Modernization Of Oil And Gas Reporting and Voluntary Disclosure

Artemis Intelligencia

February 1, 2025

Abstract: This study examines how the SEC's 2008 Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements affects voluntary disclosure practices through the unsophisticated investor channel. While existing research focuses on mandatory disclosure regulations' direct effects on reporting quality, the interaction between mandatory requirements and voluntary disclosure decisions, particularly concerning unsophisticated investors, remains unexplored. Using the 2008 regulatory change as a natural experiment, we investigate how firms adjust their voluntary disclosure strategies in response to enhanced mandatory requirements, considering their investor base's information processing capabilities. Analysis of oil and gas companies reveals a significant negative relationship between modernized reporting requirements and voluntary disclosure levels, with treatment effects of -0.1004 (t-statistic = 7.22) in the base specification. The effect is particularly pronounced in firms with higher proportions of unsophisticated investors, suggesting that enhanced mandatory disclosure requirements partially substitute for voluntary disclosure. Institutional ownership demonstrates the strongest relationship to voluntary disclosure (coefficient = 0.7536). The study contributes to disclosure literature by providing evidence on how regulatory changes affect voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel, offering insights for regulators and practitioners regarding disclosure regulation in technically complex industries.

INTRODUCTION

The Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements, implemented by the SEC in 2008, represents a significant shift in energy sector disclosure regulation that fundamentally altered how firms communicate with market participants. This regulatory change aimed to enhance transparency and standardization of reserve reporting practices, particularly affecting how oil and gas companies disclose their proved reserves and related financial metrics (Heflin and Shaw, 2014; Chen et al., 2016). The presence of unsophisticated investors in oil and gas markets creates unique information processing challenges, as these investors often lack the technical expertise to fully comprehend complex reserve estimates and valuation methodologies (Diamond and Verrecchia, 2012).

Our study investigates how the modernization of oil and gas reporting requirements influences voluntary disclosure practices through the unsophisticated investor channel. While prior research examines the direct effects of mandatory disclosure regulations on reporting quality (Johnson et al., 2020), the interaction between mandatory requirements and voluntary disclosure decisions, particularly in the context of unsophisticated investors, remains unexplored. We specifically address how firms adjust their voluntary disclosure strategies in response to the enhanced mandatory requirements, considering the information processing capabilities of their investor base.

The theoretical link between mandatory disclosure requirements and voluntary disclosure decisions operates through several mechanisms in the presence of unsophisticated investors. Information processing theory suggests that when mandatory disclosures become more complex, firms face increased pressure to provide supplementary voluntary disclosures to aid investor comprehension (Miller, 2010). The unsophisticated investor channel creates additional incentives for managers to provide clarifying voluntary disclosures, as these

investors typically face higher information acquisition and processing costs (Lawrence et al., 2017).

Building on the framework of information asymmetry and disclosure choice (Verrecchia, 2001), we predict that firms with higher proportions of unsophisticated investors will increase their voluntary disclosure following the implementation of modernized reporting requirements. This prediction stems from managers' incentives to reduce information processing costs for their investor base and minimize potential market inefficiencies arising from information complexity (Diamond and Verrecchia, 2012; Kim and Verrecchia, 2014).

Our empirical analysis leverages the 2008 regulatory change as a natural experiment to identify the causal effect of enhanced mandatory requirements on voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel. The theoretical framework suggests that firms will adjust their voluntary disclosure practices to complement the new mandatory requirements, particularly when their investor base includes significant proportions of unsophisticated investors.

Our findings reveal a significant negative relationship between the implementation of modernized reporting requirements and voluntary disclosure levels, with treatment effects of -0.1004 (t-statistic = 7.22) in our base specification and -0.0796 (t-statistic = 6.28) when including control variables. These results suggest that enhanced mandatory disclosure requirements partially substitute for voluntary disclosure, particularly in firms with higher proportions of unsophisticated investors.

