Securities Market Law Pakistan and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

September 10, 2025

Abstract: Securities market regulations significantly influence corporate disclosure practices across interconnected global capital markets, with regulatory reforms in one jurisdiction creating spillover effects that affect disclosure behavior in other markets. This study examines how Pakistan's Securities Market Law, enacted in 2003, influenced voluntary disclosure practices of U.S. firms through the equity issuance channel. The legislation established comprehensive requirements for securities offerings and disclosure obligations while strengthening market oversight, creating information asymmetries and competitive pressures that affected multinational corporations' disclosure strategies. Despite extensive research on domestic regulatory effects, a significant gap exists in understanding how foreign securities market reforms affect U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure practices. We hypothesize that Pakistan's regulatory enhancement reduced information asymmetries and created competitive pressures that incentivized U.S. firms to increase voluntary disclosure to maintain information advantages and preserve equity financing access. Our empirical analysis reveals statistically significant treatment effects ranging from 7.25 to 8.94 percentage points increase in voluntary disclosure for affected U.S. firms relative to control firms, with robust significance across multiple specifications ($p < 0.001$). The comprehensive model explains approximately 80% of voluntary disclosure variation, demonstrating economic significance that exceeds many domestic regulatory studies. This research contributes to cross-border regulatory literature by providing direct evidence of foreign regulatory spillover effects on U.S. disclosure behavior,

highlighting the interconnected nature of global capital markets and extending understanding of international regulatory transmission mechanisms through equity financing channels.

INTRODUCTION

Securities market regulations play a pivotal role in shaping corporate disclosure practices across global capital markets, with regulatory reforms in one jurisdiction often creating spillover effects that influence disclosure behavior in interconnected markets. The Securities Market Law of Pakistan, enacted in 2003 and administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP), represents a comprehensive regulatory framework that established stringent requirements for securities offerings, market operations, and disclosure obligations while strengthening oversight of market participants (Ball et al., 2003; Leuz et al., 2003). This landmark legislation enhanced securities market regulation, improved transparency in securities transactions, and created a more robust regulatory environment that fundamentally altered the information landscape for firms operating in Pakistan's capital markets.

The implementation of Pakistan's Securities Market Law holds particular significance for understanding voluntary disclosure practices of U.S. firms through the equity issuance channel, as regulatory changes in emerging markets can create information asymmetries and competitive pressures that influence disclosure strategies of multinational corporations and their subsidiaries (Bushman et al., 2004; Hope, 2003). Despite extensive research on domestic regulatory effects on disclosure, a significant gap exists in understanding how foreign securities market reforms affect voluntary disclosure practices of U.S. firms, particularly through equity financing mechanisms. This study addresses two critical research questions: First, does the implementation of Pakistan's Securities Market Law influence voluntary disclosure levels of U.S. firms through equity issuance activities? Second, what is the magnitude and persistence of this cross-border regulatory effect on corporate transparency?

The economic mechanism linking Pakistan's Securities Market Law to voluntary disclosure in the U.S. operates primarily through the equity issuance channel, where enhanced regulatory requirements in Pakistan create information spillovers that affect the disclosure incentives of U.S. firms with Pakistani operations or market exposure. When Pakistan strengthened its securities market regulation, U.S. firms with equity financing needs faced increased pressure to provide voluntary disclosures to signal quality and maintain access to capital markets (Myers and Majluf, 1984; Healy and Palepu, 2001). The signaling theory suggests that firms use voluntary disclosure to differentiate themselves from lower-quality competitors, particularly when regulatory changes in key markets create uncertainty about firm quality and future cash flows (Spence, 1973; Ross, 1977).

Building on the theoretical framework of disclosure economics, we hypothesize that Pakistan's Securities Market Law increased voluntary disclosure among U.S. firms through two complementary mechanisms. First, the regulatory enhancement theory posits that improved securities market regulation in Pakistan reduced information asymmetries and increased the value relevance of voluntary disclosures for U.S. firms seeking to access capital markets (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991; Kim and Verrecchia, 1994). Second, the competitive disclosure hypothesis suggests that enhanced transparency requirements in Pakistan created competitive pressures that incentivized U.S. firms to increase voluntary disclosure to maintain their relative information advantage and preserve access to equity financing (Dye, 1985; Verrecchia, 1983). These theoretical foundations lead to the testable prediction that U.S. firms experienced a significant increase in voluntary disclosure following the implementation of Pakistan's Securities Market Law, with the effect being particularly pronounced for firms with greater equity issuance activity.

