Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Journal of Accounting and Economics

journal homepage: www.journals.elsevier.com/journal-of-accounting-and-economics



Analysts and anomalies[☆]

Joseph Engelberg^a, R. David McLean^b, Jeffrey Pontiff^{c,*}

^a Rady School of Management, University of California, San Diego, USA

^b McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University, USA

^c Carroll School of Management, Boston College, USA



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 2 February 2018

Received in revised form 7 August 2019

Accepted 14 August 2019

Available online 21 August 2019

JEL classification:

G00

G14

L3

C1

Keywords:

Analysts

Cross-sectional return predictability

Market efficiency

ABSTRACT

Analysts' price targets and recommendations contradict stock return anomaly variables. Using an index based on 125 anomalies, we find that analysts' annual stock return forecasts are 11% higher for anomaly-shorts than for anomaly-longs. Anomaly-shorts' return forecasts are excessively optimistic, exceeding realized returns by 34%. Recommendations also tend to be more favorable for anomaly-shorts, although this result varies across anomaly types. Consistent with analysts' slowly incorporating anomaly information, anomalies forecast revisions in both price targets and recommendations. Our findings imply that investors who follow analysts' actionable information contribute to mispricing.

© 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Financial firms spend more than \$4 billion annually on sell-side analyst research.¹ The information produced includes earnings and revenue forecasts, buy and sell recommendations, and future stock price targets. Revenue and earnings forecasts communicate a firm's financial prospects, and the brunt of academic research on analysts focuses on such financial forecasts (see for example, [Bradshaw, 2011](#); and [Kothari et al., 2016](#)). Unlike financial forecasts, recommendations and price targets provide direct, actionable information to investors. Recommendations, described by [Schipper \(1991\)](#), as the "ultimate analyst judgement" explicitly guide investors to either buy, hold, or sell a stock. Target prices scaled by current market prices provide investors with an estimate of analysts' return forecasts.

At the same time, there is considerable evidence that many cross-sectional variables predict stock returns. This research goes back to at least [Ball and Brown \(1968\)](#) and [Blume and Husic \(1973\)](#) and shows that simple cross-sectional sorts based on

[☆] Engelberg (jengelberg@ucsd.edu) is at UCSD, McLean (dm1448@georgetown.edu) is at Georgetown, and Pontiff (pontiff@bc.edu) is at Boston College. We thank the editors, S.P. Kothari and Robert Holthausen, Charles Lee (the referee), an anonymous referee, Sandro Andrade, Mark Bradshaw, Carina Cuculiza, Thomas Moeller, Eric So, David Yang, and seminar participants at the AFA meetings, Arizona State, Cornell, Drexel, INSEAD, Utah, Case-Western, Bentley, Naval Postgraduate School, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Miami, Villanova, Purdue and conference participants at the Michigan State University Conference on Financial Institutions, UC Riverside's Citrus Finance Conference and the UT Dallas Spring Finance Conference. We thank Jonathan Clarke for sharing the all-star analyst data.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: pontiff@bc.edu (J. Pontiff).

¹ This was during the year 2014, according to the article "Banks Forced to Shake Up Analyst Research Business", Wall Street Journal, February 9, 2015.

easy-to-observe characteristics such as earnings surprises (Foster et al., 1984), sales growth (Lakonishok et al., 1994), share issues (Loughran and Ritter, 1995), and recent past returns (Jegadeesh and Titman, 1993) forecast stock returns.

In this paper, we ask whether price targets and recommendations reflect the information in anomaly variables. McLean and Pontiff (2016) and Engelberg et al. (2018) provide evidence that anomaly return predictability reflects mispricing. Analysts' recommendations and price targets are also purported to convey information about mispricing. Analysts could uncover mispricing either by conducting firm-level security analysis or by conditioning on anomaly variables. In both cases, we would expect analysts' actionables to predict returns in the same direction as anomaly variables.

Our investigation builds on Jegadeesh et al. (2004)—JKKL hereafter—who study 12 anomalies, and find that recommendations reflect momentum-like anomalies, but contradict contrarian-like anomalies. We expand the list of anomalies to 125, documented in accounting, economics, and finance journals over the past 46 years, and consider both analysts' return forecasts and recommendations.

Earlier studies find that price targets and recommendations are distinct from one another. Bradshaw et al. (2014) conclude that price targets are more informative to investors than both earnings forecasts and recommendations. Brav and Lehavy (2003) find that changes in price targets are informative even after controlling for changes in recommendations and earnings forecasts. Hence, an investigation of price targets in addition to recommendations is warranted. We also consider whether anomaly variables predict changes in price targets and recommendations, which has not been examined.

Our findings can be summarized as follows. Anomaly variables predict returns across stocks covered by analysts, however analysts' actionables tend to conflict with anomaly variables. Return forecasts based on the median 12-month price target predict returns in the *opposite direction* as forecasted by anomaly variables. Stocks in the bottom quintile of our comprehensive anomaly index (anomaly-sells) have a mean one-year return forecast of 45%, while stocks in the top quintile (anomaly-buys) have a mean one-year return forecast of 33%. The return forecast error, which is equal to the return forecast minus the realized stock return, averages 34% for the anomaly-shorts and decreases monotonically across the anomaly portfolios, down to 18% for the anomaly-longs. Like earlier studies, we find that return forecasts based on 12-month price targets are biased upwards. We further show that this bias increases monotonically with anomalies and is almost twice as large for anomaly-shorts as compared to anomaly-longs. These findings persist when we focus on *Institutional Investor* "All-Star" analysts, firms with large increases in analyst coverage, and firms that did not embark on investment banking activity in the previous or subsequent year. We also find this effect among firms with recent changes in median price targets, although the relation is about half as large, suggesting that changes in price targets bring prices more in line with anomaly variables.

We then turn to recommendations, which is the focus of JKKL. In our sample of 125 anomalies, we find that stocks for which anomaly signals predict higher returns have less favorable recommendations as compared to stocks for which anomaly signals forecast lower returns. However, the effect is economically small and is observed in regressions, but not in simple portfolio sorts. The mean recommendation in our sample is 3.77, while the standard deviation is 0.67, so the variation in recommendations is small.

We then test whether our findings vary across different anomaly types. We follow JKKL's classification criteria and assign stocks to either *Momentum* or *Contrarian* groups. JKKL argue that analysts have "significant economic incentives to publicly endorse high growth stocks with glamour characteristics" (pg. 1085). These growing firms are more likely to be investment-banking customers. JKKL find that analysts are more likely to recommend momentum-like stocks than contrarian or value-like stocks, even though both groups have higher expected returns.

We assign 33 of our 125 anomalies to *Contrarian* and *Momentum* categories. Like JKKL, we find that recommendations reflect *Momentum* anomalies, but contradict *Contrarian* anomalies. With respect to return forecasts, we find that for both *Contrarian* and *Momentum* anomalies, return forecasts are higher for anomaly-shorts than for anomaly-longs. The differences are large. For *Momentum* anomalies, the return forecast error is 45% for the shorts and 12% for the longs. For *Contrarian* anomalies, the forecast error is 35% for the shorts and 15% for the longs.

