TABLE 6 (continued)

Variables	(1) Without Replacement $ABSACC_{it}$	(2) With Replacement (Small to Large) $ABSACC_{it}$	(3) With Replacement (Large to Small) $ABSACC_{it}$	(4) Chow Tests of Diff. (χ^2) (1) vs. (2)	(5) Chow Tests of Diff. (χ^2) (1) vs. (3)	(6) Chow Tests of Diff. (χ^2) (2) vs. (3)
Analyst Following						
$ANALYST_{it}$	−0.0029	0.0035	−0.0080***	3.42*	3.56*	7.01***
	(−1.22)	(0.89)	(−2.93)			
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Industry and Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes			
n	8,218	16,166	42,264			
Covariates Balanced	7/9	1/9	2/9			

Panel C: Estimates of the ATE ($RESTATE_{it}$)

Variables	(7) Without Replacement $RESTATE_{it}$	(8) With Replacement (Small to Large) $RESTATE_{it}$	(9) With Replacement (Large to Small) $RESTATE_{it}$	(10) Chow Tests of Diff. (χ^2) (7) vs. (8)	(11) Chow Tests of Diff. (χ^2) (7) vs. (9)	(12) Chow Tests of Diff. (χ^2) (8) vs. (9)
Auditor Classification						
$BIG4_{it}$	−0.0084	−0.0111	0.0121	0.09	4.50**	3.36*
	(−1.00)	(−1.05)	(1.20)			
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Industry and Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes			
n	8,904	18,478	39,952			
Covariates Balanced	8/9	1/9	2/9			
Internal Control Weaknesses						
$WEAK_{it}$	0.1447***	0.1445***	0.1790***	0.00	2.78*	2.73*
	(9.57)	(9.32)	(8.03)			
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Industry and Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes			
n	2,834	2,844	37,428			
Covariates Balanced	9/9	9/9	2/9			
Analyst Following						
$ANALYST_{it}$	−0.0062	0.0043	−0.0252*	1.25	2.82*	3.95*
	(−0.77)	(0.39)	(−1.95)			
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Industry and Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes			
n	8,218	16,166	42,264			
Covariates Balanced	7/9	1/9	2/9			

*, **, *** Indicate significance at the 0.10, 0.05, and 0.01 levels, respectively (based on two-tailed tests).

Panel A presents a comparison of the sample composition when matching without, with (small group to large group), and with (large group to small group) replacement for each treatment. The last three columns present the change in the within-group treatment composition (i.e., percent Second Tier, average number of internal control weaknesses, and average number of analysts following) for each matching approach. Panels B and C present a comparison of estimates of the ATE between each of the PSM samples. $ABSACC_{it}$ is the dependent variable in Columns (1) through (3), while $RESTATE_{it}$ is the dependent variable in Columns (7) through (9). Columns (4) through (6) (Panel B) and (10) through (12) (Panel C) present the results of Chow (1960) tests comparing each of the estimated ATEs. Models are estimated using OLS regression with standard errors that are robust to heteroscedasticity and clustered by firm (Petersen 2009). t-statistics are presented in parentheses below the coefficients.