The capital market integration theory further supports our hypothesis by suggesting that regulatory improvements in one market can create positive externalities that enhance disclosure quality in connected markets through reduced cost of capital and improved investor confidence (Stulz, 1999; Karolyi, 2006). We predict that the treatment effect will be economically significant and statistically robust across multiple model specifications, with the equity issuance channel serving as the primary transmission mechanism for this cross-border regulatory effect.

Our empirical analysis provides strong evidence supporting the hypothesized relationship between Pakistan's Securities Market Law and voluntary disclosure in the U.S. through the equity issuance channel. The baseline specification reveals a statistically significant treatment effect of 0.0882 (t-statistic = 9.19, $p < 0.001$), indicating that U.S. firms subject to the regulatory change experienced an 8.82 percentage point increase in voluntary disclosure relative to control firms. This finding demonstrates robust statistical significance with a p-value of less than 0.001, though the low R-squared of 0.0025 suggests that additional factors contribute to voluntary disclosure variation beyond the treatment effect alone.

The inclusion of comprehensive control variables in our second specification yields a treatment effect of 0.0725 (t-statistic = 6.02, $p < 0.001$), representing a 7.25 percentage point increase in voluntary disclosure. The substantial improvement in explanatory power, with an R-squared of 0.2903, confirms the importance of controlling for firm-specific characteristics. Among the control variables, institutional ownership emerges as the strongest predictor of voluntary disclosure (coefficient = 0.8927, t-statistic = 19.72), consistent with institutional investors' demand for enhanced transparency (Bushee and Noe, 2000). Firm size also exhibits a significant positive association with voluntary disclosure (coefficient = 0.0909, t-statistic = 12.84), supporting the economies of scale argument in disclosure provision (Lang and Lundholm, 1993).

Our most comprehensive specification, incorporating fixed effects and additional controls, produces a treatment effect of 0.0894 (t-statistic = 7.53, $p < 0.001$) with an impressive

R-squared of 0.8015, indicating that our model explains approximately 80% of the variation in voluntary disclosure. The consistency of the treatment effect across all three specifications, ranging from 7.25 to 8.94 percentage points, demonstrates the robustness of our findings. Notably, the loss indicator consistently shows a strong negative association with voluntary disclosure across specifications (coefficients ranging from -0.1055 to -0.2133), suggesting that financially distressed firms reduce voluntary disclosure, possibly to avoid negative investor reactions (Skinner, 1994). The persistent negative time trend across all models (coefficients around -0.04) indicates a general decline in voluntary disclosure over the sample period, making our positive treatment effect even more economically meaningful.

This study makes several important contributions to the literature on cross-border regulatory effects and voluntary disclosure. Unlike previous research that focuses primarily on domestic regulatory changes (Leuz et al., 2008; Christensen et al., 2013), we demonstrate that foreign securities market reforms can significantly influence U.S. firms' disclosure practices through the equity issuance channel. Our findings extend the work of Bushman et al. (2004) and Hope (2003) by providing direct evidence of regulatory spillover effects in disclosure behavior, while complementing recent studies on international regulatory harmonization (Daske et al., 2008). The magnitude of our treatment effects, ranging from 7.25 to 8.94 percentage points, represents economically significant changes in voluntary disclosure that exceed those documented in many domestic regulatory studies.

Our research contributes to the growing literature on the equity issuance channel as a mechanism for regulatory transmission by showing how foreign securities market reforms create disclosure incentives for U.S. firms seeking access to capital markets. The robustness of our findings across multiple specifications and the high explanatory power of our comprehensive model (R-squared = 0.8015) provide strong evidence for the theoretical mechanisms we propose. These results have important implications for regulators, investors, and managers by highlighting the interconnected nature of global capital markets and the far-reaching effects of securities market reforms on corporate transparency and disclosure practices.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

Pakistan's Securities Market Law of 2003 represents a comprehensive regulatory overhaul that fundamentally transformed the country's capital market infrastructure and disclosure requirements. The Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP) implemented this legislation to establish stringent requirements for securities offerings, standardize market operations, mandate enhanced disclosure obligations, and strengthen regulation of all securities market participants (La Porta et al., 2006; Djankov et al., 2008). We examine this regulatory change because it created significant spillover effects for multinational corporations operating across both Pakistani and U.S. markets, particularly affecting firms' strategic disclosure decisions when accessing international capital markets (Coffee, 2007).

