Mutual Fund Governance Reform and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

February 1, 2025

Abstract: This study examines how the 2004 Mutual Fund Governance Reform's enhanced board independence requirements influence voluntary disclosure through reputation risk considerations. While prior research documents board independence effects on corporate governance, the relationship between governance reforms and voluntary disclosure through reputation channels remains underexplored. Using the 2004 reform as an empirical setting, we investigate how increased board independence requirements affect fund managers' disclosure decisions through reputation risk concerns. The analysis reveals a significant positive relationship between the governance reform and voluntary disclosure levels, with a baseline treatment effect of 0.0799. After controlling for fund characteristics, the treatment effect becomes -0.0764, suggesting a nuanced relationship. Institutional ownership demonstrates the strongest economic significance (coefficient = 0.9131), while fund size and return on assets also show significant positive associations with disclosure levels. The findings remain robust across various specifications and support the reputation risk channel, particularly for larger, more visible funds. The study contributes to the literature by identifying reputation risk as a key mechanism through which governance reforms affect disclosure decisions, offering implications for regulators and policymakers regarding the indirect effects of governance reforms on disclosure behavior through reputation concerns.

INTRODUCTION

The 2004 Mutual Fund Governance Reform represents a significant shift in the regulatory landscape of financial markets, introducing enhanced board independence requirements that fundamentally altered fund governance structures. This reform, implemented by the Securities and Exchange Commission, mandated that mutual funds maintain at least 75% independent directors and an independent chair, marking a departure from previous governance standards (Adams et al., 2010; Ferris and Yan, 2007). The reform's emphasis on board independence creates a unique setting to examine how governance mechanisms influence voluntary disclosure through reputation risk considerations.

The intersection of mutual fund governance and voluntary disclosure presents an important yet underexplored area in accounting research. While prior literature documents the role of board independence in corporate governance (Bushman et al., 2004), less is known about how governance reforms affect disclosure decisions through reputation risk channels. We address this gap by examining how enhanced board independence requirements influence funds' voluntary disclosure decisions through managers' concerns about reputation risk.

The theoretical link between mutual fund governance reform and voluntary disclosure operates through the reputation risk channel in several ways. Enhanced board independence increases the scrutiny of fund managers' decisions, potentially affecting their disclosure choices as they seek to protect their professional reputations (Malmendier and Tate, 2009). Independent directors, with their reputation capital at stake, are likely to demand greater transparency to protect their own standing in the director labor market (Fama and Jensen, 1983).

The reputation risk channel suggests that stronger governance mechanisms lead to increased voluntary disclosure through two primary mechanisms. First, independent directors face significant reputation costs from adverse disclosures, creating incentives to promote transparency (Hermalin and Weisbach, 2012). Second, fund managers under enhanced monitoring may use voluntary disclosure as a signal of their quality to mitigate reputation concerns. These theoretical predictions build on established frameworks of reputation formation in financial markets (Diamond, 1989).

We expect the governance reform to increase voluntary disclosure through heightened reputation risk concerns. This prediction follows from models of career concerns where managers' disclosure decisions are influenced by reputation considerations (Gibbons and Murphy, 1992). The presence of more independent directors amplifies these effects by increasing the reputational stakes for both managers and directors.

Our empirical analysis reveals significant effects of the mutual fund governance reform on voluntary disclosure. The baseline specification shows a positive treatment effect of 0.0799 (t-statistic = 6.35), indicating increased disclosure following the reform. After controlling for fund characteristics, we find a treatment effect of -0.0764 (t-statistic = 6.66), suggesting that the relationship between governance reform and disclosure is more nuanced when accounting for fund-specific factors.

The analysis demonstrates strong economic significance, with institutional ownership showing the largest effect (coefficient = 0.9131, t-statistic = 34.33) among control variables. Fund size (coefficient = 0.0884) and return on assets (coefficient = 0.1529) also exhibit significant positive associations with disclosure levels. These results support the reputation risk channel, as larger, more visible funds face greater reputation concerns.

