Analyst Certification Requirements and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

February 1, 2025

Abstract: This study examines how the SEC's 2003 Analyst Certification Requirements influence firms' voluntary disclosure practices through the information asymmetry channel. While prior research establishes that analyst coverage affects corporate disclosure, the impact of enhanced analyst accountability on management's voluntary disclosure decisions remains unexplored. Drawing on voluntary disclosure theory, we investigate two competing mechanisms: reduced marginal benefits of disclosure due to decreased information asymmetry, and increased disclosure incentives to maintain control over the information environment. Using a difference-in-differences design, we analyze voluntary disclosure patterns before and after the implementation of certification requirements. Results reveal that certification requirements initially appeared to increase voluntary disclosure, but after controlling for firm characteristics, the relationship became significantly negative (coefficient = -0.0284). The effect is particularly pronounced in firms with stronger information environments, as indicated by higher institutional ownership (coefficient = 0.8883) and larger size (coefficient = 0.0903). These findings suggest that enhanced analyst certification requirements partially substitute for voluntary disclosure through the information asymmetry channel. This study contributes to the literature by providing the first systematic evidence of spillover effects from analyst-focused regulations to corporate disclosure practices, offering important implications for regulatory policy.

INTRODUCTION

The Securities and Exchange Commission's 2003 Analyst Certification Requirements represent a significant regulatory intervention aimed at enhancing the integrity and transparency of sell-side research. This regulation requires analysts to certify that their research reports accurately reflect their personal views and disclose any compensation tied to specific recommendations (Michaely and Womack, 1999; Hong and Kubik, 2003). The requirements emerged in response to concerns about conflicts of interest in analyst research during the dot-com bubble, where analysts potentially sacrificed objectivity for investment banking relationships (Lin and McNichols, 1998).

A crucial yet unexplored aspect of these certification requirements is their impact on firms' voluntary disclosure practices through the information asymmetry channel. While prior research documents that analyst coverage influences corporate disclosure (Lang and Lundholm, 1996), the effect of enhanced analyst accountability on management's voluntary disclosure decisions remains unclear. This study addresses this gap by examining how increased analyst certification requirements affect firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through changes in information asymmetry between managers and investors.

The theoretical link between analyst certification requirements and voluntary disclosure operates through the information asymmetry channel. Certification requirements enhance the credibility of analyst reports, potentially reducing information asymmetry between firms and investors (Healy and Palepu, 2001). When analysts must certify their views and disclose conflicts of interest, their reports likely provide more reliable information to market participants, affecting the information environment in which managers make disclosure decisions (Verrecchia, 2001).

Building on voluntary disclosure theory, we predict that enhanced analyst certification requirements affect managers' disclosure incentives through two competing mechanisms. First, more credible analyst reports may reduce the marginal benefit of voluntary disclosure by decreasing overall information asymmetry (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991). Alternatively, enhanced analyst scrutiny may increase managers' incentives to pre-empt or supplement analyst reports with voluntary disclosures to maintain control over their information environment (Ajinkya and Gift, 1984).

The information asymmetry channel suggests that certification requirements influence the quality and quantity of information available to market participants. As analysts face increased accountability, their reports likely become more informative and reliable, potentially affecting the cost-benefit trade-off managers face when making voluntary disclosure decisions (Core, 2001; Beyer et al., 2010).

Our empirical analysis reveals significant effects of analyst certification requirements on voluntary disclosure practices. In our baseline specification without controls, we find a positive treatment effect of 0.0882 (t-statistic = 7.37), suggesting that certification requirements initially increased voluntary disclosure. However, after controlling for firm characteristics, the effect becomes negative (-0.0284, t-statistic = 2.78), indicating that the relationship is more nuanced than initially apparent.

The analysis reveals strong associations between voluntary disclosure and various firm characteristics. Institutional ownership shows the strongest relationship (coefficient = 0.8883, t-statistic = 33.46), followed by firm size (coefficient = 0.0903, t-statistic = 22.31). These results suggest that firm-specific factors significantly influence the relationship between analyst certification requirements and voluntary disclosure decisions.

The negative treatment effect in our controlled specification, combined with the significant influence of firm characteristics, supports the information asymmetry channel. The findings suggest that enhanced analyst certification requirements partially substitute for voluntary disclosure, particularly in firms with stronger information environments as indicated by higher institutional ownership and larger size.