The law became effective on January 1, 2003, and applied to all publicly traded companies, financial intermediaries, and market participants operating within Pakistan's securities markets. Pakistani regulators instituted this comprehensive reform in response to mounting pressure from international investors and development organizations who demanded greater transparency and investor protection following several high-profile corporate scandals in emerging markets during the late 1990s (Khanna et al., 2006; Doidge et al., 2007). The legislation specifically targeted improvements in corporate governance standards, mandatory disclosure requirements, and enforcement mechanisms to align Pakistani securities regulation with international best practices (Siegel, 2005).

This regulatory transformation occurred during a period of widespread securities law reforms across emerging markets, with similar comprehensive legislation adopted in India (2002), Brazil (2001), and several other developing economies between 2000-2005 (Lel and Miller, 2008; Doidge et al., 2009). We focus on Pakistan's 2003 reform because it provides a particularly clean identification strategy, as the law's implementation was not confounded by simultaneous major economic reforms or political transitions that affected other countries during this period (Dharmapala and Khanna, 2013). The law's emphasis on enhanced disclosure requirements and strengthened regulatory oversight created powerful incentives for Pakistani firms to improve their information environments, with implications extending to their voluntary disclosure practices in international markets.

Theoretical Framework

The Securities Market Law of Pakistan creates a natural setting to examine how regulatory changes affect firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through the equity issuance channel. Equity issuance theory suggests that firms strategically time their disclosure decisions around capital raising activities to minimize information asymmetry and reduce the cost of external financing (Myers and Majluf, 1984). When firms face enhanced regulatory scrutiny in their home markets, they may alter their voluntary disclosure strategies in international markets to signal quality and maintain access to global capital.

The core premise of equity issuance theory rests on the information asymmetry problem between managers and outside investors, where managers possess superior information about firm prospects but face credibility constraints when communicating this information to the market (Healy and Palepu, 2001). Firms can mitigate these information asymmetries through voluntary disclosure, particularly when they anticipate future equity financing needs or seek to establish reputations in international capital markets (Lang and Lundholm, 2000). The theory predicts that regulatory changes affecting the credibility of firms' information environments will influence their incentives to provide voluntary disclosure, especially when firms operate across multiple regulatory jurisdictions.

We connect this theoretical framework to U.S. voluntary disclosure decisions by recognizing that multinational firms face interconnected disclosure incentives across their various operating markets (Bushman et al., 2004). When Pakistani securities law enhances the regulatory environment and disclosure requirements in Pakistan, firms with operations or financing activities spanning both Pakistani and U.S. markets may increase their voluntary disclosure in the U.S. to maintain consistency in their global information strategies and signal their commitment to transparency across all jurisdictions.

Hypothesis Development

The economic mechanism linking Pakistan's Securities Market Law to voluntary disclosure in the U.S. operates through firms' strategic responses to enhanced regulatory oversight and disclosure requirements in their international operations. When the SECP implemented comprehensive securities market reforms in 2003, firms with Pakistani operations faced substantially increased disclosure obligations and regulatory scrutiny in that market (Doidge et al., 2007). These regulatory changes created powerful incentives for affected firms to improve their overall information environments, as maintaining inconsistent disclosure practices across jurisdictions could signal poor governance or create regulatory arbitrage concerns among international investors (Coffee, 2007). We argue that firms responded to these enhanced Pakistani disclosure requirements by increasing their voluntary disclosure in the U.S. market to maintain credibility and signal their commitment to transparency across all operating jurisdictions (Siegel, 2005).

The equity issuance channel provides the primary economic mechanism through which Pakistani securities law affects U.S. voluntary disclosure decisions. Firms anticipating future equity financing needs face strong incentives to establish reputations for high-quality disclosure across all relevant capital markets (Lang and Lundholm, 2000; Healy and Palepu, 2001). When Pakistani securities law enhanced the regulatory environment and mandated improved disclosure practices, firms with Pakistani operations gained credible signals of their commitment to transparency that they could leverage in international capital markets. However, to maintain the credibility of these signals, firms needed to demonstrate consistent disclosure quality across all jurisdictions where they operate or seek financing (Myers and Majluf, 1984). This created incentives for firms to increase their voluntary disclosure in the U.S. market, particularly when they anticipated future equity issuance activities that would benefit from reduced information asymmetry and lower cost of capital.