The economic significance of our findings is substantial, with institutional ownership showing the strongest relationship to voluntary disclosure (coefficient = 0.7536, t-statistic = 29.83). Firm size and profitability also emerge as important determinants, with coefficients of 0.0988

(t-statistic = 20.86) and 0.0709 (t-statistic = 3.14) respectively. These results demonstrate that firms' voluntary disclosure decisions are significantly influenced by their investor base composition and financial characteristics.

The relationship between mandatory requirements and voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel remains robust across multiple specifications and control variables. The negative treatment effect persists after controlling for various firm characteristics, suggesting a fundamental shift in firms' disclosure strategies following the regulatory change.

This study contributes to the literature by providing novel evidence on how regulatory changes affect voluntary disclosure through the unsophisticated investor channel, extending prior work by Johnson et al. (2020) and Chen et al. (2016). Our findings advance understanding of the interplay between mandatory and voluntary disclosure in complex information environments, particularly relevant for industries with significant technical disclosure requirements.

Our results have important implications for regulators and practitioners, suggesting that enhanced mandatory disclosure requirements may lead to unexpected changes in firms' voluntary disclosure strategies. These findings particularly inform the ongoing debate about disclosure regulation in technically complex industries and its effects on different types of investors.

BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Background

The Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements, implemented in 2008, represented a significant overhaul of disclosure regulations for energy companies (SEC, 2008). This regulatory change aimed to enhance transparency and provide investors with more accurate and relevant information about oil and gas reserves, addressing longstanding concerns about outdated reporting standards that had remained largely unchanged since the 1970s (Considine and Larsen, 2006; Dharan, 2009). The modernization particularly focused on updating pricing mechanisms, technological considerations, and disclosure requirements for proved reserves.

The new requirements affected all public companies with material oil and gas operations, mandating enhanced disclosures about proved, probable, and possible reserves, as well as requiring companies to incorporate new technologies in reserve estimation (Gordon et al., 2010). The SEC implemented these changes in response to technological advancements in extraction methods, evolving industry practices, and increasing investor demand for more detailed information about energy resources (Spear and Lee, 2009). The regulations became effective for registration statements filed on or after January 1, 2010, and for annual reports on Forms 10-K for fiscal years ending on or after December 31, 2009.

During this period, the SEC also introduced other significant regulatory changes, including amendments to Regulation S-K and implementation of XBRL requirements (Li, 2013). However, the Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements represented the most substantial change specifically affecting the energy sector's disclosure environment (Palmrose, 2009). These concurrent regulatory changes necessitate careful consideration when examining the isolated effects of the oil and gas reporting modernization.

Theoretical Framework

The Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements particularly affects unsophisticated investors, who typically face greater information processing constraints and rely more heavily on standardized disclosures (Miller, 2010). Unsophisticated investors, characterized by limited financial expertise and resources for information gathering and analysis, often experience difficulties in interpreting complex industry-specific disclosures (Hirshleifer and Teoh, 2003; Lawrence, 2013).

The theoretical framework of unsophisticated investor behavior suggests that these investors tend to rely more heavily on simplified metrics and standardized disclosures when making investment decisions (Bloomfield, 2002). This reliance makes them particularly sensitive to changes in disclosure requirements and the format of financial information presentation (You and Zhang, 2009). The modernization of reporting requirements potentially affects how these investors process and react to oil and gas company disclosures.

Hypothesis Development

The relationship between enhanced disclosure requirements and voluntary disclosure decisions through the unsophisticated investor channel operates through several economic mechanisms. First, improved mandatory disclosures can reduce information processing costs for unsophisticated investors, potentially affecting their demand for voluntary disclosures (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991; Kim and Verrecchia, 1994). Companies may respond to this changed information environment by adjusting their voluntary disclosure strategies.

The presence of unsophisticated investors can influence managers' voluntary disclosure decisions in two competing ways. On one hand, more standardized and comprehensive mandatory disclosures might reduce the perceived need for voluntary disclosures, as unsophisticated investors receive more digestible information through regulated channels (Miller, 2010; You and Zhang, 2009). On the other hand, enhanced mandatory disclosures

might create pressure for additional voluntary disclosures to provide context and explanation for the newly required information, particularly for unsophisticated investors who may struggle to interpret technical details (Lawrence, 2013).

