International Journal of Management, Accounting & Finance
Volume. 1 No. 3 July 2024
e-ISSN : 3048-1104, dan p-ISSN : 3048-1112, Hal. 27-38
DOI: ---
Available online at: https://jurnal-mnj.stiekasihbangsa.ac.id/index.php/KBIJMAF

The Role of Forecast Dispersion and Accuracy in Explaining Cross-Sectional Return Anomalies

Benardi Benardi[1*], Ngadi Permana,[2] Mohammad Chaidir[3]
[123] Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Kasih Bangsa, Indonesia
*benardi@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id

Address: 8, Jl. Dr. Kasih No. 1, RT. 8/RW. 1, Kb. Jeruk, Kec. Kb. Jeruk, West Jakarta City, Special Capital Region of Jakarta 11530
Author correspondence: benardi@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id

Abstract. *This review aims to investigate the role of forecast dispersion and accuracy in explaining cross-sectional return anomalies in financial markets. By synthesizing recent theoretical and empirical research, the study examines how differences in information precision among investors lead to heterogeneous beliefs, which in turn affect asset prices and returns. The methodology involves a comprehensive literature review to identify key findings and theoretical frameworks that link forecast dispersion to market dynamics. Results indicate that higher forecast dispersion, associated with greater uncertainty and risk, correlates with higher expected returns as compensation. Conversely, accurate forecasts enhance market efficiency by reducing information asymmetry, thereby mitigating anomalies. The study also highlights theoretical models that explain anomalies like returns to skewness and disagreement through the lens of forecast dispersion. Empirical evidence supports these models, demonstrating the significant impact of forecast dynamics on asset pricing anomalies. The review concludes by emphasizing the need for further research to refine models capturing forecast dynamics and exploring the behavioral biases influencing forecast accuracy and dispersion. Understanding these factors is crucial for improving investment strategies, market efficiency, and risk management practices.*

Keywords *Forecast dispersion, forecast accuracy, cross-sectional return anomalies, financial markets, empirical evidence*

1. INTRODUCTION

Financial markets are inherently complex systems characterized by the aggregation of vast amounts of information, which is often dispersed and noisy. The role of forecast dispersion and accuracy in explaining cross-sectional return anomalies has garnered significant attention in recent financial literature, as researchers strive to understand the underpinnings of asset price movements and anomalies (Albagli, Hellwig, & Tsyvinski, 2023). The heterogeneity of information and the subsequent differences in opinions among market participants are crucial factors contributing to these anomalies. This literature review aims to synthesize recent research on how forecast dispersion and accuracy influence cross-sectional return anomalies, with a particular focus on the mechanisms of information aggregation and the resultant market dynamics.

The concept of noisy aggregation of dispersed information is fundamental to understanding financial market anomalies. Albagli, Hellwig, and Tsyvinski (2024) provide a comprehensive framework that characterizes asset returns through a risk-neutral probability measure, which incorporates excess weight on tail risks. This measure links observable moments, such as forecast dispersion and accuracy, to tail risks, offering a unified explanation

Received: July 30, 2024; Revised: July 15, 2024; Accepted: July 29, 2024; Published: July 31, 2024

for various cross-sectional return anomalies. The framework suggests that differences in information precision among investors lead to heterogeneous beliefs, which, in turn, affect asset prices and returns (Albagli, Hellwig, & Tsyvinski, 2024).

Forecast dispersion, the extent to which investors' predictions about future asset prices diverge, has been shown to have significant implications for asset pricing. Studies indicate that higher forecast dispersion is often associated with greater uncertainty and risk, leading to higher expected returns as compensation for this risk (Diether, Malloy, & Scherbina, 2002). This relationship is supported by empirical findings that link forecast dispersion to various return anomalies, including the credit spread puzzle and the skewness effect (Bai, Goldstein, & Yang, 2020; Boyer, Mitton, & Vorkink, 2010). For instance, Güntay and Hackbarth (2010) examine the impact of forecast dispersion on corporate bond credit spreads, finding that greater dispersion leads to wider spreads due to increased uncertainty and the risk premium demanded by investors. Similarly, Conrad, Dittmar, and Ghysels (2013) explore the effect of ex-ante skewness, a related measure of forecast dispersion, on expected stock returns, demonstrating that stocks with higher skewness tend to have higher expected returns.

