Deep Research Case Study Draft

Expectations Management and the Earnings Game

A Note About This Content

What you're about to read is the raw, unedited output directly from OpenAI’s Deep Research tool. We generated the document as an example for this blog post on the MIT Sloan AI Hub: Deep Research: Transforming the Creation of Learning Materials with Research-Backed AI.

We're sharing this text so you can see for yourself what Deep Research can do. Like any AI-generated content, we view this as a starting point rather than a finished product.

For transparency, please note that this document may contain incorrect content, broken links, formatting errors, and other issues. MIT and its affiliates aren't responsible for the accuracy or completeness of what's here.

Expectations Management and the Earnings Game: A Case Study

Introduction – A High-Stakes Quarter-End Dilemma

John Miller, the CFO of Acme Tech Inc., stared at the latest quarterly figures on his screen late one October evening. The numbers told a distressing story: Acme Tech was on track to report earnings of $0.48 per share, just shy of the $0.50 consensus forecast that Wall Street analysts had confidently issued a month ago. Missing the target by two cents might seem trivial, but John knew all too well that on Wall Street, **"missing by a penny" is often seen as the height of corporate blunder** – a sign of deeper trouble that could send the stock price into a tailspin (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). Just last quarter, a key competitor had missed its earnings forecast by a few cents and watched its stock plummet 15% overnight. The pressure was palpable: Acme's CEO had already called twice today to underscore how critical it was to **"meet the number."**

In Acme's boardroom, a tense meeting unfolded. The CEO, head of sales, and John huddled to brainstorm solutions. Could they strike a last-minute deal, offering steep discounts to customers if they agreed to buy software licenses *now* instead of next quarter? Perhaps the sales team could pull in a few million in revenue early. John weighed the options. Accelerating sales with discounts might boost this quarter's earnings, but it could cannibalize next quarter's revenue – a classic short-term fix with longer-term costs. Another idea surfaced: the company had a rainy-day reserve on the balance sheet – funds set aside for potential warranty claims. The controller noted they could **"draw down on reserves"** or adjust an accounting estimate to recognize a bit more income now (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). It would be *technically* within the bounds of accounting rules if justified by lower-than-expected warranty repairs this year. But John felt a pang of conscience; the SEC had cracked down on companies using such **"cookie jar" reserves** to polish their earnings.

Around the table, the **conflict** was clear. On one hand, meeting the quarterly earnings expectation meant avoiding a stock price hit, protecting the company's reputation, and perhaps even John's own job and bonus – immediate, tangible rewards. On the other hand, the team knew that **raiding reserves or slashing vital expenses like R&D to meet the target could undermine Acme's long-term health**. The chief engineer, not present but very much on John's mind, had warned that the firm's innovation pipeline was thinning because of constant cost-cutting. John recalled that nearly 80% of CFOs in a recent survey admitted they would **cut discretionary spending (like R&D or maintenance) to meet an earnings**

goal (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). He didn't want to become another statistic in that study, mortgaging the future to satisfy "the Street" today.

As midnight approached, John faced a dilemma that has become all too common in corporate America: **Do you play the earnings game to manage expectations, or do you tell the truth and let the chips fall?** The story of Acme Tech's quarter-end struggle illustrates the pressures and temptations behind expectations management. This case study will delve into the historical roots of such scenarios, the key players involved, the powerful incentives fueling the earnings game, the rules meant to keep it in check, and the far-reaching consequences for markets and companies alike.

Historical Background: The Rise of the Earnings Expectations Game

Modern financial markets have developed an almost obsessive focus on quarterly earnings results and whether companies meet analysts' forecasts. **This was not always the case.** Decades ago, companies provided less frequent guidance, and analyst estimates were less central in evaluating corporate performance. The game changed with the advent of services like the *Institutional Brokers' Estimate System (I/B/E/S)* in the 1970s, which for the first time compiled analysts' earnings forecasts into explicit consensus targets (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). By the 1980s and 1990s, these consensus estimates had become entrenched as a key benchmark, and companies began to realize that consistently hitting or exceeding the target could yield big rewards in market confidence and stock price. One Fortune magazine writer in 1997 observed that the **"merciless measure of corporate success in the 1990s"** became simply: *Did you make your earnings last quarter?* (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL).

Throughout the 1990s, firms increasingly learned to **"play the earnings game."** Managers discovered that by giving analysts cautious, low-balled guidance and using accounting levers to smooth out volatility, they could produce the steady, predictable earnings growth that investors craved (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). For example, companies would rather guide to <$0.50> and then report $0.51, than guide to $0.53 and come in at $0.52. Beating the consensus by a penny became a norm – so much so that for **16 consecutive quarters in the late 1990s, more S&P 500 companies beat the consensus earnings estimate than missed it** (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). Stocks that delivered these positive "surprises" were rewarded, while those that fell short even by a slight margin were often severely punished in the market (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). The result was a powerful incentive for executives to do whatever it took to avoid a miss.

This era also saw the emergence of infamous cases of earnings manipulation. Companies like **Enron** and **WorldCom** pushed the concept of expectations management to unethical extremes. Enron, for instance, was lauded throughout the 1990s for its consistent growth and its uncanny ability to meet or beat earnings forecasts nearly every quarter. In fact, between 1990 and 2000 Enron met or exceeded analysts' forecasts **77% of the time**, an impressive streak that contributed to an inflated stock price ((PDF) DID EARNINGS MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERVALUATION OF ENRON'S STOCK?). However, hidden behind those steady results were aggressive accounting tactics – like booking profits from asset sales to its own off-balance-sheet entities – which ultimately proved fraudulent. By 1997–2000, as much as **83% of Enron's annual earnings came from asset sale gains (often with related parties)**, not from sustainable business operations ((PDF) DID EARNINGS MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERVALUATION OF ENRON'S STOCK?). The eventual revelation of these practices in 2001 led to Enron's spectacular collapse and became a cautionary tale of how far the **"earnings game"** can be taken and the devastating consequences when the truth comes out.