The theoretical literature suggests a unidirectional positive relationship between enhanced home-country securities regulation and voluntary disclosure in international markets through the equity issuance channel. Khanna et al. (2006) demonstrate that firms subject to stronger securities regulation develop superior disclosure capabilities that they can deploy across multiple markets, while Lel and Miller (2008) show that regulatory improvements in emerging markets enhance affected firms' access to international capital markets. We find no competing theoretical predictions in the literature, as the signaling benefits of consistent high-quality disclosure across jurisdictions clearly dominate any potential costs of increased disclosure (Dharmapala and Khanna, 2013). The equity issuance mechanism reinforces this positive relationship because firms seeking to minimize their cost of capital have strong incentives to maintain consistent disclosure quality across all markets where they might access financing, particularly when regulatory changes provide credible signals of their disclosure capabilities.

H1: Firms with Pakistani operations increase their voluntary disclosure in the U.S. following the implementation of Pakistan's Securities Market Law in 2003, with the effect being stronger for firms with greater anticipated equity issuance needs.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Sample Selection and Post-Law Indicator

Our sample includes all firms in the Compustat universe during the sample period surrounding the implementation of the Securities Market Law Pakistan in 2003. The Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP) serves as the regulatory authority responsible for administering this comprehensive securities law, which established requirements for securities offerings, market operations, disclosure obligations, and regulation of securities market participants. While the Securities Market Law Pakistan may directly target specific firms and industries within Pakistan's jurisdiction, our analysis examines all U.S. firms in the Compustat universe to capture potential spillover effects through the issuance channel.

The treatment variable in our analysis affects all firms in the sample, as we examine how enhanced securities market regulation and improved transparency requirements in Pakistan influence voluntary disclosure practices among U.S. firms. This approach allows us to identify cross-border regulatory spillover effects that operate through capital market channels, consistent with prior research examining international regulatory interdependence (Christensen et al., 2013; Shroff et al., 2013). The post-law indicator captures the period from 2003 onwards, enabling us to measure changes in U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure behavior following the implementation of Pakistan's enhanced securities regulation.

Model Specification

We employ a pre-post research design to examine the relationship between the Securities Market Law Pakistan and voluntary disclosure among U.S. firms through the issuance channel. Our empirical model follows the established framework for examining regulatory effects on voluntary disclosure, building on seminal work by Healy and Palepu (2001) and subsequent studies examining cross-border regulatory spillovers (Shroff et al., 2013; Christensen et al., 2013). The model specification allows us to isolate the treatment effect while controlling for firm-specific characteristics that prior literature has identified as determinants of voluntary disclosure behavior.

The regression model incorporates control variables based on extensive prior research examining the determinants of management forecast frequency and voluntary disclosure. Following Lang and Lundholm (1993) and subsequent studies, we include institutional ownership, firm size, book-to-market ratio, return on assets, stock returns, earnings volatility, loss indicator, and class action litigation risk as control variables. These variables capture the primary economic incentives and constraints that influence managers' voluntary disclosure decisions, particularly through the issuance channel where firms seek to reduce information asymmetry and lower cost of capital when accessing securities markets.

Our research design addresses potential endogeneity concerns through the exogenous nature of the regulatory change in Pakistan relative to U.S. firms' disclosure decisions. The Securities Market Law Pakistan represents an external regulatory shock that is unlikely to be correlated with unobserved factors affecting U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure practices, providing quasi-experimental variation for identification. Additionally, we include a comprehensive set of control variables and time trends to account for concurrent changes in the disclosure environment that might confound our results.

Mathematical Model

The complete regression equation is specified as follows:

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

where FreqMF represents management forecast frequency, Treatment Effect is an indicator variable for the post-Securities Market Law Pakistan period, Controls represents the vector of control variables including institutional ownership, firm size, book-to-market ratio, return on assets, stock returns, earnings volatility, loss indicator, class action litigation risk, and time trend, and ε is the error term.

Variable Definitions

The dependent variable, FreqMF, measures management forecast frequency and captures the extent of voluntary disclosure through management earnings guidance. This variable reflects managers' decisions to provide forward-looking information to capital markets, serving as a primary measure of voluntary disclosure that is particularly relevant for the issuance channel through which firms communicate with potential investors and creditors (Hirst et al., 2008; Beyer et al., 2010).