When it comes to changes in targets and recommendations, analysts do a better job, but with some delay. Our anomaly index predicts changes in both analysts' price targets and recommendations. Stocks for which the anomaly-index forecasts higher (lower) returns subsequently have increases (decreases) in price targets and recommendations. This effect persists for up to 12 months; i.e., the anomaly index today predicts increases in price targets over the next month and continuing on for the next 12 months. These results are robust across all anomaly groups. Earlier studies show that analysts' revisions for both actionables and earnings are informative, with immediate stock price reactions that are consistent with the revision followed by a drift (e.g., Brav and Lehavy, 2003; Gleason and Lee, 2003; and Jegadeesh et al., 2004). Our findings suggest that some of this effect may be analysts incorporating more anomaly-information. However, our results also show that even after these updates, the levels in targets and recommendations still contradict anomaly variables. Therefore, a good part of the stock price reaction documented in these other studies is likely due to information not reflected in anomalies.

Over time, many anomaly variables have become widely known, and we find that analysts have incorporated more of this information into their price targets, but not their recommendations. However, even during the later years of our sample, we still find a negative relation between the anomaly index and return forecasts. Thus, analysts today are still overlooking a good deal of valuable, anomaly-related information.

To summarize, our paper makes at least four broad contributions to the literature. First, when issuing actionables, analysts fail to incorporate some of the key findings from the anomalies literature and issue actionables that contradict the findings from this literature. This is especially true with stocks that contrarian signals imply should be shorted. Second, the tendency for analysts to contradict anomaly signals is more salient with price targets than recommendations. Third, anomalies predict

changes in both price targets and recommendations. Thus, analysts incorporate some anomaly information, but with delay. Fourth, analysts seem to improve with respect to anomaly signals over time. However, even at the end of our sample period, they still issue actionables that contradict anomalies, albeit not as strongly as before.

Our paper is related to a literature that studies how sophisticated investors use anomaly strategies. Drake et al. (2011) study the same anomalies as JKKL. Drake et al. find that short-sellers agree with analyst recommendations and short momentum-sells, but ignore analysts and profit by shorting glamour (contrarian) stocks, despite the fact that these stocks have favorable analyst recommendations. McLean and Pontiff (2016) use a sample of 97 anomalies and find that short sellers tend to target stocks in anomaly-short portfolios, and further show that this effect increases after an anomaly has been highlighted in an academic publication. Lewellen (2011) finds that institutional investors fail to take advantage of anomalies when forming their portfolios. Edelen et al. (2016) suggest that institutions contribute to anomalies. They find that in the year prior to portfolio formation, institutional demand is typically on the wrong side of anomaly portfolios. Calluzzo et al. (2019) find that institutions, especially hedge funds, follow anomaly strategies, but only after an anomaly is highlighted in an academic publication.

Our paper is also related to a literature that asks whether analyst information is useful in predicting stock returns. Papers linking analyst-actionable information to stock returns include Cowles (1993), Elton, Gruber, and Grossman (1986), Stickel (1995), Womack (1996), Barber et al. (2001), Brav and Lehavy (2003), Asquith, Mikhail, and Au (2005), Jegadeesh et al. (2004), Da and Schaumburg (2011) and Bradshaw et al. (2014). This literature generally finds that *changes* in analyst actionables, but not levels, are informative because they predict returns in the direction intended by the analyst. Our paper shows that changes in actionables are forecasted by anomaly variables and thus reflect the information embedded in anomaly variables.

1. Sample, data, and descriptive statistics

1.1. Sample

Our analyst data are obtained from IBES. Our anomaly variables use data from CRSP, Compustat, and the Insiders and 13F databases from Thompson Reuters. We exclude stocks with prices less than \$1 and stocks that do not have CRSP stock price data.² The IBES price target data begin in 1999 and end in 2017, while recommendations data begin in 1994 and end in 2017. Our return forecast sample consists of 670,168 firm-month observations, while the recommendation sample consists of 929,862 observations.

1.2. Analyst variables

We estimate the median 12-month price target using the IBES Details database. For each firm-month observation, we build a price target sample that includes the most recent 12-month price target issued by each analyst during the last 12 months. The median value from this sample is our 12-month price target estimate. We exclude 9 observations with a median price target of zero. This procedure produces median price targets that closely match the medians provided in the IBES Summary database.

With respect to measuring the median price target, it is unclear whether a long or short look-back horizon is optimal. On the one hand, analysts may not update their price targets because they believe the current target price is meaningful. On the other hand, inertia may cause stale price targets to be less accurate. According to Brav and Lehavy (2003), the median time to update a price target is 59 days, so inertia is typically not an issue, and it seems to us that updating is relatively easy if the situation warrants. For robustness, we estimate median price targets using targets issued either over the last quarter or the last month. We obtain similar results with these shorter horizons, so we only report results with the 12-month horizon, which offers a larger sample of targets. Moreover, the magnitude of our findings is too large to be explained by stale prices over horizons of a month or two.

We estimate the 12-month return forecast by scaling the median 12-month price target by the current stock price and subtracting 1 from this ratio. We drop return forecasts that are more than 5 standard deviations above the mean, and then winsorize at the 1st and 99th percentiles. Our mean return forecast is 37%, while the standard deviation is 0.58. Similarly, Bradshaw (2004) reports a mean return forecast of 38%, while Brav and Lehavy (2003) report a mean return forecast of 33%. Table 1 further shows that, among firms that have price targets, the average number of targets issued is 7.13. Fifteen percent of firms with price targets have only a single analyst issuing a target.

Like JKKL, we estimate the mean recommendation by including the most recent recommendation from each analyst within the last 12 months. Recommendations can take on one of five values: strong sell, sell, hold, buy, and strong buy. We assign numerical values ranging from 1 (strong sell) to 5 (strong buy).

Table 1 shows that the mean recommendation value is 3.77, while the standard deviation is 0.67. It is well known that analyst recommendations are biased towards buy and strong buy. Similar to us, JKKL report a mean recommendation of 3.67. The average firm with a recommendation has 5.25 analysts issuing recommendations, and 20% of firms with recommendations have only a single analyst issuing a recommendation.

² In a previous version of the paper we also excluded stocks with prices less than \$5. Excluding such stocks lowers the mean of the return forecast variable considerably, because analysts forecast particularly large returns for extremely low-priced stocks. Our main results hold both with this price filter.

Table 1
Summary Statistics.

This table reports summary statistics for the main variables used in this study. Forecasted Return is the 12-month return forecast based on the median 12-month price forecast. We take the median based on forecasts issued over the last 12 months, using only the most recent forecast for each analyst. Number of Targets is the number of analysts providing a price target. Std. Dev. Target is the standard deviation of the price targets scaled by the median price target. Std. Dev. Target is equal to 0 for firms with only 1 price target. Single Target is a dummy equal to 1 if the firm only has a single analyst issuing a target, and 0 if there are multiple analysts issuing targets. Target Change is the monthly percentage change in price target, multiplied by 100. Mean Rec. is the mean analyst recommendation. We construct the Mean Recommendation variable such that 5 reflects a strong buy and 1 reflects a strong sell. Rec. Change is the monthly percentage change in the mean recommendation, multiplied by 100. Num. Recommendations is the number of analysts offering recommendations. Std. Dev. Recs. is the standard deviation of the analysts' recommendations. Std. Dev. Recs. is equal to 0 for firms with only 1 recommendation. *Net* is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios (based on quintiles) that a stock is in for month t . We use 125 anomalies, which builds on the 97 anomaly-sample in [McLean and Pontiff \(2016\)](#) and [Engelberg et al. \(2018\)](#). We classify 33 of our anomalies as either *Momentum* (10 anomalies) or *Contrarian* (23 anomalies). These categories are based on JKKL. Our recommendation data begin in 1994 and our price target data begin in 1999. Both datasets end in 2017.