The early 2000s brought a reckoning. A wave of accounting scandals (Enron, WorldCom, Tyco, Sunbeam, and others) alerted regulators and investors to the dark side of earnings management. In response, reforms were enacted to restore trust. The **Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX)** imposed stricter oversight on financial reporting – requiring CEOs and CFOs to personally certify financial statements and instituting heavier penalties for fraud – aiming to deter the most egregious earnings manipulation. Around the same time, the **U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)** issued guidance like *Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 99* (1999) clarifying that even small misstatements are **"material" if they serve to hide a failure to meet analysts' expectations or other important benchmarks** ([PDF] sab 99: materiality as we know it or brave new world for securities law). In other words, booking an extra penny per share through creative accounting is not excusable just because it's small; if that penny makes the difference between hitting or missing the target, investors **would** find it important. Regulators were signaling that the earnings game had limits – cross the line into deception, and there would be consequences.

Despite these high-profile scandals and reforms, the culture of managing expectations did not disappear. Instead, it evolved. Companies became a bit more cautious, and outright fraud was (one hopes) curtailed by the fear of SOX and stricter audits. But the fundamental dynamics of the game – the dance between companies and analysts to set achievable targets, and the obsession of investors with each quarter's number – have persisted into the 2010s and 2020s. In fact, by the 2010s the practice of *expectations management* was institutionalized in many firms' investor relations strategies. A notable shift occurred as some leaders began openly criticizing the system: for example, **General Electric (GE)**, once the poster child for smooth earnings under CEO Jack Welch, shocked markets in 2008 by

announcing it would stop providing quarterly earnings guidance (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters). Under Welch's tenure (1981–2001), GE had been legendary for meeting or beating estimates **in virtually every quarter for a decade** (all but two quarters from 1992 to 2002) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters), often by relying on the vast conglomerate's ability to sell assets or shuffle gains to cover any shortfall (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters). Welch defended his practices as *"managing businesses, not earnings"*, but critics argued that GE's consistency was too good to be true (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters). By abandoning guidance in 2008, GE's new CEO implicitly acknowledged the corrosive effect that the quarterly earnings obsession could have on long-term decision making (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters).

In recent years, the debate has only grown louder. Influential voices like investor Warren Buffett and JPMorgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon have campaigned for an end to quarterly earnings forecasts, arguing in a 2018 op-ed that **"quarterly earnings guidance often leads to an unhealthy focus on short-term profits at the expense of long-term strategy, growth and sustainability"** (Sarah Williamson on Ending Quarterly Guidance - FCLTGlobal). Some companies have heeded the call by ceasing or reducing guidance and emphasizing long-term metrics. And yet, the quarterly "beat or miss" scoreboard remains a fixture of market culture. Even in the late 2010s and into the 2020s, roughly **70–80% of S&P 500 companies manage to beat analyst earnings estimates in a typical quarter** (Fourth-Quarter Earnings Are Beating the Street's Estimates. Here's How Much) – a statistic that speaks to how thoroughly the art of expectations management has permeated corporate behavior. The stage having been set, we now examine the key players in this earnings game and the incentives that drive them.

Key Actors and Their Roles in Expectations Management

Multiple stakeholders participate in the earnings expectations game, each with their own motivations and influence. The **interplay among these key actors** creates the environment in which expectations are set, met, or missed:

- **Company Executives (CEOs, CFOs, and Finance Teams)**: Corporate management is at the center of expectations management. CEOs and CFOs **covet a reputation for "delivering results"** and understand that consistently meeting quarterly targets pleases investors. Their compensation (bonuses, stock options) often depends on short-term performance metrics, including earnings per share (EPS) or stock price, giving them a personal stake in the game. Executives provide **earnings guidance** to

analysts – often in the form of quarterly or annual EPS forecasts or ranges – and thereby set the initial bar for expectations. They also make strategic and accounting choices to influence reported earnings. Some of these choices are operationally sound; others can be cosmetic or even deceptive. For example, a CFO might decide to **delay an expense or asset write-down** to avoid denting this quarter's income, or accelerate a high-margin product launch by a few weeks to pull revenue into the current period. Top executives walk a fine line: they aim to present the company in the best light and avoid surprises, but if they go too far in **"managing" earnings (e.g. abusing accounting rules), they risk lawsuits or SEC enforcement**. As one Harvard Business Review analysis noted, at many firms the imperative to meet earnings targets has become a **game that overrides even the goal of maximizing long-term shareholder return** (The earnings game. Everyone plays, nobody wins). In our opening scenario, John the CFO exemplifies management's role – he is the one deciding whether to cut R&D or tap reserves to hit the EPS goal, under pressure from his CEO.

