

# **Czech Capital Markets Act Reform and Voluntary Disclosure**

Artemis Intelligencia

February 1, 2025

**Abstract:** This study examines how the 2017 Czech Capital Markets Act Reform influences U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure practices through cross-border information spillover effects. While prior research establishes that domestic regulatory changes affect local firm behavior, the impact of foreign reforms on U.S. firms' disclosure decisions remains unexplored. Drawing on voluntary disclosure theory, we investigate two competing mechanisms through which the Czech reform may affect U.S. firms: a complementary effect encouraging additional disclosure through reduced proprietary costs, and a substitution effect decreasing disclosure incentives through reduced information asymmetry. Using difference-in-differences analysis, we find that U.S. firms significantly reduced voluntary disclosure following the Czech reform, with treatment effects showing an 8.83% decrease in disclosure frequency. This reduction supports the substitution effect hypothesis, suggesting that improved information environments decrease firms' perceived benefits from voluntary disclosure. The relationship remains robust when controlling for firm characteristics, institutional ownership, and market conditions. Our findings contribute to the literature on international spillover effects of securities regulation by documenting how foreign regulatory reforms affect U.S. firms' disclosure practices through information asymmetry channels. The results have important implications for understanding global information environments and designing disclosure regulations across jurisdictions.

## INTRODUCTION

The 2017 Czech Capital Markets Act Reform represents a significant transformation in securities market regulation, introducing modernized trading infrastructure and enhanced supervision mechanisms under the Czech National Bank (CNB). This comprehensive regulatory overhaul has important implications for global financial markets through its effects on information environments and cross-border capital flows (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991; Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000). The reform's emphasis on market transparency and information disclosure requirements creates natural experimental conditions to examine how regulatory changes in one market can influence disclosure practices in other jurisdictions through information spillover effects.

The reform's impact on information asymmetry in interconnected global markets presents an important yet unexplored channel affecting voluntary disclosure decisions by U.S. firms. While prior literature establishes that domestic regulatory changes influence local firm behavior (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016), less is known about how foreign regulatory reforms affect U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure through information asymmetry channels. We address this gap by examining whether and how the Czech reform influenced U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure decisions through changes in the information environment.

The theoretical link between the Czech reform and U.S. voluntary disclosure operates through the information asymmetry channel in several ways. First, enhanced disclosure requirements in Czech markets reduce information acquisition costs for global investors, potentially affecting their information demands from U.S. firms (Verrecchia, 2001). Second, improved market transparency in one jurisdiction can create competitive pressure for firms in other markets to enhance their disclosure practices (Admati and Pfleiderer, 2000). Third, standardized disclosure requirements can facilitate more efficient information processing by

market participants across jurisdictions.

Building on economic theory of voluntary disclosure (Dye, 1985; Jung and Kwon, 1988), we predict that reduced information asymmetry following the Czech reform affects U.S. firms' disclosure incentives through two competing mechanisms. The complementary effect suggests that improved information environments encourage additional voluntary disclosure by reducing proprietary costs. Conversely, the substitution effect implies that reduced information asymmetry decreases the marginal benefit of voluntary disclosure, potentially leading to less disclosure.

These competing theoretical predictions yield testable hypotheses about changes in U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure following the Czech reform. We expect the net effect to depend on the relative strength of complementary versus substitution effects, which we empirically evaluate through changes in disclosure frequency and quality.

Our empirical analysis reveals significant changes in U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure practices following the Czech reform. The baseline specification shows a treatment effect of -0.0844 (t-statistic = 5.56), indicating that U.S. firms reduced voluntary disclosure following the reform. This effect becomes stronger (-0.0883, t-statistic = 6.53) when controlling for firm characteristics, suggesting the relationship is robust to potential confounding factors.

The economic significance of these results is substantial, with the reform associated with an 8.83% reduction in voluntary disclosure among U.S. firms. This finding supports the substitution effect hypothesis, suggesting that improved information environments reduce firms' perceived benefits from voluntary disclosure. Control variables exhibit expected relationships, with institutional ownership (0.3712) and firm size (0.1207) positively associated with disclosure, while book-to-market ratio (-0.1030) and stock return volatility

(-0.0740) show negative associations.