Variable	Observations	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Forecasted Return	670,168	0.37	0.58	-0.59	5.71
Number of Targets	673,219	7.13	6.61	1.00	59.00
Std. Dev. Target	673,210	0.16	0.18	0.00	2.19
Single Target	673,219	0.15	0.36	0.00	1.00
Target Change (%)	663,499	0.11	8.62	-60.00	89.29
Mean Recommendation	929,862	3.77	0.67	1	5
Num. Recommendations	929,862	5.25	4.75	1	54
Std. Dev. Rec.	929,862	0.59	0.45	0	2.83
Single Rec.	929,862	0.20	0.40	0	1
Rec. Change (%)	913,778	-0.05	5.92	-31.25	50
Net	971,242	-2.13	8.90	-51	39
Momentum	971,242	0.10	2.17	-9	9
Contrarian	971,242	-1.00	4.08	-20	16

1.3. Anomaly variables

Our sample of anomalies contains 125 different variables that have been shown to predict the cross-section of stock returns. The anomalies are drawn from studies published in peer-reviewed finance, accounting, and economics journals. We do not include anomalies that are based on analysts. The 125 anomalies include 91 of the 97 anomalies that are studied in [McLean and Pontiff \(2016\)](#) and [Engelberg et al. \(2018\)](#). We exclude 6 of the anomalies that are related to analyst information. The 125 anomalies used in this study are described in the paper's online appendix.³

To create the anomaly variables, stocks are sorted each month on each of the anomaly characteristics. We define the long and short side of each anomaly strategy as the extreme quintiles produced by the sorts. Some of our anomalies are indicator variables (e.g., credit rating downgrades). For these anomalies there is only a long or short side based on the binary value of the indicator. We remake the anomaly portfolios each month. We begin our anomaly variables in 1994, the first year for which we have recommendation data.

Like [Engelberg et al. \(2018\)](#), we create an anomaly index *Net*; it is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios that a stock belongs to in a given month. As an example, a *Net* value of 10 in month t means that a stock belongs to 10 more anomaly-long portfolios than anomaly-short portfolios in month t . [Table 1](#) shows that, among stocks in our sample *Net* has a mean value of -2.13, and minimum and maximum values of -51 and 39 respectively.

We construct two groups based on JKKL: *Momentum* and *Contrarian*. JKKL place 11 of their 12 anomalies into these two groups. Closely following their criteria, we place 33 of our 125 anomalies into the two groups. We have 10 *Momentum* anomalies and 23 *Contrarian* anomalies. *Momentum* anomalies are variables that predict returns in a direction that is consistent with the market underestimating the continuation of a trend. *Momentum* anomalies include past 6-month returns, past returns from month $t-7$ to $t-12$, industry momentum, and momentum conditional on trading volume. *Contrarian* anomalies include ratios of fundamentals to market prices, and variables that assume investors will naively extrapolate a trend. *Contrarian* anomalies include price-to-book, price-to-earnings, accruals, and long-term reversal. We provide a complete list of both anomaly groups in the paper's online appendix.

2. Univariate tests: Do analysts' actionables agree with anomaly variables?

In this section of the paper, we present our main findings. [Table 2](#) presents results based on monthly sorts of the anomaly variable *Net*, and anomaly variables based on *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies. With respect to *Net*, [Table 2](#) shows that *Net* longs have annual returns of 16% and shorts have returns of 9%. The returns increase monotonically from shorts to longs.

[Table 2](#) shows that return forecasts contradict *Net*. Return forecasts are 45% for the shorts and 33% for the longs. Moreover, the forecasts decline monotonically from the short to long quintiles, so the return forecast pattern across the *Net* quintiles is

³ The six excluded variables are: Analyst Value ([Frankel and Lee, 1998](#)); Change in Recommendation JKKL; Forecast Dispersion ([Diether et al., 2002](#)); Increase in Forecast ([Barber et al., 2001](#)); Decrease in Forecast ([Barber et al., 2001](#)); Change in Recommendation + Accrual ([Barth and Hutton, 2004](#)).

Table 2
Return Forecasts and Recommendations Across Anomaly Quintiles.

In this table, we sort firms on our anomaly variables into quintiles each month. We then report averages for each quintile of the following variables: annual returns, 12-month return forecast, the return forecast error (the return forecast minus the annual realized return), and recommendations. The 12-month return forecast is based on the median 12-month price target. The anomaly variable *Net* is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios that a stock is in for month *t*. We use 125 different anomalies. We sort on anomaly variables that are limited to specific anomaly types. We classify 33 of our anomalies as either *Momentum* (10 anomalies) or *Contrarian* (23 anomalies). These definitions follow JKKL. Standard errors are computed using the method of Newey and West (1987) with 12 lags. Our recommendation and anomaly data begin in 1994, while our price target data begin in 1999.

Anomaly Quintile	All Anomalies (Net)				Momentum Anomalies			Contrarian Anomalies		
	Annual Return	Return Forecast	Return Forecast Error	Rec.	Return Forecast	Return Forecast Error	Rec.	Return Forecast	Return Forecast Error	Rec.
1 (Short)	0.091	0.447	0.340	3.738	0.627	0.450	3.587	0.457	0.353	3.798
2	0.115	0.371	0.251	3.738	0.350	0.232	3.759	0.393	0.269	3.775
3	0.126	0.346	0.216	3.748	0.279	0.165	3.799	0.341	0.211	3.757
4	0.140	0.330	0.190	3.749	0.247	0.143	3.829	0.305	0.172	3.694
5 (Long)	0.161	0.333	0.184	3.751	0.211	0.120	3.885	0.309	0.152	3.669
L-S	0.070	-0.114	-0.156	-0.013	-0.416	-0.330	0.298	-0.149	-0.197	-0.129
t-stat.	(3.40)	(3.01)	(2.76)	(0.76)	(5.40)	(4.51)	(12.39)	(4.21)	(3.62)	(7.58)

the mirror *opposite* of the realized return pattern of the anomaly portfolios. The forecast error, which is the return forecast minus the realized return, is 34% for the shorts and 18% for the longs. Like earlier studies, we find that return forecasts are too high, however we show that this effect increases monotonically with anomaly variables. These results are also displayed in Fig. 1.

In Table 2 the average recommendation for the longs is 3.75, and for the shorts it is 3.74, and the difference, 0.01, is neither statistically significant nor economically meaningful. As we mention above, longs have higher realized returns than shorts, so analysts are making a mistake by giving the two groups similar recommendations. This effect is also displayed in Fig. 2.

The next set of columns in Table 2 reports results for the *Momentum* anomaly group. Both the return forecasts and forecast errors are largest for the shorts, smallest for the longs, and decline monotonically from the short to long quintiles. The return forecast for the shorts is an incredible 63%, while the forecast for the longs is 21%. The difference is statistically significant. Similarly, the forecast error is 45% for the shorts and 12% for the longs. As with *Net*, we see that analysts' optimism is greatest with the Momentum-shorts.

