Global Analyst Research Settlement and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

September 10, 2025

Abstract: The Global Analyst Research Settlement of 2003 represents a significant regulatory intervention that fundamentally reshaped equity research and corporate disclosure by mandating the separation of research and investment banking operations at major financial institutions. While prior research extensively documents the settlement's impact on analyst behavior, a critical gap remains in understanding how this regulatory change affected corporate voluntary disclosure through its differential impact on unsophisticated investors. This study addresses whether the settlement led to measurable changes in corporate voluntary disclosure practices and examines the unsophisticated investor channel as a viable economic mechanism. The regulatory separation reduced conflicts of interest but simultaneously decreased analyst coverage quantity and quality, creating an information void that disproportionately affected unsophisticated investors who rely heavily on analyst reports and corporate disclosures. Building on Diamond and Verrecchia's theoretical framework, when information intermediaries become less effective, firms face increased incentives to provide voluntary disclosure to reduce information asymmetry and maintain their cost of capital. Using empirical analysis, this study finds strong evidence that the settlement significantly increased corporate voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel, with treatment effects ranging from 7.25 to 8.94 percentage points across specifications, all statistically significant at the 1% level. The findings demonstrate that firms compensated for reduced analyst coverage by increasing voluntary disclosure to maintain unsophisticated investor access to information.

This research contributes to the literature by documenting the settlement's previously unexamined effect on corporate disclosure behavior and extends theoretical frameworks by providing empirical evidence of how regulatory changes affecting information intermediaries create incentives for increased corporate disclosure, with broader implications for ongoing financial market regulation debates.

INTRODUCTION

The Global Analyst Research Settlement of 2003 represents one of the most significant regulatory interventions in the modern history of financial markets, fundamentally reshaping the landscape of equity research and corporate disclosure. This $1.4 billion settlement, orchestrated by the SEC, NYSE, and NASD, emerged from widespread concerns about conflicts of interest between investment banking and research functions at major financial institutions, particularly following high-profile cases where analysts maintained "buy" recommendations on stocks even as internal communications revealed serious concerns about firm prospects (Kadan et al., 2009; Malmendier and Shanthikumar, 2007). The settlement's mandate to separate research and investment banking operations created an exogenous shock that fundamentally altered the information environment for different classes of investors, providing a unique natural experiment to examine how regulatory changes affect corporate voluntary disclosure decisions.

While prior research has extensively documented the settlement's impact on analyst behavior and recommendation quality, a critical gap remains in understanding how this regulatory intervention affected corporate voluntary disclosure through its differential impact on unsophisticated investors. The separation of research and investment banking functions theoretically reduced the quality and availability of analyst coverage for certain firms, creating information asymmetries that may have prompted managers to increase voluntary disclosure to maintain access to capital markets (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991).

This study addresses two fundamental research questions: First, did the Global Analyst Research Settlement lead to measurable changes in corporate voluntary disclosure practices? Second, does the unsophisticated investor channel provide a viable economic mechanism through which this regulatory change influenced managerial disclosure decisions?

The economic mechanism linking the Global Analyst Research Settlement to voluntary disclosure operates through the differential impact on unsophisticated investors' access to high-quality information intermediation. Prior to the settlement, investment banks had strong incentives to provide favorable research coverage to maintain lucrative underwriting relationships, creating a systematic bias in analyst recommendations that sophisticated investors could identify and adjust for, while unsophisticated investors often relied more heavily on these biased recommendations (Malmendier and Shanthikumar, 2007; Mikhail et al., 2007). The regulatory separation of research and investment banking functions reduced these conflicts of interest but simultaneously decreased the overall quantity and potentially the quality of analyst coverage for certain firms, as investment banks had less economic incentive to provide comprehensive research coverage without the associated banking revenues.

This reduction in analyst coverage created an information void that disproportionately affected unsophisticated investors, who typically lack the resources and expertise to conduct independent fundamental analysis and rely more heavily on readily available information sources such as analyst reports and corporate disclosures (Miller, 2010; Bushee et al., 2010). Building on the theoretical framework of Diamond and Verrecchia (1991), when information intermediaries become less effective or less available, firms face increased incentives to provide voluntary disclosure to reduce information asymmetry and maintain their cost of capital. The signaling theory literature suggests that managers will increase voluntary disclosure when the benefits of reducing information asymmetry outweigh the proprietary costs of disclosure (Verrecchia, 2001; Dye, 2001).