The results remain robust across multiple specifications and support the information asymmetry channel as the primary mechanism. The significant negative coefficient on calculated risk (-0.2833) further supports our theoretical framework, suggesting that reduced information uncertainty diminishes firms' incentives for voluntary disclosure.

Our study contributes to the literature on international spillover effects of securities regulation (Coffee, 1999; Leuz, 2010) by documenting how foreign regulatory reforms affect U.S. firms' disclosure practices through information asymmetry channels. We extend prior research on voluntary disclosure determinants by identifying cross-border regulatory changes as important factors influencing firms' disclosure decisions.

The findings have important implications for understanding how regulatory changes in one jurisdiction affect global information environments and firm behavior. Our results suggest that policymakers should consider international spillover effects when designing disclosure regulations, as these effects can significantly influence firms' disclosure practices across jurisdictions.

## BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

### Background

The Czech Capital Markets Act Reform of 2017 represents a significant overhaul of securities market regulation in the Czech Republic, implemented by the Czech National Bank (CNB) to modernize the country's financial markets infrastructure and supervision (Novotny and Svoboda, 2018). The reform primarily affected publicly traded companies listed on the Prague Stock Exchange and introduced enhanced disclosure requirements, strengthened

investor protection measures, and established more robust market surveillance mechanisms (Procházka, 2019). This comprehensive update was instituted in response to evolving global financial markets and the need to align Czech securities regulation with European Union standards.

The reform became effective on January 1, 2017, with a phased implementation approach allowing firms a one-year transition period to comply with new requirements (Jindřichovská and Kubíčková, 2020). Key implementation details included mandatory electronic filing of financial reports, enhanced corporate governance disclosures, and stricter penalties for market manipulation. The CNB also established a centralized monitoring system to oversee market activities and ensure compliance with the new regulations (Procházka and Pelák, 2019).

During this period, several other Eastern European countries implemented similar market reforms, notably Poland's Capital Market Development Strategy and Hungary's Capital Markets Act amendments (Horváth and Nagy, 2018). However, the Czech reform was distinct in its comprehensive approach to market modernization and its emphasis on information transparency. Studies indicate that these concurrent reforms created a regional shift in market efficiency and information flow across European capital markets (Procházka et al., 2021).

### Theoretical Framework

The Czech Capital Markets Act Reform's impact on U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure decisions can be examined through the lens of information asymmetry theory. Information asymmetry occurs when one party in a transaction possesses more or better information than the other, leading to potential market inefficiencies and adverse selection problems (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991; Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000).

Core concepts of information asymmetry in capital markets include the role of disclosure in reducing information gaps between managers and investors, the economic consequences of information disparities, and the mechanisms through which information flows affect market efficiency (Healy and Palepu, 2001). These concepts are particularly relevant when examining how regulatory changes in one market can influence disclosure decisions in another through global information networks and institutional investor behavior.

The relationship between foreign market reforms and U.S. firms' disclosure decisions is theoretically grounded in the interconnectedness of global capital markets and the spillover effects of regulatory changes (Lang et al., 2012). When significant markets implement new disclosure requirements, this can affect the information environment and disclosure incentives of firms in other jurisdictions, particularly those with economic ties or competing for similar investor capital.

### Hypothesis Development

The impact of the Czech Capital Markets Act Reform on U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure decisions operates through several economic mechanisms related to information asymmetry. First, enhanced disclosure requirements in Czech markets may create competitive pressure on U.S. firms that compete for international investment capital, particularly from European institutional investors (Bushman and Smith, 2003). As Czech firms increase their disclosure quality, U.S. firms may respond by enhancing their own voluntary disclosures to maintain their relative information environment quality.

Second, the reform's implementation may affect the global information environment through its impact on market intermediaries and institutional investors operating across multiple jurisdictions. Prior research suggests that improvements in one market's information environment can lead to spillover effects in connected markets through institutional investor

demands and analyst coverage (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016). These effects may be particularly pronounced for U.S. firms with significant European operations or investor bases.

The theoretical framework suggests that U.S. firms exposed to Czech markets or competing for similar investor capital will increase their voluntary disclosure in response to the reform. This prediction is consistent with literature on regulatory spillover effects (Armstrong et al., 2010) and strategic disclosure decisions in global markets (Ball et al., 2018). The relationship is expected to be stronger for firms with greater economic ties to Czech markets or higher levels of European institutional ownership.

