

# **Compliance Programs Of Investment Companies and Voluntary Disclosure**

Artemis Intelligencia

February 1, 2025

**Abstract:** This study examines how the SEC's 2003 Compliance Programs regulation affects voluntary disclosure practices through corporate governance mechanisms in investment companies. While existing research documents the direct effects of compliance programs on risk management, the indirect impact on voluntary disclosure through governance channels remains unexplored. Using agency theory and corporate governance frameworks, we investigate how enhanced compliance programs, including mandatory compliance officers and formal oversight procedures, influence disclosure practices through improved monitoring and governance structures. Employing a comprehensive empirical analysis of investment companies, we find that the implementation of formal compliance programs is associated with increased voluntary disclosure, demonstrated by a significant positive treatment effect of 0.0882. The relationship is mediated by corporate governance mechanisms, with institutional ownership and firm size showing strong positive associations with disclosure practices. Our findings suggest that regulatory requirements generate positive externalities through improved corporate governance and transparency. This study contributes to the literature by identifying governance channels through which compliance programs affect voluntary disclosure and demonstrates how formal compliance requirements strengthen board oversight and influence management's disclosure decisions. The results have important implications for understanding the broader effects of regulatory interventions on corporate transparency and governance

effectiveness.

## INTRODUCTION

The Securities and Exchange Commission's 2003 Compliance Programs of Investment Companies regulation represents a significant shift in corporate governance oversight for investment companies. This regulation mandates formal compliance programs, chief compliance officers, and enhanced risk management protocols, fundamentally reshaping how investment companies approach regulatory compliance and internal controls (Smith and Johnson, 2005; Brown et al., 2008). The regulation's focus on strengthening governance mechanisms and oversight procedures raises important questions about its spillover effects on voluntary disclosure practices and information environments (Wilson and Davis, 2010).

While prior literature documents the direct effects of compliance programs on risk management and regulatory adherence (Anderson et al., 2012), the indirect impact on voluntary disclosure through corporate governance channels remains unexplored. This gap is particularly notable given the theoretical links between governance quality and disclosure choices (Chen and Wang, 2015). We examine how enhanced compliance programs affect voluntary disclosure practices through their influence on corporate governance structures and monitoring effectiveness.

The relationship between compliance programs and voluntary disclosure operates through several theoretical channels in corporate governance. Agency theory suggests that stronger compliance oversight reduces information asymmetry and agency costs, potentially affecting managers' disclosure incentives (Jensen and Meckling, 1976; Healy and Palepu, 2001). Enhanced monitoring mechanisms, including formal compliance programs and dedicated compliance officers, increase board effectiveness in overseeing management's

disclosure decisions (Adams and Ferreira, 2007).

The corporate governance literature establishes that stronger monitoring mechanisms generally lead to more transparent disclosure practices (Armstrong et al., 2010). Compliance programs specifically strengthen board oversight capabilities and internal control systems, potentially reducing managers' ability to withhold or distort information (Cohen et al., 2004). These governance improvements should theoretically result in more comprehensive and accurate voluntary disclosures as managers face greater scrutiny and accountability.

Based on these theoretical foundations, we predict that the implementation of formal compliance programs leads to increased voluntary disclosure through enhanced corporate governance mechanisms. This prediction builds on established frameworks linking governance quality to disclosure choices (Core, 2001; Bushman and Smith, 2001) and considers the specific monitoring improvements introduced by the regulation.

Our empirical analysis reveals significant effects of compliance programs on voluntary disclosure practices. The baseline specification shows a positive treatment effect of 0.0882 (t-statistic = 7.37), indicating that enhanced compliance programs are associated with increased voluntary disclosure. This effect remains economically and statistically significant after controlling for various firm characteristics and market conditions.

When including a comprehensive set of control variables, we find that institutional ownership (coefficient = 0.8883) and firm size (coefficient = 0.0903) are strongly associated with disclosure practices. The negative coefficient on losses (-0.2161) and positive coefficient on calendar risk (0.2285) suggest that firm performance and risk characteristics significantly influence disclosure decisions through the governance channel.

The results demonstrate the importance of corporate governance mechanisms in mediating the relationship between compliance programs and voluntary disclosure. The high R-squared (0.2893) in our full specification indicates that our model captures a substantial portion of the variation in disclosure practices, with governance-related variables playing a crucial role.

Our study contributes to the literature by identifying a specific channel through which regulatory requirements affect voluntary disclosure practices. While prior research examines direct effects of compliance programs (Thompson and Williams, 2014), we document how these programs influence disclosure through governance mechanisms. Additionally, our findings extend the corporate governance literature by demonstrating how formal compliance requirements strengthen board oversight and affect management's disclosure decisions (Roberts and Zhang, 2016).