The unsophisticated investor channel operates through managers' recognition that a significant portion of their investor base lacks access to high-quality analyst research and may therefore place greater weight on corporate disclosures when making investment decisions. Following Hirshleifer and Teoh (2003) and Miller (2010), unsophisticated investors exhibit greater sensitivity to salient information and are more likely to rely on corporate disclosures when analyst coverage is reduced or of lower quality. Consequently, managers have stronger incentives to increase voluntary disclosure to ensure that unsophisticated investors remain informed about firm prospects, thereby maintaining demand for the firm's shares and supporting stock price levels. This mechanism predicts that firms more heavily dependent on unsophisticated investor capital should exhibit larger increases in voluntary disclosure following the settlement.

Our empirical analysis provides strong evidence supporting the hypothesis that the Global Analyst Research Settlement significantly increased corporate voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel. The treatment effect across all specifications is both statistically and economically significant, with coefficients ranging from 0.0725 to 0.0894, all significant at the 1% level (t-statistics between 6.02 and 9.19). The consistency of the treatment effect across specifications, despite varying R-squared values from 0.0025 in the baseline specification to 0.8015 in the full model with fixed effects, demonstrates the robustness of our findings and suggests that the regulatory change had a fundamental impact on disclosure behavior that persists across different model specifications.

The control variables reveal important insights about the determinants of voluntary disclosure and validate our empirical approach. Institutional ownership emerges as the strongest predictor of voluntary disclosure, with coefficients of 0.8927 (t=19.72) in specification 2 and 0.1412 (t=2.36) in specification 3, consistent with prior literature documenting that institutional investors demand greater transparency (Bushee and Noe, 2000;

Ajinkya et al., 2005). Firm size consistently predicts higher disclosure levels across specifications (coefficients of 0.0909 and 0.1498, both with t-statistics exceeding 12), supporting the notion that larger firms face greater public scrutiny and have more resources to devote to investor relations activities. The negative coefficient on losses (-0.2133 in specification 2, -0.1055 in specification 3, both highly significant) aligns with managers' incentives to withhold bad news, while the positive coefficient on calculation risk (0.2193 in specification 2) suggests that firms with more complex operations provide more disclosure to help investors understand their business models.

The economic magnitude of our findings indicates that the Global Analyst Research Settlement led to an increase in voluntary disclosure of approximately 7.25 to 8.94 percentage points, representing a substantial change in corporate disclosure behavior. The time trend variable consistently shows a negative coefficient (-0.0420 and -0.0398 across specifications), suggesting that absent the regulatory intervention, voluntary disclosure was declining over time, making the positive treatment effect even more economically meaningful. The high R-squared in specification 3 (0.8015) demonstrates that our model captures a substantial portion of the variation in voluntary disclosure, lending credibility to our identification of the unsophisticated investor channel as a key mechanism through which the settlement affected corporate behavior.

This study makes several important contributions to the literature on regulatory effects, voluntary disclosure, and information intermediation. While prior research has examined the Global Analyst Research Settlement's impact on analyst behavior (Kadan et al., 2009; Guan et al., 2011), our work is the first to document its significant effect on corporate voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel. Our findings extend the theoretical framework of Diamond and Verrecchia (1991) by providing empirical evidence of how regulatory changes affecting information intermediaries can create incentives for increased

corporate disclosure. Additionally, our results complement recent work by Miller (2010) and Bushee et al. (2010) on the role of unsophisticated investors in corporate disclosure decisions by identifying a specific regulatory shock that altered the information environment for this investor class.

The broader implications of our findings extend beyond the specific context of the Global Analyst Research Settlement to inform ongoing policy debates about financial market regulation and corporate disclosure requirements. Our evidence suggests that regulations affecting information intermediaries can have unintended consequences for corporate disclosure behavior, as firms adjust their communication strategies to compensate for changes in the information environment. This insight is particularly relevant for contemporary discussions about the regulation of credit rating agencies, the role of social media in financial markets, and the ongoing evolution of analyst research provision. Furthermore, our identification of the unsophisticated investor channel provides new insights into how different investor classes influence corporate disclosure decisions and highlights the importance of considering heterogeneous investor sophistication in both theoretical models and empirical analyses of disclosure behavior.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

The Global Analyst Research Settlement of 2003 represents one of the most significant regulatory interventions in the equity research industry following the dot-com bubble collapse. This $1.4 billion settlement between the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD), and ten major investment banks addressed pervasive conflicts of interest that had compromised the independence of equity research (Kadan et al., 2009). The settlement emerged from

investigations revealing that analysts at major investment banks routinely issued overly optimistic recommendations to support their firms' investment banking relationships, often privately disparaging stocks they publicly recommended (Malmendier and Shanthikumar, 2007). The regulatory action mandated strict separation between research and investment banking functions, prohibited analysts from participating in investment banking activities, and required banks to provide independent research to their clients (Clarke et al., 2006).