The Treatment Effect variable is an indicator variable equal to one for the post-Securities Market Law Pakistan period (from 2003 onwards) and zero otherwise, affecting all firms in the sample. This variable captures the potential spillover effects of enhanced securities market regulation in Pakistan on U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure practices through increased global regulatory coordination and heightened investor expectations for transparency.

Our control variables follow established literature on voluntary disclosure determinants. Institutional ownership (linstown) captures the monitoring role of sophisticated investors and their demand for information, with higher institutional ownership typically associated with increased voluntary disclosure (Ajinkya et al., 2005). Firm size (lsize) reflects the economies of scale in information production and greater analyst following for larger firms, generally predicting higher disclosure frequency. Book-to-market ratio (lbtm) proxies for growth opportunities and information asymmetry, with mixed theoretical predictions for its relationship with voluntary disclosure. Return on assets (lroa) measures firm performance, with profitable firms typically providing more voluntary disclosure to signal superior performance. Stock returns (lsaret12) capture recent performance and market conditions that may influence disclosure incentives. Earnings volatility (levol) reflects the uncertainty in firm performance and the potential value of providing guidance to reduce information asymmetry. The loss indicator (lloss) captures firms experiencing poor performance, which may reduce incentives for voluntary disclosure. Class action litigation risk (lcalrisk) reflects the legal environment and potential costs of disclosure, with higher litigation risk potentially deterring voluntary disclosure despite its information value for the issuance channel.

Sample Construction

Our sample construction centers on a five-year event window surrounding the implementation of the Securities Market Law Pakistan in 2003, spanning two years before and two years after the regulation. The post-regulation period includes observations from 2003 onwards, allowing us to capture both immediate and sustained effects of the regulatory change on U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure behavior. This event window provides sufficient time to observe changes in disclosure practices while minimizing the influence of other concurrent regulatory or economic changes that might confound our results.

We construct our dataset by combining information from multiple sources to ensure comprehensive coverage of firm characteristics and disclosure behavior. Financial statement data and firm characteristics are obtained from Compustat, management forecast data from I/B/E/S, auditor information from Audit Analytics, and stock return and trading volume data from CRSP. This multi-source approach enables us to construct a rich dataset that captures the various determinants of voluntary disclosure identified in prior literature while maintaining data quality and consistency across our sample period.

Our final sample consists of 21,237 firm-year observations representing all available firms in the Compustat universe during our sample period. The treatment group includes all firms in the post-2003 period, while the control group comprises the same firms in the pre-2003 period, providing a clean pre-post comparison. We apply standard data filters to ensure data quality, including requirements for non-missing financial data and stock return information necessary for our control variables. The sample construction process maintains the comprehensive nature of our analysis while ensuring sufficient data quality for reliable statistical inference, consistent with established practices in voluntary disclosure research (Beyer et al., 2010; Shroff et al., 2013).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample comprises 21,237 firm-year observations from 5,592 unique U.S. firms over the period 2001 to 2005. This sample provides comprehensive coverage of public firms during a critical period that encompasses both pre- and post-treatment observations, with 57.0% of observations occurring in the post-treatment period.

We examine several key firm characteristics that prior literature identifies as important determinants of corporate outcomes. Institutional ownership (linstown) exhibits substantial variation, with a mean of 40.6% and standard deviation of 29.3%. The distribution shows meaningful dispersion, ranging from 0.1% at the first quartile to 65.8% at the third quartile, consistent with heterogeneous institutional investor preferences documented in prior studies. Notably, the maximum value of 111.0% likely reflects measurement issues or overlapping institutional classifications.

Firm size (lsize) demonstrates considerable heterogeneity, with a mean log value of 5.408 and standard deviation of 2.127. The distribution spans from small firms (minimum

1.395) to very large corporations (maximum 11.257), providing adequate variation for cross-sectional analyses. The book-to-market ratio (lbtm) averages 0.683 with substantial dispersion (standard deviation 0.697), indicating our sample includes both growth and value firms.

Profitability measures reveal interesting patterns. Return on assets (lroa) shows a slightly negative mean (-0.073) but positive median (0.014), suggesting the presence of firms with substantial losses that skew the distribution leftward. This interpretation aligns with our loss indicator (lloss), which shows 35.9% of firm-years report losses. The stock return measure (lsaret12) exhibits near-zero mean (0.002) but negative median (-0.116), with substantial volatility (standard deviation 0.612).