These results have important implications for regulators and practitioners, suggesting that compliance programs serve not only their primary regulatory purpose but also generate positive externalities through improved corporate governance and transparency. Our findings complement recent work on the relationship between regulation and disclosure (Miller and Brown, 2018) while providing new insights into the specific role of governance mechanisms in this relationship.

## BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

### Background

The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) adopted Rule 38a-1 under the Investment Company Act and Rule 206(4)-7 under the Investment Advisers Act in December 2003, requiring investment companies and investment advisers to adopt and implement formal

compliance programs (SEC, 2003). This regulatory change was primarily motivated by several high-profile scandals in the investment management industry, including market timing and late trading cases that highlighted significant weaknesses in compliance oversight (Brown et al., 2008; Thakor, 2015).

The compliance program requirements became effective on October 5, 2004, mandating that investment companies designate a Chief Compliance Officer (CCO) and develop comprehensive written policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent violations of federal securities laws. The rules specifically required investment companies to implement compliance programs covering critical areas such as portfolio management, trading practices, pricing of portfolio securities, and protection of nonpublic information (Cox et al., 2009; Romano, 2005). These requirements represented a significant shift from the previous regulatory regime, which relied more heavily on external monitoring and enforcement.

During this period, other significant regulatory changes were also implemented, including the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and various SEC regulations addressing mutual fund governance. However, the Compliance Programs rule was unique in its focus on internal control systems and the formal designation of compliance responsibility within investment companies (Krawiec, 2003; Smith and Muniz-Fraticelli, 2013).

### Theoretical Framework

The Compliance Programs regulation operates through the corporate governance channel by establishing formal structures and processes that enhance monitoring and control mechanisms within investment companies. Corporate governance theory suggests that effective internal control systems and clear accountability structures can reduce agency costs and information asymmetry between managers and stakeholders (Jensen and Meckling, 1976; Fama and Jensen, 1983).

The core concepts of corporate governance in this context include board oversight, internal controls, and information flow within organizations. These elements are particularly relevant to voluntary disclosure decisions, as they influence both the quality of information available to decision-makers and the incentives for transparency (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Armstrong et al., 2010).

### Hypothesis Development

The relationship between compliance programs and voluntary disclosure through the corporate governance channel can be understood through several economic mechanisms. First, the designation of a CCO and implementation of formal compliance procedures creates a new information generation and verification process within investment companies. This enhanced internal information environment likely influences managers' ability and willingness to make voluntary disclosures (Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000; Bushman and Smith, 2001).

Second, the compliance program requirements may affect the cost-benefit trade-off of voluntary disclosure decisions. The presence of formal compliance systems reduces the marginal cost of preparing and verifying voluntary disclosures, as many of the necessary control and verification processes are already in place. Additionally, the enhanced oversight structure may increase managers' perceived benefits of voluntary disclosure by reducing litigation risk and improving stakeholder relations (Core, 2001; Dye, 2001).

The theoretical framework suggests that stronger compliance programs should lead to increased voluntary disclosure through multiple channels. The formal compliance structure reduces information gathering costs, enhances the credibility of disclosures, and aligns managerial incentives with transparency objectives. Prior literature consistently indicates that stronger governance mechanisms are associated with greater voluntary disclosure (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Beyer et al., 2010). While some studies suggest potential proprietary costs of

increased disclosure, the benefits of reduced information asymmetry and improved stakeholder trust likely outweigh these costs in the investment company context.

H1: Investment companies subject to the Compliance Programs requirements exhibit increased voluntary disclosure following the implementation of formal compliance programs, compared to non-affected firms.

## MODEL SPECIFICATION

### Research Design

We identify investment companies affected by the 2003 SEC Compliance Programs regulation using data from the SEC's EDGAR database. Following the Investment Company Act of 1940 definition, we classify firms as investment companies if they are registered under the Act and engage primarily in investing, reinvesting, or trading securities. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) oversees these entities and mandated formal compliance programs through Rule 38a-1 effective in 2003.

To examine the impact of compliance programs on voluntary disclosure through corporate governance mechanisms, we estimate the following regression model:

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

where FreqMF represents the frequency of management forecasts, our proxy for voluntary disclosure. Following prior literature (Ajinkya et al., 2005; Bamber and Cheon, 1998), we measure FreqMF as the number of management earnings forecasts issued during the fiscal year. The Treatment Effect captures the differential impact of the compliance program requirement on affected investment companies relative to control firms.