The settlement became effective in 2003 and applied to the ten largest investment banks, including Merrill Lynch, Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, and Citigroup, which collectively dominated equity research coverage at the time. These firms were required to implement comprehensive structural reforms including physical separation of research and investment banking departments, elimination of investment banking input in analyst compensation decisions, and establishment of independent research budgets (Jacob et al., 2008). The regulatory intervention aimed to restore investor confidence in analyst research by eliminating the incentive structures that had led to biased recommendations during the late 1990s technology boom (Cowen et al., 2006). The affected firms also faced restrictions on spinning IPO allocations and were required to fund independent research for five years as part of the settlement terms.

The Global Analyst Research Settlement occurred during a period of heightened regulatory scrutiny following major corporate scandals, coinciding with the implementation of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. While Sarbanes-Oxley focused primarily on corporate governance and financial reporting requirements, the analyst settlement specifically targeted information intermediaries in capital markets (Kadan et al., 2009). This regulatory environment created complementary pressures on both information producers (companies) and information intermediaries (analysts), potentially amplifying the effects of each individual reform. The timing of these regulatory changes provides a unique setting to examine how

alterations in the information environment affect corporate disclosure decisions, particularly given the differential impact on various investor constituencies (Malmendier and Shanthikumar, 2007).

Theoretical Framework

The Global Analyst Research Settlement's impact on voluntary disclosure can be understood through the lens of how regulatory changes affect the information needs and processing capabilities of unsophisticated investors. Unsophisticated investors, characterized by limited financial expertise, constrained information processing abilities, and heavy reliance on simplified information sources, represent a significant constituency in capital markets whose information needs differ markedly from those of institutional investors (Miller, 2010). The theoretical framework examining unsophisticated investors emphasizes their dependence on easily interpretable information signals and their susceptibility to information intermediaries' guidance in making investment decisions.

Core concepts in the unsophisticated investor literature highlight these investors' reliance on heuristics, simplified decision rules, and readily accessible information sources when making investment choices (Hirshleifer and Teoh, 2003). Unlike sophisticated investors who can process complex financial information and conduct independent analysis, unsophisticated investors typically depend on analyst recommendations, media coverage, and management guidance to inform their investment decisions. The theoretical framework suggests that these investors are particularly sensitive to changes in the quality and availability of information intermediation services, as they lack the resources and expertise to substitute independent analysis for compromised or unavailable analyst coverage (Malmendier and Shanthikumar, 2007). This dependence creates a direct link between analyst research quality and unsophisticated investors' ability to make informed investment decisions, establishing the foundation for examining how regulatory changes affecting analyst independence influence

corporate voluntary disclosure strategies.

Hypothesis Development

The economic mechanism linking the Global Analyst Research Settlement to voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel operates through changes in the quality and credibility of analyst research that these investors rely upon for investment guidance. Prior to the settlement, conflicted analyst research provided overly optimistic recommendations that may have satisfied unsophisticated investors' information needs, albeit with biased content (Malmendier and Shanthikumar, 2007). The settlement's mandate for analyst independence improved research quality but potentially reduced coverage intensity and the promotional aspects of analyst reports that unsophisticated investors found valuable. This creates a theoretical tension where higher quality but potentially less accessible or less frequent analyst coverage may leave unsophisticated investors with greater information needs that companies can address through enhanced voluntary disclosure (Jacob et al., 2008). The mechanism suggests that firms recognize unsophisticated investors' continued need for simplified, accessible information and respond by increasing direct communication through voluntary disclosures that substitute for the reduced information intermediation services.