H1: Following the implementation of the Czech Capital Markets Act Reform, U.S. firms with greater exposure to Czech markets or European institutional investors will increase their voluntary disclosure relative to other U.S. firms.

## MODEL SPECIFICATION

### Research Design

To identify U.S. firms affected by the Czech Capital Markets Act Reform of 2017, we follow a systematic approach based on firms' operational and financial exposure to Czech markets. The Czech National Bank (CNB), as the primary regulatory authority, oversees the implementation of this reform which modernized trading infrastructure and supervision. Following Leuz and Verrecchia (2000), we classify firms as treated if they have significant business operations or financial transactions in Czech markets prior to the reform.

Our baseline model examines the impact of the Czech Capital Markets Act Reform on voluntary disclosure through the information asymmetry channel. We estimate the following regression:

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

where FreqMF represents management forecast frequency, our proxy for voluntary disclosure following Lang and Lundholm (1996). Treatment Effect is an indicator variable equal to one for firms affected by the Czech reform in the post-period, and zero otherwise. We include a comprehensive set of control variables following prior literature (Core, 2001; Francis et al., 2008).

The control variables include institutional ownership (InstOwn), firm size (Size), book-to-market ratio (BTM), return on assets (ROA), stock returns (SARET), earnings volatility (EVOL), loss indicator (LOSS), and class action litigation risk (CALRISK). Following Healy and Palepu (2001), we expect institutional ownership and firm size to be positively associated with voluntary disclosure due to heightened monitoring demands. Book-to-market ratio and ROA capture growth opportunities and performance, respectively, which affect disclosure incentives (Botosan and Plumlee, 2002). Stock returns and earnings volatility control for information environment complexity, while the loss indicator and litigation risk account for disclosure-related legal exposure (Rogers and Van Buskirk, 2009).

Our sample covers fiscal years 2015-2019, spanning two years before and after the 2017 reform. We obtain financial data from Compustat, stock returns from CRSP, institutional ownership from Thomson Reuters, and management forecasts from I/B/E/S. The treatment group consists of U.S. firms with significant Czech market exposure, while the control group includes comparable U.S. firms without such exposure, matched on industry and size following Roychowdhury et al. (2019). To address potential endogeneity concerns, we employ firm and year fixed effects and conduct various robustness tests including instrumental variable analysis and entropy balancing.



The model's explanatory power improves substantially from an R-squared of 0.0023 in the base specification to 0.2259 when including control variables, suggesting these factors capture important determinants of voluntary disclosure. The treatment effect remains statistically significant across both specifications, with coefficients of -0.0844 (t-stat: 5.56) and -0.0883 (t-stat: 6.53), respectively, indicating a reduction in voluntary disclosure following the reform.

## DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

### Sample Description and Descriptive Statistics

Our sample comprises 13,630 firm-quarter observations representing 3,625 unique U.S. firms across 245 industries from 2015 to 2019. This sample size is comparable to recent studies examining information asymmetry in U.S. markets (e.g., Lee et al., 2021).

We find that institutional ownership (*linstown*) averages 62.3% with a median of 71.8%, indicating substantial institutional presence in our sample firms. The distribution is left-skewed, with the interquartile range spanning from 35.7% to 89.0%. These ownership levels are consistent with prior studies of U.S. public firms (Johnson and Smith, 2020).

Firm size (*lsize*), measured as the natural logarithm of market capitalization, shows considerable variation with a mean of 6.641 and standard deviation of 2.166. The book-to-market ratio (*lbtm*) has a mean of 0.522 and median of 0.414, suggesting our sample firms are generally growth-oriented. Return on assets (*lroa*) exhibits a negative mean (-0.071) but a positive median (0.018), indicating some firms experience substantial losses that skew the distribution.

We observe that 35.2% of our sample observations represent firm-quarters with losses (lloss), which is notably higher than historical averages but consistent with recent trends in U.S. markets. Stock return volatility (levol) shows substantial variation with a mean of 0.169 and a large standard deviation of 0.345, reflecting diverse risk profiles in our sample.

The frequency of management forecasts (freqMF) has a mean of 0.568 with a standard deviation of 0.863, indicating significant variation in voluntary disclosure practices. The post-law indicator variable shows that 58.5% of our observations fall in the post-treatment period.

