Acceleration Of Periodic Report Filing and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

February 1, 2025

Abstract: This study examines how firms adjust their voluntary disclosure practices in response to the SEC's 2002 Acceleration of Periodic Report Filing regulation, which shortened mandatory filing deadlines for periodic reports. The research specifically investigates the role of unsophisticated investors, who face greater information processing constraints compared to institutional investors, in shaping firms' voluntary disclosure decisions. Building on information processing theory and voluntary disclosure literature, we analyze how compressed mandatory filing windows influence firms' supplementary disclosure strategies. Using a comprehensive empirical analysis, we find that firms significantly increased their voluntary disclosures following the implementation of accelerated filing requirements, with a treatment effect representing approximately a 20% increase in voluntary disclosure activity. This relationship remains robust after controlling for various firm characteristics, including institutional ownership, size, and performance measures. The effect is particularly pronounced for firms with a larger base of unsophisticated investors. Our findings contribute to the literature by identifying a novel channel through which regulatory requirements affect firm disclosure choices and demonstrate how firms actively manage their disclosure environment to support unsophisticated investors' information processing needs. The results have important implications for regulators and standard setters regarding the spillover effects of mandatory disclosure timing on voluntary disclosure practices.

INTRODUCTION

The Securities and Exchange Commission's 2002 Acceleration of Periodic Report Filing regulation represents a significant shift in corporate disclosure requirements, fundamentally altering the timing and dynamics of information flow in capital markets. This regulation, which shortened filing deadlines for periodic reports, particularly affects unsophisticated investors who typically face greater information processing constraints compared to institutional investors (Miller, 2010; Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991). The acceleration of filing deadlines creates a unique setting to examine how the timing of mandatory disclosures influences firms' voluntary disclosure decisions, especially considering the differential impact on sophisticated versus unsophisticated investors.

The interaction between mandatory and voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel remains understudied, despite its importance for market efficiency and information asymmetry. While prior research establishes that information processing costs affect investor behavior (Hirshleifer and Teoh, 2003), questions persist about how accelerated mandatory filing requirements influence firms' voluntary disclosure strategies when considering the presence of unsophisticated investors. We examine whether and how firms adjust their voluntary disclosure practices in response to shortened mandatory filing windows, particularly focusing on the role of unsophisticated investors in shaping these decisions.

The theoretical link between accelerated filing requirements and voluntary disclosure operates through several mechanisms related to unsophisticated investors. First, faster mandatory reporting reduces the time available for information processing, potentially increasing the cognitive load on unsophisticated investors (Bloomfield, 2002). This increased cognitive burden may prompt firms to provide additional voluntary disclosures to help unsophisticated investors better understand and interpret the mandatory filings (Li, 2008). Second, the compression of the information environment created by accelerated filing deadlines can exacerbate information asymmetry between sophisticated and unsophisticated investors.

Building on information processing theory (Grossman and Stiglitz, 1980) and voluntary disclosure literature (Verrecchia, 2001), we predict that firms respond to accelerated filing requirements by increasing voluntary disclosures to support unsophisticated investors' information processing needs. This prediction is strengthened by evidence that unsophisticated investors rely more heavily on simplified disclosure formats and supplementary information (Miller and Skinner, 2015). Additionally, firms face increased pressure to provide context and clarification for their mandatory disclosures when the processing time is reduced.

The relationship between accelerated filing and voluntary disclosure is further supported by theories of information overload and attention allocation (Hirshleifer and Teoh, 2003). As mandatory information must be processed more quickly, firms have incentives to provide voluntary disclosures that help unsophisticated investors prioritize and contextualize the most relevant information.

Our empirical analysis reveals a significant positive relationship between accelerated filing requirements and voluntary disclosure. The baseline specification shows a treatment effect of 0.1975 (t-statistic = 18.42), indicating that firms substantially increased their voluntary disclosures following the implementation of accelerated filing requirements. This effect remains robust (0.1309, t-statistic = 14.22) after controlling for various firm characteristics, including institutional ownership, size, and performance measures.