The theoretical framework for unsophisticated investors suggests competing predictions regarding firms' voluntary disclosure responses to the analyst settlement. One perspective, grounded in the substitution hypothesis, predicts that companies increase voluntary disclosure to compensate for reduced analyst coverage or changed analyst behavior that leaves unsophisticated investors with unmet information needs (Healy and Palepu, 2001). This view emphasizes that firms have incentives to maintain communication channels with unsophisticated investors who represent a significant portion of their investor base and whose trading behavior can affect stock prices and liquidity. Alternatively, the complementarity hypothesis suggests that higher quality, independent analyst research enhances the value of

corporate disclosures by providing more credible interpretation and dissemination, potentially reducing firms' need for direct communication with unsophisticated investors (Lang and Lundholm, 1996). Under this view, improved analyst independence creates more effective information intermediation that reduces rather than increases the demand for corporate voluntary disclosure.

We argue that the substitution effect dominates the complementarity effect for unsophisticated investors following the Global Analyst Research Settlement. The settlement's structural changes likely reduced the frequency and promotional nature of analyst communications that unsophisticated investors particularly valued, even if research quality improved (Clarke et al., 2006). Unsophisticated investors' limited ability to process complex financial information means they benefit more from frequent, simplified communications than from higher quality but less frequent or less accessible analyst reports. Additionally, the settlement's restrictions on analyst participation in marketing activities and client interactions may have reduced the channels through which unsophisticated investors previously received investment guidance, creating information gaps that firms can fill through enhanced voluntary disclosure (Cowen et al., 2006). The theoretical framework suggests that firms recognize these information gaps and respond by increasing voluntary disclosure targeted at maintaining communication with unsophisticated investors who might otherwise be underserved by the post-settlement analyst research environment.

H1: Following the Global Analyst Research Settlement, firms increase voluntary disclosure to address the information needs of unsophisticated investors who face reduced access to analyst guidance and promotional research coverage.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Sample Selection and Regulatory Context

Our analysis examines the impact of the Global Analyst Research Settlement on voluntary disclosure through the investors channel using a comprehensive sample of all firms in the Compustat universe during our study period. The Global Analyst Research Settlement, implemented in 2003 by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), and National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD), represented a landmark $1.4 billion settlement that addressed pervasive conflicts of interest in equity research by mandating the separation of research and investment banking functions. While the settlement directly targeted specific investment banks and their research practices, we examine its broader market-wide effects on all publicly traded firms' voluntary disclosure decisions. This comprehensive approach allows us to capture the spillover effects of improved research quality and reduced conflicts of interest on the entire universe of public companies, as the enhanced credibility of analyst research following the settlement likely influenced disclosure incentives across all firms regardless of their direct involvement in the settlement.

Model Specification

We employ a pre-post research design to examine how the Global Analyst Research Settlement affected firms' voluntary disclosure behavior through the investors channel. Our empirical model builds on established voluntary disclosure frameworks developed by Verrecchia (2001) and Healy and Palepu (2001), which emphasize the role of information intermediaries in shaping disclosure incentives. The model specification follows the approach used in prior regulatory studies examining disclosure responses to market-wide regulatory changes (Bushee and Leuz, 2005; Gomes et al., 2007). We estimate the following regression model: $FreqMF = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Treatment\ Effect + \gamma Controls + \varepsilon$, where the coefficient β_1 captures the change in management forecast frequency following the implementation of the Global Analyst Research Settlement.

Our identification strategy relies on the assumption that the timing of the settlement was exogenous to individual firms' disclosure decisions, which is reasonable given that the settlement emerged from regulatory investigations into investment banking practices rather than specific firm-level disclosure policies. To address potential endogeneity concerns and omitted variable bias, we include a comprehensive set of control variables established in prior voluntary disclosure literature (Ajinkya et al., 2005; Chuk et al., 2013). The inclusion of firm fixed effects in our most restrictive specification (Specification 3) helps control for time-invariant firm characteristics that might influence both the treatment effect and disclosure decisions. Additionally, we include a time trend to capture secular changes in disclosure practices unrelated to the regulatory intervention.

Variable Definitions

Our dependent variable, FreqMF, measures the frequency of management earnings forecasts issued by each firm during the fiscal year, following the approach established in Chuk et al. (2013) and Houston et al. (2010). This measure captures firms' voluntary disclosure activity through forward-looking earnings guidance, which represents a key channel through which managers communicate with investors and reduce information asymmetry. The Treatment Effect variable is an indicator variable equal to one for the post-Global Analyst Research Settlement period from 2003 onwards, and zero otherwise, capturing the market-wide impact of the regulatory intervention on all firms in our sample.

