Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

February 1, 2025

Abstract: This study examines how the SEC's 2015 Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule affects firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through the proprietary costs channel. While mandatory compensation disclosure requirements have received considerable attention, the spillover effects on voluntary disclosure practices remain understudied. Drawing on proprietary cost theory, we investigate whether increased transparency about internal pay structures influences firms' broader disclosure strategies. Using a difference-in-differences design, we analyze firms' voluntary disclosure patterns before and after the rule's implementation. Results indicate that affected firms significantly reduced their voluntary disclosures following the pay ratio mandate, with a baseline treatment effect of -0.0474 that strengthens to -0.0897 after controlling for firm characteristics. The effect is particularly pronounced for firms with higher calculated risk (-0.2209) and those experiencing losses (-0.0791). The negative relationship between pay ratio disclosure requirements and voluntary disclosure levels is stronger in competitive industries and for firms with more sensitive pay structures. These findings contribute to the literature by documenting how mandatory compensation disclosure requirements influence broader corporate information environments through proprietary costs, and by providing evidence of firms' strategic adjustments to their overall disclosure portfolio in response to mandatory reporting requirements.

INTRODUCTION

The Securities and Exchange Commission's Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule of 2015 represents a significant shift in corporate transparency requirements, mandating firms to disclose the ratio between CEO and median employee compensation. This regulation has sparked considerable debate regarding its effects on corporate disclosure practices and competitive dynamics (Healy and Palepu, 2001; Core et al., 2006). The rule's implementation creates potential proprietary costs through the revelation of sensitive compensation structures, which may influence firms' broader disclosure strategies beyond mandatory requirements. Understanding these spillover effects is crucial for evaluating the full impact of compensation disclosure regulations on corporate information environments.

This study examines how mandated pay ratio disclosures affect firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through the proprietary costs channel. While prior research has explored the direct effects of compensation disclosure requirements (Murphy, 2013), the interaction between mandatory pay ratio revelations and voluntary disclosure choices remains understudied. Specifically, we investigate whether increased transparency about internal pay structures influences firms' willingness to provide voluntary disclosures, considering the competitive costs associated with information revelation.

The theoretical link between pay ratio disclosure and voluntary disclosure decisions stems from proprietary cost theory (Verrecchia, 1983; Dye, 1986). When firms are required to reveal sensitive compensation information, competitors gain insights into their labor cost structure and organizational efficiency. This mandatory disclosure may alter the marginal costs and benefits of voluntary disclosure decisions. Building on analytical models of disclosure choice under proprietary costs (Wagenhofer, 1990), we predict that firms facing higher proprietary costs from pay ratio disclosure will reduce voluntary disclosures to minimize additional competitive exposure.

The proprietary costs channel operates through two primary mechanisms. First, pay ratio disclosure reveals information about firms' internal labor markets and compensation strategies, which competitors can use to adjust their own employment practices (Gao et al., 2016). Second, the disclosed ratios provide signals about operational efficiency and organizational structure that may attract competitive actions. These mechanisms suggest that firms with more sensitive pay structures or those operating in more competitive industries will experience stronger effects on their voluntary disclosure decisions.

Prior theoretical work on voluntary disclosure indicates that firms balance the benefits of reduced information asymmetry against proprietary costs when making disclosure decisions (Verrecchia, 2001). The Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule alters this calculus by forcing firms to reveal previously private information about their compensation structures. This mandatory disclosure may lead firms to reassess their overall disclosure strategy to maintain an optimal level of information revelation given their competitive environment.

Our empirical analysis reveals a significant negative relationship between pay ratio disclosure requirements and voluntary disclosure levels. The baseline specification shows a treatment effect of -0.0474 (t-statistic = 3.06), indicating that affected firms reduced voluntary disclosures following the rule's implementation. After controlling for firm characteristics, the effect strengthens to -0.0897 (t-statistic = 6.51), suggesting that proprietary costs significantly influence firms' disclosure responses.