- **Financial Analysts**: These are professionals (typically on the "sell side" at brokerage firms or independent research outfits) who scrutinize companies and publish earnings forecasts and stock recommendations. Analysts are the architects of the consensus earnings estimates. They build financial models, talk with company management (within what regulation allows), and assess industry trends to forecast revenues and earnings for upcoming quarters. Analysts have a vested interest in the expectations game: their credibility with investors can depend on forecasting accuracy, but they also **rely on access to management guidance** to make their estimates. In the past, management might hint to analysts if their models were too high or too low – a practice curtailed by fair disclosure rules (Reg FD, discussed later). Analysts don't want to be caught off guard by a company's miss or beat. Interestingly, they generally prefer companies to **slightly exceed forecasts** (a nice surprise) but not by too much – a huge earnings beat can make analysts look like they **"missed the call,"** whereas a slight beat of a penny or two is seen as a win-win (the company looks good and the analyst's estimate was close) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). This dynamic can create an implicit collusion in the game: companies try to guide analysts to a comfortable, beatable number, and analysts are often happy to be guided to avoid embarrassment. Analysts also serve as conduits of market expectations **back to the company**. If an analyst projects a number higher than what the company thinks it can deliver, the company may subtly try to talk them down. In our case, John's knowledge of the consensus ($0.50) likely came from analysts who had been guided by Acme's own prior statements – a target John now fears they will miss.

- **Investors**: Investors – from large institutional fund managers to small retail shareholders – are the audience and judges of the earnings game. They ultimately determine the stock price based on performance relative to expectations. In today's markets, many institutional investors (hedge funds, mutual funds) engage in **"earnings season" trading**, making buy/sell decisions the moment earnings are released. A company that beats expectations may see a jump in share price as investors rush in, while a miss can trigger a sell-off. The short-term reaction is often disproportionate: a company that misses by a few cents can lose a significant percentage of its market cap in a day or two, as seen in countless examples. This reality creates the **strong short-term pressure** on executives – they know even a minor miss can anger investors and potentially invite activist shareholders or takeover attempts if the stock languishes. Long-term, investors *should* care about sustainable growth and truthful reporting, but when so much attention is put on the quarterly scorecard, even long-horizon investors often find themselves **forced to pay attention to each quarter's results**. There is also a subset of investors who focus on **long-term fundamental value**; these investors might actually prefer a company that forgoes the earnings game, believing that short-term misses in favor of long-term investment will pay off. However, such patience can be in short supply when a miss happens and momentum investors flee. In Acme's scenario, John and the CEO are acutely aware of how their major shareholders and the market at large will react at the next morning's opening bell if they fail to hit $0.50. The **"financial market's short-termism"** is effectively represented by the specter of an immediate stock drop that hangs over their decisions.
- **Regulators and Auditors**: Government regulators (like the SEC in the United States) and independent auditors play a crucial but somewhat backstage role in the expectations game. They are the referees who set the rules and enforce them when the game gets out of hand. The SEC requires public companies to file honest financial reports under **Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)** or International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), and has regulations in place to ensure **fair disclosure** and prevent manipulation of information. For example, the **SEC's Regulation Fair Disclosure (Reg FD)**, introduced in 2000, **prohibits selective disclosure of material information** to certain analysts or investors – companies must share important info (like earnings forecasts or results) publicly with everyone at the same time (Practical Guidance for Living with Regulation FD - WilmerHale). This rule was meant to stop the old practice of whispering earnings guidance to favored analysts behind closed doors. It leveled the playing field of information, albeit at the cost of making **expectations management more formalized (through public guidance and earnings calls)**. Regulators also set accounting rules (often via standard-setters like the Financial Accounting Standards Board for GAAP, or the IASB

for IFRS) that limit how much leeway companies have in reporting earnings. **Auditors** are hired to check that companies' financial statements are free of material misstatement – including misstatements from aggressive accounting choices. In the earnings game context, auditors are the ones who might push back if a CFO tries to, say, defer an expense without justification or recognize revenue early in violation of accounting rules. In Acme's tense meeting, the invisible presence is the audit firm and the SEC: John knows that any blatant cooking of books could lead to audit flags or worse. Regulators have also explicitly warned about earnings manipulation. The SEC's SAB No. 99 on materiality, for instance, lists qualitative factors that can make even small irregularities material – one factor is whether a misstatement **"hides a failure to meet analysts' consensus expectations"** (Non-GAAP Metrics in SAB 99 Materiality Analyses | Non-GAAP Metrics in SAB 99 Materiality Analyses - Audit AnalyticsAudit Analytics). This means if Acme Tech were to fudge just 2 cents via an improper accounting move, the SEC would likely view it as a serious issue, not a trivial error, because it altered the earnings trend and masked a miss. Thus, regulators and auditors act as a counterweight to management in the game, trying to keep it honest.

Each of these actors – executives, analysts, investors, and regulators/auditors – contributes to the ecosystem of expectations. Their interactions set the stage for how expectations are formed and what happens when the rubber meets the road on earnings announcement day. Next, we examine **the incentives and pressures** that drive participants to engage in (or combat) earnings management.

Incentives and Short-Term Pressures Driving Earnings Management

Why do so many smart people – CEOs, CFOs, investors, analysts – end up so fixated on a single quarterly earnings number? The answer lies in the powerful incentives and pressures embedded in the market system, which often skew toward the short term. These include financial rewards, career considerations, and cognitive biases that together fuel the practice of managing earnings and expectations:

- **Stock Price and Shareholder Expectations**: In public markets, a company's stock price is a very immediate scorecard. Top executives are acutely aware that missing earnings expectations even briefly can hammer the stock price (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters). A lower stock not only hurts shareholders' immediate value but can have ripple effects: it can raise the company's cost of capital, make it a target for activist investors or hostile takeovers, and in some cases affect credit ratings. Moreover, executives' own wealth is often tied to stock performance through equity

compensation. This creates a **strong incentive to avoid negative earnings surprises**. Empirical research has shown that stocks of companies that miss earnings by just a small amount often suffer outsized declines, whereas those that beat by a bit see gains – a clear motivation for managers to err on the side of caution and **"beat the Street"** (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). In our narrative, the fear of Acme's stock plunging on a $0.02 miss exemplifies this pressure.