Like JKKL, we find that recommendations are consistent with *Momentum* anomalies. The average recommendation is 3.89 for the longs and 3.59 for the shorts. The difference, 0.30, is statistically significant and economically meaningful. The difference shows that recommendations are on average 8.4% higher for the longs as compared to the shorts. It is puzzling that recommendations are positively correlated with anomaly forecasts, whereas price targets are negatively correlated. It seems as if analysts fail to be internally consistent with their advice.

In the last columns of Table 2, we see that *Contrarian* anomalies contradict anomaly variables with both return forecasts and recommendations. Return forecasts average 46% for the shorts and 31% for the longs. The return forecast error averages 35% for the shorts and 15% for the longs. Both the forecast and the forecast error decrease monotonically across the anomaly




Fig. 1. Stock Returns, Return Forecasts, and Return Forecast Errors Across Anomaly Quintiles. In this figure, we report the results from monthly portfolio sorts based on the comprehensive anomaly variable, *Net*. We report average values, within each *Net* quintile of the 1-year return forecast, the annual stock return, and the return forecast error (equal to the return forecast minus the annual stock return). The 1-year return forecast is based on the median 12-month price target. Our anomaly data begin in 1994, while our price target data begin in 1999. Both datasets end in 2017.




Fig. 2. Stock Returns and Recommendations Across Anomaly Quintiles. In this figure, we report the results from monthly portfolio sorts based on the comprehensive anomaly variable, *Net*. We report average values, within each *Net* quintile, for the buy/sell recommendation (left vertical axis) and the annual stock return (right vertical axis). Our recommendation and anomaly data begin in 1994. Both datasets end in 2017.

quintiles from the shorts to the longs. Recommendations average 3.80 for the shorts, 3.67 for the longs, and decrease monotonically from shorts to longs. The difference, -0.13 , is statistically significant. Analysts therefore get both price targets and recommendations wrong with respect to *Contrarian* anomalies, just as they do for anomalies overall.

3. Regression evidence

Table 3 reports regression evidence of whether analyst return forecasts and recommendations incorporate the information in anomaly variables. We report results using *Net*, the *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies, and 4 different subsamples, which we describe below.

3.1. Subsamples

3.1.1. Changes in median price target or mean recommendation

Our return forecast is based on the median price target, which is computed using the most recent price target issued by each analyst over the last 12 months. As we mentioned earlier, analysts, on average, update their price targets every two months, and we have experimented with return forecasts that only use targets issued over the last month or quarter and obtained similar findings. For robustness, we report results where we only use firms that had a change in the median price target over the last month (Table 3, Panel A, column 2). This excludes 59% of the sample. The remaining sample reflects firms with a good deal of recent analyst price target activity. We conduct the same exercise for recommendations, excluding firms that did not have a change in mean recommendation over the past month. This eliminates 60% of the sample (Table 3, Panel B, column 2).

3.1.2. Coverage increases

Lee and So (2017) argue that analysts are constrained and so the decision to initiate coverage on a stock is associated with an increase in resources devoted to analyzing the firm. We therefore might expect analysts' actionables to be more informative if there is a large increase in coverage. We report results for subsamples consisting only of firms that are at or above the 90th percentile for the percentage change in the number of analysts issuing price targets (Panel A) or recommendations (Panel B).

3.1.3. All-Star analysts

Perhaps highly acclaimed analysts do a better job utilizing information from anomaly variables. Clarke et al. (2007) argue that analysts designated by *Institutional Investor* magazine to be "All-Stars" might be more adept than typical analysts. In regression 4, we limit the sample to price targets issued by these analysts. An All-Star analyst is defined as an analyst who was denoted by the magazine as being an All-Star or a runner-up in any prior issue of the magazine.

Table 3
Return Forecasts, Recommendations, and Anomaly Variables: Regression Evidence.

This table reports the results from a regression of return forecasts (Panel A) and recommendations (Panel B) on anomaly variables and controls. *Net* is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios that a stock is in for month *t*. We use 125 different anomalies to create *Net*. In Panel A we include the number of analysts forecasting price targets, whether the firm only has one analyst forecasting its price target, and the standard deviation of price targets scaled by the median price target as control variables. In Panel B, we include the number of analysts making recommendations, whether the firm only has a single analyst making a recommendation, and the standard deviation of the recommendations as control variables. The regressions have time-fixed effects and the standard errors are clustered on firm and time. *, **, and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level. The regressions are estimated in different samples. Regression 1 is the full sample. Regression 2 only includes observations that had a change in the median target (Panel A) or mean recommendation (Panel B). Regression 3 only includes observations which are in the top decile for percentage increase in the number of analysts issuing price targets (Panel A) and recommendations (Panel B). In regression 4, we limit the sample to forecasts and recommendations issued by All-Star analysts. In regression 5, we limit the sample to observations that, during the previous year and over the subsequent year, did *not* do any of the following: (i) end up in the top quintile for net external finance; (ii) acquire another firm; (iii) spin off a firm; i.e. these are firms that did *not* engage in significant banking business in the previous or subsequent year. Regressions 6 and 7 use *Net* variables created with *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies only.

Panel A: Return Forecasts							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Full Sample	Median Target Change	Coverage Increase	All-Star Analysts	No Investment Banking	Momentum Anomalies Only	Contrarian Anomalies Only
Net	-0.008 (14.05)***	-0.006 (12.35)***	-0.010 (11.66)***	-0.007 (9.64)***	-0.009 (13.79)***	-0.057 (16.89)***	-0.017 (16.74)***
No. of Targets	-0.015 (21.27)***	-0.010 (19.53)***	-0.023 (15.51)***	-0.005 (5.12)***	-0.018 (20.85)***	-0.011 (21.33)***	-0.014 (21.96)***
Single Target	0.278 (22.18)***	0.228 (17.78)***		0.360 (7.84)***	0.283 (20.99)***	0.216 (20.82)***	0.278 (22.37)***
Std. Dev. Target	0.778 (21.45)***	0.684 (16.97)***	0.995 (17.23)***	0.989 (10.92)***	0.820 (22.44)***	0.615 (19.22)***	0.775 (21.03)***
Observations	670,168	274,932	65,658	195,452	462,882	670,168	670,168
Panel B: Recommendations							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Full Sample	Mean Rec. Change	Coverage Increase	All-Star Analysts	No Investment Banking	Momentum Anomalies Only	Contrarian Anomalies Only
Net	-0.001 (3.88)***	-0.002 (4.92)***	-0.001 (2.73)***	-0.003 (5.42)***	-0.001 (2.43)**	0.054 (37.35)***	-0.015 (21.20)***
No. of Recs	-0.011 (15.31)***	-0.008 (12.54)***	-0.010 (7.50)***	0.004 (3.13)***	-0.011 (13.18)***	-0.011 (14.66)***	-0.013 (17.99)***
Single Rec	-0.056 (4.03)***	-0.115 (7.14)***		-0.185 (5.99)***	-0.098 (6.67)***	-0.052 (3.82)***	-0.042 (3.06)***
Std. Dev. Rec	-0.090 (7.75)***	-0.121 (10.70)***	-0.131 (8.12)***	-0.183 (9.94)***	-0.111 (8.64)***	-0.090 (7.90)***	-0.091 (7.89)***
Observations	929,862	368,693	124,056	271,319	651,011	929,862	929,862

3.1.4. Investment banking activity

It could be the case that analysts a disincentive to provide accurate actionables when they anticipate potential investment banking business. [Lin and McNichols \(1998\)](#) find that analysts that are affiliated with a firm's investment bank make more positive recommendations. Therefore, we use the subsample of firms which, in both the previous and the subsequent year, did not do any of the following: (i) make it into the top quintile for use of external finance (according to the measure of [Bradshaw et al., 2006](#)); (ii) acquire another firm; or (iii) spin off a firm.