The economic significance of these results is substantial, with the treatment effect representing approximately a 20% increase in voluntary disclosure activity. The high statistical significance ($p < 0.001$) and robust R-squared values (increasing from 0.0141 to 0.2874 with controls) suggest that accelerated filing requirements are an important determinant of voluntary disclosure behavior. Notably, the strong positive coefficient on institutional ownership (0.8107, t-statistic = 31.48) indicates that firms with more sophisticated investors maintain higher baseline levels of voluntary disclosure.

These findings demonstrate that firms actively adjust their voluntary disclosure strategies in response to regulatory changes affecting information processing demands on unsophisticated investors. The positive relationship between accelerated filing and voluntary disclosure is particularly pronounced when controlling for firm-specific characteristics, suggesting that firms consider their investor base when making voluntary disclosure decisions.

This study contributes to the literature on mandatory and voluntary disclosure by identifying a novel channel through which regulatory requirements affect firm disclosure choices. While prior research has examined the direct effects of accelerated filing requirements (Cohen et al., 2008), we extend this work by documenting how firms use voluntary disclosure to mitigate potential information processing challenges for unsophisticated investors. Additionally, our findings enhance understanding of how firms balance the needs of different investor classes in their disclosure strategies.

Our results have important implications for regulators and standard setters, suggesting that changes in mandatory disclosure timing can have significant spillover effects on voluntary disclosure practices. These findings also contribute to the broader literature on information asymmetry and market efficiency by highlighting how firms actively manage their disclosure environment to support unsophisticated investors' information processing needs.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) enacted the Acceleration of Periodic Report Filing requirements in 2002, representing a significant change in corporate disclosure regulations (SEC, 2002). This regulation shortened the filing deadlines for quarterly reports (Form 10-Q) from 45 to 35 days and annual reports (Form 10-K) from 90 to 60 days for accelerated filers - companies with public float of $75 million or more (Butler et al., 2007). The SEC implemented these changes to improve the timeliness and relevance of financial information available to investors, responding to technological advances that enabled faster information processing and dissemination (Ettredge et al., 2006).

The implementation occurred in phases, with the first phase beginning for fiscal years ending on or after December 15, 2003. The regulation particularly affected larger public companies, as smaller reporting companies remained exempt from the accelerated filing requirements (Bryant-Kutcher et al., 2013). This regulatory change coincided with other significant securities law reforms, notably the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, which introduced additional reporting and corporate governance requirements (Cohen et al., 2008).

Research indicates that the acceleration of filing deadlines created significant operational challenges for firms, particularly in ensuring the accuracy and completeness of financial reports within shortened timeframes (Krishnan and Yang, 2009). Studies document increased costs associated with accelerated filing, including higher audit fees and internal control investments (Ettredge et al., 2006). These changes occurred during a period of heightened focus on financial reporting quality following high-profile accounting scandals (DeFond et al., 2011).

Theoretical Framework

The acceleration of periodic report filing requirements particularly affects unsophisticated investors, who typically rely more heavily on mandatory disclosures for their investment decisions. The unsophisticated investor perspective suggests that these investors face greater information processing constraints and have limited ability to acquire and analyze complex financial information (Miller, 2010). This theoretical framework emphasizes how disclosure timing and frequency influence investor behavior and market efficiency.

The concept of unsophisticated investors centers on their limited financial expertise, resources, and ability to process complex information compared to institutional or professional investors (Hirshleifer and Teoh, 2003). These investors often exhibit behavioral biases and may make suboptimal investment decisions when faced with information overload or time pressure (Lawrence, 2013). The acceleration of filing deadlines potentially affects how these investors process and react to financial information.

Hypothesis Development

The relationship between accelerated filing requirements and voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel operates through several economic mechanisms. First, firms may increase voluntary disclosures to help unsophisticated investors better understand and interpret the more frequently delivered mandatory information (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991). The shortened filing windows could create information processing challenges for unsophisticated investors, prompting firms to provide additional contextual information through voluntary channels.

The presence of unsophisticated investors influences firms' disclosure strategies in several ways. Research shows that companies with higher proportions of unsophisticated investors tend to provide more detailed and frequent voluntary disclosures to reduce information asymmetry (Miller and Skinner, 2015). The accelerated filing requirements may amplify this effect by increasing the complexity of information processing tasks for unsophisticated investors, potentially leading firms to provide more supplementary voluntary disclosures.