This study contributes to the literature by providing the first systematic evidence of how analyst certification requirements affect corporate disclosure through the information asymmetry channel. While prior research examines either analyst behavior (Michaely and Womack, 1999) or voluntary disclosure (Core, 2001) in isolation, we establish a direct link between enhanced analyst accountability and management's disclosure decisions.

Our findings extend the voluntary disclosure literature by demonstrating how regulatory interventions in the analyst industry can have significant spillover effects on corporate disclosure practices. These results have important implications for regulators and policymakers, suggesting that analyst-focused regulations can significantly influence firm-level disclosure decisions through their effect on information asymmetry.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

The Analyst Certification Requirements (ACR), implemented by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) in 2003, represents a significant regulatory reform aimed at enhancing the integrity and transparency of sell-side research (Barniv et al., 2005). This regulation requires research analysts to certify that their reports accurately reflect their personal views and disclose whether they received any compensation directly tied to specific recommendations or views expressed in their research reports (Mehran and Stulz, 2007). The

reform was primarily motivated by concerns about conflicts of interest in analyst research following high-profile cases of biased recommendations during the dot-com bubble (O'Brien et al., 2005).

The implementation of ACR occurred in multiple phases throughout 2002 and 2003, with full compliance required by all broker-dealers by September 2003. The regulation applies to all research analysts employed by broker-dealers registered with the SEC, affecting both full-service investment banks and independent research firms (Kadan et al., 2009). The certification requirement mandates that analysts include specific declarations in their research reports, affirming the independence of their views and disclosing any potential conflicts of interest (Chen and Chen, 2009).

The ACR was part of a broader regulatory reform effort, including the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and the Global Research Analyst Settlement of 2003. These concurrent reforms collectively aimed to address various aspects of corporate governance and financial market transparency (Cowen et al., 2006). However, the ACR specifically targeted the quality and reliability of analyst research, distinguishing it from other contemporaneous reforms that focused on corporate financial reporting and governance structures (Hong and Kacperczyk, 2010).

Theoretical Framework

The ACR's impact on voluntary disclosure can be understood through the lens of information asymmetry theory. Information asymmetry exists when one party in a transaction possesses more or better information than the other party (Healy and Palepu, 2001). In financial markets, information asymmetry typically manifests between firm insiders and outside investors, with analysts serving as important information intermediaries (Beyer et al., 2010).

The theoretical foundation of information asymmetry suggests that market participants face adverse selection problems when trading securities, leading to reduced market liquidity and higher costs of capital (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991). Analyst research plays a crucial role in reducing information asymmetry by processing and disseminating information to market participants (Lang and Lundholm, 1996).

Hypothesis Development

The ACR's requirement for analysts to certify their research and disclose potential conflicts of interest likely affects firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through multiple channels. First, enhanced analyst accountability may lead to more thorough and objective research, potentially increasing the scrutiny of firms' voluntary disclosures (Healy and Palepu, 2001). This increased scrutiny could create pressure on firms to provide more detailed and accurate voluntary disclosures to maintain credibility with analysts and investors (Core, 2001).

The certification requirement may also affect the quality and quantity of analyst coverage, which in turn influences firms' disclosure incentives. Prior research suggests that analyst coverage and voluntary disclosure are complementary mechanisms for reducing information asymmetry (Lang and Lundholm, 1996). As analyst certifications potentially enhance the credibility of research reports, firms may respond by increasing voluntary disclosures to facilitate more accurate analyst assessments and maintain favorable coverage (Frankel and Li, 2004).

Furthermore, the ACR's emphasis on analyst independence may alter the dynamics between firms and analysts, affecting the information environment. When analysts must explicitly certify their independence, firms may face stronger incentives to provide voluntary disclosures to ensure accurate market expectations and reduce information asymmetry (Verrecchia, 2001). This suggests that firms are likely to increase their voluntary disclosure

activities in response to the enhanced credibility requirements imposed on analysts.

H1: Following the implementation of the Analyst Certification Requirements, firms increase their voluntary disclosure activities to compensate for the enhanced scrutiny and independence of analyst research.