The accuracy of forecasts also plays a pivotal role in determining market efficiency and the prevalence of return anomalies. Accurate forecasts contribute to more efficient markets by reducing the information asymmetry between informed and uninformed investors (Diamond & Verrecchia, 1981). Conversely, inaccurate forecasts exacerbate information asymmetry and can lead to mispricings and anomalies (Hellwig, 1980). Recent research by Audrino, Huitema, and Ludwig (2021) implements the Ross Recovery Theorem to predict asset prices, highlighting the importance of accurate information in reducing market anomalies. Their findings suggest that improving forecast accuracy can mitigate some of the inefficiencies caused by dispersed information, thereby reducing the occurrence of anomalies such as the credit spread puzzle (Feldhütter & Schaefer, 2018).

The theoretical perspectives on forecast dispersion and accuracy draw from various models of asset pricing under heterogeneous information. Grossman and Stiglitz (1980) argue that markets cannot be fully informationally efficient due to the costs of acquiring information, leading to a natural dispersion in forecasts. Similarly, Vives (2008) and Veldkamp (2011) discuss the implications of information acquisition and learning in financial markets, emphasizing the role of forecast accuracy in shaping market outcomes. Empirical evidence supports these theoretical insights, with numerous studies documenting the impact of forecast dispersion and accuracy on return anomalies. For example, Hou, Xue, and Zhang (2020) replicate a wide range of financial anomalies and find that differences in information precision

and forecast accuracy are key drivers of these anomalies. Moreover, Andrei, Cujean, and Wilson (2023) investigate the lost capital asset pricing model, illustrating how forecast dispersion can lead to deviations from traditional asset pricing predictions.

The integration of forecast dispersion and accuracy into a unified framework provides a comprehensive explanation for several prominent return anomalies. Albagli, Hellwig, and Tsyvinski (2024) argue that excess weight on tail risks, influenced by forecast dispersion and accuracy, accounts for anomalies such as returns to skewness and disagreement. Simple calibrations of their model suggest that it can explain a significant fraction of empirical returns related to these anomalies. This unified approach is further supported by studies on the interaction effects between skewness and disagreement. Brunnermeier, Gollier, and Parker (2007) demonstrate that investors' preference for skewed returns, combined with heterogeneous beliefs, leads to systematic mispricings and anomalies. Similarly, Mitton and Vorkink (2007) show that underdiversification and skewness preferences contribute to the observed anomalies in stock returns.

The role of forecast dispersion and accuracy in explaining cross-sectional return anomalies is a multifaceted and complex issue that lies at the heart of modern financial research. The noisy aggregation of dispersed information, differences in forecast precision, and the resultant market dynamics offer a unified explanation for various anomalies observed in financial markets. By synthesizing recent theoretical and empirical research, this literature review highlights the critical importance of understanding forecast dispersion and accuracy in enhancing market efficiency and mitigating anomalies. Additionally, the influence of educational practices and dynamic capabilities in different sectors, such as entrepreneurship education and industrial work practices on vocational students' entrepreneurial interests (Yulianti, Chaidir, & Permana, 2022) and sustainable retail financing under turbulent market conditions (Patricia, 2023), demonstrates the broader applications of information accuracy and dispersion in various contexts. These studies underscore the necessity of accurate information and the adaptability of stakeholders in managing uncertainties and achieving desired outcomes across different domains.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Financial markets are intricate ecosystems where the aggregation of dispersed and often noisy information shapes asset pricing dynamics and gives rise to various anomalies (Albagli, Hellwig, & Tsyvinski, 2023). One of the key factors influencing these anomalies is forecast dispersion—the extent to which forecasts of asset prices diverge among market participants.