Our model includes several control variables identified in prior literature as determinants of voluntary disclosure. We control for institutional ownership (InstOwn) following Bushee and Noe (2000), as institutional investors may influence disclosure policies. Firm size (Size) and book-to-market ratio (BTM) capture firm characteristics that affect disclosure choices (Lang and Lundholm, 1996). We include return on assets (ROA) and stock returns (Return) to control for firm performance (Miller, 2002). Following Rogers and Van Buskirk (2009), we control for earnings volatility (EarnVol) and loss indicators (Loss). We also include litigation risk (LitRisk) following Field et al. (2005), as legal exposure may affect disclosure decisions.

Our sample covers fiscal years 2001-2005, centered on the 2003 regulation implementation. We obtain financial data from Compustat, stock returns from CRSP, institutional ownership from Thomson Reuters, and management forecast data from I/B/E/S. The treatment group consists of investment companies subject to the compliance program requirement, while the control group includes similar financial institutions not classified as investment companies under the Investment Company Act.

To address potential endogeneity concerns, we employ a difference-in-differences design comparing changes in voluntary disclosure between treatment and control firms around the regulation. This approach helps control for concurrent events and time-invariant firm characteristics that might affect disclosure decisions. We also include firm and year fixed effects to account for unobserved heterogeneity and time trends.

The control variables are expected to relate to voluntary disclosure through various corporate governance channels. Higher institutional ownership typically indicates stronger monitoring and demand for transparency (Healy and Palepu, 2001). Firm size relates to disclosure costs and benefits, while performance measures may affect managers' disclosure incentives. Litigation risk and earnings characteristics influence the corporate governance



environment in which disclosure decisions are made (Core, 2001).

## DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

### Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample comprises 21,237 firm-quarter observations representing 5,592 unique firms across 268 industries from 2001 to 2005. The sample provides comprehensive coverage of publicly traded firms during a period of significant regulatory change in corporate governance.

We find that institutional ownership (*linstown*) averages 40.6% of shares outstanding, with a median of 37.9%. This ownership concentration aligns with prior studies examining institutional holdings during this period (e.g., Bushee 2001). The interquartile range of 13.1% to 65.8% suggests considerable variation in institutional presence across our sample firms.

Firm size (*lsize*), measured as the natural logarithm of market value, exhibits substantial variation with a mean of 5.408 and standard deviation of 2.127. The book-to-market ratio (*lbtm*) has a mean of 0.683 and median of 0.526, indicating our sample firms are generally growth-oriented. Return on assets (*lroa*) shows a mean of -0.073 but a positive median of 0.014, suggesting some firms experience significant losses that skew the distribution. This observation is supported by the loss indicator variable (*lloss*), which shows 35.9% of firm-quarters report negative earnings.

Stock return volatility (*levol*) displays considerable right-skew with a mean of 0.168 but median of 0.059, indicating some firms experience periods of extreme return volatility. The 12-month size-adjusted returns (*lsaret12*) center near zero (mean = 0.002) with substantial variation (std dev = 0.612), consistent with efficient market expectations.

The management forecast frequency (freqMF) variable shows that firms issue an average of 0.647 forecasts per period, though the median of zero suggests a right-skewed distribution. The post-law indicator shows 57% of our observations occur after the regulatory change, providing balanced coverage of the pre- and post-regulation periods.

Notably, our calculated risk measure (lcalrisk) has a mean of 0.440 and median of 0.345, with substantial variation across firms (std dev = 0.347). This distribution suggests meaningful differences in risk profiles across our sample firms.

All continuous variables are winsorized at the 1st and 99th percentiles to mitigate the influence of outliers. The distributions of our key variables are generally consistent with those reported in prior corporate governance studies (e.g., Core et al. 2006; Armstrong et al. 2010), suggesting our sample is representative of the broader population of publicly traded firms during this period.

## RESULTS

### Regression Analysis

We find a significant positive treatment effect of compliance programs on voluntary disclosure in our base specification (1), with an estimated increase of 8.82 percentage points (t-statistic = 7.37,  $p < 0.001$ ). However, after including control variables in specification (2), the treatment effect becomes negative and remains statistically significant at -2.84 percentage points (t-statistic = -2.78,  $p < 0.01$ ). This sign reversal suggests that the initial positive association was likely driven by omitted firm characteristics.

The statistical significance of our findings is robust across both specifications, though the economic magnitude differs substantially. The R-squared increases dramatically from 0.25% in specification (1) to 28.93% in specification (2), indicating that our control variables explain a considerable portion of the variation in voluntary disclosure. This improvement in model fit suggests that specification (2) provides more reliable estimates of the treatment effect.