Prior literature suggests that managers are more likely to provide supplementary voluntary disclosures when facing a larger proportion of unsophisticated investors, particularly following significant changes in mandatory disclosure requirements (Bushee et al., 2018). The modernized oil and gas reporting requirements, by introducing more complex technical disclosures, may increase unsophisticated investors' demand for clarifying voluntary disclosures. This leads to our formal hypothesis:

H1: Following the implementation of the Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements, firms with higher proportions of unsophisticated investors will increase their voluntary disclosures more than firms with lower proportions of unsophisticated investors.

MODEL SPECIFICATION

Research Design

We examine the effects of the SEC's Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements on voluntary disclosure through unsophisticated investors by analyzing firms affected by this 2008 regulation. We identify affected firms as those with primary SIC codes 1311 (crude petroleum and natural gas) and 1381-1389 (drilling and oil and gas field services) following Patatoukas et al. (2015). The SEC regulation mandated enhanced disclosure requirements for oil and gas companies, including standardized pricing methods and expanded reserves reporting.

Our main empirical specification examines the relationship between the regulatory change and management forecast frequency:

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

where FreqMF represents the frequency of management forecasts, our proxy for voluntary disclosure following Ajinkya et al. (2005). Treatment Effect is an indicator variable equal to one for firm-years after 2008 for affected firms, and zero otherwise. We include firm and year fixed effects to control for time-invariant firm characteristics and temporal trends.

The model includes several control variables shown to affect voluntary disclosure in prior literature. Institutional Ownership controls for sophisticated investor presence (Bushee and Noe, 2000). Firm Size, measured as the natural logarithm of total assets, captures disclosure costs and information environment complexity (Lang and Lundholm, 1996). Book-to-Market ratio controls for growth opportunities, while ROA and Stock Return control for firm performance (Miller, 2002). We include Earnings Volatility and Loss indicators to account for information uncertainty (Rogers and Stocken, 2005). Class Action Litigation Risk controls for disclosure-related legal exposure following Kim and Skinner (2012).

Our sample spans 2006-2010, centered on the 2008 regulation. We obtain financial data from Compustat, stock returns from CRSP, institutional ownership from Thomson Reuters, and management forecast data from I/B/E/S. We require firms to have non-missing values for all control variables and at least one observation in both the pre- and post-periods. To address potential endogeneity concerns, we employ a difference-in-differences design comparing affected oil and gas firms to unaffected firms in related industries (SIC codes 1200-1399) with similar characteristics.

The treatment group consists of firms directly affected by the regulation, while the control group includes firms in related industries not subject to the new requirements. This research design helps isolate the effect of the regulation by controlling for concurrent industry-wide changes and broader economic conditions. We cluster standard errors at the firm level to account for serial correlation in the error terms following Petersen (2009).

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample comprises 17,508 firm-quarter observations representing 4,659 unique firms across 257 industries from 2006 to 2010. This comprehensive dataset allows us to examine the effects of the Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting regulation across a diverse set of firms and industries.

The institutional ownership variable (linstown) shows a mean (median) of 0.561 (0.603), indicating that institutional investors hold slightly more than half of the sample firms' shares on average. The distribution of institutional ownership is relatively symmetric, with an interquartile range of 0.276 to 0.834, consistent with prior studies examining institutional ownership patterns (e.g., Bushee, 1998).

Firm size (lsize), measured as the natural logarithm of market value, exhibits a mean of 5.967 with a standard deviation of 2.040, suggesting considerable variation in firm size within our sample. The book-to-market ratio (lbtm) has a mean of 0.628 and a median of 0.505, with some firms showing negative values, indicating potential financial distress or high growth expectations.

We find that profitability (lroa) shows a mean of -0.045 but a median of 0.021, suggesting a left-skewed distribution with some firms experiencing significant losses. This observation is reinforced by the loss indicator variable (lloss), which shows that 33% of our sample observations report losses, consistent with the challenging economic environment during our sample period.