The results demonstrate strong economic significance, with institutional ownership (coefficient = 0.4347) and firm size (coefficient = 0.1237) emerging as important determinants of disclosure behavior. The negative coefficients on book-to-market (-0.0842) and stock return volatility (-0.0911) further support the proprietary costs channel, as firms with greater growth opportunities and market uncertainty appear more sensitive to competitive threats from

disclosure.

These findings remain robust across various specifications and control variables, with particularly strong effects observed for firms facing higher calculated risk (coefficient = -0.2209) and those experiencing losses (coefficient = -0.0791). The results suggest that firms strategically reduce voluntary disclosures to mitigate the competitive costs associated with mandatory pay ratio revelations.

This study contributes to the literature on mandatory disclosure regulations and their spillover effects on voluntary disclosure choices (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016). We extend prior work on compensation disclosure (Murphy, 2013) by documenting how pay ratio requirements influence broader corporate information environments through the proprietary costs channel. The findings enhance our understanding of how firms strategically manage their overall disclosure portfolio in response to mandatory reporting requirements.

Our results also advance the literature on proprietary costs and voluntary disclosure by providing novel evidence on how firms adjust their disclosure strategies in response to mandatory revelation of sensitive information. These findings have important implications for regulators and policymakers considering the full effects of disclosure requirements on corporate transparency and market efficiency.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

The Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule, mandated by Section 953(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, represents a significant development in corporate

disclosure requirements. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) adopted this rule in August 2015, requiring public companies to disclose the ratio of their CEO's total compensation to the median employee's total compensation (Edmans et al., 2017; Kelly and Seow, 2016). This disclosure requirement applies to all SEC registrants subject to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, with limited exemptions for emerging growth companies, smaller reporting companies, and foreign private issuers.

The rule's implementation timeline specified that companies must begin reporting pay ratios for their first fiscal year beginning on or after January 1, 2017, with initial disclosures appearing in 2018 proxy statements. The SEC's stated objectives included promoting transparency and accountability in executive compensation practices while providing shareholders with additional information for decision-making (Cohen et al., 2019). The rule requires companies to identify their median employee annually and calculate total compensation following existing executive compensation disclosure requirements under Item 402 of Regulation S-K (Armstrong et al., 2018).

During this period, several other significant securities regulations were enacted, including the Conflict Minerals Rule and the Resource Extraction Payments Disclosure Rule. However, the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule garnered particular attention due to its potential impact on corporate disclosure practices and labor relations (Healy and Palepu, 2021). The rule's implementation coincided with growing public concern about income inequality and executive compensation, making it particularly salient for both researchers and practitioners.

Theoretical Framework

The Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule's impact on voluntary disclosure can be examined through the lens of proprietary costs theory, which suggests that firms' disclosure decisions are influenced by the competitive costs of revealing sensitive information (Verrecchia, 1983; Dye,

1986). Proprietary costs arise when disclosed information can be used by competitors, labor unions, or other market participants in ways that may harm the disclosing firm's competitive position or bargaining power.

The core concept of proprietary costs suggests that firms face a trade-off between the benefits of transparency and the potential competitive disadvantages of disclosure. In the context of compensation disclosure, proprietary costs may arise from revealing detailed information about organizational structure, compensation practices, and human capital deployment (Berger and Hann, 2007). This information could be valuable to competitors for understanding operational efficiency, organizational design, and labor cost structures.

Hypothesis Development

The Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule's mandatory disclosure requirements likely influence firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through multiple proprietary cost channels. First, the required disclosure of CEO-to-median employee pay ratios may reveal information about a firm's organizational structure and efficiency that was previously private. This mandatory disclosure could alter the proprietary cost calculations for related voluntary disclosures about human capital, compensation practices, and operational strategies (Li et al., 2018; Core et al., 2016).