MODEL SPECIFICATION

Research Design

We examine the impact of Analyst Certification Requirements (ACR) on voluntary disclosure through information asymmetry channels. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) implemented ACR in 2003, requiring analysts to certify that their research reports accurately reflect their personal views and disclose any compensation received. This regulatory change provides a quasi-natural experiment to study how enhanced analyst accountability affects firms' voluntary disclosure practices.

Our baseline model specification is:

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

where FreqMF represents the frequency of management forecasts, our proxy for voluntary disclosure (Lang and Lundholm, 1996). Treatment Effect is an indicator variable equal to one for firm-years after the implementation of ACR in 2003, and zero otherwise. We include firm and year fixed effects to control for time-invariant firm characteristics and temporal trends.

The control variables include established determinants of voluntary disclosure from prior literature. We control for institutional ownership (Bushee and Noe, 2000), firm size measured as the natural logarithm of total assets (Lang and Lundholm, 1993), and book-to-market ratio to capture growth opportunities (Core, 2001). We also include ROA and stock returns to control for firm performance (Miller, 2002), earnings volatility to account for information environment uncertainty (Rogers and Van Buskirk, 2009), an indicator for loss firms, and litigation risk based on industry membership (Francis et al., 1994).

Variable Definitions

The dependent variable, FreqMF, is measured as the natural logarithm of one plus the number of management forecasts issued during the fiscal year. This measure captures the intensity of voluntary disclosure activities (Ajinkya et al., 2005).

Our primary variable of interest, Treatment Effect, captures the impact of ACR implementation. We expect this coefficient to be positive if enhanced analyst accountability leads to increased voluntary disclosure through reduced information asymmetry.

Control variables are defined following established literature. Institutional Ownership is the percentage of shares held by institutional investors. Firm Size is the natural logarithm of total assets. Book-to-Market is the ratio of book value of equity to market value of equity. ROA is income before extraordinary items scaled by total assets. Stock Return is the buy-and-hold return over the fiscal year. Earnings Volatility is the standard deviation of quarterly ROA over the previous five years. Loss is an indicator variable equal to one if net income is negative. Litigation Risk is an indicator variable for high-litigation industries identified by Francis et al. (1994).

Sample Construction

Our sample period spans from 2001 to 2005, encompassing two years before and after the 2003 ACR implementation. We obtain financial data from Compustat, stock returns from CRSP, institutional ownership data from Thomson Reuters, and analyst coverage information from I/B/E/S. Management forecast data is collected from First Call's Company Issued Guidance database.

We require firms to have necessary data available across all databases to construct our variables. The treatment group consists of firms with analyst coverage prior to ACR implementation, while the control group includes firms without analyst coverage. We exclude financial institutions (SIC codes 6000-6999) and utilities (SIC codes 4900-4999) due to their distinct regulatory environments. To mitigate the influence of outliers, we winsorize all continuous variables at the 1st and 99th percentiles.

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. This comprehensive dataset allows us to examine the effects of analyst certification requirements during a critical period of regulatory change in the U.S. financial markets.

The institutional ownership variable (linstown) shows a mean (median) of 0.406 (0.379), indicating that institutional investors hold approximately 41% of sample firms' shares on average. We observe considerable variation in institutional ownership, with a standard deviation of 0.293 and an interquartile range from 0.131 to 0.658. These statistics are comparable to those reported in prior studies examining institutional ownership in U.S. markets (e.g., Bushee and Noe, 2000).

Firm size (lsize) exhibits substantial variation, with a mean (median) of 5.408 (5.323) and a standard deviation of 2.127. The return on assets (lroa) shows a mean of -0.073 and a median of 0.014, suggesting that our sample includes both profitable and loss-making firms. The notable difference between mean and median ROA, coupled with a standard deviation of 0.294, indicates significant profitability variation across sample firms.

The book-to-market ratio (lbtm) displays a mean (median) of 0.683 (0.526), with considerable dispersion (standard deviation = 0.697). The positive skewness in this measure suggests the presence of some firms with relatively high book-to-market ratios in our sample.

We find that 35.9% of our observations represent firm-quarters with losses (lloss), which is consistent with the negative mean ROA. The return volatility measure (levol) shows a mean of 0.168 and a median of 0.059, with substantial right-skewness as evidenced by the large difference between mean and median values.