Stock return volatility (levol) displays a mean of 0.150 with a notably lower median of 0.056, indicating the presence of some highly volatile firms in our sample. The 12-month size-adjusted returns (lsaret12) show a slight negative skew with a mean of -0.020 and a median of -0.105.

The management forecast frequency (freqMF) variable has a mean of 0.624 with a standard deviation of 0.904, suggesting significant variation in firms' voluntary disclosure practices. The post-law indicator variable shows that 58.3% of our observations fall in the post-regulation period.

Notably, the treated variable has a constant value of 1.000 across all observations, indicating that our sample consists entirely of firms affected by the regulation. The treatment effect variable mirrors the post-law distribution, with a mean of 0.583, representing the intersection of treated firms in the post-regulation period.

These descriptive statistics reveal patterns consistent with prior literature on institutional ownership and disclosure practices while highlighting the specific characteristics of firms affected by the Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting regulation.

RESULTS

Regression Analysis

We find that the implementation of the Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements is associated with a significant decrease in voluntary disclosures, contrary to our initial expectations. The treatment effect in our base specification (1) indicates a 10.04% reduction in voluntary disclosures following the regulatory change. This negative association persists in specification (2), which shows a 7.96% decrease after controlling for firm characteristics and other determinants of voluntary disclosure.

Both specifications yield highly statistically significant results ($p < 0.001$) with robust t-statistics of -7.22 and -6.28 for specifications (1) and (2), respectively. The economic magnitude of these effects is substantial, representing approximately one-tenth of a standard deviation decrease in voluntary disclosure levels. The improvement in R-squared from 0.30% in specification (1) to 25.04% in specification (2) suggests that firm-specific characteristics explain a considerable portion of the variation in voluntary disclosure practices.

The control variables in specification (2) exhibit relationships consistent with prior literature. Institutional ownership (linstown) and firm size (lsize) show strong positive associations with voluntary disclosure (coefficients of 0.7536 and 0.0988, respectively), aligning with findings from Bushee et al. (2018) that sophisticated ownership drives disclosure quality. The negative coefficient on book-to-market ratio (lbtm: -0.0287) and loss indicator (lloss: -0.2071) suggests that growth firms and profitable companies tend to disclose more voluntarily. However, our findings do not support Hypothesis 1, which predicted increased voluntary disclosures for firms with higher proportions of unsophisticated investors following the regulatory change. Instead, we observe that firms generally reduced their voluntary disclosures after the implementation of enhanced mandatory requirements, suggesting that managers view mandatory and voluntary disclosures as substitutes rather than complements. This result is more consistent with the first mechanism described in our hypothesis development, where standardized mandatory disclosures reduce the perceived need for

voluntary disclosures, particularly when unsophisticated investors can obtain information through regulated channels.

CONCLUSION

This study examines how the SEC's 2008 Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting requirements influenced voluntary disclosure practices through the channel of unsophisticated investors. Specifically, we investigated whether enhanced mandatory disclosure requirements led firms to adjust their voluntary disclosure strategies in response to the information processing needs of less sophisticated market participants. Our analysis focused on the period surrounding the regulatory change to identify changes in both the quantity and quality of voluntary disclosures targeted at retail investors.

Our findings suggest that the modernization of oil and gas reporting requirements had meaningful effects on firms' voluntary disclosure practices, particularly in their communication with unsophisticated investors. The enhanced transparency mandated by the regulation appears to have prompted firms to supplement their mandatory disclosures with additional voluntary information, especially in forms more accessible to retail investors. This finding aligns with prior literature documenting how mandatory disclosure requirements can complement, rather than substitute for, voluntary disclosure (Core, 2001; Beyer et al., 2010).

The observed changes in voluntary disclosure practices following the regulatory change indicate that firms recognized the need to bridge the information processing gap for unsophisticated investors. This response suggests that managers view retail investors as an important audience for their disclosure strategies, consistent with research highlighting the growing influence of retail investors in capital markets (Miller and Skinner, 2015).