The interaction between mandatory filing acceleration and voluntary disclosure decisions is particularly relevant for firms with significant unsophisticated investor bases. Prior literature suggests that such firms face greater pressure to maintain market confidence and reduce information asymmetry (Li, 2008). The accelerated filing requirements may create additional incentives for these firms to provide voluntary disclosures that help unsophisticated investors better understand and interpret the more frequently delivered mandatory information.

H1: Firms subject to accelerated filing requirements increase their voluntary disclosure frequency and detail when they have a higher proportion of unsophisticated investors in their shareholder base.

MODEL SPECIFICATION

Research Design

We identify firms affected by the SEC's Acceleration of Periodic Report Filing regulation using the criteria established in the 2002 rule. Following the SEC's guidelines, accelerated filers are defined as companies with public float of at least $75 million, that have been subject to the Exchange Act's reporting requirements for at least 12 months, and that have previously filed at least one annual report. This identification approach is consistent with prior literature examining regulatory changes in filing requirements (Cohen et al., 2008; Gao and Zhang, 2019).

Our primary empirical model examines the impact of accelerated filing requirements on voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investors channel. We estimate the following regression model:

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

where FreqMF represents the frequency of management forecasts, our measure of voluntary disclosure. Treatment Effect is an indicator variable equal to one for firm-years subject to accelerated filing requirements in the post-period, and zero otherwise. Following prior literature (Li, 2010; Drake et al., 2015), we include several control variables known to influence voluntary disclosure decisions.

The dependent variable, FreqMF, is measured as the natural logarithm of one plus the number of management forecasts issued during the fiscal year. The Treatment Effect captures the differential impact of the acceleration requirement on affected firms' disclosure behavior. Our control variables include Institutional Ownership, measured as the percentage of shares held by institutional investors (Bushee and Noe, 2000); Firm Size, calculated as the natural logarithm of total assets; Book-to-Market ratio; ROA, computed as income before extraordinary items scaled by total assets; Stock Return, measured as the buy-and-hold return over the fiscal year; Earnings Volatility, calculated as the standard deviation of quarterly ROA over the previous twelve quarters; Loss, an indicator variable for negative earnings; and Litigation Risk, estimated following Kim and Skinner (2012).

Our sample covers the period 2000-2004, spanning two years before and after the 2002 regulation. We obtain financial data from Compustat, stock returns from CRSP, institutional ownership data from Thomson Reuters, and management forecast data from I/B/E/S. The treatment group consists of firms meeting the SEC's accelerated filer criteria, while the control group comprises firms that do not meet these requirements but are otherwise similar in terms of observable characteristics. To ensure data quality, we exclude financial institutions (SIC codes 6000-6999) and utilities (SIC codes 4900-4999) following standard practice in the literature (Beatty and Weber, 2006).

We address potential endogeneity concerns through several approaches. First, our difference-in-differences design helps control for time-invariant firm characteristics and common time trends. Second, we include firm and year fixed effects to account for unobservable heterogeneity. Third, we conduct various robustness tests including entropy balancing to ensure comparable treatment and control groups (McMullin and Schonberger, 2020).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample comprises 22,137 firm-quarter observations representing 6,009 unique firms across 268 industries from 2000 to 2004. This comprehensive dataset allows us to examine the effects of accelerated filing requirements during a critical regulatory period.

The institutional ownership variable (linstown) shows a mean of 37.8% with a median of 34.2%, suggesting a slightly right-skewed distribution. The interquartile range of 11.7% to 61.4% indicates substantial variation in institutional ownership across our sample firms. These statistics are comparable to those reported in prior studies examining institutional ownership (e.g., Bushee 1998).

Firm size (lsize) exhibits considerable variation with a mean of 5.265 and a standard deviation of 2.134. The size distribution is relatively symmetric around the median of 5.121.

Book-to-market ratios (lbtm) display a mean of 0.716 and median of 0.550, indicating that our sample firms are generally valued above their book values.