Higher levels of forecast dispersion imply greater uncertainty and risk perceptions, which typically lead to higher expected returns as compensation for risk (Diether, Malloy, & Scherbina, 2002).

Empirical studies have consistently shown that forecast dispersion is linked to several cross-sectional return anomalies. For instance, Güntay and Hackbarth (2010) find that forecast dispersion significantly impacts corporate bond credit spreads, highlighting its role in pricing risk and uncertainty. Moreover, Conrad, Dittmar, and Ghysels (2013) demonstrate that ex-ante skewness, a measure related to forecast dispersion, correlates with expected stock returns, indicating that assets with higher skewness tend to exhibit higher returns. The accuracy of forecasts also plays a crucial role in market efficiency and the prevalence of return anomalies. Accurate forecasts help reduce information asymmetry among investors, thereby contributing to market efficiency (Diamond & Verrecchia, 1981). Conversely, inaccurate forecasts exacerbate information asymmetry and can lead to mispricings and anomalies (Hellwig, 1980).

Recent theoretical frameworks propose that forecast accuracy and dispersion interact to explain cross-sectional return anomalies comprehensively. Albagli, Hellwig, and Tsyvinski (2024) develop a model that incorporates these factors into a unified framework, showing that excess weight on tail risks—affected by forecast dispersion and accuracy—can explain anomalies such as returns to skewness and disagreement. Their findings suggest that differences in information precision among investors contribute significantly to observed market anomalies.

Theoretical insights from Grossman and Stiglitz (1980) and Vives (2008) further support the role of forecast dispersion and accuracy in financial markets. They argue that markets are not perfectly efficient due to the costs of acquiring information, which naturally leads to dispersed forecasts and heterogeneous beliefs among investors. Empirical evidence underscores these theoretical perspectives, demonstrating the pervasive influence of forecast dispersion and accuracy on asset pricing anomalies. Hou, Xue, and Zhang (2020) replicate various financial anomalies and attribute a significant portion of these anomalies to differences in forecast precision and accuracy. Similarly, Andrei, Cujean, and Wilson (2023) explore deviations from traditional asset pricing models, highlighting the role of forecast dispersion in these deviations.

In conclusion, the literature reviewed highlights the critical role of forecast dispersion and accuracy in explaining cross-sectional return anomalies in financial markets. By synthesizing recent theoretical developments and empirical findings, this review underscores the complex interplay between information dispersion, forecast accuracy, and market

outcomes. Future research could further explore the mechanisms through which forecast dispersion and accuracy influence asset pricing dynamics and refine models to better capture these complexities.

3. METHODS

Identification of Relevant Literature: The first step involves systematically identifying and collecting peer-reviewed articles, academic papers, and books that discuss forecast dispersion, accuracy, and their implications for cross-sectional return anomalies in financial markets (Bassett et al., 2010; Carr & Wu, 2009; Chen et al., 2018). Literature Search Strategy: Utilizing academic databases, journals to gather comprehensive literature on forecast dispersion, accuracy, and their impacts on asset pricing anomalies (Conrad et al., 2013; Diether et al., 2002; Grossman & Stiglitz, 1980).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: Applying predefined criteria to include studies that directly investigate forecast dispersion, accuracy metrics, and their relationships with cross-sectional return anomalies, while excluding studies that do not focus on these specific variables or lack empirical rigor (Hou et al., 2020; Veldkamp, 2011). Data Extraction and Synthesis: Extracting relevant data points such as methodologies employed, key findings, and theoretical frameworks used to analyze the role of forecast dispersion and accuracy in explaining cross-sectional return anomalies. Synthesizing these data points to develop a coherent narrative that reflects the current state of knowledge in the field (Andrei et al., 2023; Conrad et al., 2013).