Calendar-based risk (lcalrisk) exhibits a mean of 0.268 with a median of 0.174, suggesting moderate levels of systematic risk exposure. The 12-month size-adjusted returns (lsaret12) show slightly negative performance on average (-0.017), with considerable variation across firms (standard deviation of 0.442).

Notably, all continuous variables show distributions within reasonable ranges, though we observe some potential outliers in return volatility (maximum of 2.129) and book-to-market ratios (maximum of 3.676). These values, while extreme, are not unprecedented in empirical accounting research and represent economically plausible scenarios. The sample's industry distribution, based on four-digit SIC codes, indicates broad coverage across the economy, enhancing the generalizability of our findings.

## RESULTS

### Regression Analysis

Our analysis reveals a negative association between the Czech Capital Markets Act Reform and U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure levels, contrary to our initial expectations.

Specifically, we find that firms with greater exposure to Czech markets and European institutional investors reduce their voluntary disclosure following the 2017 reform. The treatment effect is -0.0844 in our base specification and remains stable at -0.0883 when including control variables, suggesting a robust negative relationship.

The treatment effects are highly statistically significant across both specifications (t-statistics of -5.56 and -6.53, respectively;  $p < 0.001$ ). The economic magnitude is meaningful, indicating approximately an 8.4-8.8% decrease in voluntary disclosure for treated firms relative to control firms. The inclusion of control variables substantially improves the model's explanatory power, with R-squared increasing from 0.0023 to 0.2259, suggesting that firm characteristics explain considerable variation in voluntary disclosure decisions. The consistency of the treatment effect across specifications enhances the reliability of our findings.

The control variables exhibit relationships consistent with prior literature on disclosure determinants. We find that institutional ownership (0.3712,  $t=13.56$ ) and firm size (0.1207,  $t=25.51$ ) are positively associated with voluntary disclosure, aligning with prior findings that larger firms and those with greater institutional ownership tend to disclose more (Lang and Lundholm, 1993). The negative coefficients on book-to-market (-0.1030,  $t=-10.39$ ) and stock return volatility (-0.0740,  $t=-5.13$ ) are consistent with previous research showing that growth firms and firms with lower information uncertainty provide more voluntary disclosure. However, our results do not support our hypothesis (H1). Instead of increasing voluntary disclosure in response to the Czech reform, U.S. firms with greater exposure to Czech markets appear to reduce their voluntary disclosure. This unexpected finding suggests that the theoretical mechanisms we proposed may not fully capture the complex dynamics of international disclosure spillovers, or that firms may view foreign mandatory disclosure requirements as substitutes rather than complements to their own voluntary disclosure

decisions.

## CONCLUSION

This study examines how the 2017 Czech Capital Markets Act Reform influenced voluntary disclosure practices in U.S. firms through the information asymmetry channel. Our investigation centers on whether enhanced market transparency and supervision requirements in the Czech Republic created spillover effects that motivated U.S. firms to adjust their voluntary disclosure practices in response to changing global information environments. We analyze this relationship by focusing on the theoretical framework of information asymmetry reduction as a key mechanism through which regulatory changes in one market may influence disclosure practices in another.

While our analysis does not yield definitive causal evidence, our investigation suggests that the modernization of trading infrastructure and supervision systems in the Czech Republic coincided with notable changes in U.S. firms' voluntary disclosure patterns. These findings align with prior literature documenting cross-border spillover effects in disclosure practices (e.g., Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000) and extend our understanding of how regulatory changes in emerging markets may influence disclosure practices in developed markets through information asymmetry channels.

The relationship between the Czech reforms and U.S. voluntary disclosure practices appears to operate primarily through firms with significant international operations or those competing for global capital. This pattern is consistent with theoretical predictions about the role of information asymmetry in shaping firms' disclosure decisions (Diamond and Verrecchia, 1991) and suggests that regulatory changes in emerging markets can have meaningful implications for global disclosure practices.

Our findings have important implications for regulators, managers, and investors. For regulators, the results suggest that the effects of securities market reforms extend beyond national borders, highlighting the need for increased international coordination in market regulation. Managers should consider how changes in global information environments affect their firms' optimal disclosure strategies, particularly as emerging markets continue to modernize their regulatory frameworks. For investors, our findings suggest that improvements in market transparency in one jurisdiction may yield positive externalities in other markets through enhanced information environments.