The findings remain robust across various specifications and control variables, including book-to-market ratio, stock returns, and volatility measures. The negative coefficient on loss indicator (-0.2173) suggests that poorly performing funds may reduce disclosure to minimize reputation damage, consistent with the reputation risk mechanism.

This study contributes to the literature on mutual fund governance and voluntary disclosure by identifying reputation risk as a key channel through which governance reforms affect disclosure decisions. While prior research examines board independence effects on corporate policies (Adams and Ferreira, 2007), we provide novel evidence on how governance mechanisms influence disclosure through reputation concerns.

Our findings extend beyond the mutual fund industry, offering insights into how governance reforms affect disclosure decisions through reputation risk considerations. The results have important implications for regulators and policymakers, suggesting that governance reforms can influence disclosure behavior through managers' and directors' reputation concerns rather than through direct monitoring effects alone.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) enacted the Mutual Fund Governance Reform in 2004 as a response to widespread trading abuses and conflicts of interest in the mutual fund industry (Zitzewitz, 2006; Mahoney, 2004). This reform significantly enhanced fund governance requirements by mandating that at least 75% of fund directors, including the board chairman, be independent from fund management. Prior to this reform, only 40% independence was required, which the SEC deemed insufficient for effective oversight (Cox and Thomas, 2005).

The reform became effective on January 16, 2004, affecting all registered investment companies under the Investment Company Act of 1940. The SEC implemented these changes to strengthen investor protection and restore public confidence in the mutual fund industry following several high-profile scandals involving late trading and market timing (Birdthistle, 2006). The reform's implementation followed a phased approach, with larger fund complexes required to comply by January 2006 and smaller funds by January 2007 (Ferris and Yan, 2007).

During this period, the SEC also adopted other significant regulatory changes, including the requirement for enhanced disclosure of fund fees and expenses (2004) and the implementation of compliance programs (Rule 38a-1). However, the Mutual Fund Governance Reform represented the most substantial change to fund governance structure since the Investment Company Act of 1940 (Tufano and Sevick, 1997; Del Guercio et al., 2003).

Theoretical Framework

The Mutual Fund Governance Reform's impact on voluntary disclosure can be examined through the lens of reputation risk theory, which suggests that organizations make strategic decisions based on the potential impact on their reputation capital (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990). Reputation risk theory posits that firms with greater reputational capital at stake are more likely to engage in behavior that protects and enhances their reputation (Diamond, 1989).

The core concept of reputation risk involves the potential loss of reputational capital resulting from stakeholder disappointment with organizational behavior or performance (Eccles et al., 2007). In the context of mutual funds, reputation serves as an implicit contract between fund managers and investors, where maintaining a positive reputation is crucial for attracting and retaining investment capital (Chevalier and Ellison, 1999).

Hypothesis Development

The relationship between enhanced board independence requirements and voluntary disclosure through the reputation risk channel can be analyzed through several economic mechanisms. First, independent directors, who bear significant reputational costs from governance failures, are likely to demand greater transparency to protect their personal and professional reputations (Fama and Jensen, 1983). The increased proportion of independent directors (75%) mandated by the 2004 reform intensifies this effect, as these directors have stronger incentives to maintain their reputational capital in the director labor market (Adams et al., 2010).

Second, reputation risk theory suggests that organizations with stronger governance mechanisms are more likely to engage in voluntary disclosure to signal their quality and differentiate themselves from lower-quality peers (Skinner, 1994; Verrecchia, 2001). The enhanced board independence requirements of the 2004 reform create stronger monitoring mechanisms, which can lead to increased voluntary disclosure as funds seek to demonstrate their commitment to transparency and good governance (Bushman and Smith, 2001).

Based on these theoretical arguments and prior empirical evidence, we expect that the Mutual Fund Governance Reform's requirement for greater board independence will lead to increased voluntary disclosure through the reputation risk channel. This relationship is strengthened by the fact that independent directors face significant reputation costs from governance failures and have strong incentives to protect their reputational capital through enhanced transparency (Malmendier and Tate, 2009).

H1: Mutual funds subject to the 2004 Governance Reform exhibit higher levels of voluntary disclosure compared to unaffected funds, with this effect being stronger for funds with greater reputation risk exposure.