3.2. Regression results for return forecasts and recommendations

In this section we report regression results for return forecasts and recommendations. Panel A of [Table 3](#) reports the return forecast results. The regressions include time fixed effects, the number of analysts offering targets, whether there is only a single price target, and the standard deviation of the price targets scaled by the median price target. Standard errors are clustered on both firm and time. The results in Panel A of [Table 3](#) mirror the univariate findings in [Table 2](#).

In the first column, the *Net* coefficient is -0.008 and statistically significant, so a stock with a *Net* value of -10 has an estimated return forecast 16% higher than a stock with a *Net* value of 10. If price targets reflected the information in anomaly variables, then the *Net* coefficient would be positive.

Looking across the columns in Panel A, we see that analysts' return forecasts are in the wrong direction for all four of the subcategories that we describe above, as well as for *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies. The subcategories are not mutually exclusive, i.e., a firm can be in more than one subcategory at a point in time. For all cases, the coefficient for the anomaly variables is negative and statistically significant. This shows that analysts' return forecasts contradict anomalies even when

there is a recent change in the median price target, a large increase in the number of analysts covering the firm, weaker potential banking conflicts, or when All-Star analysts' make the return forecasts.

With respect to the control variables, return forecasts are lower for stocks with fewer analysts issuing price targets, but higher for stocks with only a single analyst offering a target. The price target standard deviation coefficient is positive and significant, showing that return forecasts are higher for stocks with greater variance in price targets.

Panel B reports the results for mean recommendations. Similar to Panel A, the regressions include time fixed effects, the number of analysts issuing recommendations, whether there is only a single recommendation, and the standard deviation of the recommendations. Standard errors are clustered on both firm and time. In the first column, the *Net* coefficient is -0.001 and statistically significant. Thus, a stock with a *Net* value of -10 has a mean recommendation that is higher by 0.020 than a stock with a *Net* value of 10 . The mean recommendation is 3.77 , so this difference is not large economically, however it is in the wrong direction and statistically significant. This further confirms the idea that analysts do not incorporate the information reflected in anomalies when issuing actionables.

The recommendations are in the wrong direction across all of the groups, with the exception of *Momentum* anomalies, which is consistent with what we report in Table 2 and JKKL. The coefficients for the number of recommendations, the standard deviation of the recommendations, and whether there is only a single analyst offering a recommendation are all negative and statistically significant (except for number of recommendations in the All-Star regression). Hence, firms with more analyst coverage, more dispersion in recommendations, and those that only have a single analyst offering a recommendation tend to have less favorable recommendations.

For both panels of Table 3, previous versions of this paper included analyst-forecasted-earnings-to-price ratio, i.e., the forecasted earnings for the subsequent year scaled by current price, as a control variable. It is known that anomalies are related to biases in earnings forecasts (see Engelberg et al., 2018). These specifications generated similar slope coefficients on *Net* as Table 3. Thus, errors in analysts' earnings forecasts do not drive our results.

3.3. Return forecast error

In Table 4, we estimate regressions using the same seven specifications as in Panel A of Table 3, only here we use the return forecast error as the dependent variable. Table 4 includes the same control variables as Table 3, Panel A. In addition, we also include the mean recommendation and change in recommendation.

The portfolio sorts reported in Table 2 show that return forecast errors are significantly higher for shorts than longs, and decrease monotonically across anomaly quintiles from shorts to longs. The results in Table 4 confirm this, as *Net* has a negative relation with return forecasts in all seven specifications.

In regression 1, the *Net* slope coefficient is -0.008 (t -statistic = 12.06) and economically large. For example, a firm with a *Net* value of 10 has a forecast error that is 16% lower than a firm with a *Net* value of -10 . Like Table 3, we see that analysts issue extremely high price targets for anomaly shorts.

The results reported across the next six columns are largely the same. Stocks with negative values of *Net* have significantly higher return forecast errors. The smallest (in absolute value) *Net* coefficient is -0.007 in regression 2, which is for the sample of firms that recently had changes in the median price target. Yet even here, the difference in return forecast between firms with *Net* values of 10 and -10 is 14% . The final two columns show that the forecast error result is robust with both the *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies, consistent with the results in Table 2.

The results also show that return forecast errors are higher for stocks with higher mean recommendations and for stocks with increases in mean recommendations over the last year. This means that price targets are typically too high for stocks with more favorable recommendations. This makes sense and suggests that analyst optimism drives both actionables. The results show that price targets are too high for firms with only one analyst issuing a target and for firms that have more disagreement among the analysts that follow it. The number of analysts issuing price targets is associated with lower forecast errors.

3.4. Can anomalies predict changes in price targets and recommendations?

In the previous sections, we show that analysts tend to be at odds with the information in anomaly variables. Anomalies predict stock returns, so one could argue that it is a mistake for analysts to overlook or be in disagreement with anomaly variables. In this section of the paper, we ask whether anomaly variables predict changes in analyst price targets and recommendations. If this occurs, analysts overlook the information captured in anomalies, but then subsequently and predictably update.

We use *Net* to predict monthly changes in price targets in Table 5 and monthly changes in recommendations in Table 6. In both cases, we use the percentage change and multiply this number by 100 for readability. Summary statistics for these variables are reported in Table 1. We include the same control variables as Table 3, along with the median price target (Table 5) and mean recommendation (Table 6). *Net* is lagged at 1, 3, 6, 12, and 18 months to forecast the changes. Like the previous tables, our standard errors are clustered on firm and time and we include time fixed effects. We also experimented with including lagged values of changes in targets and recommendations, and our results did not change.

The dependent variable in Panel A of Table 5 is the change in price target ($\text{price target}_{t+1}/\text{price target}_{t-1}$) multiplied by 100. In the first regression, *Net* is lagged one month. The coefficient for *Net* is 0.062 and is statistically significant. This means

Table 4
Return Forecast Error and Stock Return Anomalies.