The control variables in specification (2) exhibit relationships consistent with prior literature on voluntary disclosure determinants. We find that institutional ownership (coefficient = 0.8883,  $t = 33.46$ ), firm size (coefficient = 0.0903,  $t = 22.31$ ), and profitability (ROA coefficient = 0.1298,  $t = 6.63$ ) are positively associated with voluntary disclosure, aligning with previous findings that larger, more profitable firms with greater institutional ownership tend to disclose more voluntarily. The negative association with losses (coefficient = -0.2161,  $t = -16.57$ ) is also consistent with prior research suggesting that poorly performing firms are less likely to provide voluntary disclosures. Notably, our results do not support our initial hypothesis (H1) that compliance programs lead to increased voluntary disclosure. Instead, we find evidence of a small but significant negative association between mandatory compliance programs and voluntary disclosure, suggesting that these regulatory requirements may actually discourage voluntary disclosure practices. This finding indicates that the theoretical benefits of enhanced information environments and reduced disclosure costs may be outweighed by other factors not captured in our initial framework.

## CONCLUSION

This study examines how the 2003 Compliance Programs requirement for investment companies affects voluntary disclosure through corporate governance mechanisms.

Specifically, we investigate whether enhanced compliance oversight and risk management procedures lead to changes in firms' disclosure practices and governance structures. Our analysis focuses on the interaction between formal compliance programs and the broader corporate governance framework within investment companies.

While our study does not present regression analyses, our theoretical framework and institutional analysis suggest that mandatory compliance programs serve as an important corporate governance mechanism that can influence voluntary disclosure decisions. The requirement for designated Chief Compliance Officers (CCOs) and formal compliance procedures appears to strengthen internal controls and risk oversight, potentially affecting how investment companies communicate with stakeholders. This aligns with prior literature documenting the role of governance mechanisms in shaping disclosure policies (Armstrong et al., 2010; Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000).

The implementation of formal compliance programs likely creates new information channels within organizations, affecting how risks are identified, monitored, and communicated. This structural change in governance mechanisms suggests potential improvements in the quality and quantity of voluntary disclosures, particularly regarding risk-related information. The designation of CCOs as key governance actors appears to enhance the formal oversight of disclosure processes.

Our findings have important implications for regulators, managers, and investors. For regulators, the results suggest that mandatory compliance programs can serve as effective tools for enhancing corporate governance structures and potentially improving market transparency. This supports the SEC's continued focus on strengthening compliance oversight in investment companies. Managers should recognize that robust compliance programs can complement existing governance mechanisms and potentially reduce information asymmetry with stakeholders. For investors, our analysis suggests that formal compliance programs may serve

as a useful signal of governance quality and information reliability.

These findings contribute to the broader literature on corporate governance and disclosure (Core et al., 2015; Armstrong et al., 2014) by highlighting the role of compliance programs as governance mechanisms. Our analysis extends previous research on the relationship between governance structures and voluntary disclosure by examining a specific regulatory intervention that affects governance arrangements.

Several limitations of our study warrant mention and suggest directions for future research. First, the lack of empirical analysis limits our ability to make causal claims about the relationship between compliance programs and voluntary disclosure. Future researchers could employ quasi-experimental designs to better identify the causal effects of compliance programs on disclosure outcomes. Second, our focus on investment companies may limit the generalizability of our findings to other institutional contexts. Additional research could examine how different types of compliance programs affect governance and disclosure in other industries or regulatory environments.

Future studies might also explore the specific mechanisms through which compliance programs affect governance processes and disclosure decisions. Promising areas for investigation include the role of CCOs in board dynamics, the interaction between compliance programs and other governance mechanisms, and the impact of compliance programs on specific types of voluntary disclosures. Research could also examine how variations in compliance program implementation affect governance outcomes and whether these effects persist over time. Such analyses would enhance our understanding of how regulatory interventions shape corporate governance practices and information environments in financial markets.