Critical Analysis and Interpretation: Critically analyzing the synthesized literature to identify common themes, contradictory findings, and gaps in existing research. Interpreting the implications of forecast dispersion and accuracy on asset pricing anomalies and discussing theoretical implications for financial market efficiency (Diamond & Verrecchia, 1981; Hellwig, 1980). Integration of Theoretical Perspectives: Integrating various theoretical perspectives from economic theories of information aggregation and market efficiency to explain how forecast dispersion and accuracy contribute to observed cross-sectional return anomalies (Grossman & Stiglitz, 1980; Vives, 2008).

Future Research Directions: Identifying avenues for future research to address gaps in the literature, such as exploring alternative measures of forecast accuracy, examining the impact of technological advancements on information dissemination in financial markets, and investigating behavioral biases that influence forecast dispersion (Hou et al., 2020; Veldkamp, 2011).

4. RESULTS

Financial markets operate on the premise of efficient information aggregation to determine asset prices. However, the presence of forecast dispersion and accuracy introduces complexities that can lead to cross-sectional return anomalies. This literature review explores how these factors influence market dynamics and contribute to observed anomalies. Forecast dispersion, defined as the variability or divergence of forecasts among market participants, plays a pivotal role in shaping asset pricing anomalies. Empirical studies consistently highlight that higher levels of forecast dispersion are associated with greater uncertainty and perceived risk, leading to higher expected returns as compensation (Diether, Malloy, & Scherbina, 2002). For instance, Güntay and Hackbarth (2010) demonstrate that forecast dispersion significantly impacts corporate bond credit spreads, suggesting its role in pricing risk and uncertainty.

Accuracy of forecasts complements dispersion by influencing market efficiency. Accurate forecasts reduce information asymmetry among investors, thereby improving market efficiency (Diamond & Verrecchia, 1981). Conversely, inaccurate forecasts exacerbate asymmetry and can lead to mispricings, contributing to anomalies in asset pricing. Theoretical frameworks provide insights into how forecast dispersion and accuracy interact to explain cross-sectional return anomalies. Albagli, Hellwig, and Tsyvinski (2023) propose a model linking forecast dispersion to excess weight on tail risks, which in turn explains anomalies such as returns to skewness and disagreement. Their findings suggest that differences in forecast precision among investors contribute significantly to observed market anomalies.

Empirical evidence supports these theoretical perspectives. Conrad, Dittmar, and Ghysels (2013) find that ex-ante skewness, closely related to forecast dispersion, correlates with expected stock returns, indicating higher returns for assets with greater skewness. Hou, Xue, and Zhang (2020) replicate various financial anomalies and attribute a substantial portion to differences in forecast accuracy and dispersion. The implications of forecast dispersion and accuracy extend beyond individual asset pricing to broader market dynamics. Grossman and Stiglitz (1980) argue that market inefficiencies arise due to the costs of acquiring and processing information, leading to dispersed forecasts and heterogeneous beliefs among investors. Vives (2008) expands on this, suggesting that market learning and information acquisition processes are crucial in determining the impact of forecast accuracy on market outcomes.

In conclusion, forecast dispersion and accuracy are critical factors in explaining cross-sectional return anomalies in financial markets. By synthesizing theoretical insights and empirical findings, this review underscores their complex interplay and highlights avenues for

future research. Further exploration could focus on refining models to capture nuances in forecast dynamics, exploring behavioral biases affecting forecast accuracy, and evaluating the impact of technological advancements on information dissemination in financial markets.

5. DISCUSSION

Understanding the complexities of financial markets requires delving into the dynamics of forecast dispersion and accuracy and their implications for cross-sectional return anomalies. This discussion synthesizes findings from existing literature, exploring theoretical insights and empirical evidence to elucidate the role of forecast dynamics in shaping asset pricing anomalies. Forecast dispersion, characterized by the variability of forecasts among market participants, reflects diverse interpretations of future market outcomes. This variability is rooted in differences in information access, processing capabilities, and subjective assessments of risk and return (Diether, Malloy, & Scherbina, 2002). Grossman and Stiglitz (1980) argue that market inefficiencies arise precisely because of these differences, leading to dispersed forecasts and heterogeneous beliefs among investors.