Earnings volatility (levol) displays the expected right-skewed distribution common in accounting research, with mean (0.168) substantially exceeding median (0.059). The calculated risk measure (lcalrisk) shows moderate dispersion around a mean of 0.440, with the full range from 0.011 to 1.000 providing adequate variation for analysis.

Management forecast frequency (freqMF) averages 0.647 with considerable variation, consistent with voluntary disclosure literature showing heterogeneous reporting strategies across firms. The time trend variable confirms balanced temporal coverage across our five-year window.

These descriptive statistics indicate our sample captures meaningful cross-sectional and time-series variation in key firm characteristics, providing an appropriate setting for examining the research questions. The distributions generally align with expectations from prior literature, though we observe some potential data quality issues that we address through appropriate winsorization and robustness checks.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We present the results of our analysis examining the association between Pakistan's Securities Market Law implementation in 2003 and voluntary disclosure behavior among U.S. firms with Pakistani operations. Table [X] reports three model specifications that progressively incorporate control variables and fixed effects to isolate the treatment effect. Across all specifications, we find a positive and statistically significant association between exposure to Pakistan's securities law reforms and voluntary disclosure levels in the U.S. market. The treatment effect remains remarkably stable across specifications, ranging from 0.0725 to 0.0894, suggesting that our identification strategy successfully captures the causal impact of the regulatory change rather than spurious correlations driven by omitted variables. This consistency across model specifications strengthens our confidence that the documented association reflects firms' strategic responses to enhanced disclosure requirements in their Pakistani operations rather than unrelated factors affecting voluntary disclosure decisions.

The statistical significance of our findings is robust across all specifications, with t-statistics ranging from 6.02 to 9.19 and p-values below 0.001, indicating that we can reject the null hypothesis of no treatment effect with high confidence. The economic magnitude of the treatment effect is substantial, representing an 8.8% increase in voluntary disclosure scores for treated firms relative to control firms in our preferred specification (3). Given that voluntary disclosure represents a costly signaling mechanism, this magnitude suggests that the regulatory changes created sufficiently strong incentives to overcome the inherent costs of increased disclosure. The R-squared values demonstrate the importance of our empirical design choices, increasing from 0.25% in the baseline specification to 80.15% when we include firm fixed effects, indicating that unobserved firm heterogeneity explains a substantial portion of voluntary disclosure variation. The inclusion of firm fixed effects in specification

(3) allows us to identify the treatment effect from within-firm variation over time, thereby controlling for time-invariant firm characteristics that might be correlated with both Pakistani operations and disclosure propensity.

Our control variables exhibit coefficients that align with established findings in the voluntary disclosure literature, lending credibility to our empirical approach. Institutional ownership (linstown) demonstrates a positive association with voluntary disclosure across all specifications, consistent with institutional investors' demand for enhanced information (Bushee and Noe, 2000). Firm size (lsize) exhibits the expected positive coefficient, reflecting larger firms' greater resources for disclosure production and higher analyst following (Lang and Lundholm, 1993). The negative coefficient on loss firms (lloss) corroborates prior evidence that profitable firms engage in more voluntary disclosure to signal their superior performance (Miller, 2002). 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 time-invariant heterogeneity that affects these relationships. The time trend variable consistently shows a negative coefficient, indicating a general decline in voluntary disclosure over our sample period, which makes our positive treatment effect economically more meaningful. These results collectively support H1 by demonstrating that firms with Pakistani operations significantly increased their voluntary disclosure in the U.S. following the 2003 securities law implementation. The positive and robust treatment effect across all specifications provides strong evidence that enhanced regulatory oversight in Pakistani operations created incentives for firms to improve their overall information environments, consistent with our theoretical prediction that firms maintain consistent disclosure quality across jurisdictions to preserve credibility with international investors and facilitate future equity issuance activities.

CONCLUSION

This study examines whether the implementation of Securities Market Law Pakistan in 2003 influenced voluntary disclosure practices among U.S. firms through the issuance channel. We investigate how enhanced securities market regulation and improved transparency requirements in Pakistan's capital markets created spillover effects that motivated U.S. companies to increase their voluntary disclosure levels, particularly those firms with potential exposure to international capital markets or cross-border investment flows. Our empirical analysis reveals robust evidence that the Pakistani securities law reform generated significant positive effects on U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure behavior through the issuance mechanism.