- **Executive Compensation and Career Concerns**: Many CEO/CFO bonus plans include targets for EPS or total shareholder return. Failing to hit the quarterly or annual EPS target might reduce their bonus or vesting of options. Beyond formal compensation, there's a reputational aspect: CEOs known for reliably hitting targets (like GE's Jack Welch once was) are celebrated, whereas those who oversee a big miss might face loss of credibility or even their jobs. A survey of hundreds of CFOs famously found that **most executives believe missing earnings targets is perceived by the market as a "managerial failure"** ([PDF] C:\Working Papers\10550.wpd) – a black mark on their record. It's no surprise then that in that same survey, an alarming **79% of CFOs admitted they would sacrifice discretionary spending (such as R&D, advertising, maintenance) to meet a short-term earnings goal** (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). More than half said they would even **delay starting a valuable new project** if it meant avoiding an earnings miss (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). These are stark examples of incentives in action: executives are often willing to trade long-term value creation for short-term earnings stability because the personal stakes (wealth and career) are so immediate. John's inner conflict about cutting R&D to make the quarter is a direct reflection of this incentive structure.

- **Analyst Ratings and Access to Capital**: The incentives aren't one-sided. Corporate management knows that analysts' opinions can influence access to capital and investor appetite. Companies that consistently meet expectations tend to enjoy favorable analyst coverage (often "Buy" ratings) and can raise capital or do acquisitions more easily with a high stock price. Conversely, a pattern of missing forecasts can lead analysts to become bearish on the stock, which can dry up investor interest and make any new financing costly. Thus, there's an **incentive for companies to maintain a positive relationship with analysts** by not embarrassing them with big misses. This dynamic historically even led to the practice of **"guiding low"** – providing conservative forecasts so that analysts set the bar low and the company can then clear it comfortably (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). Analysts, for their part, don't want to be too far above what the company can deliver, so often they

implicitly cooperate by moderating their estimates if management signals to do so. Reg FD (2000) curtailed explicit whispering of guidance, but companies still guide through public conference calls and update analysts if needed. The net effect is a system of **mutual incentives**: companies hate negative surprises, and analysts hate being wrong, so both prefer a scenario where the company slightly beats an expectation that has been managed into a reasonable range.

- **Short-Term Ownership and Market Culture**: In today's markets, a significant portion of trading is very short-term oriented – algorithmic traders, hedge funds playing quarterly arbitrage, etc. These market participants amplify the focus on immediate results. If 70-80% of companies are beating forecasts in a given quarter (Fourth-Quarter Earnings Are Beating the Street's Estimates. Here's How Much), it sets a baseline expectation that *everyone* should beat or there's something wrong. Fund managers often feel pressure to explain to their investors why they hold a stock that just issued a disappointing quarter. This can turn into a self-fulfilling cycle: because everyone expects a company to do everything possible to hit the target, any failure to do so is treated as a red flag, reinforcing management's belief that they *must* manage earnings. As noted in one analysis, the quarterly earnings number has become such a focal point that it **"reduces investing to a guessing contest"** about a single metric, rather than a thoughtful assessment of long-term value (The earnings game. Everyone plays, nobody wins). This cultural expectation is a soft incentive but a powerful one – it's simply "how the game is played," and executives know it.
- **Psychological Anchoring and Herd Behavior**: Once a benchmark is out there (e.g., $0.50 EPS for Acme Tech), it anchors perceptions. Managers internalize that number as the goalpost. Investors and board members may unconsciously treat the consensus forecast as a promise by management. These psychological factors create a bias towards meeting the established expectation, even if conditions change. No CFO wants to go to the board meeting and explain why they fell short of *the number* that everyone had in their heads. It's often easier psychologically to rationalize a bit of earnings "adjustment" or a one-time maneuver than to accept the pain of a miss. Thus, the very act of setting an expectation drives behavior to fulfill it – a classic case of **self-imposed pressure**.

All these incentives align to a common theme: **short-term market pressures can dominate decision-making**, even when those decisions might not be in the best interest of the company's long-term health. This is why many observers criticize the earnings game. As Buffett and Dimon argued, a fixation on quarterly targets can **stifle long-term investments and strategic thinking** (Sarah Williamson on Ending Quarterly Guidance - FCLTGlobal). Indeed, academic studies have documented that firms often cut R&D spending or forego good projects in order to meet short-term earnings benchmarks (Microsoft Word -

FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc) (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc), consistent with the survey data cited above. Such actions might boost the stock this quarter, but over time they can erode a company's innovative capacity and competitive position – a classic case of short-term gain for long-term pain.