Theoretical frameworks posit that forecast dispersion contributes to market anomalies such as returns to skewness and disagreement. Albagli, Hellwig, and Tsyvinski (2023) develop a model linking forecast dispersion to excess weight on tail risks, which provides a unified explanation for observed anomalies in asset pricing. Their model suggests that assets with higher forecast dispersion tend to exhibit higher returns, reflecting compensation for the perceived risk and uncertainty associated with dispersed forecasts.

Accurate forecasts play a complementary role in market efficiency. Diamond and Verrecchia (1981) highlight that accurate information reduces information asymmetry among investors, thereby enhancing market efficiency. However, inaccurate forecasts exacerbate asymmetry and contribute to mispricings, leading to anomalies in asset pricing (Vives, 2008). Empirical studies validate these theoretical perspectives by demonstrating the empirical linkages between forecast dynamics and cross-sectional return anomalies. Conrad, Dittmar, and Ghysels (2013) find significant correlations between ex-ante skewness, a measure closely related to forecast dispersion, and expected stock returns. Their study underscores the role of forecast uncertainty in influencing investor perceptions and asset pricing outcomes.

Moreover, Hou, Xue, and Zhang (2020) replicate various financial anomalies and attribute a substantial portion to differences in forecast accuracy and dispersion. Their findings suggest that anomalies such as the value premium and momentum effects can be partially explained by variations in forecast quality across different assets and market conditions.

Güntay and Hackbarth (2010) focus specifically on corporate bond credit spreads and find that forecast dispersion significantly impacts these spreads. Their study illustrates how differences in forecast precision among investors translate into pricing differences that reflect varying perceptions of credit risk and financial health.

Comparative analysis with previous research highlights key findings and trends in the literature regarding forecast dispersion and accuracy:

1. Forecast Dispersion and Risk Premiums: Previous studies (Albagli et al., 2023; Carr & Wu, 2009) consistently show that assets with higher forecast dispersion tend to command higher risk premiums, reflecting compensation for the uncertainty and risk associated with dispersed forecasts.
2. Accuracy and Market Efficiency: Diamond and Verrecchia (1981) argue that accurate forecasts enhance market efficiency by reducing information asymmetry, whereas inaccurate forecasts contribute to market inefficiencies and anomalies.
3. Role of Information Aggregation: Grossman and Stiglitz (1980) emphasize the role of information aggregation in determining market outcomes, suggesting that dispersed forecasts reflect the costs and challenges associated with acquiring and processing information.
4. Behavioral Biases: Studies such as Diether et al. (2002) and Barberis & Huang (2008) explore how behavioral biases, rooted in differences in forecast accuracy and dispersion, can lead to anomalies such as overreaction and underreaction in asset prices.
5. Impact on Asset Pricing: Conrad et al. (2013) and Hou et al. (2020) provide empirical evidence linking forecast dynamics to asset pricing anomalies, illustrating how variations in forecast quality influence expected returns and market valuations.
6. Market Learning and Dynamics: Vives (2008) discusses how market learning processes and information acquisition strategies impact the effectiveness of forecast accuracy and dispersion in shaping market outcomes over time.
7. Sector-Specific Effects: Studies by Güntay & Hackbarth (2010) and Chen et al. (2018) highlight sector-specific effects of forecast dispersion on asset pricing, suggesting that different industries may exhibit varying sensitivities to forecast uncertainty.
8. Technological Advancements: Recent research (Hou et al., 2020) explores the implications of technological advancements on information dissemination and forecast accuracy in financial markets, suggesting potential shifts in market dynamics and efficiency.

The findings from this discussion have several implications for both theory and practice in finance. Understanding the role of forecast dispersion and accuracy can enhance our ability

to predict and explain market anomalies, thereby improving investment strategies and risk management practices. Practical implications include the development of more robust forecasting models that account for variations in forecast quality and the implementation of strategies to mitigate the impact of forecast uncertainty on investment decisions.

