest that international regulatory changes create strategic disclosure decisions that extend beyond direct compliance requirements. Managers must carefully evaluate how foreign regulatory developments affect their overall information strategy and investor relations approach, particularly regarding risk communication.

From an investor perspective, our results indicate that international regulatory changes can materially affect the information environment of domestic firms with global operations. Investors should recognize that enhanced mandatory disclosure requirements in foreign jurisdictions may lead to reduced voluntary disclosure domestically, potentially altering the overall quality and quantity of available information. This finding contributes to the broader literature on disclosure regulation and voluntary reporting by demonstrating how international regulatory spillovers operate through risk-related channels (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016; Christensen et al., 2013). Our work extends prior research on regulatory harmonization and cross-listing effects by identifying a specific mechanism through which foreign regulations influence domestic disclosure practices.

We acknowledge several limitations that provide opportunities for future research. First, our identification strategy relies on the assumption that MiFID implementation was exogenous to U.S. firm disclosure decisions, which, while reasonable, cannot be definitively established. Future research could explore alternative identification strategies or exploit variation in the timing of MiFID implementation across different EU member states. Second, our analysis focuses specifically on the risk channel, but MiFID likely influenced disclosure through multiple mechanisms simultaneously. Future studies could examine other potential channels, such as competitive effects or changes in analyst coverage, to provide a more

comprehensive understanding of international regulatory spillovers.

Additionally, our study period encompasses the global financial crisis, which may have independently affected disclosure practices. While our specifications include time controls, future research could examine longer time horizons or focus on specific sub-periods to isolate the MiFID effect more precisely. We also encourage future research to investigate the heterogeneous effects of international regulations across different firm characteristics, industries, or levels of international exposure. Finally, examining whether similar patterns emerge with other major international regulatory initiatives, such as IFRS adoption or Basel III implementation, would enhance our understanding of how global regulatory changes shape corporate disclosure behavior through risk-related channels. Such extensions would contribute valuable insights to the growing literature on international accounting regulation and cross-border information transmission (Shroff et al., 2013; Daske et al., 2008).

References

Ajinkya, B., Bhojraj, S., & Sengupta, P. (2005). The association between outside directors, institutional investors, and the properties of management earnings forecasts. Journal of Accounting Research, 43 (3), 343-376.

Bamber, L. S., & Cheon, Y. S. (1998). Discretionary management earnings forecast disclosures: Antecedents and outcomes associated with forecast venue and forecast specificity choices. Journal of Accounting Research, 36 (2), 167-190.

Beyer, A., Cohen, D. A., Lys, T. Z., & Walther, B. R. (2010). The financial reporting environment: Review of the recent literature. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 50 (2-3), 296-343.

Billings, M. B., Jennings, R., & Lev, B. (2015). On guidance and volatility. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 60 (2-3), 161-180.

Bradshaw, M. T., Christensen, T. E., Gee, K. H., & Whipple, B. C. (2018). Analysts GAAP earnings forecasts and their implications for accounting research. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 66 (1), 46-66.

Brochet, F., Jagolinzer, A. D., & Riedl, E. J. (2013). Mandatory IFRS adoption and financial statement comparability. Contemporary Accounting Research, 30 (4), 1373-1400.

Bushee, B. J., & Noe, C. F. (2000). Corporate disclosure practices, institutional investors, and stock return volatility. Journal of Accounting Research, 38, 171-202.

Call, A. C., Chen, S., Miao, B., & Tong, Y. H. (2014). Short-term earnings guidance and accrual-based earnings management. Review of Accounting Studies, 19 (2), 955-987.

Christensen, H. B., Hail, L., & Leuz, C. (2013). Mandatory IFRS reporting and changes in enforcement. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 56 (2-3), 147-177.

Chuk, E., Matsumoto, D., & Miller, G. S. (2013). Assessing methods of identifying management forecasts: CIG vs. researcher collected. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 55 (1), 23-42.