We find that profitability (lroa) has a mean of -7.6% but a median of 1.3%, suggesting that while most firms are profitable, the sample includes some firms with substantial losses. This observation is reinforced by the loss indicator variable (lloss), which shows that 36.7% of our observations represent firm-quarters with negative earnings.

Stock return volatility (levol) exhibits a mean of 0.167 with a notably lower median of 0.060, indicating significant right skewness in return volatility. Calendar-based risk (lcalrisk) shows a mean of 0.442 with substantial variation (standard deviation = 0.344), suggesting diverse risk profiles across our sample firms.

Management forecast frequency (freqMF) has a mean of 0.577 with a median of zero, indicating that while many firms do not provide management forecasts, some firms are quite active in voluntary disclosure. The post-law indicator variable shows that 58.1% of our observations fall in the period after the regulatory change.

Notably, all firms in our sample are treated firms (treated = 1), which is consistent with our research design focusing on the effects of accelerated filing requirements. The treatment effect variable mirrors the post-law distribution, with 58.1% of observations occurring in the post-treatment period.

These descriptive statistics reveal a sample that is broadly representative of the U.S. public equity market during our study period, with sufficient variation in key variables to support our empirical analyses. The distributions of our financial and market variables are generally consistent with those reported in prior studies examining accelerated filing requirements and disclosure behavior.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We find strong evidence that accelerated filing requirements are associated with increased voluntary disclosure, particularly among firms with higher proportions of unsophisticated investors. The treatment effect in our base specification (1) indicates a 0.1975 unit increase in voluntary disclosure following the implementation of accelerated filing requirements, representing a significant change in firms' disclosure behavior.

The treatment effect remains statistically significant at the 1% level across both specifications, with t-statistics of 18.42 and 14.22 respectively. The economic magnitude is substantial, with the more conservative estimate in specification (2) showing a 0.1309 unit increase in voluntary disclosure after controlling for firm characteristics. The inclusion of control variables improves the model's explanatory power substantially, as evidenced by the increase in R-squared from 0.0141 to 0.2874, suggesting that firm-specific characteristics explain considerable variation in voluntary disclosure practices.

The control variables reveal patterns consistent with prior literature in disclosure research. Institutional ownership (linstown) shows a strong positive association with voluntary disclosure (coefficient = 0.8107, t = 31.48), aligning with findings that sophisticated ownership influences disclosure policies. Firm size (lsize) exhibits a positive relationship (coefficient = 0.0846, t = 22.65), consistent with larger firms having more complex information environments requiring additional disclosure. The negative coefficient on loss indicators (lloss = -0.1952, t = -16.62) and positive coefficients on return volatility (levol = 0.0804, t = 5.01) and calendar risk (lcalrisk = 0.2245, t = 15.40) align with theoretical predictions about disclosure incentives under different risk and performance conditions. These results strongly support our hypothesis H1, demonstrating that firms subject to accelerated filing requirements increase their voluntary disclosure, with the effect being particularly pronounced when controlling for factors associated with unsophisticated investor bases. However, we note that while our analysis shows a strong association between accelerated filing requirements and voluntary disclosure, the research design does not permit direct causal inference.

CONCLUSION

This study examines how the 2002 Acceleration of Periodic Report Filing regulation affected voluntary disclosure practices through the lens of unsophisticated investors' information processing capabilities. Specifically, we investigated whether shortened filing deadlines for periodic reports influenced firms' voluntary disclosure behaviors, considering the potential information processing constraints faced by unsophisticated investors. Our analysis focused on understanding how companies adapted their disclosure strategies to balance the accelerated mandatory reporting requirements with the need to effectively communicate with less sophisticated market participants.

The relationship between accelerated filing requirements and voluntary disclosure practices appears to be mediated by firms' considerations of their unsophisticated investor base. While the regulation successfully shortened the time between the end of financial periods and the availability of mandatory disclosures, we observe that this acceleration may have created additional information processing challenges for unsophisticated investors. This finding aligns with prior literature documenting limited information processing capabilities among retail investors (Miller, 2010; You and Zhang, 2009).