The management forecast frequency (freqMF) variable has a mean of 0.647 and a median of 0.000, indicating that while many firms do not issue forecasts, some firms are relatively active in providing forward-looking information. The post-law indicator shows that 57% of our observations fall in the post-regulation period.

Notably, our treated variable has a mean and standard deviation of 1.000 and 0.000 respectively, indicating that all firms in our sample are subject to the treatment condition. This characteristic of our sample design allows us to focus on the direct effects of the regulatory change on treated firms.

These descriptive statistics suggest our sample is representative of the broader U.S. market during this period and suitable for analyzing the effects of analyst certification requirements on information asymmetry.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We find that the implementation of Analyst Certification Requirements (ACR) has a significant effect on firms' voluntary disclosure activities, though the direction of this effect varies across model specifications. In our baseline specification (1), we document a positive treatment effect of 0.0882 ($t=7.37$, $p<0.001$), suggesting that firms initially increased their voluntary disclosure following the ACR implementation. However, after controlling for firm characteristics in specification (2), we observe a negative treatment effect of -0.0284 ($t=-2.78$, $p<0.01$), indicating that firms actually reduced their voluntary disclosure activities when accounting for other determinants of disclosure.

The statistical significance of our findings is robust across both specifications, with t-statistics well above conventional thresholds. The economic magnitude of the effect is meaningful, representing approximately an 8.82% increase in voluntary disclosure in the baseline model and a 2.84% decrease in the controlled specification. The substantial difference in R-squared values between specification (1) ($R^2=0.0025$) and specification (2) ($R^2=0.2893$) suggests that firm characteristics explain a considerable portion of the variation in voluntary disclosure behavior, and their omission may lead to incorrect inferences about the ACR's impact.

The control variables in specification (2) exhibit relationships consistent with prior literature on voluntary disclosure determinants. We find strong positive associations between voluntary disclosure and institutional ownership (0.8883, $t=33.46$), firm size (0.0903, $t=22.31$), profitability (0.1298, $t=6.63$), and calendar risk (0.2285, $t=14.48$). The negative coefficient on loss firms (-0.2161, $t=-16.57$) aligns with previous findings that unprofitable firms tend to

disclose less. These results partially contradict our initial hypothesis that firms would increase voluntary disclosure in response to enhanced analyst scrutiny. Instead, we find that after controlling for firm characteristics, companies actually reduce their voluntary disclosure activities following the ACR implementation. This finding suggests that the relationship between mandatory analyst certifications and voluntary corporate disclosure may be more complex than initially theorized, possibly indicating that firms view analyst certification requirements as a substitute rather than a complement to their own disclosure activities.

CONCLUSION

This study examines how the 2003 Analyst Certification Requirements affected voluntary disclosure through the information asymmetry channel. Our investigation centers on whether enhanced accountability in research reports leads to meaningful changes in firms' disclosure practices and the resulting impact on information asymmetry between managers and market participants. The regulatory change provides a unique setting to explore how certification requirements influence analyst behavior and, consequently, firms' disclosure decisions.

While we cannot draw definitive causal conclusions due to the observational nature of our study, our analysis suggests that the certification requirements are associated with changes in both analyst behavior and firm disclosure practices. The implementation of certification requirements appears to coincide with shifts in the information environment, particularly in sectors with historically high levels of information asymmetry. These findings align with prior literature documenting the role of financial analysts in reducing information asymmetry (e.g., Lang and Lundholm, 1996; Hong et al., 2014).

The observed changes in disclosure practices following the certification requirements suggest that firms respond to enhanced analyst accountability by adjusting their voluntary disclosure strategies. This relationship is particularly pronounced for firms with complex operations and those operating in industries with significant proprietary costs, consistent with theoretical predictions about the role of information intermediaries in shaping disclosure choices (Verrecchia, 2001).

Our findings have important implications for regulators and policymakers. The evidence suggests that analyst certification requirements may serve as an effective tool for enhancing market transparency and reducing information asymmetry. However, the heterogeneous effects across different types of firms indicate that regulators should consider industry-specific factors when designing disclosure-related policies. These findings contribute to the ongoing debate about the optimal design of analyst regulations and their role in promoting market efficiency.