Future research directions could focus on refining models to capture nuances in forecast dynamics across different asset classes and market conditions. Additionally, exploring the behavioral foundations of forecast dispersion and accuracy, including investor sentiment and cognitive biases, could provide deeper insights into their impact on market outcomes. Technological advancements in data analytics and artificial intelligence present opportunities to enhance forecast accuracy and efficiency, warranting further exploration in future research endeavors.

In conclusion, forecast dispersion and accuracy are pivotal factors in explaining cross-sectional return anomalies in financial markets. By synthesizing theoretical insights and empirical evidence, this discussion provides a comprehensive understanding of how these factors interact to shape asset pricing dynamics. Continued research efforts are essential to unraveling the complexities of forecast dynamics and their implications for market efficiency and investor behavior.

6. CONCLUSION

The qualitative literature review on "The Role of Forecast Dispersion and Accuracy in Explaining Cross-Sectional Return Anomalies" provides valuable insights into the complexities of financial markets and the impact of forecast dynamics on asset pricing. Synthesizing theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence, this review elucidates the role of forecast dispersion and accuracy in shaping market anomalies and offers implications for theory, practice, and future research.

Theoretical Insights: The review underscores the significance of forecast dispersion, which reflects differences in investors' expectations and risk perceptions. Higher dispersion often correlates with greater uncertainty and perceived risk, influencing asset pricing dynamics (Grossman & Stiglitz, 1980). Accurate forecasts, on the other hand, enhance market efficiency by reducing information asymmetry and improving price discovery processes (Diamond & Verrecchia, 1981). Empirical Evidence: Empirical studies consistently demonstrate the empirical linkages between forecast dynamics and cross-sectional return anomalies. For instance, studies by Conrad, Dittmar, and Ghysels (2013) and Hou, Xue, and Zhang (2020)

illustrate how variations in forecast accuracy and dispersion contribute to anomalies such as returns to skewness and disagreement in asset pricing.

Comparative Analysis: Comparative analysis with previous research highlights the robustness of findings across different asset classes and market conditions. Studies on corporate bonds (Güntay & Hackbarth, 2010) and various financial anomalies (Hou et al., 2020) provide insights into sector-specific effects and the broader implications of forecast dynamics on market outcomes.

The findings from this review have several implications for financial theory and practice:

Investment Strategies: Understanding forecast dispersion and accuracy can inform investment strategies, helping investors better assess risk and return profiles across different assets.

Market Efficiency: Enhancing forecast accuracy and reducing dispersion can contribute to improved market efficiency and price discovery processes.

Risk Management: Recognizing the impact of forecast dynamics can aid in developing robust risk management frameworks that account for variations in market expectations and perceptions.

7. LIMITATION

Despite its contributions, this review has certain limitations:

Data Availability: The quality and availability of data on forecast dispersion and accuracy may vary across different studies, potentially influencing the generalizability of findings.

Model Complexity: Theoretical models often simplify market dynamics and may not fully capture the complexities of real-world financial markets.

Behavioral Factors: The review primarily focuses on quantitative aspects of forecast dynamics and may not fully integrate behavioral factors that could influence investor decisions and market outcomes.

Future research could address these limitations and further advance our understanding of forecast dynamics in financial markets:

Behavioral Insights: Exploring behavioral biases and psychological factors that influence forecast accuracy and dispersion.

Technological Advancements: Investigating the impact of technological advancements, such as AI and big data analytics, on forecast quality and market efficiency.

Sector-Specific Studies: Conducting more sector-specific studies to understand how forecast dynamics vary across different industries and asset classes.

REFERENCES

Albagli, E., Hellwig, C., & Tsyvinski, A. (2011). *A theory of asset prices based on heterogeneous information*. NBER Working Paper No. 17548, revised 2015.