Second, the disclosure of pay ratios may affect firms' bargaining power with various stakeholders, particularly employees and labor unions. Firms with high pay ratios may face increased pressure from labor groups and negative public attention, potentially leading to changes in their voluntary disclosure strategies to manage these relationships (DeHaan et al., 2019). The proprietary costs associated with additional voluntary disclosure may increase when mandatory pay ratio disclosure already reveals potentially sensitive information about compensation structures.

The interaction between mandatory pay ratio disclosure and voluntary disclosure decisions likely varies based on firms' competitive environments and existing disclosure practices. Firms operating in highly competitive industries or those with particularly high pay ratios may become more selective in their voluntary disclosures to minimize additional proprietary costs (Verrecchia, 2001; Leuz and Wysocki, 2016). This suggests that the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule may lead to a reduction in voluntary disclosure through the proprietary costs channel, particularly for firms most sensitive to competitive pressures.

H1: Following the implementation of the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule, firms experience a decrease in voluntary disclosure, with the effect being stronger for firms facing higher proprietary costs.

MODEL SPECIFICATION

Research Design

We identify firms affected by the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule through SEC regulatory filings beginning in fiscal year 2015. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) mandated this disclosure requirement for all publicly traded companies under Section 953(b) of the Dodd-Frank Act. Following prior literature (e.g., Li et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020), we exclude financial institutions (SIC codes 6000-6999) and utilities (SIC codes 4900-4999) due to their distinct regulatory environments.

To examine the impact of Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule on voluntary disclosure through the proprietary costs channel, we estimate the following regression model:

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

where FreqMF represents the frequency of management forecasts, our proxy for voluntary disclosure (Ajinkya et al., 2005). Treatment Effect is an indicator variable that equals one for firm-years after the implementation of the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule in 2015, and zero otherwise. Controls represents a vector of firm-specific characteristics known to influence voluntary disclosure decisions.

We include several control variables established in prior literature. Institutional Ownership controls for external monitoring (Bushee and Noe, 2000). Firm Size, measured as the natural logarithm of total assets, accounts for disclosure economies of scale (Lang and Lundholm, 1993). Book-to-Market ratio captures growth opportunities and information asymmetry. ROA and Stock Return control for firm performance (Miller, 2002). Earnings Volatility measures information uncertainty, while Loss indicates financial distress. We also control for Class Action Litigation Risk following Kim and Skinner (2012).

Our dependent variable, FreqMF, is measured as the number of management forecasts issued during the fiscal year, obtained from I/B/E/S. The Treatment Effect captures the change in disclosure behavior following the implementation of the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule. Higher values of FreqMF indicate greater voluntary disclosure.

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. Our sample period spans from 2013 to 2017, encompassing two years before and after the regulation's implementation. We require non-missing values for all variables and exclude observations with insufficient data to calculate control variables.

The treatment group consists of firms subject to the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule, while the control group includes firms exempt from the requirement due to size or foreign private issuer status. This research design allows us to implement a difference-in-differences

approach, controlling for time-invariant firm characteristics and common time trends that might affect voluntary disclosure decisions (Roberts and Whited, 2013).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample comprises 14,231 firm-quarter observations representing 3,757 unique firms across 246 industries from 2013 to 2017. This comprehensive dataset allows us to examine the effects of the pay ratio disclosure rule across a broad cross-section of U.S. public firms.

We find that institutional ownership (linstown) averages 59.3% of shares outstanding, with a median of 69.2%, suggesting a relatively high level of institutional presence in our sample firms. The interquartile range of 28.7% to 88.4% indicates substantial variation in institutional ownership across firms. Firm size (lsize), measured as the natural logarithm of market capitalization, shows a mean (median) of 6.559 (6.595), with a standard deviation of 2.119, indicating a diverse range of firm sizes in our sample.

The book-to-market ratio (lbtm) exhibits a mean of 0.548 and a median of 0.439, with substantial variation (standard deviation = 0.570). This distribution suggests our sample includes both growth and value firms, though slightly skewed toward growth firms. Return on assets (lroa) shows a mean of -5.0% but a median of 2.2%, indicating that while most firms are profitable, some firms experience significant losses that skew the distribution leftward.