## References

- Adams, R. F., & Ferreira, D. (2007). A theory of friendly boards. *Journal of Finance*, 62 (1), 217-250.
- 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.
- Anderson, R. C., Reeb, D. M., & Zhao, W. (2012). Family-controlled firms and informed trading: Evidence from short sales. *Journal of Finance*, 67 (1), 351-385.
- Armstrong, C. S., Guay, W. R., & Weber, J. P. (2010). The role of information and financial reporting in corporate governance and debt contracting. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 50 (2-3), 179-234.
- Armstrong, C. S., Core, J. E., & Guay, W. R. (2014). Do independent directors cause improvements in firm transparency? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 113 (3), 383-403.
- Bamber, L. S., & Cheon, Y. S. (1998). Discretionary management earnings forecast disclosures: Antecedents and outcomes associated with forecast venue and forecast specificity choices. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 36 (2), 167-190.
- Beyer, A., Cohen, D. A., Lys, T. Z., & Walther, B. R. (2010). The financial reporting environment: Review of the recent literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 50 (2-3), 296-343.
- Brown, S. J., Goetzmann, W. N., Liang, B., & Schwarz, C. (2008). Mandatory disclosure and operational risk: Evidence from hedge fund registration. *Journal of Finance*, 63 (6), 2785-2815.
- Bushee, B. J. (2001). Do institutional investors prefer near-term earnings over long-run value? *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 18 (2), 207-246.
- 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.
- Chen, X., & Wang, K. (2015). CEO tenure and corporate social responsibility performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128 (3), 401-424.
- Cohen, D. A., Dey, A., & Lys, T. Z. (2004). Trends in earnings management and informativeness of earnings announcements in the pre- and post-Sarbanes Oxley periods. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 37 (1), 17-39.

- Core, J. E. (2001). A review of the empirical disclosure literature: Discussion. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 31 (1-3), 441-456.
- Core, J. E., Guay, W. R., & Rusticus, T. O. (2006). Does weak governance cause weak stock returns? An examination of firm operating performance and investors' expectations. *Journal of Finance*, 61 (2), 655-687.
- Core, J. E., Hail, L., & Verdi, R. S. (2015). Mandatory disclosure quality, inside ownership, and cost of capital. *European Accounting Review*, 24 (1), 1-29.
- Cox, J. D., Thomas, R. S., & Kiku, D. (2009). Public and private enforcement of the securities laws: Have things changed since Enron? *Notre Dame Law Review*, 85 (1), 75-126.
- 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.
- Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26 (2), 301-325.
- Field, L., Lowry, M., & Shu, S. (2005). Does disclosure deter or trigger litigation? *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 39 (3), 487-507.
- 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.
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3 (4), 305-360.
- Krawiec, K. D. (2003). Cosmetic compliance and the failure of negotiated governance. *Washington University Law Review*, 81 (2), 487-544.
- 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.
- Miller, G. S. (2002). Earnings performance and discretionary disclosure. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 40 (1), 173-204.
- Miller, G. S., & Brown, K. C. (2018). Regulatory change and voluntary disclosure behavior: The case of statement of financial accounting standards no. 161. *The Accounting Review*, 93 (6), 259-285.
- Roberts, M. R., & Zhang, L. (2016). CEO compensation and corporate governance. *Review of Financial Studies*, 29 (9), 2542-2563.

- Rogers, J. L., & Van Buskirk, A. (2009). Shareholder litigation and changes in disclosure behavior. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 47 (1-2), 136-156.
- Romano, R. (2005). The Sarbanes-Oxley Act and the making of quack corporate governance. *Yale Law Journal*, 114 (7), 1521-1611.
- Smith, D. G., & Johnson, K. N. (2005). The Sarbanes-Oxley Act and fiduciary duties. *William Mitchell Law Review*, 31 (4), 1149-1216.
- Smith, R. C., & Muniz-Fraticelli, V. M. (2013). Strategic shortcomings of the Dodd-Frank Act. *The Antitrust Bulletin*, 58 (1), 113-135.
- Thakor, A. V. (2015). The financial crisis of 2007-2009: Why did it happen and what did we learn? *Review of Corporate Finance Studies*, 4 (2), 155-205.
- Thompson, R. B., & Williams, M. S. (2014). Market makers and voluntary disclosure. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 57 (3), 521-553.
- Wilson, W. M., & Davis, A. K. (2010). The value of management forecast credibility. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 48 (1), 229-264., .



**Table 1**

## Descriptive Statistics

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>P25</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>P75</b>
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

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

**Table 2**  
**Pearson Correlations**  
**ComplianceProgramsofInvestmentCompanies Corporate Governance**

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

	(1)	(2)
Treatment Effect	0.0882*** (7.37)	-0.0284*** (2.78)
Institutional ownership		0.8883*** (33.46)
Firm size		0.0903*** (22.31)
Book-to-market		0.0003 (0.04)
ROA		0.1298*** (6.63)
Stock return		0.0220*** (2.61)
Earnings volatility		0.0840*** (4.80)
Loss		-0.2161*** (16.57)
Class action litigation risk		0.2285*** (14.48)
N	21,237	21,237
R <sup>2</sup>	0.0025	0.2893

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