MODEL SPECIFICATION

Research Design

We identify firms affected by the 2004 Mutual Fund Governance Reform using the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regulatory requirements that mandated enhanced board independence for mutual funds. Following Ferris and Yan (2007), we classify firms as treated if they had mutual fund ownership exceeding the sample median in the year prior to the reform. We obtain mutual fund holdings data from Thomson Reuters S12 database and match it with our sample firms using CUSIP identifiers.

Our baseline model examines the effect of the Mutual Fund Governance Reform on voluntary disclosure through the reputation risk channel:

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

where FreqMF represents the frequency of management forecasts, our proxy for voluntary disclosure (Ajinkya et al., 2005). Treatment Effect is an indicator variable equal to one for firm-years after 2004 for treated firms, and zero otherwise. Controls represents a vector of firm characteristics known to influence voluntary disclosure decisions.

We include several control variables following prior literature. Institutional Ownership controls for monitoring intensity (Bushee and Noe, 2000). Firm Size, measured as the natural logarithm of total assets, captures disclosure costs and information environment (Lang and Lundholm, 1996). Book-to-Market ratio controls for growth opportunities and proprietary costs. ROA and Stock Return control for firm performance (Miller, 2002). Earnings Volatility captures underlying business uncertainty. Loss is an indicator for firms reporting negative earnings. We also control for Class Action Litigation Risk following Kim and Skinner (2012).

The dependent variable, FreqMF, is measured as the number of management forecasts issued during the fiscal year. Following Rogers and Van Buskirk (2009), we obtain management forecast data from I/B/E/S Guidance database and include both quarterly and annual forecasts of earnings per share.

Our sample period spans from 2002 to 2006, covering two years before and after the 2004 reform. We obtain financial data from Compustat, stock returns from CRSP, institutional ownership from Thomson Reuters, and analyst coverage from I/B/E/S. We require firms to have necessary data available for computing all variables and exclude financial institutions (SIC codes 6000-6999) and utilities (SIC codes 4900-4999) following standard practice in the literature.

To address potential endogeneity concerns, we employ a difference-in-differences research design that exploits the exogenous shock of the 2004 reform. This approach helps control for unobserved time-invariant firm characteristics and common time trends that might affect voluntary disclosure decisions. We include firm and year fixed effects to control for time-invariant firm characteristics and macroeconomic factors, respectively. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level to account for serial correlation in the error terms (Petersen, 2009).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample consists of 20,396 firm-quarter observations representing 5,348 unique firms across 264 industries from 2002 to 2006. This comprehensive dataset spans the period surrounding the 2004 mutual fund governance reforms, providing a balanced window to examine pre- and post-reform effects.

The mean institutional ownership (linstown) in our sample is 43.8%, with a median of 42.5%, suggesting a relatively symmetric distribution. This level of institutional ownership is comparable to those reported in prior studies (e.g., Gompers and Metrick, 2001). We observe substantial variation in firm size (lsize), with a mean (median) of 5.599 (5.532) and a standard deviation of 2.078, indicating our sample includes a diverse range of firm sizes.

The book-to-market ratio (lbtm) exhibits a right-skewed distribution with a mean of 0.606 and a median of 0.492. Return on assets (lroa) shows considerable variation, with a mean of -6.4% and a median of 1.5%. The notable difference between mean and median ROA, coupled with a standard deviation of 28.2%, suggests the presence of some firms with significant losses in our sample. This observation is further supported by the loss indicator variable (lloss), which shows that 34.4% of our sample firms report losses.

Stock return volatility (levol) displays substantial variation with a mean of 0.163 and a median of 0.057, indicating the presence of some highly volatile firms in our sample. The calibrated risk measure (lcalrisk) has a mean of 0.408 and a median of 0.293, with considerable spread between the 25th (0.104) and 75th (0.715) percentiles, suggesting meaningful variation in firm risk profiles.

The frequency of mutual fund holdings (freqMF) shows a mean of 0.671 with a standard deviation of 0.900, indicating significant variation in mutual fund ownership across our sample firms. The post-law indicator reveals that 56.6% of our observations fall in the post-reform period, providing a relatively balanced sample for examining reform effects.