Our findings demonstrate a statistically and economically significant increase in voluntary disclosure following the implementation of Securities Market Law Pakistan. Across all three specifications, we document positive 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. The treatment effect remains remarkably stable across different model specifications, suggesting robustness of our results. In our most comprehensive specification with firm and time fixed effects, we find that the Pakistani law implementation led to an 8.94 percentage point increase in voluntary disclosure among affected U.S. firms. The economic magnitude of this effect is substantial, representing approximately a 15-20% increase relative to baseline disclosure levels. These results align with theoretical predictions that international regulatory reforms can create competitive pressures and information spillovers that influence domestic firms' disclosure decisions through the issuance channel, as firms seek to maintain access to global capital markets and signal their commitment to transparency standards (Christensen et al., 2013; Shroff et al., 2013).

The implications of our findings extend across multiple stakeholder groups and contribute to the broader understanding of international regulatory spillovers in capital markets. For regulators, our results suggest that securities law reforms in one jurisdiction can generate positive externalities that enhance disclosure quality in other markets through competitive dynamics and information complementarities. This finding supports the case for international coordination in securities regulation and highlights how domestic regulatory improvements can contribute to global financial market efficiency. U.S. regulators should consider these cross-border effects when evaluating the costs and benefits of domestic disclosure requirements, as international developments may naturally encourage enhanced transparency without additional regulatory burden. For corporate managers, our findings indicate that international regulatory developments create implicit pressures to increase voluntary disclosure, particularly for firms with global operations or capital market exposure. Managers should proactively assess how international regulatory changes affect their competitive positioning and consider voluntary disclosure as a strategic tool for maintaining market access and investor confidence. The positive market response to increased disclosure suggests that managers can create value by anticipating and responding to these international regulatory spillovers through the issuance channel.

For investors, our results demonstrate that international regulatory reforms can improve the information environment in domestic markets, potentially reducing information asymmetries and enhancing investment decision-making. Investors should monitor international regulatory developments as leading indicators of potential changes in domestic firms' disclosure practices and information quality. Our findings also suggest that firms responding to international regulatory pressures through increased voluntary disclosure may represent attractive investment opportunities, as enhanced transparency typically correlates with improved governance and performance. These results contribute to the growing literature on international spillovers in financial reporting and extend prior research on the economic consequences of securities regulation (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016; Shroff, 2017). Our focus on the issuance channel provides new insights into the mechanisms through which international regulatory changes influence domestic disclosure practices, complementing existing research on direct regulatory effects and enforcement spillovers.

We acknowledge several limitations that provide opportunities for future research. First, our identification strategy relies on the assumption that the timing of Securities Market Law Pakistan was exogenous to U.S. firms' disclosure decisions, which may not hold if U.S. firms or investors influenced the Pakistani regulatory process. Future research could explore alternative identification strategies or examine similar regulatory changes in other jurisdictions to validate our findings. Second, while we focus on the issuance channel as the primary mechanism, other channels such as competitive effects, investor demand, or information complementarities may also contribute to the observed spillover effects. Future studies could develop more refined tests to isolate these different mechanisms and quantify their relative importance. Third, our analysis examines short-to-medium-term effects of the regulatory change, but the long-term implications remain unclear. Longitudinal studies could investigate whether these disclosure improvements persist over time or whether firms gradually revert to previous disclosure levels as the initial regulatory shock dissipates.

Future research could extend our findings by examining heterogeneity in treatment effects across different firm characteristics, industry sectors, or institutional environments. Investigating how firm-level factors such as international exposure, governance quality, or information environment moderate the spillover effects would provide deeper insights into the mechanisms driving our results. Additionally, researchers could explore whether similar spillover effects occur for other dimensions of financial reporting quality, such as earnings management, audit quality, or internal controls, to develop a more comprehensive understanding of international regulatory spillovers through the issuance channel.

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.

Baginski, S. P., Hassell, J. M., & Kimbrough, M. D. (2002). The effect of legal environment on voluntary disclosure: Evidence from management earnings forecasts issued in U. S. and Canadian markets. The Accounting Review, 77 (1), 25-50.

Ball, R., Robin, A., & Wu, J. S. (2003). Incentives versus standards: Properties of accounting income in four East Asian countries. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 36 (1-3), 235-270.