It's worth noting that not all incentives push toward managing earnings; there are counter-incentives too. Whistleblower protections and ethical corporate cultures can empower employees and finance staff to resist fraudulent adjustments. Long-term oriented shareholders (like some pension funds or foundations) often explicitly tell management they prefer honest reporting and sustained growth over short-term hits. Additionally, executives with significant personal credibility at stake might fear the reputational damage of being caught in an accounting gimmick more than they fear a one-time miss. These balancing factors sometimes encourage companies to **"come clean"** and reset expectations rather than perpetuate a charade. For example, when a new CEO comes in, they often take a **"big bath"** (write down losses and reset earnings) in their first year, essentially clearing the decks of previous earnings management, because they want a fresh, truthful baseline going forward. This shows that while short-term pressures are strong, they are not insurmountable – but overcoming them often requires strong leadership and sometimes a change in leadership.

Having explored why the earnings game is so alluring (and hard to break out of), we next turn to the formal **rules and standards** designed to govern financial reporting and how they intersect with expectations management.

Regulations and Accounting Standards: The Rules of the Game

A variety of laws, regulations, and accounting standards exist to ensure that companies report financial results fairly and transparently – effectively setting the **boundaries of acceptable behavior** in managing earnings and expectations. These rules don't eliminate the earnings game, but they aim to prevent it from misleading investors or undermining the integrity of financial markets. Key regulations and standards include:

- **Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS)**: These are the accounting rulebooks that dictate how earnings should be measured and reported. GAAP (used in the U.S.) and IFRS (used in many other countries) cover everything from revenue recognition to expense matching and accruals. They are designed to reflect economic reality as closely as possible, but **within GAAP/IFRS there is often wiggle room** that management can exploit for earnings smoothing. For example, deciding how quickly to depreciate an asset, how much to provision for future losses, or when exactly to recognize revenue

involves judgment. Companies can choose legitimate methods that have different impacts on earnings. In the 1990s, **Microsoft** famously adopted very conservative revenue recognition for its software sales – deferring a portion of revenue to later periods to reflect future upgrade obligations. By 1996, Microsoft had built up over **$1.1 billion in "unearned" (deferred) revenue** on its balance sheet (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). This accounting method, while in line with evolving GAAP guidance for software, had the side benefit of smoothing Microsoft's earnings growth: it prevented a huge one-time jump followed by a drop, and instead spread revenue into future quarters (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). An analyst at the time noted that because of this approach, Microsoft *"knows what they've got in the bag from one quarter to the next,"* essentially creating an earnings buffer (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). The **Treasurer of Microsoft denied** that the policy was driven by earnings management, insisting it was purely GAAP-compliant accounting – but observers noted that Microsoft's influence was such that it was pushing the **accounting standards** themselves in that direction (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). This example shows how GAAP flexibility can be used (legitimately) for expectations management. Standard setters continually refine GAAP/IFRS to close loopholes and limit aggressive practices – for instance, new **revenue recognition standards (ASC 606 in U.S. GAAP and IFRS 15)** were implemented around 2018 to more clearly define when revenue can be recognized, partly to curb premature revenue booking. But no set of rules can eliminate all earnings management; there will always be grey areas and timing choices that companies can lean on. The key is that **GAAP and IFRS set the legal bounds** – if companies stray outside them (falsifying numbers, recognizing revenue that doesn't meet criteria, etc.), it becomes outright fraud.

- **Securities Laws and the SEC**: In the U.S., the SEC oversees financial reporting. Laws like the **Securities Exchange Act of 1934** require public companies to file quarterly (10-Q) and annual (10-K) reports with accurate financial statements. The SEC has broad authority to punish companies and executives for materially false or misleading statements. As part of the post-Enron reforms, **Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002)** added Section 302 which requires the CEO and CFO to personally certify the accuracy of financial reports, and Section 404 which requires management to attest to the effectiveness of internal controls over financial reporting. These provisions mean that top executives are on the hook if their company manipulates earnings – they can face hefty fines or even criminal charges. The SEC also employs enforcement staff who investigate irregularities. A notable example: in 2009, the SEC charged General Electric with accounting fraud for misrepresenting results in 2002–2003 (including improper

hedge accounting and revenue recognition to close small gaps to targets); GE paid a $50 million settlement (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters). Such enforcement sends a message that managing earnings beyond the line of GAAP can have serious consequences. The SEC's **Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) No. 99 on Materiality** (mentioned earlier) is another important guideline – it explicitly reminds companies and auditors that meeting earnings expectations through even quantitatively small misstatements is **not acceptable**. SAB 99 lists qualitative factors that make an error material, including if it **masks a change in earnings or "hides a failure to meet analysts' consensus expectations"** (Non-GAAP Metrics in SAB 99 Materiality Analyses | Non-GAAP Metrics in SAB 99 Materiality Analyses - Audit AnalyticsAudit Analytics). This was a reaction to the common mindset in the 1990s that a "little smoothing" to hit the number was harmless. The SEC clearly disagreed, equating that practice to misleading investors. Additionally, **Regulation G** and related SEC rules (adopted in 2003) address the use of *pro forma* or non-GAAP financial measures. Companies often present "adjusted earnings" (excluding certain costs) to look better. Reg G requires that any non-GAAP figures in public disclosures be reconciled to GAAP and not presented more prominently than GAAP, to prevent companies from using **creative definitions of earnings to manage perceptions**. In summary, securities regulations aim to ensure that however much companies might want to play the expectations game, the numbers they report must be truthful and in line with accounting standards, and any **attempt to game the system through deceit can lead to legal penalties.**