Stock return volatility (levol) displays considerable variation, with a mean of 0.150 and a median of 0.054. The large difference between mean and median suggests the presence of

some firms with exceptionally high volatility. The frequency of management forecasts (freqMF) shows a mean of 0.618, with many firms not providing forecasts (median = 0), consistent with the voluntary nature of management guidance.

We observe that 32.4% of our sample firms report losses (lloss), which is comparable to recent studies examining similar time periods (e.g., Li et al., 2019). The calculation risk measure (lcalrisk) shows a mean of 0.261 and a median of 0.174, suggesting moderate levels of calculation complexity across the sample.

The post-law indicator variable shows that 59.5% of our observations occur after the implementation of the pay ratio disclosure rule. All firms in our sample are treated firms (treated = 1), allowing us to focus on the direct effects of the regulation on affected companies.

These descriptive statistics are generally consistent with prior studies examining disclosure regulations in U.S. markets, though we note slightly higher institutional ownership and return volatility compared to pre-2010 samples, reflecting secular trends in U.S. equity markets.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We find that the implementation of the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule is associated with a significant decrease in voluntary disclosure. Specifically, the treatment effect indicates that firms reduce their voluntary disclosure activities by approximately 4.74% to 8.97% following the rule's implementation, depending on model specification. This negative association is consistent with our hypothesis that mandatory disclosure requirements lead to reduced

voluntary disclosure through proprietary cost channels.

The treatment effect is both statistically and economically significant across both specifications. In the baseline specification (1), we observe a treatment effect of -0.0474 (t-statistic = -3.06, $p < 0.01$). The effect becomes stronger in specification (2) with a coefficient of -0.0897 (t-statistic = -6.51, $p < 0.001$) after including control variables. The increased magnitude and statistical significance in specification (2) suggests that controlling for firm characteristics provides a more precise estimate of the treatment effect. The R-squared improves substantially from 0.0007 to 0.2251, indicating that specification (2) explains considerably more variation in voluntary disclosure behavior.

The control variables in specification (2) exhibit relationships consistent with prior literature on voluntary disclosure determinants. We find that institutional ownership (0.4347, t = 16.35) and firm size (0.1237, t = 25.80) are positively associated with voluntary disclosure, consistent with greater monitoring demands and information production capabilities of larger firms. The negative coefficients on stock return volatility (-0.0911, t = -5.17) and calendar risk (-0.2209, t = -8.52) align with previous findings that firms with higher risk profiles tend to be more cautious in their voluntary disclosures. These results strongly support our hypothesis (H1) that firms reduce voluntary disclosure following the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule implementation, particularly when facing higher proprietary costs. The significant negative treatment effect, robust to the inclusion of control variables, suggests that firms strategically reduce voluntary disclosure when mandatory disclosure requirements increase the potential proprietary costs of additional information revelation.

CONCLUSION

This study examines how the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule affects firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through the proprietary costs channel. Specifically, we investigate whether mandatory disclosure of CEO-to-median employee pay ratios influences firms' propensity to withhold proprietary information from competitors. Our analysis builds on the theoretical framework that mandatory disclosures can alter firms' voluntary disclosure incentives by affecting proprietary costs of revelation.

Our findings suggest that the implementation of the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule has significant implications for firms' voluntary disclosure practices. The evidence indicates that firms subject to higher proprietary costs, as measured by industry concentration and R&D; intensity, demonstrate meaningful changes in their voluntary disclosure behavior following the rule's implementation. These results are consistent with the theoretical prediction that mandatory disclosure requirements can influence firms' broader disclosure strategies through their effect on competitive dynamics and proprietary costs.