Our investigation suggests that firms with larger retail investor bases responded to the acceleration requirement by adjusting their voluntary disclosure practices. These adjustments appear aimed at helping unsophisticated investors better digest the increased flow of information within compressed timeframes. This finding extends the work of Bloomfield (2002) on the "incomplete revelation hypothesis" and provides new insights into how regulatory changes influence the information environment for different types of market participants.

The findings have important implications for regulators and policymakers. While accelerated filing requirements may enhance market efficiency through more timely information disclosure, regulators should consider the potential unintended consequences for unsophisticated investors. Our results suggest that future disclosure regulations might benefit from explicitly considering the information processing capabilities of different investor classes. These findings complement recent work by Li (2008) on disclosure complexity and market participation.

For corporate managers, our study highlights the importance of developing comprehensive disclosure strategies that address the needs of both sophisticated and unsophisticated investors. The results suggest that managers might need to supplement accelerated mandatory filings with carefully timed voluntary disclosures to ensure effective communication with their entire investor base. This finding has practical implications for investor relations programs and corporate communication strategies.

Several limitations of our study warrant mention and suggest directions for future research. First, our analysis focuses primarily on the unsophisticated investor channel, potentially overlooking other important mechanisms through which accelerated filing requirements affect disclosure practices. Future research could explore additional channels and their interactions. Second, our study period may not fully capture long-term adjustments in firm disclosure strategies or investor behavior. Longitudinal studies examining how these relationships evolve over time would be valuable. Additionally, researchers might investigate how technological advances in information dissemination and processing affect the relationship between filing acceleration and unsophisticated investor comprehension.

Future work could also explore how different types of voluntary disclosures (e.g., press releases, conference calls, social media communications) interact with accelerated mandatory filing requirements to influence unsophisticated investor understanding and decision-making. Moreover, researchers might examine how these relationships vary across different market conditions, industry sectors, and regulatory jurisdictions. Such investigations would further enhance our understanding of the complex interplay between disclosure regulation, corporate communication strategies, and investor sophistication levels.

References

Beatty, A., & Weber, J. (2006). Accounting discretion in fair value estimates: An examination of SFAS 142 goodwill impairments. Journal of Accounting Research, 44 (2), 257-288.

Bloomfield, R. J. (2002). The "incomplete revelation hypothesis" and financial reporting. Accounting Horizons, 16 (3), 233-243.

Bryant-Kutcher, L., Peng, E. Y., & Weber, D. P. (2013). Regulating the timing of disclosure: Insights from the acceleration of 10-K filing deadlines. Journal of Accounting and Public Policy, 32 (6), 475-494.

Bushee, B. J. (1998). The influence of institutional investors on myopic R & D investment behavior. The Accounting Review, 73 (3), 305-333.

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

Butler, M., Kraft, A., & Weiss, I. S. (2007). The effect of reporting frequency on the timeliness of earnings: The cases of voluntary and mandatory interim reports. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 43 (2-3), 181-217.

Cohen, D. A., Dey, A., & Lys, T. Z. (2008). Real and accrual-based earnings management in the pre- and post-Sarbanes-Oxley periods. The Accounting Review, 83 (3), 757-787.

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.

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

Drake, M. S., Roulstone, D. T., & Thornock, J. R. (2015). The determinants and consequences of information acquisition via EDGAR. Contemporary Accounting Research, 32 (3), 1128-1161.

Ettredge, M. L., Li, C., & Sun, L. (2006). The impact of SOX Section 404 internal control quality assessment on audit delay in the SOX era. Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory, 25 (2), 1-23.

Gao, F., & Zhang, J. (2019). Firm value consequences of mandatory disclosure regulation: Evidence from the acceleration of 10-K filing deadlines. The Accounting Review, 94 (6), 363-392.

Grossman, S. J., & Stiglitz, J. E. (1980). On the impossibility of informationally efficient markets. The American Economic Review, 70 (3), 393-408.

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

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

Krishnan, J., & Yang, J. S. (2009). Recent trends in audit report and earnings announcement lags. Accounting Horizons, 23 (3), 265-288.

Lawrence, A. (2013). Individual investors and financial disclosure. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 56 (1), 130-147.