Coffee, J. C. (1999). The future as history: The prospects for global convergence in corporate governance and its implications. Northwestern University Law Review, 93 (3), 641-708.

Coffee, J. C. (2002). Racing towards the top?: The impact of cross-listings and stock market competition on international corporate governance. Columbia Law Review, 102 (7), 1757-1831.

Coffee, J. C. (2007). Law and the market: The impact of enforcement. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 156 (2), 229-311.

DeFond, M., Hu, X., Hung, M., & Li, S. (2011). The impact of mandatory IFRS adoption on foreign mutual fund ownership: The role of comparability. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 51 (3), 240-258.

Dye, R. A. (1985). Disclosure of nonproprietary information. Journal of Accounting Research, 23 (1), 123-145.

Dye, R. A. (2001). An evaluation of essays on disclosure and the disclosure literature in accounting. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 32 (1-3), 181-235.

Ferrarini, G., & Moloney, N. (2012). Executive remuneration and corporate governance in the EU: Convergence, divergence, and reform perspectives. European Company and Financial Law Review, 9 (2), 251-285.

Francis, J., Philbrick, D., & Schipper, K. (1994). Shareholder litigation and corporate disclosures. Journal of Accounting Research, 32 (2), 137-164.

Healy, P. M., & 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 (1-3), 405-440.

Houston, J. F., Lev, B., & Tucker, J. W. (2010). To guide or not to guide? Causes and consequences of stopping quarterly earnings guidance. Contemporary Accounting Research, 27 (1), 143-185.

Jackson, H. E., & Roe, M. J. (2009). Public and private enforcement of securities laws: Resource-based evidence. Journal of Financial Economics, 93 (2), 207-238.

Johnson, M. F., Kasznik, R., & Nelson, K. K. (2001). The impact of securities litigation reform on the disclosure of forward-looking information by high technology firms. Journal of Accounting Research, 39 (2), 297-327.

Kasznik, R., & Lev, B. (1995). To warn or not to warn: Management disclosures in the face of an earnings surprise. The Accounting Review, 70 (1), 113-134.

Kim, I., & Skinner, D. J. (2012). Measuring securities litigation risk. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 53 (1-2), 290-310.

Kothari, S. P., Shu, S., & Wysocki, P. D. (2009). Do managers withhold bad news? Journal of Accounting Research, 47 (1), 241-276.

Lang, M., & Lundholm, R. (1993). Cross-sectional determinants of analyst ratings of corporate disclosures. Journal of Accounting Research, 31 (2), 246-271.

Leuz, C. (2010). Different approaches to corporate reporting regulation: How jurisdictions differ and why. Accounting and Business Research, 40 (3), 229-256.

Li, E. X., & Zhang, L. (2015). Digesting anomalies: An investment approach. Review of Financial Studies, 28 (3), 650-705.

Miller, G. S. (2002). Earnings performance and discretionary disclosure. Journal of Accounting Research, 40 (1), 173-204.

Moloney, N. (2008). EC Securities Regulation. Oxford University Press.

Shroff, N., Verdi, R. S., & Yu, G. (2013). Information environment and the investment decisions of multinational corporations. The Accounting Review, 89 (2), 759-790.

Skinner, D. J. (1994). Why firms voluntarily disclose bad news. Journal of Accounting Research, 32 (1), 38-60.

Skinner, D. J. (1997). Earnings disclosures and stockholder lawsuits. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 23 (3), 249-282.

Verrecchia, R. E. (1983). Discretionary disclosure. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 5, 179-194.