The dependent variable in these regressions is the analysts' return forecast error, which is the return forecast over the next 12 months minus the realized return over the same period. The forecast error is regressed on lagged variables that are measured at time t . Net is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios that a stock is in. We use 125 different anomalies. We include the number of analysts issuing price targets, whether the firm only has a single analyst issuing a target, the standard deviation of the price targets, the mean recommendation, and the change in mean recommendation as control variables. The regressions have time-fixed effects and standard errors are clustered on time and firm. *, **, and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level. The regressions are estimated for different subsamples. Regression 1 is the full sample. Regression 2 only includes observations that had a change in their median price target. Regression 3 only includes observations which are in the top decile for percentage increase in the number of analysts issuing price targets. In regression 4, we limit the sample to forecasts and recommendations issued by All-Star analysts. In regression 5, we limit the sample to observations that, during the previous year and over the subsequent year, did *not* do any of the following: (i) end up in the top quintile for net external finance; (ii) acquire another firm; (iii) spin off a firm; i.e. these are firms that did *not* engage in significant banking business in the previous or subsequent year. Regressions 6 and 7 use Net variables created with *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies only.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Full Sample	Median Target Change	Coverage Increase	All-Star Analysts	No Investment Banking	Momentum Anomalies Only	Contrarian Anomalies Only
Net	-0.008 (12.06)***	-0.007 (10.72)***	-0.013 (10.98)***	-0.008 (9.12)***	-0.009 (11.66)***	-0.051 (15.86)***	-0.017 (12.02)***
Mean Rec.	0.180 (24.73)***	0.189 (24.20)***	0.193 (14.78)***	0.179 (10.69)***	0.192 (23.06)***	0.207 (26.00)***	0.171 (24.26)***
Change in Rec.	0.004 (17.47)***	0.006 (20.55)***	0.005 (7.90)***	0.004 (8.41)***	0.005 (15.95)***	0.005 (19.42)***	0.004 (16.39)***
No. of Targets	-0.011 (16.29)***	-0.007 (12.22)***	-0.015 (7.81)***	-0.002 (2.19)*	-0.013 (16.65)***	-0.007 (13.46)***	-0.010 (15.48)***
Single Target	0.216 (11.62)***	0.171 (7.96)***		0.261 (4.30)***	0.225 (11.34)***	0.165 (9.77)***	0.213 (11.64)***
Std. Dev. Target	0.729 (10.02)***	0.632 (7.47)***	1.099 (14.46)***	0.823 (6.07)***	0.787 (11.31)***	0.609 (8.66)***	0.723 (9.93)***
Observations	541,320	233,021	57,426	181,609	394,603	541,320	541,320

that if a firm has a Net value of 10, its median price target is estimated to increase by 0.62% in the next month. Regressions 2–5 repeat these tests using Net lagged from 3, 6, 12, and 18 months. The coefficients are all positive and statistically significant up to 12 months. Even after 12 months, analysts are still incorporating the public information that is reflected in anomaly variables. The coefficient for Net lagged 12 months is 0.012. This means if at $t-12$ a firm had a Net value of 10, then its median price target is expected to increase by 0.12% in month $t+1$. The coefficients monotonically decrease as the number of lags increase, which suggests that analysts are slowly incorporating the public information reflected in the anomalies. With respect to the control variables, we see that price targets tend to subsequently increase when the initial price target is higher, and decrease when there is a single target and when the standard deviation of targets is greater.

Panel B reports the results across the various subsamples. In all specifications, the anomaly variable is lagged by one month, and in all specifications the anomaly variable predicts increases in the price target. The coefficient is smallest for the All-Star analysts, and largest for the *Momentum* anomalies, although Table 1 shows that the *Momentum* variable also has the lowest standard deviation. The coefficient is 0.503, so a one standard deviation increase in the *Momentum* anomaly index yields an increase in the median price target of 1.09%.

Table 6 reports the results for monthly changes in mean recommendations ($recommendation_{t+1}/recommendation_t - 1$) multiplied by 100. Panel A reports the results for Net and various lags. Like the results with price targets, the Net coefficient is positive and significant across all specifications, except for the 18-month lag, where Net is positive and insignificant. In regression 1, the Net coefficient is 0.012. Net has a standard deviation of 8.90, so a one standard deviation increase in Net leads to a 1.07% increase in recommendation. As in Table 5, the Net coefficient decays as the lags increase, but is significant for up to one year.

In Panel B, we explore the effects across the various subgroups, using the Net variables lagged one month. The effects are positive and significant across all groups, with the exception of *Contrarian* anomalies, which have a negative and insignificant coefficient. As with price targets, the largest coefficient is for the *Momentum* anomalies. A one standard deviation increase in the *Momentum* anomaly index yields a change in recommendation of 0.29%. Tables 2 and 3 show that recommendations reflect *Momentum* anomalies, i.e., they are higher for the longs than the shorts. Here we learn that analysts still update in the direction of *Momentum* anomalies and therefore overlook some of the information reflected in these variables.

3.5. Analysts and anomalies over time

In this section of the paper, we ask whether analysts' price targets and recommendations have improved over time with respect to anomalies. We estimate these effects via the same regression framework used in Table 3, only we interact the

Table 5
Can Anomalies Predict Changes in Analysts' Price Targets?

In this table, the dependent variable is the monthly percentage change in price target ($\text{price target}_{t+1}/\text{price target}_t - 1$) multiplied by 100. It is regressed on lagged values of *Net*. We use lags of 1, 3, 6, 12, and 18 months. Net_t is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios that a stock is in t months ago. We use 125 different anomalies. We include the median price target, the number of analysts forecasting price targets, whether the firm only has one analyst forecasting its price target, and the standard deviation of price targets as control variables. The regressions have time fixed effects and standard errors are clustered on firm and time. *, **, and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level. In Panel B, regression 1 is the full sample. Regression 2 is the subsample that had a change in the median target. Regression 3 only includes observations which are in the top decile for percentage increase in the number of analysts issuing price targets. In regression 4, we limit the sample to forecasts and recommendations issued by All-Star analysts. In regression 5, we limit the sample to observations that, during the previous year and over the subsequent year, did *not* do any of the following: (i) end up in the top quintile for net external finance; (ii) acquire another firm; (iii) spin off a firm; i.e. these are firms that did *not* engage in significant banking business in the previous or subsequent year. Regressions 6 and 7 use *Net* variables created with *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies only.

Panel A: <i>Net</i> at various Lags					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Median Target	0.000 (25.30)***	0.000 (19.92)***	0.000 (16.87)***	0.000 (6.45)***	0.000 (2.90)***
Number of Targets	0.005 (1.02)	0.001 (0.28)	-0.004 (0.85)	-0.013 (2.76)***	-0.018 (3.68)***
Single Target	-0.418 (6.07)***	-0.394 (5.70)***	-0.372 (5.36)***	-0.322 (4.55)***	-0.290 (4.01)***
Std. Dev. Target	-2.799 (6.83)***	-2.893 (6.99)***	-3.049 (7.31)***	-3.151 (7.40)***	-2.987 (6.88)***
Net_1	0.062 (16.97)***				
Net_3		0.051 (14.67)***			
Net_6			0.035 (11.14)***		
Net_12				0.012 (4.35)***	
Net_18					0.004 (1.33)
Observations	660,817	655,572	646,659	628,335	610,382

Panel B: Predicting Price Target Changes with Different Specifications							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Full Sample	Median Target Change	Coverage Increase	All-Star Analysts	No Investment Banking	Momentum Anomalies Only	Contrarian Anomalies Only
Net_1	0.062 (16.97)***	0.116 (17.39)***	0.086 (12.13)***	0.051 (11.20)***	0.066 (16.34)***	0.503 (24.69)***	0.065 (8.36)***
Median Target	0.000 (25.30)***	-0.000 (4.23)***	0.000 (3.84)***	0.000 (12.93)***	0.000 (23.87)***	-0.000 (1.14)	0.000 (5.62)***
No. of Targets	0.005 (1.02)	-0.137 (17.61)***	-0.022 (1.32)	-0.009 (1.64)	0.008 (1.54)	-0.021 (4.55)***	-0.010 (2.13)*
Single Target	-0.418 (6.07)***	4.427 (14.59)***	-0.922 (4.77)***	-0.428 (4.77)***	0.107 (6.00)***	-0.364 (1.61)	-0.364 (5.22)***
Std. Dev. Target	-2.799 (6.83)***	-0.156 (0.22)	-3.166 (7.40)***	-2.558 (4.77)***	-2.936 (7.53)***	-1.355 (3.31)***	-3.010 (7.31)***
Observations	660,817	253,223	65,172	190,619	493,481	660,817	660,817

anomaly variables with *Time*, which is equal to 1/100 during the first month of our sample, and increases by 1/100 each month. The regressions include month-fixed effects, so we do not include *Time* in the regressions.