Li, F. (2008). Annual report readability, current earnings, and earnings persistence. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 45 (2-3), 221-247.

Li, X. (2010). The impacts of product market competition on the quantity and quality of voluntary disclosures. Review of Accounting Studies, 15 (3), 663-711.

McMullin, J. L., & Schonberger, B. (2020). Entropy-balanced accruals. Review of Accounting Studies, 25 (1), 84-119.

Miller, B. P. (2010). The effects of reporting complexity on small and large investor trading. The Accounting Review, 85 (6), 2107-2143.

Miller, G. S., & Skinner, D. J. (2015). The evolving disclosure landscape: How changes in technology, the media, and capital markets are affecting disclosure. Journal of Accounting Research, 53 (2), 221-239.

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

You, H., & Zhang, X. J. (2009). Financial reporting complexity and investor underreaction to 10-K information. Review of Accounting Studies, 14 (4), 559-586., .

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	P25	Median	P75
FreqMF	22,137	0.5769	0.8215	0.0000	0.0000	1.0986
Treatment Effect	22,137	0.5808	0.4934	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Institutional ownership	22,137	0.3778	0.2821	0.1174	0.3421	0.6140
Firm size	22,137	5.2653	2.1337	3.6724	5.1206	6.7038
Book-to-market	22,137	0.7157	0.7261	0.2837	0.5498	0.9385
ROA	22,137	-0.0759	0.2966	-0.0629	0.0134	0.0558
Stock return	22,137	-0.0005	0.6729	-0.4154	-0.1571	0.1924
Earnings volatility	22,137	0.1671	0.3141	0.0241	0.0603	0.1652
Loss	22,137	0.3674	0.4821	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Class action litigation risk	22,137	0.4420	0.3442	0.1210	0.3544	0.7752

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

Table 2
Pearson Correlations
AccelerationofPeriodicReportFiling 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	**0.12**	**0.10**	**0.05**	**-0.05**	**-0.05**	-0.00	**0.02**	**0.04**	**0.09**
FreqMF	**0.12**	1.00	**0.48**	**0.47**	**-0.15**	**0.21**	-0.01	**-0.12**	**-0.23**	**0.11**
Institutional ownership	**0.10**	**0.48**	1.00	**0.69**	**-0.16**	**0.27**	**-0.11**	**-0.23**	**-0.24**	**0.09**
Firm size	**0.05**	**0.47**	**0.69**	1.00	**-0.38**	**0.30**	0.00	**-0.22**	**-0.32**	**0.11**
Book-to-market	**-0.05**	**-0.15**	**-0.16**	**-0.38**	1.00	**0.09**	**-0.18**	**-0.13**	**0.07**	**-0.12**
ROA	**-0.05**	**0.21**	**0.27**	**0.30**	**0.09**	1.00	**0.12**	**-0.60**	**-0.59**	**-0.27**
Stock return	-0.00	-0.01	**-0.11**	0.00	**-0.18**	**0.12**	1.00	0.01	**-0.09**	**-0.03**
Earnings volatility	**0.02**	**-0.12**	**-0.23**	**-0.22**	**-0.13**	**-0.60**	0.01	1.00	**0.39**	**0.30**
Loss	**0.04**	**-0.23**	**-0.24**	**-0.32**	**0.07**	**-0.59**	**-0.09**	**0.39**	1.00	**0.32**
Class action litigation risk	**0.09**	**0.11**	**0.09**	**0.11**	**-0.12**	**-0.27**	**-0.03**	**0.30**	**0.32**	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 Acceleration of Periodic Report Filing on Management Forecast Frequency

	(1)	(2)
Treatment Effect	0.1975*** (18.42)	0.1309*** (14.22)
Institutional ownership		0.8107*** (31.48)
Firm size		0.0846*** (22.65)
Book-to-market		0.0042 (0.71)
ROA		0.1287*** (7.15)
Stock return		0.0110 (1.56)
Earnings volatility		0.0804*** (5.01)
Loss		-0.1952*** (16.62)
Class action litigation risk		0.2245*** (15.40)
N	22,137	22,137
R^2	0.0141	0.2874

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