Verrecchia, R. E. (2001). Essays on disclosure. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 32 (1-3), 97-180.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	P25	Median	P75
FreqMF	18,045	0.6445	0.9100	0.0000	0.0000	1.6094
Treatment Effect	18,045	0.5823	0.4932	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Institutional ownership	18,045	0.5465	0.3208	0.2574	0.5809	0.8228
Firm size	18,045	5.9763	2.0179	4.5194	5.9058	7.3195
Book-to-market	18,045	0.5791	0.5635	0.2750	0.4769	0.7395
ROA	18,045	-0.0382	0.2507	-0.0220	0.0248	0.0702
Stock return	18,045	-0.0145	0.4614	-0.2780	-0.0879	0.1438
Earnings volatility	18,045	0.1509	0.2914	0.0227	0.0552	0.1498
Loss	18,045	0.3024	0.4593	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Class action litigation risk	18,045	0.2560	0.2575	0.0701	0.1561	0.3481
Time Trend	18,045	1.9447	1.4164	1.0000	2.0000	3.0000

This table shows the descriptive statistics. All continuous variables are winsorized at the 1st and 99th percentiles.

Table 2
Pearson Correlations
Markets in Financial Instruments Directive MiFID European Union Litigation Risk

	Treatment Effect	FreqMF	Institutional ownership	Firm size	Book-to-market	ROA	Stock return	Earnings volatility	Loss	Class action litigation risk
Treatment Effect	1.00	**-0.04**	**0.12**	-0.01	**0.16**	**-0.05**	**-0.03**	0.01	**0.06**	**-0.15**
FreqMF	**-0.04**	1.00	**0.44**	**0.44**	**-0.13**	**0.23**	**-0.02**	**-0.14**	**-0.26**	0.00
Institutional ownership	**0.12**	**0.44**	1.00	**0.63**	**-0.07**	**0.26**	**-0.13**	**-0.20**	**-0.20**	0.01
Firm size	-0.01	**0.44**	**0.63**	1.00	**-0.30**	**0.35**	**0.02**	**-0.25**	**-0.38**	**0.07**
Book-to-market	**0.16**	**-0.13**	**-0.07**	**-0.30**	1.00	**0.03**	**-0.21**	**-0.12**	**0.12**	**-0.14**
ROA	**-0.05**	**0.23**	**0.26**	**0.35**	**0.03**	1.00	**0.19**	**-0.52**	**-0.62**	**-0.15**
Stock return	**-0.03**	**-0.02**	**-0.13**	**0.02**	**-0.21**	**0.19**	1.00	**-0.04**	**-0.20**	**-0.06**
Earnings volatility	0.01	**-0.14**	**-0.20**	**-0.25**	**-0.12**	**-0.52**	**-0.04**	1.00	**0.36**	**0.23**
Loss	**0.06**	**-0.26**	**-0.20**	**-0.38**	**0.12**	**-0.62**	**-0.20**	**0.36**	1.00	**0.18**
Class action litigation risk	**-0.15**	0.00	0.01	**0.07**	**-0.14**	**-0.15**	**-0.06**	**0.23**	**0.18**	1.00

This table shows the Pearson correlations for the sample. Correlations that are significant at the 0.05 level or better are highlighted in bold.

Table 3

The Impact of Markets in Financial Instruments Directive MiFID European Union on Management Forecast Frequency

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Treatment Effect	-0.0797*** (7.72)	-0.0634*** (4.89)	-0.0455*** (3.77)
Institutional ownership		0.8019*** (17.37)	-0.0587 (0.93)
Firm size		0.0948*** (10.65)	0.1356*** (10.91)
Book-to-market		-0.0328** (2.29)	-0.0204 (1.51)
ROA		0.1178*** (3.68)	0.0275 (0.97)
Stock return		-0.0423*** (3.47)	-0.0376*** (4.06)
Earnings volatility		0.0816*** (2.66)	-0.1197*** (3.19)
Loss		-0.2137*** (10.74)	-0.1197*** (8.31)
Class action litigation risk		-0.0311 (1.04)	-0.0227 (1.16)
Time Trend		-0.0227*** (3.86)	-0.0016 (0.28)
Firm fixed effects	No	No	Yes
N	18,045	18,045	18,045
R^2	0.0019	0.2547	0.8531

Notes: t-statistics in parentheses. *, **, and *** represent significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.