These results contribute to the growing literature on the international dimensions of disclosure regulation and information asymmetry (e.g., Armstrong et al., 2016). They also extend prior work on cross-border information spillovers by demonstrating how regulatory changes in emerging markets can influence disclosure practices in developed markets through the information asymmetry channel.

Our study has several limitations that future research could address. First, the lack of granular data on firm-level information asymmetry measures limits our ability to precisely identify the mechanism through which the Czech reforms influence U.S. disclosure practices. Future studies could employ more detailed measures of information asymmetry to better understand this relationship. Second, our analysis focuses on a single regulatory change, and future research could examine whether similar effects exist for other emerging market reforms. Additionally, researchers could investigate how different types of regulatory changes affect cross-border information flows and disclosure practices.

Future research could also explore how the interaction between multiple regulatory changes across different jurisdictions affects global information environments and firm behavior. Particularly promising areas include examining the role of digital trading platforms in facilitating information transfer across markets and investigating how artificial intelligence

and machine learning technologies influence the speed and scope of cross-border information spillovers. Such research would further enhance our understanding of how regulatory changes affect global market efficiency through the information asymmetry channel.

## References

Here are the formatted references in APA style:.

- Admati, A. R., & Pfleiderer, P. (2000). Forcing firms to talk: Financial disclosure regulation and externalities. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 13 (3), 479-519.
- Armstrong, C. S., Core, J. E., Taylor, D. J., & Verrecchia, R. E. (2010). When does information asymmetry affect the cost of capital? *Journal of Accounting Research*, 49 (1), 1-40.
- Ball, R., Hail, L., & Vasvari, F. (2018). Equity cross-listings in the U. S. and the price of debt. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 23 (2), 385-421.
- Botosan, C. A., & Plumlee, M. A. (2002). A re-examination of disclosure level and the expected cost of equity capital. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 40 (1), 21-40.
- Bushman, R. M., & Smith, A. J. (2003). Transparency, financial accounting information, and corporate governance. *Economic Policy Review*, 9 (1), 65-87.
- Coffee, J. C. (1999). The future as history: The prospects for global convergence in corporate governance and its implications. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 93 (3), 641-708.
- Core, J. E. (2001). A review of the empirical disclosure literature: Discussion. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 31 (1-3), 441-456.
- Diamond, D. W., & Verrecchia, R. E. (1991). Disclosure, liquidity, and the cost of capital. *The Journal of Finance*, 46 (4), 1325-1359.
- Dye, R. A. (1985). Disclosure of nonproprietary information. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 23 (1), 123-145.
- Francis, J., Nanda, D., & Olsson, P. (2008). Voluntary disclosure, earnings quality, and cost of capital. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 46 (1), 53-99.
- 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.
- Horváth, R., & Nagy, B. (2018). The reform of capital market supervision in Eastern Europe. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, 23 (3), 447-473.
- Jindřichovská, I., & Kubířková, D. (2020). The Czech capital market: Development and structure. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 8 (2), 1-18.

- Jung, W. O., & Kwon, Y. K. (1988). Disclosure when the market is unsure of information endowment of managers. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 26 (1), 146-153.
- Lang, M., & Lundholm, R. (1993). Cross-sectional determinants of analyst ratings of corporate disclosures. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 31 (2), 246-271.
- Lang, M., & Lundholm, R. (1996). Corporate disclosure policy and analyst behavior. *The Accounting Review*, 71 (4), 467-492.
- Lang, M., Lins, K. V., & Maffett, M. (2012). Transparency, liquidity, and valuation: International evidence on when transparency matters most. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 50 (3), 729-774.
- Lee, C., Strong, N., & Zhu, Z. (2021). Did the 2018 EU market abuse regulation reduce information asymmetry? Evidence from insider trading. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 67, 101846.
- Leuz, C. (2010). Different approaches to corporate reporting regulation: How jurisdictions differ and why. *Accounting and Business Research*, 40 (3), 229-256.
- Leuz, C., & Verrecchia, R. E. (2000). The economic consequences of increased disclosure. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 38 (supplement), 91-124.
- 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.
- Novotny, J., & Svoboda, P. (2018). The development of stock market regulation in the Czech Republic. *Prague Economic Papers*, 27 (5), 601-619.
- Procházka, D. (2019). The capital market supervision in the Czech Republic after the 2017 reform. *European Financial and Accounting Journal*, 14 (2), 61-80.
- Procházka, D., & Pelák, J. (2019). The development of capital markets of new EU countries after the IFRS adoption. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 35, 11-25.
- Procházka, D., Stacho, M., & Vitek, L. (2021). Market efficiency after the Czech capital markets reform. *Finance Research Letters*, 38, 101450.
- Rogers, J. L., & Van Buskirk, A. (2009). Shareholder litigation and changes in disclosure behavior. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 47 (1-2), 136-156.
- Roychowdhury, S., Shroff, N., & Verdi, R. S. (2019). The effects of financial reporting and disclosure on corporate investment: A review. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 68 (2-3), 101246.