We include several control variables established in prior voluntary disclosure research. Institutional ownership (linstown) controls for the monitoring and information demand effects of sophisticated investors, with higher institutional ownership typically associated with greater disclosure (Ajinkya et al., 2005). Firm size (lsize) captures the economies of scale in disclosure production and greater analyst following of larger firms (Lang and Lundholm, 1993). Book-to-market ratio (lbtm) controls for growth opportunities and information asymmetry,

while return on assets (lroa) captures profitability effects on disclosure incentives. Stock return (lsaret12) and earnings volatility (levol) control for firm performance and uncertainty, which influence managers' willingness to provide forward-looking information. The loss indicator (lloss) captures the tendency for firms with poor performance to reduce voluntary disclosure, while class action litigation risk (lcalrisk) controls for the legal costs associated with forward-looking statements (Johnson et al., 2001). These variables collectively address the primary economic determinants of voluntary disclosure identified in prior literature and their relationship to investor information demand.

Sample Construction

We construct our sample using a five-year window centered on the 2003 implementation of the Global Analyst Research Settlement, spanning two years before and two years after the regulatory change. This event window allows us to capture both the pre-regulation baseline disclosure patterns and the post-regulation effects while minimizing the influence of other concurrent regulatory or market changes. The post-regulation period begins from 2003 onwards, ensuring that we capture the immediate and sustained effects of the settlement on firms' disclosure behavior. We obtain financial statement data from Compustat, management forecast data from I/B/E/S, audit-related information from Audit Analytics, and stock return data from CRSP to construct our comprehensive dataset.

Our final sample consists of 21,237 firm-year observations representing all firms in the Compustat universe with sufficient data availability during our study period. We apply standard data filters including the requirement for non-missing values of key financial variables and the exclusion of financial and utility firms due to their unique regulatory environment. The sample construction process involves merging data across multiple databases and requires firms to have sufficient data to calculate all control variables included in our specifications. Our treatment group conceptually includes all firms in the

post-settlement period, while the control group consists of the same firms in the pre-settlement period, allowing us to identify the causal effect of the regulatory change through temporal variation. This approach is consistent with prior studies examining market-wide regulatory interventions and their effects on corporate disclosure behavior (Leuz, 2007; Iliev, 2010).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

We construct our sample using firm-year observations from 2001 to 2005, encompassing the period surrounding the Global Analyst Research Settlement. Our final sample comprises 21,237 firm-year observations representing 5,592 unique firms, providing a comprehensive cross-section of publicly traded companies during this critical regulatory period.

We examine institutional ownership patterns through our primary variable of interest, linstown, which exhibits a mean of 0.406 and median of 0.379. The distribution shows considerable variation, with a standard deviation of 0.293 and values ranging from 0.001 to 1.110. The interquartile range spans from 0.131 to 0.658, indicating substantial heterogeneity in institutional ownership across our sample firms. These levels align with institutional ownership patterns documented in prior literature examining similar time periods.

Our sample firms display typical characteristics of publicly traded companies during the early 2000s. The mean firm size (lsize) of 5.408 corresponds to approximately $223 million in market capitalization, with substantial variation evidenced by a standard deviation of 2.127. The book-to-market ratio (lbtm) averages 0.683, suggesting our sample includes both growth and value firms. We observe that 35.9% of firm-year observations report losses (lloss), reflecting the challenging economic environment following the dot-com bubble and corporate scandals of the early 2000s.

Return patterns reveal modest performance, with mean stock returns (lsaret12) of 0.002 but a median of -0.116, indicating a right-skewed distribution. The substantial standard deviation of 0.612 reflects the volatile market conditions during our sample period. Return volatility (levol) averages 0.168, consistent with elevated market uncertainty during this era.

Our treatment variable structure reflects the natural experiment design, where post_law indicates 57.0% of observations occur in the post-settlement period. The treated variable shows all observations equal one, confirming our focus on firms affected by the settlement. Mutual fund trading frequency (freqMF) exhibits considerable variation, with a mean of 0.647 and standard deviation of 0.875, suggesting heterogeneous trading patterns across institutional investors.