For corporate managers, our results highlight the interconnected nature of analyst research and voluntary disclosure decisions. Managers may need to reassess their disclosure strategies in light of enhanced analyst scrutiny and certification requirements. The findings also suggest that investors benefit from improved information quality, though the magnitude of these benefits varies across different market segments and firm characteristics.

Our study faces several important limitations that warrant consideration. First, the absence of a clear control group makes it challenging to establish definitive causal relationships. Second, our analysis may not fully capture the dynamic nature of firms' disclosure decisions and analysts' adaptation to the new regulatory environment. Third, the focus on voluntary disclosure may not fully reflect other channels through which certification requirements affect information asymmetry.

Future research could address these limitations by exploring alternative identification strategies and examining longer-term effects of the certification requirements. Promising avenues include investigating the interaction between certification requirements and other regulatory changes, analyzing the role of technological advances in shaping analyst research practices, and examining cross-country variations in analyst certification regimes. Additionally, researchers might explore how certification requirements affect other aspects of market behavior, such as price formation and trading patterns. Such investigations would further our understanding of how regulatory interventions influence the complex relationships between analysts, firms, and market participants in reducing information asymmetry.

These findings contribute to the broader literature on information intermediaries and market efficiency (e.g., Healy and Palepu, 2001; Beyer et al., 2010) while opening new avenues for research on the interaction between regulatory requirements and voluntary disclosure. As markets continue to evolve and new regulations emerge, understanding these relationships becomes increasingly important for both academic research and policy design.

References

"Ajinkya, B. B., & Gift, M. J. (1984). Corporate managers earnings forecasts and symmetrical adjustments of market expectations. Journal of Accounting Research, 22 (2), 425-444.

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.

Barniv, R., Hope, O. K., Myring, M. J., & Thomas, W. B. (2005). The impact of analyst following and regulation fair disclosure on market reaction to earnings announcements. Review of Accounting Studies, 10 (4), 497-525.

Beyer, A., Cohen, D. A., Lys, T. Z., & Walther, B. R. (2010). The financial reporting environment: Review of the recent literature. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 50 (2-3), 296-343.

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

Chen, C. Y., & Chen, P. F. (2009). NASD Rule 2711 and changes in analysts independence in making stock recommendations. The Accounting Review, 84 (4), 1041-1071.

Core, J. E. (2001). A review of the empirical disclosure literature: Discussion. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 31 (1-3), 441-456.

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

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

Francis, J., Philbrick, D., & Schipper, K. (1994). Shareholder litigation and corporate disclosures. Journal of Accounting Research, 32 (2), 137-164.

Frankel, R., & Li, X. (2004). Characteristics of a firms information environment and the information asymmetry between insiders and outsiders. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 37 (2), 229-259.

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.

Hong, H., & Kacperczyk, M. (2010). Competition and bias. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 125 (4), 1683-1725.

Hong, H., & Kubik, J. D. (2003). Analyzing the analysts: Career concerns and biased earnings forecasts. The Journal of Finance, 58 (1), 313-351.

Hong, H., Lim, T., & Stein, J. C. (2014). Bad news travels slowly: Size, analyst coverage, and the profitability of momentum strategies. The Journal of Finance, 55 (1), 265-295.

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

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

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

Lin, H. W., & McNichols, M. F. (1998). Underwriting relationships, analysts earnings forecasts and investment recommendations. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 25 (1), 101-127.

Mehran, H., & Stulz, R. M. (2007). The economics of conflicts of interest in financial institutions. Journal of Financial Economics, 85 (2), 267-296.

Michaely, R., & Womack, K. L. (1999). Conflict of interest and the credibility of underwriter analyst recommendations. Review of Financial Studies, 12 (4), 653-686.

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

OBrien, P. C., McNichols, M. F., & Lin, H. W. (2005). Analyst impartiality and investment banking relationships. Journal of Accounting Research, 43 (4), 623-650.

Rogers, J. L., & Van Buskirk, A. (2009). Shareholder litigation and changes in disclosure behavior. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 47 (1-2), 136-156.

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

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

Table 2
Pearson Correlations
AnalystCertificationRequirements Information Asymmetry

	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 Analyst Certification Requirements 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^2	0.0025	0.2893

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