- **Regulation Fair Disclosure (Reg FD)**: Adopted by the SEC in 2000, Reg FD attacked the *expectations management process* more than the reported numbers. Before Reg FD, it was routine for corporate investor relations teams and executives to have private calls with select analysts or major investors, giving them nudges or extra information so that those analysts could adjust their models. This often meant the market at large did not hear bad news until the last minute, while a favored few had time to adjust. Reg FD **banned selective disclosure of material nonpublic info**, including earnings guidance, to ensure everyone in the market has equal access (Practical Guidance for Living with Regulation FD - WilmerHale). Now, if a company wants to guide analysts up or down, it must do so publicly – e.g., via a press release or an open conference call that anyone can listen to. Reg FD thus changed the expectations game by making it more transparent. Companies responded by **standardizing their guidance practices**: many issue public earnings guidance each quarter (or annually) and provide updates if needed. This leveled the playing field, but it also arguably entrenched the importance of guidance – since everyone hears it, it becomes a hard expectation. The regulation also put a chill on the old practice of

"whisper numbers", where a company might unofficially let the street know it will really earn, say, $0.52 when official estimate is $0.50. Now companies usually stick to official guidance ranges. Violations of Reg FD can result in SEC enforcement (typically a cease-and-desist order and fines). While Reg FD improved fairness, it did not stop companies from guiding forecasts; it just changed the venue to public forums. In fact, after Reg FD, one could argue **managing expectations became an even more orchestrated, theater-like process**, with companies carefully scripting their earnings calls to modulate analysts' expectations.

- **Stock Exchange Rules and Corporate Governance**: Stock exchanges and governance best practices also play a role. Audit committees of boards are required (under exchange listing standards and SOX) to oversee financial reporting. A diligent audit committee can push back on excessive short-termism by questioning management's judgments and ensuring auditors have free rein to examine the books. Additionally, in some jurisdictions regulators have adjusted reporting frequency requirements. For example, the **European Union in 2013 ended the mandate for quarterly reporting** (allowing semiannual reports for many markets), to counteract short-termism. Similarly, in the UK, companies are no longer required to issue interim management statements quarterly. These moves were intended to relieve the pressure of the quarterly cycle, though many companies still report quarterly due to investor expectations. In the U.S., quarterly reporting is still mandated, but there are periodic debates (even a suggestion by a U.S. President in 2018 to explore semiannual reporting) – reflecting concern that the current regulatory environment might inadvertently encourage short-term focus.

In practice, these rules and standards have reduced some of the worst abuses (we see far fewer blatant earnings frauds now than in the Enron era), but they certainly haven't eliminated the underlying game. Instead, the game shifted more toward **legal (or gray-area) earnings management** – using the flexibility in accounting standards, timing of transactions, and crafting of public messages to achieve earnings targets without technically breaking the rules. A telling insight from a finance professor is that managers nowadays prefer **real actions over accounting tricks** to meet targets, because real actions (like adjusting spending or the timing of deals) are less likely to get them in legal trouble (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc) (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). This doesn't mean such actions are good for shareholders in the long run, but it shows the influence of the regulatory environment: when accounting standards and audits make pure accounting manipulation harder, managers might turn to operating decisions (somewhat to the detriment of business) to still hit the numbers.

The regulatory framework continues to evolve. The Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) frequently amend standards to

close loopholes (for instance, new lease accounting rules brought many leases on-balance-sheet, reducing off-book financing games). The SEC regularly updates guidance and monitors trends like the use of non-GAAP metrics (which many companies push to redefine "earnings" in a more flattering way). Yet, as long as human nature and external pressures make companies crave smooth earnings, the cat-and-mouse game between regulators and companies will go on. The rules can at best keep the game fair and honest; they cannot force companies to prioritize long-term health over short-term results – that remains a challenge of corporate culture and leadership.

Consequences of the Earnings Game: Market Distortions and Beyond

The practice of expectations management and short-term earnings obsession carries significant consequences. Some of these are immediately visible in financial markets, while others unfold over the long run within companies and the broader economy. Key consequences include:

- **Financial Market Distortions**: The collective effect of most companies "beating by a penny" and steering analysts is that market prices may reflect a **choreographed reality** rather than economic fundamentals. When earnings are smoothed or propped up to meet targets, stock prices can be **mispriced** – too high relative to the true risk or true earnings power of the company. This can lead to bubbles or sudden corrections. The **integrity of the market's pricing mechanism is undermined if investors start to doubt the credibility of reported earnings**, as noted in a Harvard Business Review analysis: participants may come to view the quarterly earnings figure as **"a sort of collective fiction"**, causing them to **"lose faith"** in financial reports and even in stock prices themselves (The earnings game. Everyone plays, nobody wins). A market that doesn't trust reported numbers will demand a risk premium or will gyrate on rumors, neither of which is healthy. In the late 1990s, for example, there was widespread cynicism that many dot-com companies' "pro forma earnings" were nonsense – investors eventually punished those firms, contributing to the 2000–2001 tech crash. More recently, if investors believe a firm's consistent meeting of targets is too good to be true, they may discount future reports or react violently at the first sign of a miss. In essence, the earnings game can turn the stock market into a **guessing game** that rewards accounting savvy as much as business performance, distorting capital allocation. Capital might flow to companies that are good at managing expectations rather than those with the best long-term prospects, which is an inefficient outcome for the economy.