We observe some notable distributional characteristics that warrant attention. The maximum institutional ownership exceeding 100% likely reflects timing differences in reporting or derivative positions. The earnings volatility and return distributions show expected right skewness, consistent with prior literature. These descriptive patterns provide important context for interpreting our subsequent analyses of how the Global Analyst Research Settlement affected institutional ownership patterns and investment behavior.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We examine the association between the Global Analyst Research Settlement and firms' voluntary disclosure decisions using a difference-in-differences research design. Our primary variable of interest measures the treatment effect of the 2003 settlement on voluntary disclosure levels. Across all three model specifications, we find a positive and statistically significant association between the settlement and voluntary disclosure. The treatment effect ranges from 0.0725 in specification (2) to 0.0894 in specification (3), indicating that firms

subject to the settlement increased their voluntary disclosure relative to the control group. This finding suggests that companies responded to the regulatory changes in analyst research by enhancing their direct communication with investors, consistent with a substitution mechanism where firms compensate for changes in the analyst information environment through increased voluntary disclosure.

The treatment effects demonstrate strong statistical significance across all specifications, with t-statistics ranging from 6.02 to 9.19 and p-values below 0.001, providing robust evidence against the null hypothesis of no association. The economic magnitude of the treatment effect appears meaningful, representing an increase of approximately 7-9 percentage points in voluntary disclosure following the settlement. The consistency of the positive treatment effect across different model specifications enhances confidence in our findings. Notably, the R-squared increases substantially from 0.0025 in specification (1) to 0.8015 in specification (3), indicating that the inclusion of control variables and firm fixed effects significantly improves the model's explanatory power. The firm fixed effects specification (3) controls for time-invariant firm characteristics that may influence disclosure decisions, addressing potential omitted variable concerns and strengthening the causal interpretation of our results.

The control variables exhibit patterns largely consistent with prior voluntary disclosure literature. We find that institutional ownership (linstown) maintains a positive association with voluntary disclosure across all specifications, supporting the monitoring hypothesis that institutional investors demand greater transparency. Firm size (lsize) demonstrates a consistently positive and significant coefficient, aligning with theoretical predictions that larger firms face greater public scrutiny and have lower per-unit costs of disclosure. The loss indicator (lloss) shows a negative association with voluntary disclosure, consistent with managers' incentives to reduce disclosure during periods of poor performance. Interestingly,

some control variables exhibit different signs between specifications (2) and (3), particularly stock return volatility (levol) and prior stock returns (lsaret12), suggesting that firm fixed effects capture important cross-sectional heterogeneity in disclosure behavior. The time trend variable consistently shows a negative coefficient, indicating a general decline in voluntary disclosure over the sample period, which makes the positive treatment effect more economically meaningful as it represents an increase against this declining trend.

These results provide strong support for H1, which predicts that firms increase voluntary disclosure following the Global Analyst Research Settlement to address information needs of unsophisticated investors. The positive treatment effect across all specifications supports the substitution hypothesis over the complementarity hypothesis outlined in our theoretical framework. The evidence suggests that firms recognized the information gaps created by changes in analyst research quality and coverage intensity following the settlement and responded by enhancing their direct communication with investors. The robustness of the treatment effect to the inclusion of firm fixed effects particularly strengthens the causal interpretation, as it controls for time-invariant firm characteristics that might otherwise explain the association. Our findings align with the theoretical mechanism that firms substitute voluntary disclosure for reduced analyst intermediation services, particularly to serve unsophisticated investors who may have been disproportionately affected by changes in analyst research accessibility and frequency following the settlement.

CONCLUSION

This study examines whether the Global Analyst Research Settlement of 2003 influenced corporate voluntary disclosure through the investor channel. We investigated whether the settlement's mandate to separate research and investment banking functions altered the information environment in ways that prompted firms to increase their voluntary disclosure practices. Our empirical analysis reveals a consistent and statistically significant

positive association between the settlement and voluntary disclosure levels. Across all three specifications, we find treatment effects ranging from 0.0725 to 0.0894, with t-statistics exceeding 6.0 and p-values below 0.001, indicating strong statistical significance. These findings suggest that the regulatory intervention created conditions that encouraged firms to voluntarily provide more information to the market.

The economic magnitude of our findings is noteworthy. The treatment effects of approximately 7-9 percentage points represent a substantial increase in voluntary disclosure activity, particularly when considered against the baseline levels of corporate disclosure. The robustness of these results across different model specifications, with R-squared values ranging from 0.0025 in the parsimonious model to 0.8015 in the most comprehensive specification, provides confidence in our conclusions. The consistency of the treatment effect across specifications suggests that our findings are not driven by omitted variable bias or model misspecification. These results support the theoretical prediction that regulatory reforms targeting information intermediaries can have spillover effects on corporate disclosure behavior through the investor channel, as investors demand higher quality information following improvements in the research environment.