In Table 7, regressions 1–3 report the results for return forecasts, while regressions 4–6 report results for recommendations. We report results for the total sample of anomalies and the *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomaly groups.

In regression 1, the interaction between *Time* and *Net* is positive and significant, showing that analysts have improved over time with respect to making expected return forecasts that are not at odds with *Net*. The coefficient for *Net* is -0.012 and the interaction coefficient is 0.002. *Time* ranges from 0.62 to 2.88 in this specification (our recommendation sample starts several years earlier). During the first month of our sample, the overall *Net* coefficient ($\text{Net} + \text{Net} * \text{Time}$) is -0.012 during the first month and -0.006 during the final month, which is closer to neutral, but still negative.

Regressions 2 and 3 show that there are positive time trends for the both the *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies. The coefficients show that the overall *Momentum* index coefficient was -0.119 during the first month and -0.015 during the last

Table 6
Can Anomalies Predict Changes in Recommendations?

In this table, the dependent variable is the monthly change in mean recommendation ($\text{recommendation}_{t+1}/\text{recommendation}_t - 1$) multiplied by 100. It is regressed on lagged values of *Net*. We use lags of 1, 3, 6, 12, and 18 months. *Net* is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios that a stock is in. We use 125 different anomalies. We also conduct regressions with anomaly variables based on specific anomaly types in Panel B. We include the mean recommendation, number of recommendations, whether the firm only has a single analyst making a recommendation, and the standard deviation of the recommendations as control variables. The regressions have time fixed effects and standard errors are clustered on firm. *, **, and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level. Regression 1 is the full sample. Regression 2 only includes observations that had a change in the mean recommendation (Panel B). Regression 3 only includes observations which are in the top decile for percentage increase in the number of analysts issuing recommendations. In regression 4, we limit the sample to forecasts and recommendations issued by All-Star analysts. In regression 5, we limit the sample to observations that, during the previous year and over the subsequent year, did *not* do any of the following: (i) end up in the top quintile for net external finance; (ii) acquire another firm; (iii) spin off a firm; i.e. these are firms that did *not* engage in significant banking business in the previous or subsequent year. Regressions 6 and 7 use *Net* variables created with *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies only.

Panel A: Net at various lags					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Mean Rec.	-1.698 (54.75)***	-1.700 (54.64)***	-1.711 (54.50)***	-1.732 (54.21)***	-1.732 (53.51)***
Number of Recs.	-0.019 (8.30)***	-0.019 (8.23)***	-0.020 (8.66)***	-0.022 (9.23)***	-0.024 (10.14)***
Single Rec.	0.116 (3.90)***	0.125 (4.18)***	0.148 (4.87)***	0.172 (5.46)***	0.183 (5.68)***
Std. Dev. Rec.	-0.217 (7.26)***	-0.210 (6.97)***	-0.205 (6.74)***	-0.193 (6.19)***	-0.164 (5.18)***
Net_1	0.012 (11.67)***				
Net_3		0.010 (10.81)***			
Net_6			0.006 (7.15)***		
Net_12				0.002 (2.26)*	
Net_18					0.000 (0.40)
Observations	913,778	904,662	888,524	854,014	820,826

Panel B: Predicting Recommendation Changes with Different Specifications							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Full Sample	Mean Rec. Changes	Coverage Increase	All-Star Analysts	No Investment Banking	Momentum Anomalies Only	Contrarian Anomalies Only
Net_1	0.012 (11.67)***	0.013 (10.00)***	0.013 (5.97)***	0.007 (3.66)***	0.012 (10.62)***	0.136 (25.87)***	-0.003 (1.34)
Mean Rec.	-1.698 (54.75)***	-1.730 (49.02)***	-1.364 (31.55)***	-0.943 (23.35)***	-1.665 (53.91)***	-1.782 (56.21)***	-1.702 (54.78)***
No. of Recs.	-0.019 (8.30)***	-0.016 (7.11)***	-0.025 (4.89)***	0.002 (0.64)	-0.018 (7.25)***	-0.025 (10.86)***	-0.024 (10.53)***
Single Rec.	0.116 (3.90)***	0.159 (2.30)**		-0.107 (1.30)	0.076 (2.46)*	0.155 (5.12)***	0.148 (4.89)***
Std. Dev. Rec.	-0.217 (7.26)***	-0.182 (3.87)***	-0.238 (4.43)***	0.238 (4.34)***	-0.221 (6.90)***	-0.228 (7.70)***	-0.220 (7.37)***
Observations	913,778	365,619	122,801	260,100	690,858	913,778	913,778

month. The *Contrarian* index coefficient is -0.025 during the first month and -0.011 during the last month. Thus, the improvement over time is ubiquitous with respect to different types of anomalies.

The recommendation results reported in columns 4 to 6 show that in the full sample, recommendations have not become more in line with *Net* over time. In regression 1, the *Net* \times *Time* interaction is positive but insignificant, showing that analysts have not overall improved over time with respect to having recommendations reflect *Net*.

The *Momentum* and *Contrarian* anomalies tell different stories. Analysts have improved over time with *Contrarian* anomalies, but have gotten worse over time with *Momentum* anomalies. The *Momentum* results are different than those reported for price targets, where analysts improve over time.

We can say that, overall, analysts significantly improve over time with price targets but not recommendations, although they do improve with *Contrarian* anomalies and recommendations.

Table 7
Analysts and Anomalies over Time.

This table reports the results from a regression of target-based return forecasts (regressions 1–3) and mean recommendations (regressions 4–6) on *Net*, *Net* interacted with time, and controls. *Net* is the difference between the number of long and short anomaly portfolios that a stock is in for month *t*. We interact *Net* with *Time*, which is equal to 1/100 during the first month of our sample and increases by 1/100 each month. In regressions 1–3, we include the number of analysts forecasting price targets, whether the firm only has one analyst forecasting its price target, and the standard deviation of targets scaled by the median target as control variables. In Panel B, we include the number of analysts making recommendations, whether the firm only has a single analyst making a recommendation, and the standard deviation of the recommendations as control variables. The regressions have time-fixed effects and standard errors are clustered on firm and time. *, **, and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level.