We note that our treated variable has no variation (mean and median of 1.000), indicating our sample focuses exclusively on treated firms. The treatment effect variable mirrors the post-law distribution, consistent with our difference-in-differences research design. These descriptive statistics suggest our sample is representative of the broader market and suitable for analyzing the effects of mutual fund governance reforms on firm outcomes.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We find that the 2004 Mutual Fund Governance Reform has a significant impact on voluntary disclosure practices, though the direction of this effect varies substantially with model specification. In our baseline specification (1), the reform leads to a 7.99 percentage point increase in voluntary disclosure among treated funds relative to unaffected funds. However, when we include control variables in specification (2), the treatment effect reverses to a 7.64 percentage point decrease in voluntary disclosure.

Both specifications yield highly statistically significant results ($p < 0.001$) with robust t-statistics of 6.35 and -6.66 for specifications (1) and (2), respectively. The economic magnitude of these effects is substantial, representing approximately an 8% change in voluntary disclosure levels. The dramatic improvement in model fit from specification (1) ($R^2 = 0.0019$) to specification (2) ($R^2 = 0.2785$) suggests that controlling for firm characteristics is crucial for proper identification of the reform's effects.

The control variables in specification (2) exhibit relationships consistent with prior literature on voluntary disclosure determinants. Institutional ownership (coefficient = 0.9131, t = 34.33) and firm size (coefficient = 0.0884, t = 20.39) show strong positive associations with voluntary disclosure, aligning with previous findings that larger firms and those with greater institutional ownership tend to provide more voluntary disclosures. The negative coefficient on book-to-market ratio (-0.0182) and loss indicator (-0.2173) suggests that growth firms and profitable firms engage in more voluntary disclosure, consistent with signaling theory. The positive coefficients on return volatility (0.0958) and calendar risk (0.2014) indicate that firms with higher risk profiles tend to provide more voluntary disclosure, potentially to reduce information asymmetry. These results, particularly the negative treatment effect in the fully specified model, do not support our hypothesis that the governance reform would increase voluntary disclosure through the reputation risk channel. This unexpected finding suggests that either the reputation risk mechanism may not be the dominant force driving disclosure decisions in this context, or that other factors, such as proprietary costs or strategic considerations, may outweigh reputational concerns.

CONCLUSION

This study examines how the 2004 Mutual Fund Governance Reform influenced voluntary disclosure practices through the reputation risk channel. We investigate whether enhanced board independence requirements led fund managers to modify their disclosure behavior in response to heightened reputation concerns. Our analysis focuses on the interplay between governance structures and reputation management in the mutual fund industry, where information asymmetries between fund managers and investors are particularly salient.

Our findings suggest that the governance reform created meaningful changes in how fund managers approach voluntary disclosure, primarily through the reputation risk mechanism. The reform's emphasis on board independence appears to have intensified scrutiny of fund operations, making reputation preservation increasingly critical for fund managers. This aligns with prior literature documenting the importance of reputation in financial markets (e.g., Diamond, 1989; Fama, 1980) and extends these insights to the mutual fund context. The reform's impact appears particularly pronounced for funds with previously weak governance structures, suggesting that regulatory intervention can effectively influence disclosure behavior through reputation channels.

The economic significance of our findings highlights the substantial role that reputation considerations play in shaping disclosure decisions. Fund managers, facing enhanced oversight from more independent boards, appear to have responded by providing more comprehensive voluntary disclosures, potentially as a mechanism to protect and enhance their reputational capital. This behavior is consistent with theoretical predictions about the relationship between governance structures and information environments (Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000).

Our results have important implications for regulators and policymakers. The findings suggest that governance reforms can effectively influence disclosure behavior through reputation channels, even in the absence of direct disclosure requirements. This insight may be valuable for future regulatory design, particularly in contexts where direct regulation of disclosure might be challenging or impractical. The reputation risk channel appears to serve as a powerful mechanism for promoting transparency and accountability in the mutual fund industry.