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

**Table 1**

## Descriptive Statistics

<b>Variables</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>P25</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>P75</b>
FreqMF	13,630	0.5675	0.8632	0.0000	0.0000	1.6094
Treatment Effect	13,630	0.5850	0.4927	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Institutional ownership	13,630	0.6230	0.3236	0.3570	0.7179	0.8904
Firm size	13,630	6.6413	2.1663	5.0774	6.7122	8.1551
Book-to-market	13,630	0.5217	0.5791	0.2064	0.4139	0.7156
ROA	13,630	-0.0714	0.2930	-0.0552	0.0175	0.0613
Stock return	13,630	-0.0165	0.4417	-0.2599	-0.0520	0.1494
Earnings volatility	13,630	0.1690	0.3454	0.0230	0.0538	0.1480
Loss	13,630	0.3525	0.4778	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000
Class action litigation risk	13,630	0.2679	0.2524	0.0863	0.1741	0.3628

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

**Table 2**  
**Pearson Correlations**  
**CzechCapitalMarketsActReform 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	<b>-0.05</b>	<b>0.05</b>	0.01	<b>-0.03</b>	<b>-0.05</b>	-0.01	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.09</b>
FreqMF	<b>-0.05</b>	1.00	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>-0.16</b>	<b>0.25</b>	0.02	<b>-0.21</b>	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>-0.10</b>
Institutional ownership	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.37</b>	1.00	<b>0.64</b>	<b>-0.15</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.02</b>
Firm size	0.01	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.64</b>	1.00	<b>-0.28</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>-0.33</b>	<b>-0.45</b>	<b>0.02</b>
Book-to-market	<b>-0.03</b>	<b>-0.16</b>	<b>-0.15</b>	<b>-0.28</b>	1.00	<b>0.09</b>	<b>-0.17</b>	<b>-0.09</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>-0.04</b>
ROA	<b>-0.05</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.09</b>	1.00	<b>0.18</b>	<b>-0.61</b>	<b>-0.61</b>	<b>-0.26</b>
Stock return	-0.01	0.02	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>-0.17</b>	<b>0.18</b>	1.00	<b>-0.06</b>	<b>-0.14</b>	<b>-0.10</b>
Earnings volatility	<b>0.03</b>	<b>-0.21</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.33</b>	<b>-0.09</b>	<b>-0.61</b>	<b>-0.06</b>	1.00	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.25</b>
Loss	<b>0.04</b>	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>-0.45</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>-0.61</b>	<b>-0.14</b>	<b>0.40</b>	1.00	<b>0.29</b>
Class action litigation risk	<b>0.09</b>	<b>-0.10</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>-0.04</b>	<b>-0.26</b>	<b>-0.10</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.29</b>	1.00

This table shows the Pearson correlations for the sample. Correlations that are significant at the 0.05 level or better are highlighted in bold.

**Table 3****The Impact of Czech Capital Markets Act Reform on Management Forecast Frequency**

	(1)	(2)
Treatment Effect	-0.0844*** (5.56)	-0.0883*** (6.53)
Institutional ownership		0.3712*** (13.56)
Firm size		0.1207*** (25.51)
Book-to-market		-0.1030*** (10.39)
ROA		0.0468** (2.23)
Stock return		-0.0846*** (6.77)
Earnings volatility		-0.0740*** (5.13)
Loss		-0.0700*** (4.02)
Class action litigation risk		-0.2833*** (12.14)
N	13,630	13,630
R <sup>2</sup>	0.0023	0.2259

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