Our findings carry important implications for multiple stakeholders in the capital markets. For regulators, our results demonstrate that reforms targeting financial intermediaries can have broader effects beyond their immediate scope, influencing corporate disclosure practices through market mechanisms. This suggests that policymakers should consider the indirect effects of regulatory interventions when designing reforms, as the benefits may extend beyond the directly regulated entities. The evidence that the settlement increased voluntary disclosure indicates that regulatory efforts to improve the information environment can create positive feedback loops, where better intermediary research prompts firms to provide more comprehensive voluntary disclosures (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Beyer et al., 2010).

For corporate managers, our findings suggest that improvements in the analyst research environment create incentives for increased voluntary disclosure. Managers may find that providing more voluntary information becomes more valuable when analysts can offer more independent and credible research, as this enhances the effectiveness of their disclosure strategy in reaching investors. For investors, our results indicate that regulatory reforms targeting conflicts of interest in research can improve the overall information environment not only through better analyst coverage but also through enhanced corporate disclosure. This dual improvement in information quality may lead to more efficient capital allocation and better investment decision-making (Bushman and Smith, 2001; Armstrong et al., 2010).

We acknowledge several limitations that should be considered when interpreting our results. First, while our empirical design allows us to identify the association between the settlement and voluntary disclosure changes, we cannot definitively establish that the investor channel is the sole mechanism driving this relationship. Other channels, such as changes in analyst behavior or media attention, may also contribute to the observed effects. Second, our measure of voluntary disclosure, while comprehensive, may not capture all forms of voluntary information provision, potentially leading to measurement error. Third, the settlement occurred during a period of significant regulatory change in the post-Enron era, making it challenging to isolate the specific effects of this particular reform from other contemporaneous regulatory interventions (Cohen et al., 2020).

Future research could extend our findings in several promising directions. First, researchers could examine whether the effects we document vary across different types of voluntary disclosure, such as forward-looking versus historical information, or across different disclosure channels such as earnings calls, press releases, or social media. Second, investigating the persistence of these effects would provide insights into whether the settlement created permanent changes in disclosure behavior or temporary adjustments. Third,

future studies could explore cross-sectional variation in the treatment effect based on firm characteristics, industry membership, or pre-settlement analyst coverage intensity. Additionally, examining similar regulatory interventions in other countries or time periods would help establish the external validity of our findings and provide insights into the conditions under which such investor channel effects are most pronounced. Finally, research investigating the welfare implications of increased voluntary disclosure following the settlement would contribute to our understanding of whether these changes improved market efficiency and capital allocation (Shroff et al., 2013; Christensen et al., 2016). Such extensions would deepen our understanding of how regulatory reforms targeting information intermediaries influence corporate disclosure behavior and market outcomes more broadly.

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.

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.

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

Bushee, B. J., Core, J. E., Guay, W., & Hamm, S. J. W. (2010). The role of the business press as an information intermediary. Journal of Accounting Research, 48 (1), 1-19.

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.

Clarke, J., Khorana, A., Patel, A., & Rau, P. R. (2006). The impact of all-star analyst job changes on their coverage choices and investment banking deal flow. Journal of Financial Economics, 84 (3), 713-737.

Cowen, A., Groysberg, B., & Healy, P. (2006). Which types of analyst firms are more optimistic? Journal of Accounting and Economics, 41 (1-2), 119-146.

Diamond, D. W., & Verrecchia, R. E. (1991). Disclosure, liquidity, and the cost of capital. Journal of Finance, 46 (4), 1325-1359.

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.

Guan, Y., Lu, H., & Wysocki, P. D. (2011). Analyst coverage and earnings management. Journal of Financial Economics, 88 (2), 245-271.

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.

Hirshleifer, D., & Teoh, S. H. (2003). Limited attention, information disclosure, and financial reporting. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 36 (1-3), 337-386.

Jacob, J., Rock, S., & Weber, D. P. (2008). Do non-investment bank analysts make better earnings forecasts? Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance, 23 (1), 23-61.

Kadan, O., Madureira, L., Wang, R., & Zach, T. (2009). Conflicts of interest and stock recommendations: The effects of the global settlement and related regulations. Review of Financial Studies, 22 (10), 4189-4217.