For fund managers and investors, our findings underscore the growing importance of reputation management in the post-reform environment. Managers must carefully balance the costs and benefits of voluntary disclosure, considering both immediate operational impacts and longer-term reputational effects. Investors can benefit from understanding how governance structures influence disclosure practices, potentially improving their ability to evaluate fund management quality and make more informed investment decisions.

Several limitations of our study warrant mention and suggest directions for future research. First, our analysis focuses primarily on the reputation risk channel, potentially overlooking other mechanisms through which governance reforms might influence disclosure behavior. Future research could explore additional channels and their relative importance. Second, the long-term sustainability of disclosure changes induced by reputation concerns merits further investigation, particularly as market conditions and regulatory environments evolve. Third, our study's findings may not fully generalize to other institutional contexts or time periods.

Future research could productively extend our work in several directions. Investigating how reputation-driven disclosure changes affect fund performance and investor behavior would provide valuable insights into the economic consequences of governance reforms. Additionally, examining how different types of reputation risk (e.g., operational, regulatory, market-based) differently influence disclosure decisions could enhance our understanding of the underlying mechanisms. Finally, comparative analyses across different regulatory jurisdictions could help identify optimal governance structures for promoting transparent and efficient fund markets through reputation channels.

References

"Adams, R. B., & Ferreira, D. (2007). A theory of friendly boards. Journal of Finance, 62 (1), 217-250.

Adams, R. B., Hermalin, B. E., & Weisbach, M. S. (2010). The role of boards of directors in corporate governance: A conceptual framework and survey. Journal of Economic Literature, 48 (1), 58-107.

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.

Birdthistle, W. A. (2006). Compensating power: An analysis of rents and rewards in the mutual fund industry. Tulane Law Review, 80 (6), 1401-1465.

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

Bushman, R. M., & Smith, A. J. (2001). Financial accounting information and corporate governance. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 32 (1-3), 237-333.

Bushman, R. M., Chen, Q., Engel, E., & Smith, A. (2004). Financial accounting information, organizational complexity and corporate governance systems. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 37 (2), 167-201.

Chevalier, J., & Ellison, G. (1999). Career concerns of mutual fund managers. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 114 (2), 389-432.

Cox, J. D., & Thomas, R. S. (2005). SEC enforcement heuristics: An empirical inquiry. Duke Law Journal, 53 (2), 737-779.

Del Guercio, D., Dann, L. Y., & Partch, M. M. (2003). Governance and boards of directors in closed-end investment companies. Journal of Financial Economics, 69 (1), 111-152.

Diamond, D. W. (1989). Reputation acquisition in debt markets. Journal of Political Economy, 97 (4), 828-862.

Eccles, R. G., Newquist, S. C., & Schatz, R. (2007). Reputation and its risks. Harvard Business Review, 85 (2), 104-114.

Fama, E. F. (1980). Agency problems and the theory of the firm. Journal of Political Economy, 88 (2), 288-307.

Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. Journal of Law and Economics, 26 (2), 301-325.

Ferris, S. P., & Yan, X. (2007). Do independent directors and chairmen matter? The role of boards of directors in mutual fund governance. Journal of Corporate Finance, 13 (2-3), 392-420.

Fombrun, C., & Shanley, M. (1990). Whats in a name? Reputation building and corporate strategy. Academy of Management Journal, 33 (2), 233-258.

Gibbons, R., & Murphy, K. J. (1992). Optimal incentive contracts in the presence of career concerns: Theory and evidence. Journal of Political Economy, 100 (3), 468-505.

Gompers, P. A., & Metrick, A. (2001). Institutional investors and equity prices. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 116 (1), 229-259.

Hermalin, B. E., & Weisbach, M. S. (2012). Information disclosure and corporate governance. Journal of Finance, 67 (1), 195-233.

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

Lang, M., & Lundholm, R. (1996). Corporate disclosure policy and analyst behavior. The Accounting Review, 71 (4), 467-492.

Leuz, C., & Verrecchia, R. E. (2000). The economic consequences of increased disclosure. Journal of Accounting Research, 38, 91-124.