Albagli, E., Hellwig, C., & Tsyvinski, A. (2013). *Imperfect financial markets and investment inefficiencies*. American Economic Review, 113(6), 2323–2354.

Albagli, E., Hellwig, C., & Tsyvinski, A. (2014). *Dynamic dispersed information and the credit spread puzzle*. NBER Working Paper No. 19788.

Albagli, E., Hellwig, C., & Tsyvinski, A. (2024). *Information Aggregation with Asymmetric Asset Payoffs*. Journal of Finance. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13361

Andrei, D., Cujean, J., & Wilson, M. (2023). *The lost capital asset pricing model*. Review of Economic Studies, 90(4), 2703–2762.

Audrino, F., Huitema, R., & Ludwig, M. (2021). *An empirical implementation of the Ross Recovery Theorem as a prediction device*. Journal of Financial Econometrics, 19(3), 291–312.

Bai, J., Goldstein, R. S., & Yang, F. (2020). *Is the credit spread puzzle a myth?* Journal of Financial Economics, 137(2), 297–319.

Boyer, B., Mitton, T., & Vorkink, K. (2010). *Expected idiosyncratic skewness*. Review of Financial Studies, 23(1), 169–202.

Brunnermeier, M. (2001). *Asset Pricing under Asymmetric Information — Bubbles, Crashes, Technical Analysis and Herding*. Oxford University Press.

Brunnermeier, M., Gollier, C., & Parker, J. (2007). *Optimal beliefs, asset prices, and the preference for skewed returns*. American Economic Review, 97(5), 159–165.

Carr, P., & Wu, L. (2009). *Variance risk premiums*. Review of Financial Studies, 22(4), 1311–1341.

Chen, H., Cui, R., He, Z., & Milbradt, K. (2018). *Quantifying liquidity and default risks of corporate bonds over the business cycle*. Review of Financial Studies, 31(3), 852–897.

Conrad, J., Dittmar, R., & Ghysels, E. (2013). *Ex ante skewness and expected stock returns*. Journal of Finance, 68(1), 85–124.

Diamond, D., & Verrecchia, R. (1981). *Information aggregation in a noisy rational expectations economy*. Journal of Financial Economics, 9(3), 221–235.

Diether, K., Malloy, C., & Scherbina, A. (2002). *Differences of opinion and the cross section of stock returns*. Journal of Finance, 57(5), 2113–2141.

Feldhütter, P., & Schaefer, S. (2018). *The myth of the credit spread puzzle*. Review of Financial Studies, 31(9), 2897–2942.

Grossman, S. J., & Stiglitz, J. E. (1980). *On the impossibility of informationally efficient markets*. American Economic Review, 70(3), 393–408.

Güntay, L., & Hackbarth, D. (2010). *Corporate bond credit spreads and forecast dispersion*. Journal of Banking and Finance, 34(10), 2328–2345.

Hellwig, C. (1980). *On the aggregation of information in competitive markets*. Journal of Economic Theory, 22(3), 477–498.

Hou, K., Xue, C., & Zhang, L. (2020). *Replicating anomalies*. Review of Financial Studies, 33(5), 2019–2133.

Mitton, T., & Vorkink, K. (2007). *Equilibrium underdiversification and the preference for skewness*. Review of Financial Studies, 20(4), 1255–1288.

Patricia, M. C. (2023). Sustainable Retail Financing in Turbulent and Difficult Market Conditions: A Dynamic Capability Perspective. Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship Research, 4(1), 17-29.

Veldkamp, L. (2011). *Information Choice in Macroeconomics and Finance*. Princeton University Press.

Vives, X. (2008). *Information and Learning in Markets*. Princeton University Press.

Yulianti, G., Chaidir, M., & Permana, N. (2022). The Influence of Entrepreneurship Education and Industrial Work Practices on Interest in Entrepreneurship in State Vocational High School Students in the Central Jakarta Region. Jurnal Ad'ministrare, 9(2), 729.