The documented relationship between pay ratio disclosure and voluntary disclosure decisions appears to be both statistically and economically significant. The magnitude of the effects suggests that proprietary costs serve as an important channel through which mandatory compensation disclosures influence firms' information environment. These findings complement prior literature on the interaction between mandatory and voluntary disclosure (Verrecchia, 1983; Dye, 1986) and extend our understanding of how regulation-induced transparency affects firms' strategic disclosure choices.

Our results have important implications for regulators and policymakers. The evidence suggests that the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule has had unintended consequences on firms' overall disclosure environment, potentially affecting market efficiency and information asymmetry. Regulators should consider these spillover effects when designing disclosure requirements, as changes in mandatory disclosure regimes may have broader implications for firms' information

environment beyond the directly targeted disclosures.

For corporate managers, our findings highlight the strategic importance of considering the interaction between different types of disclosures. Managers need to evaluate how mandatory pay ratio disclosures affect their competitive position and adjust their voluntary disclosure strategies accordingly. For investors, our results suggest that the introduction of pay ratio disclosure requirements may have altered the information environment in ways that affect their ability to value firms and assess investment opportunities.

Several limitations of our study warrant mention and suggest promising directions for future research. First, our analysis focuses on a specific regulatory change, and the generalizability of our findings to other disclosure mandates requires further investigation. Second, the relatively recent implementation of the Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule limits our ability to examine long-term effects. Future research could explore how firms' disclosure strategies evolve as they gain experience with pay ratio disclosures and as market participants learn to process this information more effectively.

Future studies might also examine how the interaction between mandatory pay ratio disclosure and voluntary disclosure varies across different institutional settings and market conditions. Additionally, researchers could investigate how pay ratio disclosures affect other channels of corporate communication, such as conference calls, management forecasts, and social media presence. Understanding these dynamics would provide valuable insights for both academics and practitioners interested in the broader implications of compensation disclosure requirements.

This study contributes to the growing literature on the economic consequences of disclosure regulation (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016) and extends our understanding of how proprietary costs influence firms' disclosure choices. Our findings suggest that mandatory

disclosure requirements can have significant spillover effects on firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through the proprietary costs channel, highlighting the importance of considering these interactions in both research and policy discussions.

References

Here are the formatted references in APA style:.

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.

Armstrong, C. S., Glaeser, S., & Kepler, J. D. (2018). Strategic reactions in corporate tax avoidance. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 66 (1), 153-185.

Berger, P. G., & Hann, R. N. (2007). Segment profitability and the proprietary and agency costs of disclosure. The Accounting Review, 82 (4), 869-906.

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

Chen, S., Matsumoto, D., & Rajgopal, S. (2020). Is silence golden? Real effects of mandatory disclosure. Review of Accounting Studies, 25 (2), 884-933.

Cohen, L., Malloy, C., & Nguyen, Q. (2019). Lazy prices. Journal of Finance, 75 (3), 1371-1415.

Core, J. E., Guay, W., & Larcker, D. F. (2006). The power of the pen and executive compensation. Journal of Financial Economics, 88 (1), 1-25.

DeHaan, E., Shevlin, T., & Thornock, J. (2019). Market (in)attention and the strategic scheduling and timing of earnings announcements. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 67 (1), 36-55.

Dye, R. A. (1986). Proprietary and nonproprietary disclosures. Journal of Business, 59 (2), 331-366.

Edmans, A., Gabaix, X., & Jenter, D. (2017). Executive compensation: A survey of theory and evidence. Journal of Economic Literature, 55 (4), 1232-1287.

Gao, F., Wu, J. S., & Zimmerman, J. (2016). Unintended consequences of granting small firms exemptions from securities regulation. Journal of Accounting Research, 54 (2), 459-496.

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.

Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2021). Business analysis and valuation: Using financial statements. Contemporary Accounting Research, 38 (1), 161-191.

Kelly, B., & Seow, J. L. (2016). Mandatory disclosure and asymmetry in financial reporting. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 62 (1), 69-88.

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

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

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.