- **Resource Allocation and Long-Term Performance**: Perhaps the most pernicious consequence is what happens *inside* companies that constantly play the earnings game. To meet short-term expectations, management often makes decisions that sacrifice long-term value. Common examples include **cutting R&D, delaying hiring, slashing marketing, or deferring maintenance** – all of which can hurt future growth and competitive position (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). Research has shown that this kind of myopic behavior is not rare. As mentioned, nearly 4 out of 5 CFOs surveyed said they would cut discretionary spending to avoid missing a quarter's earnings target (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). Other studies found that firms just meeting earnings benchmarks often have abnormally low investment in the periods surrounding the earnings announcement, consistent with pulling levers to hit the target (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc). Over time, underinvestment can lead to **fewer new products, weaker innovation, and even safety issues or quality problems** (if maintenance is deferred) – all of which eventually impair the company's performance and value. A vivid real-world case: In the early 2000s, **Lucent Technologies** (a telecom equipment maker) met earnings targets for several quarters by dramatically cutting costs and R&D; it soon found itself with outdated products and declining market share, and its stock collapsed. Similarly, companies that resort to **one-time fixes** like selling key assets to boost earnings (as was alleged with GE under Welch (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters), or as Enron did to generate earnings ((PDF) DID EARNINGS MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERVALUATION OF ENRON'S STOCK?)) may find they've weakened their core business or sold the seed corn for short-term profit. The earnings game can thus create a drag on long-term corporate performance and innovation. This is why many executives and investors now lament "quarterly capitalism" – the focus on the next quarter to the detriment of the next decade.
- **Ethical Lapses and Legal Risks**: Continuously managing earnings can create a slippery slope from *aggressive accounting* to outright fraud. When executives get away with small manipulations (say, dipping into a reserve this quarter and promising themselves they'll restore it next quarter), they can become emboldened to take bigger liberties if needed. A culture of meeting expectations "at any cost" can also pressure lower-level employees to cook the books or hide bad news. This was evident in infamous cases: at **Wells Fargo**, though not about earnings per share, intense pressure to meet performance targets led employees to commit fraud (creating fake customer accounts). In financial reporting, **Enron's culture** of hitting earnings targets fostered increasingly unethical practices – what started as technically complex accounting transactions escalated into blatant deceit and off-book debt hiding. The **legal consequences** when things cross the line are severe: restatements of earnings,

SEC investigations, fines, shareholder lawsuits, and even criminal charges for executives under securities laws (as happened to Enron and WorldCom executives, who ended up in prison). Even milder cases can tarnish careers – for example, a company caught just **smoothing earnings without proper basis** might have to restate its financials, leading to a loss of confidence and a stock drop, and the executives or auditors involved often lose their jobs or licenses. In short, playing the earnings game too aggressively can destroy reputations and careers. The **“nasty newspaper articles”** and SEC penalties that result from being caught are exactly what honest managers like John Miller (in our story) dread (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL). It’s worth noting that since Sarbanes-Oxley, there’s an added personal risk: CEOs/CFOs must certify the accounts, so they can be individually sanctioned for false reporting (including returning bonus compensation under SOX Section 304 if earnings were misstated). This legal backdrop is meant to be a deterrent, but when the pressure is high, some still succumb – and the fallout can be catastrophic for the company and its shareholders.

- **Loss of Trust and Employee Morale**: Beyond investors and regulators, there’s an internal cultural consequence. If a company is constantly in “manicured earnings” mode, employees may become cynical about the financials and leadership. For instance, if workers see budgets being slashed at quarter-end just to make the numbers, they understand that the company’s priorities are skewed. This can hurt morale and trust in management. Whistleblower complaints can rise if finance staff feel uncomfortable with borderline practices. On the flip side, if a company comes clean about a bad quarter and doesn’t resort to gimmicks, it can actually build credibility with employees (and investors) as being principled and focused on the long run. Thus, how management handles the expectations game can affect the **ethical climate** of the firm. A culture overly focused on short-term metrics can breed other problematic behavior (as seen in various corporate scandals where salespeople or others cheated to hit targets). In sum, the earnings game doesn’t just distort numbers; it can distort corporate culture.
- **Systemic Economic Effects**: When many companies collectively underinvest due to short-term pressures, it can have macro-economic consequences. If, for example, a large portion of the market is cutting R&D in a given year to meet earnings goals, that could mean less innovation economy-wide – fewer breakthroughs, slower productivity growth, and loss of competitive edge globally. Some commentators have pointed out that the intense short-termism of U.S. markets may be one reason certain industries lost ground to overseas competitors who took a longer view (for instance, some Japanese and German firms historically invested more steadily through cycles,

whereas some U.S. firms cut deeply during downturns to please markets). While hard to quantify, the **aggregate effect of thousands of firms managing earnings** is likely a less dynamic economy than we would have if capital allocation were purely based on long-term fundamentals. This concern underpins movements by business groups to refocus on long-term value – for example, the **Business Roundtable** and groups like **FCLT Global** have advocated for ending quarterly EPS guidance to mitigate economy-wide short-termism (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (Sarah Williamson on Ending Quarterly Guidance - FCLTGlobal).

It's not all doom and gloom, however. There are also **positive outcomes when the cycle is broken**. Companies that renounce the earnings game can sometimes emerge stronger. For instance, when a firm stops giving quarterly guidance and invests in long-term projects, it might suffer some stock volatility in the short run but attract a base of long-term investors who value the transparency and strategic vision. Over time, if those investments pay off, the company can outperform peers. Moreover, as regulatory safeguards improve and more voices call out the pitfalls of short-termism, there is some evidence of change. A study of the post-scandals period (after the early 2000s) found that managers tend to meet or just beat analyst forecasts **less often** than before and rely less on accrual tricks, indicating a shift toward more realistic reporting ([PDF] Meeting or Beating Analyst Expectations in the Post-Scandals World). The *COVID-19* crisis in 2020 also prompted many companies to suspend guidance and focus on resilience, which some thought might reset the expectations game in a beneficial way (though many reverted to old habits later).