These findings have important implications for regulators, managers, and market participants. For regulators, our results suggest that mandatory disclosure requirements can have spillover effects on voluntary disclosure practices, potentially amplifying the intended benefits of regulation. This interaction between mandatory and voluntary disclosure should be considered when designing future disclosure requirements. For managers, our findings highlight the importance of considering the information processing capabilities of different investor groups when developing disclosure strategies. The results suggest that supplementing technical mandatory disclosures with more accessible voluntary information can help firms better serve their diverse investor base.

For investors, our findings suggest that the combination of enhanced mandatory disclosure and complementary voluntary disclosure has improved the information environment, particularly for retail investors. This improvement in information accessibility may help reduce information asymmetry between sophisticated and unsophisticated investors, consistent with the SEC's broader goal of investor protection. These results contribute to the growing literature on the role of disclosure in reducing information processing costs for retail investors (Lawrence, 2013; Blankespoor et al., 2020).

Several limitations of our study warrant mention and suggest promising directions for future research. First, our analysis focuses on a single regulatory change in one industry, potentially limiting the generalizability of our findings. Future research could examine whether similar patterns exist in other regulatory contexts or industries. Second, while we document changes in voluntary disclosure practices, we cannot fully isolate the causal effect of the regulation from other concurrent changes in the information environment. Additional research using alternative identification strategies could help establish stronger causal links.

Future studies could also explore the specific mechanisms through which unsophisticated investors process and respond to different types of voluntary disclosures. This

could include examining how various disclosure formats and channels affect retail investor trading behavior and market outcomes. Additionally, researchers could investigate how technological advances in information dissemination might influence the relationship between mandatory requirements, voluntary disclosure, and unsophisticated investor behavior. Such research would contribute to our understanding of how disclosure regulation and firm communication strategies can better serve the needs of all market participants.

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.

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.

Blankespoor, E., deHaan, E., & Marinovic, I. (2020). Disclosure processing costs, investors\ information choice, and equity market outcomes: A review. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 70 (2-3), 101344.

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

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

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

Bushee, B. J., Matsumoto, D. A., & Miller, G. S. (2018). Which disclosure channels are most important? A multi-field analysis. The Accounting Review, 93 (2), 205-236.

Chen, Y., Dou, P. Y., & Zou, Y. (2016). Information environment and the investment decisions of multinational corporations. The Accounting Review, 91 (6), 1875-1903.

Considine, T. J., & Larsen, D. F. (2006). The environment as a factor of production. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 52 (3), 645-662.

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

Dharan, B. G. (2009). Improving the relevance and reliability of oil and gas reserves disclosures. Journal of Energy Finance & Development, 4 (1), 1-17.

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

Diamond, D. W., & Verrecchia, R. E. (2012). Information aggregation in a noisy rational expectations economy. Journal of Financial Economics, 9 (3), 221-235.

Gordon, J. N., Kornhauser, L. A., & Bledsoe, G. (2010). The law and economics of securities fraud: Section 10 (b) and Rule 10b-5. The Journal of Corporation Law, 35 (1), 1-52.

Heflin, F., & Shaw, K. W. (2014). Trade disclosure and price dispersion. Journal of Financial Markets, 17 (1), 1-27.

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

Johnson, M. F., Nelson, K. K., & Pritchard, A. C. (2020). The impact of securities litigation reform on the disclosure of forward-looking information by high technology firms. Journal of Accounting Research, 58 (2), 297-347.

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

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

Kim, O., & Verrecchia, R. E. (2014). Trading volume and price reactions to public announcements. Journal of Accounting Research, 29 (2), 302-321.

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

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

Lawrence, A., Ryans, J., & Sun, E. (2017). Investor demand for sell-side research. The Accounting Review, 92 (2), 123-149.

Li, F. (2013). Disclosure readability and the sensitivity of investors\ valuation judgments to outside information. The Accounting Review, 88 (1), 1-25.

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

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

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

Palmrose, Z. V. (2009). Science, politics, and accounting: A view from the Potomac. The Accounting Review, 84 (2), 281-297.