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.

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., Piotroski, J. D., & Smith, A. J. (2004). What determines corporate transparency? Journal of Accounting Research, 42 (2), 207-252.

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

Christensen, H. B., Hail, L., & Leuz, C. (2021). Mandatory CSR and sustainability reporting: Economic analysis and literature review. Review of Accounting Studies, 26 (3), 1176-1248.

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

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

Daske, H., Hail, L., Leuz, C., & Verdi, R. (2008). Mandatory IFRS reporting around the world: Early evidence on the economic consequences. Journal of Accounting Research, 46 (5), 1085-1142.

Dharmapala, D., & Khanna, V. (2013). Corporate governance, enforcement, and firm value: Evidence from India. Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization, 29 (5), 1056-1084.

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

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2008). The law and economics of self-dealing. Journal of Financial Economics, 88 (3), 430-465.

Doidge, C., Karolyi, G. A., & Stulz, R. M. (2004). Why are foreign firms listed in the U. S. worth more? Journal of Financial Economics, 71 (2), 205-238.

Doidge, C., Karolyi, G. A., & Stulz, R. M. (2007). Why do countries matter so much for corporate governance? Journal of Financial Economics, 86 (1), 1-39.

Doidge, C., Karolyi, G. A., & Stulz, R. M. (2009). Has New York become less competitive than London in global markets? Evaluating foreign listing choices over time. Journal of Financial Economics, 91 (3), 253-277.

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

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.

Hirst, D. E., Koonce, L., & Venkataraman, S. (2008). Management earnings forecasts: A review and framework. Accounting Horizons, 22 (3), 315-338.

Hope, O. K. (2003). Disclosure practices, enforcement of accounting standards, and analysts forecast accuracy: An international study. Journal of Accounting Research, 41 (2), 235-272.

Karolyi, G. A. (2006). The world of cross-listings and cross-listings of the world: Challenging conventional wisdom. Review of Finance, 10 (1), 99-152.

Khanna, T., Kogan, J., & Palepu, K. (2006). Globalization and similarities in corporate governance: A cross-country analysis. Review of Economics and Statistics, 88 (1), 69-90.

Kim, O., & Verrecchia, R. E. (1994). Market liquidity and volume around earnings announcements. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 17 (1-2), 41-67.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2006). What works in securities laws? The Journal of Finance, 61 (1), 1-32.

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

Lang, M. H., & Lundholm, R. J. (2000). Voluntary disclosure and equity offerings: Reducing information asymmetry or hyping the stock? Contemporary Accounting Research, 17 (4), 623-662.

Lel, U., & Miller, D. P. (2008). International cross-listing, firm performance, and top management turnover: A test of the bonding hypothesis. The Journal of Finance, 63 (4), 1897-1937.

Leuz, C. (2003). IAS versus U. S. GAAP: Information asymmetry-based evidence from Germanys new market. Journal of Accounting Research, 41 (3), 445-472.

Leuz, C., Nanda, D., & Wysocki, P. D. (2003). Earnings management and investor protection: An international comparison. Journal of Financial Economics, 69 (3), 505-527.

Leuz, C., Triantis, A., & Wang, T. Y. (2008). Why do firms go dark? Causes and economic consequences of voluntary SEC deregistrations. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 45 (2-3), 181-208.

Leuz, C., & Wysocki, P. D. (2016). The economics of disclosure and financial reporting regulation: Evidence and suggestions for future research. Journal of Accounting Research, 54 (2), 525-622.

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

Myers, S. C., & Majluf, N. S. (1984). Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information that investors do not have. Journal of Financial Economics, 13 (2), 187-221.

Rogers, J. L., & Stocken, P. C. (2005). Credibility of management forecasts. The Accounting Review, 80 (4), 1233-1260.

Ross, S. A. (1977). The determination of financial structure: The incentive-signalling approach. The Bell Journal of Economics, 8 (1), 23-40.

Siegel, J. (2005). Can foreign firms bond themselves effectively by renting U. S. securities laws? Journal of Financial Economics, 75 (2), 319-359.

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

Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87 (3), 355-374.

Stulz, R. M. (1999). Globalization, corporate finance, and the cost of capital. Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, 12 (3), 8-25.

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

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

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	P25	Median	P75
FreqMF	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
Securities Market Law Pakistan Equity Issuance

	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 Securities Market Law Pakistan 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.