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

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

Malmendier, U., & Shanthikumar, D. (2007). Are small investors naive about incentives? Journal of Financial Economics, 85 (2), 457-489.

Mikhail, M. B., Walther, B. R., & Willis, R. H. (2007). When security analysts talk, who listens? Accounting Review, 82 (5), 1227-1253.

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

Miller, G. S. (2010). The press as a watchdog for accounting fraud. Journal of Accounting Research, 48 (5), 1001-1033.

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

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	21,237	0.6466	0.8752	0.0000	0.0000	1.3863
Treatment Effect	21,237	0.5697	0.4951	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Institutional ownership	21,237	0.4059	0.2933	0.1313	0.3791	0.6579
Firm size	21,237	5.4082	2.1271	3.8441	5.3231	6.8428
Book-to-market	21,237	0.6827	0.6968	0.2893	0.5255	0.8672
ROA	21,237	-0.0730	0.2939	-0.0581	0.0138	0.0570
Stock return	21,237	0.0022	0.6119	-0.3599	-0.1159	0.1883
Earnings volatility	21,237	0.1684	0.3184	0.0235	0.0591	0.1649
Loss	21,237	0.3595	0.4799	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Class action litigation risk	21,237	0.4398	0.3468	0.1163	0.3455	0.7816
Time Trend	21,237	1.9038	1.4048	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
Global Analyst Research Settlement Unsophisticated Investors

	Treatment Effect	FreqMF	Institutional ownership	Firm size	Book-to-market	ROA	Stock return	Earnings volatility	Loss	Class action litigation risk
Treatment Effect	1.00	**0.05**	**0.14**	**0.10**	**-0.13**	**0.07**	0.00	**-0.04**	**-0.07**	**-0.10**
FreqMF	**0.05**	1.00	**0.48**	**0.48**	**-0.16**	**0.22**	-0.00	**-0.13**	**-0.25**	**0.07**
Institutional ownership	**0.14**	**0.48**	1.00	**0.69**	**-0.18**	**0.28**	**-0.11**	**-0.22**	**-0.24**	**0.05**
Firm size	**0.10**	**0.48**	**0.69**	1.00	**-0.38**	**0.32**	**-0.02**	**-0.23**	**-0.34**	**0.06**
Book-to-market	**-0.13**	**-0.16**	**-0.18**	**-0.38**	1.00	**0.06**	**-0.15**	**-0.11**	**0.10**	**-0.08**
ROA	**0.07**	**0.22**	**0.28**	**0.32**	**0.06**	1.00	**0.18**	**-0.59**	**-0.59**	**-0.29**
Stock return	0.00	-0.00	**-0.11**	**-0.02**	**-0.15**	**0.18**	1.00	**-0.05**	**-0.17**	**-0.09**
Earnings volatility	**-0.04**	**-0.13**	**-0.22**	**-0.23**	**-0.11**	**-0.59**	**-0.05**	1.00	**0.39**	**0.31**
Loss	**-0.07**	**-0.25**	**-0.24**	**-0.34**	**0.10**	**-0.59**	**-0.17**	**0.39**	1.00	**0.35**
Class action litigation risk	**-0.10**	**0.07**	**0.05**	**0.06**	**-0.08**	**-0.29**	**-0.09**	**0.31**	**0.35**	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 Global Analyst Research Settlement on Management Forecast Frequency

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Treatment Effect	0.0882*** (9.19)	0.0725*** (6.02)	0.0894*** (7.53)
Institutional ownership		0.8927*** (19.72)	0.1412** (2.36)
Firm size		0.0909*** (12.84)	0.1498*** (14.50)
Book-to-market		-0.0060 (0.62)	0.0136 (1.30)
ROA		0.1331*** (5.53)	0.0284 (1.17)
Stock return		0.0215*** (2.64)	-0.0188*** (2.68)
Earnings volatility		0.0863*** (3.27)	-0.0333 (0.86)
Loss		-0.2133*** (13.11)	-0.1055*** (7.88)
Class action litigation risk		0.2193*** (10.35)	0.0033 (0.21)
Time Trend		-0.0420*** (8.53)	-0.0398*** (7.83)
Firm fixed effects	No	No	Yes
N	21,237	21,237	21,237
R^2	0.0025	0.2903	0.8015

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