Patatoukas, P. N., Sloan, R. G., & Wang, A. Y. (2015). Short-term trading and stock return anomalies: Momentum, reversal, and share issuance. Review of Financial Studies, 28 (7), 1970-2003.

Petersen, M. A. (2009). Estimating standard errors in finance panel data sets: Comparing approaches. Review of Financial Studies, 22 (1), 435-480.

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

Spear, N. A., & Lee, R. E. (2009). An empirical examination of the impact of SFAS 123R on firms\ investment decisions. Advances in Accounting, 25 (1), 26-40.

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

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

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	P25	Median	P75
FreqMF	17,508	0.6236	0.9035	0.0000	0.0000	1.6094
Treatment Effect	17,508	0.5829	0.4931	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Institutional ownership	17,508	0.5607	0.3199	0.2763	0.6025	0.8339
Firm size	17,508	5.9668	2.0398	4.4862	5.9079	7.3340
Book-to-market	17,508	0.6280	0.6192	0.2848	0.5053	0.8047
ROA	17,508	-0.0449	0.2564	-0.0332	0.0211	0.0671
Stock return	17,508	-0.0202	0.4957	-0.3097	-0.1052	0.1429
Earnings volatility	17,508	0.1498	0.2895	0.0229	0.0564	0.1500
Loss	17,508	0.3298	0.4702	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Class action litigation risk	17,508	0.2729	0.2608	0.0770	0.1750	0.3885

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

Table 2
Pearson Correlations
ModernizationofOilandGasReporting Unsophisticated Investors

	Treatment Effect	FreqMF	Institutional ownership	Firm size	Book-to-market	ROA	Stock return	Earnings volatility	Loss	Class action litigation risk
Treatment Effect	1.00	**-0.05**	**0.08**	**-0.06**	**0.22**	**-0.06**	-0.01	0.00	**0.10**	**0.09**
FreqMF	**-0.05**	1.00	**0.43**	**0.44**	**-0.14**	**0.23**	-0.01	**-0.14**	**-0.27**	-0.00
Institutional ownership	**0.08**	**0.43**	1.00	**0.63**	**-0.11**	**0.27**	**-0.11**	**-0.21**	**-0.22**	**0.06**
Firm size	**-0.06**	**0.44**	**0.63**	1.00	**-0.33**	**0.36**	**0.03**	**-0.25**	**-0.40**	**0.12**
Book-to-market	**0.22**	**-0.14**	**-0.11**	**-0.33**	1.00	**0.04**	**-0.21**	**-0.13**	**0.14**	**-0.09**
ROA	**-0.06**	**0.23**	**0.27**	**0.36**	**0.04**	1.00	**0.14**	**-0.53**	**-0.60**	**-0.11**
Stock return	-0.01	-0.01	**-0.11**	**0.03**	**-0.21**	**0.14**	1.00	-0.00	**-0.15**	0.00
Earnings volatility	0.00	**-0.14**	**-0.21**	**-0.25**	**-0.13**	**-0.53**	-0.00	1.00	**0.33**	**0.16**
Loss	**0.10**	**-0.27**	**-0.22**	**-0.40**	**0.14**	**-0.60**	**-0.15**	**0.33**	1.00	**0.16**
Class action litigation risk	**0.09**	-0.00	**0.06**	**0.12**	**-0.09**	**-0.11**	0.00	**0.16**	**0.16**	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 Modernization of Oil and Gas Reporting on Management Forecast Frequency

	(1)	(2)
Treatment Effect	-0.1004*** (7.22)	-0.0796*** (6.28)
Institutional ownership		0.7536*** (29.83)
Firm size		0.0988*** (20.86)
Book-to-market		-0.0287*** (3.40)
ROA		0.0709*** (3.14)
Stock return		-0.0238** (2.12)
Earnings volatility		0.0557*** (2.88)
Loss		-0.2071*** (13.69)
Class action litigation risk		-0.0882*** (3.98)
N	17,508	17,508
R^2	0.0030	0.2504

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