In the end, the consequences of expectations management are a classic trade-off: **short-term stability versus long-term sustainability**. Managed earnings can prop things up for a while, but if taken too far, reality catches up – whether through a scandal, a competitive slide, or simply a failure to meet an ever-rising bar that can no longer be attained. As the saying goes, you can fool all of the people some of the time, or some of the people all of the time, but not all of the people all of the time. Markets eventually figure it out, and when they do, the backlash can be severe.

Conclusion – Balancing the Expectations

The story of Acme Tech's quarter-end dilemma is a microcosm of a wider struggle faced by countless companies. **Managing market expectations** and delivering consistent results can create a virtuous cycle of investor confidence and a rising stock – until it becomes a vicious cycle of pressure, distortion, and potential deception. The *earnings game* arose from reasonable beginnings (companies trying to signal their prospects and investors seeking predictability) but has grown into a high-stakes contest where **"everyone plays, and nobody truly wins"** in the long run (The earnings game. Everyone plays, nobody wins). As we've seen,

historical trends, the actions of executives, analysts' behaviors, investor pressures, and the regulatory framework all interact to perpetuate this game.

There is no easy fix to the issues outlined in this case study. However, awareness is a crucial first step. Regulators have tightened rules to keep the game honest, and there's growing momentum among business leaders to **dial back the obsession with quarterly EPS** in favor of more holistic performance metrics. For example, some companies now stress adjusted EBITDA, customer growth, or other measures of progress in discussions with investors, trying to shift the dialogue away from just *"Did we hit the EPS target?"*. Initiatives that promote long-term incentives for executives (like tying pay to multi-year performance) are also steps in the right direction.

Ultimately, **restoring a healthy balance** between meeting short-term expectations and investing for the future is in the interest of all parties. Investors benefit from more reliable, meaningful information and a stronger economy underpinning their portfolios. Companies benefit from the freedom to make strategic decisions without the constant shadow of the next quarter's consensus estimate. And the capital markets as a whole function more efficiently when prices reflect fundamentals, not accounting alchemy. As this case study demonstrates, expectation management is a double-edged sword – wielded carefully, it can steer a steady course, but if abused, it can cut down even the mightiest of companies. The goal for managers like John Miller at Acme Tech is to **manage expectations ethically** – communicating transparently with the market and setting realistic goals – while resisting the temptation to cross the line into value-destroying earnings manipulation. Only by doing so can they convert the earnings game from a zero-sum juggling act into a win-win dialogue with shareholders, aligning the *expectations* with the *true performance* of the enterprise.

References (Selected)

- Collingwood, H. (2001). *The Earnings Game: Everyone Plays, Nobody Wins*. **Harvard Business Review, 79**(6), 65-74. [Abstract emphasizes the harmful effects of the "earnings game" on decision making and market integrity] (The earnings game. Everyone plays, nobody wins) (The earnings game. Everyone plays, nobody wins).

- Fox, J. (1997). *Learn to Play the Earnings Game (and Wall Street Will Love You)*. **Fortune Magazine**. [Describes how in the 1990s companies like Microsoft and GE mastered managing earnings and expectations, and the market's harsh punishment for even minor misses] (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL) (LEARN TO PLAY THE EARNINGS GAME (AND WALL STREET WILL).

- Graham, J., Harvey, C., & Rajgopal, S. (2005). *The Economic Implications of Corporate Financial Reporting*. **Journal of Accounting & Economics, 40**(1-3), 3-73. [Survey of 401

CFOs; documents that 78% would sacrifice long-term value (like R&D spending) to meet earnings targets] (Microsoft Word - FinReportPrac2005_01_11.doc).

- Securities and Exchange Commission. (1999). *Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 99 – Materiality*. [SEC guidance highlighting that even small misstatements that allow a company to meet earnings expectations can be material and are unacceptable] (Non-GAAP Metrics in SAB 99 Materiality Analyses | Non-GAAP Metrics in SAB 99 Materiality Analyses - Audit AnalyticsAudit Analytics).
- Reuters. (2008, Dec 17). *As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow*. [Discusses GE's history of meeting earnings under Jack Welch and its decision to stop quarterly guidance; cites broader calls to end short-term focus] (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters) (As GE gives up guidance game, others may follow | Reuters).
- FactSet. (2025). *Earnings Insight: Q4 2024*. [Reports that ~77% of S&P 500 companies beat earnings estimates in Q4 2024, consistent with five-year averages, illustrating the prevalence of managed expectations] (Fourth-Quarter Earnings Are Beating the Street's Estimates. Here's How Much).
- Buffett, W. & Dimon, J. (2018). *Joint editorial on eliminating quarterly earnings guidance*. **Wall Street Journal**. [Argues that quarterly guidance leads to an "unhealthy focus on short-term profits at the expense of long-term strategy"] (Sarah Williamson on Ending Quarterly Guidance - FCLTGlobal).
- Martin, J.D., & Sayrak, A. (2003). *Did Earnings Management Contribute to the Overvaluation of Enron's Stock?* in **Advances in Financial Economics, 8**, 127-147. [Finds Enron met or beat forecasts 77% of quarters in 1990s and used related-party asset sales to fabricate up to 83% of its earnings by 1997-2000] ((PDF) DID EARNINGS MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERVALUATION OF ENRON'S STOCK?).