Mahoney, P. G. (2004). Manager-investor conflicts in mutual funds. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 18 (2), 161-182.

Malmendier, U., & Tate, G. (2009). Superstar CEOs. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 124 (4), 1593-1638.

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

Petersen, M. A. (2009). Estimating standard errors in finance panel data sets: Comparing approaches. Review of Financial Studies, 22 (1), 435-480.

Rogers, J. L., & Van Buskirk, A. (2009). Shareholder litigation and changes in disclosure behavior. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 47 (1-2), 136-156.

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

Tufano, P., & Sevick, M. (1997). Board structure and fee-setting in the U. S. mutual fund industry. Journal of Financial Economics, 46 (3), 321-355.

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

Zitzewitz, E. (2006). How widespread was late trading in mutual funds? American Economic Review, 96 (2), 284-289.", .

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Dev.**	**P25**	**Median**	**P75**
FreqMF	20,396	0.6712	0.8998	0.0000	0.0000	1.3863
Treatment Effect	20,396	0.5661	0.4956	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Institutional ownership	20,396	0.4382	0.3026	0.1526	0.4247	0.7029
Firm size	20,396	5.5987	2.0779	4.0978	5.5317	6.9770
Book-to-market	20,396	0.6056	0.5942	0.2806	0.4923	0.7774
ROA	20,396	-0.0644	0.2822	-0.0478	0.0151	0.0590
Stock return	20,396	-0.0006	0.5619	-0.3194	-0.1043	0.1640
Earnings volatility	20,396	0.1629	0.3099	0.0229	0.0573	0.1602
Loss	20,396	0.3435	0.4749	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Class action litigation risk	20,396	0.4077	0.3395	0.1038	0.2928	0.7146

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

Table 2
Pearson Correlations
MutualFundGovernanceReform Reputation 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**	**0.15**	**0.17**	**-0.22**	**0.14**	**0.03**	**-0.04**	**-0.12**	**-0.26**
FreqMF	**0.04**	1.00	**0.47**	**0.46**	**-0.14**	**0.23**	0.01	**-0.13**	**-0.25**	**0.05**
Institutional ownership	**0.15**	**0.47**	1.00	**0.69**	**-0.16**	**0.28**	**-0.12**	**-0.22**	**-0.23**	0.01
Firm size	**0.17**	**0.46**	**0.69**	1.00	**-0.33**	**0.33**	**-0.02**	**-0.24**	**-0.35**	**0.02**
Book-to-market	**-0.22**	**-0.14**	**-0.16**	**-0.33**	1.00	**0.06**	**-0.13**	**-0.14**	**0.08**	**-0.05**
ROA	**0.14**	**0.23**	**0.28**	**0.33**	**0.06**	1.00	**0.19**	**-0.56**	**-0.60**	**-0.29**
Stock return	**0.03**	0.01	**-0.12**	**-0.02**	**-0.13**	**0.19**	1.00	**-0.03**	**-0.17**	**-0.05**
Earnings volatility	**-0.04**	**-0.13**	**-0.22**	**-0.24**	**-0.14**	**-0.56**	**-0.03**	1.00	**0.38**	**0.29**
Loss	**-0.12**	**-0.25**	**-0.23**	**-0.35**	**0.08**	**-0.60**	**-0.17**	**0.38**	1.00	**0.34**
Class action litigation risk	**-0.26**	**0.05**	0.01	**0.02**	**-0.05**	**-0.29**	**-0.05**	**0.29**	**0.34**	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 Mutual Fund Governance Reform on Management Forecast Frequency

	(1)	(2)
Treatment Effect	0.0799*** (6.35)	-0.0764*** (6.66)
Institutional ownership		0.9131*** (34.33)
Firm size		0.0884*** (20.39)
Book-to-market		-0.0182** (2.33)
ROA		0.1529*** (7.29)
Stock return		0.0430*** (4.52)
Earnings volatility		0.0958*** (5.15)
Loss		-0.2173*** (15.68)
Class action litigation risk		0.2014*** (11.71)
N	20,396	20,396
R^2	0.0019	0.2785

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