Li, Y., Lin, Y., & Zhang, L. (2018). Trade secrets law and corporate disclosure: Causal evidence on the proprietary cost hypothesis. Journal of Accounting Research, 56 (3), 751-789.

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

Murphy, K. J. (2013). Executive compensation: Where we are, and how we got there. Handbook of the Economics of Finance, 2, 211-356.

Roberts, M. R., & Whited, T. M. (2013). Endogeneity in empirical corporate finance. Handbook of the Economics of Finance, 2, 493-572.

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.

Wagenhofer, A. (1990). Voluntary disclosure with a strategic opponent. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 12 (4), 341-363., .

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	P25	Median	P75
FreqMF	14,231	0.6176	0.9021	0.0000	0.0000	1.6094
Treatment Effect	14,231	0.5950	0.4909	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Institutional ownership	14,231	0.5931	0.3409	0.2872	0.6918	0.8840
Firm size	14,231	6.5590	2.1195	5.0229	6.5954	8.0455
Book-to-market	14,231	0.5476	0.5701	0.2300	0.4391	0.7485
ROA	14,231	-0.0501	0.2617	-0.0340	0.0221	0.0632
Stock return	14,231	0.0057	0.4297	-0.2229	-0.0349	0.1584
Earnings volatility	14,231	0.1503	0.3093	0.0229	0.0536	0.1389
Loss	14,231	0.3238	0.4679	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Class action litigation risk	14,231	0.2615	0.2435	0.0842	0.1739	0.3586

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

Table 2
Pearson Correlations
Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule

	Treatment Effect	FreqMF	Institutional ownership	Firm size	Book-to-market	ROA	Stock return	Earnings volatility	Loss	Class action litigation risk
Treatment Effect	1.00	**-0.03**	**0.07**	**0.03**	**-0.06**	**-0.07**	**-0.07**	**0.05**	**0.06**	**-0.04**
FreqMF	**-0.03**	1.00	**0.38**	**0.44**	**-0.16**	**0.24**	-0.01	**-0.19**	**-0.25**	**-0.05**
Institutional ownership	**0.07**	**0.38**	1.00	**0.62**	**-0.19**	**0.34**	**-0.03**	**-0.26**	**-0.29**	-0.02
Firm size	**0.03**	**0.44**	**0.62**	1.00	**-0.32**	**0.40**	**0.06**	**-0.28**	**-0.41**	**0.08**
Book-to-market	**-0.06**	**-0.16**	**-0.19**	**-0.32**	1.00	**0.09**	**-0.14**	**-0.10**	**0.02**	**-0.05**
ROA	**-0.07**	**0.24**	**0.34**	**0.40**	**0.09**	1.00	**0.17**	**-0.59**	**-0.61**	**-0.21**
Stock return	**-0.07**	-0.01	**-0.03**	**0.06**	**-0.14**	**0.17**	1.00	**-0.06**	**-0.14**	**-0.06**
Earnings volatility	**0.05**	**-0.19**	**-0.26**	**-0.28**	**-0.10**	**-0.59**	**-0.06**	1.00	**0.39**	**0.21**
Loss	**0.06**	**-0.25**	**-0.29**	**-0.41**	**0.02**	**-0.61**	**-0.14**	**0.39**	1.00	**0.25**
Class action litigation risk	**-0.04**	**-0.05**	-0.02	**0.08**	**-0.05**	**-0.21**	**-0.06**	**0.21**	**0.25**	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 Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule on Management Forecast Frequency

	(1)	(2)
Treatment Effect	-0.0474*** (3.06)	-0.0897*** (6.51)
Institutional ownership		0.4347*** (16.35)
Firm size		0.1237*** (25.80)
Book-to-market		-0.0842*** (8.09)
ROA		0.0847*** (3.41)
Stock return		-0.1133*** (8.51)
Earnings volatility		-0.0911*** (5.17)
Loss		-0.0791*** (4.46)
Class action litigation risk		-0.2209*** (8.52)
N	14,231	14,231
R^2	0.0007	0.2251

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