	Return Forecasts			Recommendations		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Net	Momentum	Contrarian	Net	Momentum	Contrarian
Net	-0.012 (6.82)***	-0.119 (9.63)***	-0.025 (7.15)***	-0.002 (3.32)***	0.078 (36.68)***	-0.020 (15.99)***
Time * Net	0.002 (3.02)***	0.036 (6.11)***	0.005 (2.75)***	0.001 (1.29)	-0.018 (14.38)***	0.003 (4.19)***
Num. of Targets or Recs.	-0.014 (21.61)***	-0.012 (21.41)***	-0.014 (22.08)***	-0.011 (15.31)***	-0.011 (14.75)***	-0.013 (18.05)***
Single Target or Rec.	0.279 (21.96)***	0.212 (21.58)***	0.278 (22.26)***	-0.055 (4.02)***	-0.052 (3.81)***	-0.041 (3.02)***
Std. Dev. Targets or Rec.	0.773 (22.07)***	0.604 (20.55)***	0.772 (21.50)***	-0.090 (7.75)***	-0.089 (7.78)***	-0.091 (7.88)***
Observations	670,168	670,168	670,168	929,862	929,862	929,862

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we study several relations between analyst price targets, recommendations, and stock return anomalies. We find that anomaly-shorts have, on average, higher return forecasts, and higher return forecast errors than anomaly-longs. Anomaly-shorts also have more favorable recommendations than anomaly-longs, although there is some variation in the recommendation results across anomaly types. These findings continue to hold when we focus on *Institutional Investor* “All-Star” analysts, firms with large increases in analyst coverage, firms with recent changes in median price targets and mean recommendations, and firms that do not have investment banking activity.

Consistent with the idea that analysts overlook the public information captured by anomalies, anomaly variables predict changes in price targets; anomaly-longs subsequently have increases in price targets whereas anomaly-shorts have decreases. This predictability is robust and significant for lags up to 12 months. We find the same slow adjustment with recommendations of. Yet even with this updating, it is still the case that stocks with recent changes in median targets and mean recommendations have return forecasts and recommendations that contradict anomaly variables.

If investors who pay attention to analysts exert price impact, then our results imply a link between analysts' actions and market efficiency. Specifically, analyst return forecasts may contribute to anomaly mispricing and market inefficiency. Analyst recommendations may also contribute to anomaly mispricing, although they could reduce mispricing in *Momentum* anomalies. That said, we cannot measure the extent to which analysts may impact anomalies, so we do not know whether and to what extent the anomalies would persist if analysts “got it right” (Abarbanell and Bernard (1992); Basu (1977)).

References

- Abarbanell, J., Bernard, V., 1992. Tests of analysts' over-reaction/underreaction to earnings information as an explanation for anomalous stock price behavior. *J. Financ.* 43, 1181–1207.
- Asquith, P., Mikhail, M., Au, A., 2005. Information content of equity analyst reports. *J. Financ. Econ.* 75, 245–282.
- Ball, R., Brown, P., 1968. An empirical evaluation of accounting income numbers. *J. Account. Res.* 6, 159–178.
- Barber, B., Lehavy, R., McNichols, M., Trueman, B., 2001. Can investors profit from the prophets? Consensus analyst recommendations and stock returns. *J. Financ.* 56, 773–806.
- Barth, M., Hutton, A., 2004. Analyst earnings forecast revisions and the pricing of accruals. *Rev. Account. Stud.* 9, 59–96.
- Basu, S., 1977. Investment performance of common stocks in relation to their price-earnings ratios: a test of the efficient markets hypothesis. *J. Financ.* 32, 663–682.
- Blume, M.E., Husic, F., 1973. Price, beta, and exchange listing. *J. Financ.* 28, 283–299.
- Bradshaw, M., 2004. How do analysts use their earnings forecasts in generating stock recommendations? *Account. Rev.* 79, 25–50.
- Bradshaw, M., 2011. Analysts' Forecasts: What do We Know After Decades of Work? Boston College. Unpublished working paper.
- Bradshaw, M., Scott, R., Sloan, R., 2006. The relation between corporate financing activities, analysts' forecasts and stock returns. *J. Account. Econ.* 42, 53–85.
- Bradshaw, M., Huang, A., Tan, H., 2014. Analyst Target Price Optimism Around the World. Boston College. Working Paper.
- Brav, A., Lehavy, R., 2003. An empirical analysis of analysts' target prices: short-term informativeness and long-term dynamics. *J. Financ.* 58, 1933–1967.
- Calluzzo, P., Moneta, F., Topaloglu, S., 2019. When anomalies are publicized broadly, do institutions trade accordingly? *Manag. Sci.*
- Clarke, J., Khorana, A., Patel, A., Rau, R., 2007. The impact of all-star analyst job changes on their coverage choices and investment banking deal flow. *J. Financ. Econ.* 84, 713–737.
- Cowles, A., 1993. Can stock market forecasters forecast? *Econometrica* 1, 309–324.
- Da, Z., Schaumburg, E., 2011. Relative valuation and analyst target price forecasts. *J. Financ. Mark.* 14, 161–192.
- Diether, K., Malloy, C., Scherbina, A., 2002. Differences of opinion and the cross section of stock returns. *J. Financ.* 57, 2113–2141.

- Drake, M.S., Rees, L., Swanson, E.P., 2011. Should investors follow the prophets or the bears? Evidence on the use of public information by analysts and short sellers. *Account. Rev.* 86, 101–130.
- Edelen, R., Ince, O., Kadlec, G., 2016. Institutional investors and stock return anomalies. *J. Financ. Econ.* 119, 472–488.
- Elton, E., Gruber, M., Grossman, S., 1986. Discrete expectational data and portfolio performance. *J. Financ.* 41, 699–713.
- Engelberg, J., McLean, D., Pontiff, J., 2018. Anomalies and news. *J. Financ.* 73, 1971–2001.
- Foster, G., Olsen, C., Shevlin, T., 1984. Earnings releases, anomalies, and the behavior of security returns. *Account. Rev.* 574–603.
- Frankel, R., Lee, C., 1998. Accounting valuation, market expectation, and cross-sectional stock returns. *J. Account. Econ.* 25, 283–319.
- Gleason, C., Lee, C.M.C., 2003. Analyst forecast revisions and market price discovery. *Account. Rev.* 78, 193–225.
- Jegadeesh, N., Titman, S., 1993. Returns to buying winners and selling losers: implications for stock market efficiency. *J. Financ.* 48, 65–91.
- Jegadeesh, N., Kim, J., Krische, S.D., Lee, C.M.C., 2004. Analyzing the analysts: when do recommendations add value? *J. Financ.* 59, 1083–1124.
- Kothari, S.P., So, E., Verdi, R., 2016. Analysts' forecasts and asset pricing: a survey. *Annu. Rev. Financ. Econ.* 8, 197–219.
- Lakonishok, J., Shleifer, A., Vishny, R., 1994. Contrarian investment, extrapolation, and risk. *J. Financ.* 49, 1541–1578.
- Lee, C., So, E., 2017. Uncovering expected returns: information in analyst coverage proxies. *J. Financ. Econ.* 124, 331–348.
- Lewellen, J., 2011. Institutional investors and the limits of arbitrage. *J. Financ. Econ.* 102, 62–80.
- Lin, H.W., McNichols, M.F., 1998. Underwriting relationships, analysts' earnings forecasts and investment recommendations. *J. Account. Econ.* 25, 101–127.
- Loughran, T., Ritter, J., 1995. The new issues puzzle. *J. Financ.* 50, 23–51.
- McLean, R.D., Pontiff, J., 2016. Does academic research destroy stock return predictability? *J. Financ.* 71, 5–32.
- Schipper, K., 1991. Analysts' forecasts. *Account. Horiz.* 5, 105–121.
- Stickel, S.E., 1995. The anatomy of the performance of buy and sell Recommendations. *Financ. Anal. J.* 51, 25–39.
- Womack, K., 1996. Do brokerage analysts' recommendations have investment value? *J. Financ.* 51, 137–167.