European Accounting Review ›
Volume 14, 2005 - Issue 3

Original Articles

Voluntary adoption of non-local GAAP in the European Union: A study of determinants and consequences

Rick Cuijpers ✉ & Willem Buijink

66 Cite this article   ↗ https://doi.org/10.1080/0963818042000337132

Abstract

This ... tion of non-local a... the Europea... ionally accepted ... (IAS) and United S... e used various ... e 1999 annual r... ore recent years m... an Commission in February 2001 to mandate IAS usage from 2005 on. The maintained

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 909 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting "I Accept" enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under "we and our partners process data to provide," whereas selecting "Reject All" or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the ["privacy preferences"] link on the bottom of the webpage [or the floating icon on the bottom-left of the webpage, if applicable]. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. Here

We and our partners process data to provide:

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose

hypothesis is that firms that voluntarily adopt IAS or US GAAP expect to experience net benefits from adoption. The finding that 133 non-financial firms in the EU voluntarily used non-local GAAP in 1999 suggests that the majority of listed EU firms does not expect to benefit from non-local GAAP adoption. By studying the characteristics of non-local GAAP adopters this study provides insight into the determinants of non-local GAAP adoption. We find that firms voluntarily using non-local GAAP are more likely to be listed on a US exchange, the EASDAQ exchange in Brussels, and have more geographically dispersed operations. Furthermore, they are more likely to be domiciled in a country with lower quality financial reporting and where IAS is explicitly allowed as an alternative to local GAAP. We also study whether non-local GAAP adopters have lower levels of information asymmetry, a much cited benefit of using more transparent financial reporting, than non-adopters. We examine three proxies for information asymmetry: analyst following, cost of equity capital, and uncertainty among analysts and investors (forecast dispersion and stock return volatility). We document a positive effect of non-local GAAP adoption on analyst following, but fail to find evidence of a lower cost of capital for non-local GAAP adopters. Contrary to expectations, uncertainty among analysts and investors appears to be higher for firms using IAS or US GAAP than for firms using local GAAP. However, by comparing 'early' and 'late' adopters, we find some evidence that suggests that benefits take some time to fully materialise.

Acknow

Notes

[1] For an overview of listing requirements of EU stock exchanges, see Haller (2002).

[2] Private communication with Stefano Zambon confirmed this. His research shows that only three Italian firms comply fully with IAS.

[3] The authors would like to thank Paul Pacter of the IASC for providing the list that was no longer available from the IASC website.

[4] To be included, the auditor's report and summary of accounting policies, or footnotes must state that the financial statements comply with IAS without qualification (IASC, 2001).

[5] Not necessarily IAS, however, no more specific data was available.

[6] Item number GF66: Accounting standard – Note (ASTD). Again, no more specific data was available.

[7] There was considerable overlap between the different data sources.

[8] We also excluded a small number of firms classified as SIC code 9.

[9] The inclusion of firms domiciled in the UK in our regression analyses (we do not have data on the quality of Irish accounting standards) does not materially influence the results.

[10] See M...sues in using in an ac...a (1991).

[11] Mutua...exchange in the EU c...

[12] The ...Greece and Italy...

[13] Althou...till expect the mea...s, because regulatio...

[14] EU co...orting standard...erlands (Ireland ...not analyse

the enforcement mechanisms in Greece, which forces us to exclude Greek firms from this sensitivity analysis.

[15] The coefficient on the indicator variable is statistically significant (1% level, one-sided). Inclusion of this variable leaves the results reported earlier qualitatively unchanged.

[16] We estimate the logistic regression equation (1) including only firms using IAS or local GAAP (i.e. excluding US GAAP users), with IAS as the dependent variable (an indicator variable that takes the value 1 if a firm uses IAS and 0 otherwise) and without the dummy variable indicating a US listing (US_EX).

[17] In contrast to Auer (1998) and Ashbaugh and Pincus (2001) we employ a cross-sectional design to study the consequences of non-local GAAP adoption, mainly because of data availability constraints. After contacting the 114 firms using non-local GAAP examined in Section 3, we were able to obtain the date of first usage for 92 firms. However, many of these firms did not switch to non-local GAAP but were using (or started using) IAS or US GAAP at the time of the IPO. Consequently, for many firms we do not have pre-adoption data available. Furthermore, Leuz and Verrecchia (2000) point out that, based on an event study (around the switch to non-local GAAP), it is hard to separate the effect on information asymmetry from the news effect (the revision in capital m   herefore,
Leuz and   ck for their
cross-se

[18] We us   allow the
publicati   ur
informat   not
availabl   owth rate
impl   e exclude
observa

[19] We es   t least 150
observat   accounting
standard

[20] Specif   ocal GAAP
users pe   sation and

probability of adoption (the fitted value per firm from regression equation (1)).

21 We thank one of the anonymous reviewers for suggesting this possibility.

22 We contacted the 114 firms using non-local GAAP included in the determinants analysis and asked when they started using IAS or US GAAP. In this way we were able to obtain the date of first usage of non-local GAAP for 92 firms. Data availability constraints reduce the number of observations in the various consequences analyses even further.

23 An alternative would be to directly examine changes in a firm's investor base. We did not perform this analysis because, based on our data, it is hard to come up with a proxy for investor base.

24 Data is available at the statistics section of the website of the World Federation of Exchanges (http://www.world-exchanges.org).

25 At least 150 daily return observations are required.

26 Wilcoxon two-sample tests for differences between the groups of non-local and local GAAP users for the independent variables appearing in equation (7) reveal differences comparable to those in Table 3, suggesting that the reduction in observations has not changed   ket
developr   on-local
GAAP th   nce in
abnorma   al and local
GAAP us

27 The m   or the group
of non-lo   (1.21) and
the m   rs), the
mean

28 Wilcox   al and local
GAAP us   ) confirm
earlier fi

29 The m   cal) GAAP
users is   0.26 (0.25).
For the full sample (non-local and local GAAP users), the mean is 0.41, the standard

deviation is 0.91 and the median is 0.25. The mean stock return volatility (VOLATILITY) for the group of non-local (local) GAAP users is 0.03 (0.03), the standard deviation is 0.01 (0.01) and the median is 0.02 (0.02). For the full sample (non-local and local GAAP users), the mean is 0.03, the standard deviation is 0.01 and the median is 0.02.

[30] In the analysis of cost of capital differences between non-local and local GAAP users, self-selection bias is less of an issue, since we match local GAAP users to non-local GAAP users on the estimated benefit of adoption, i.e. the fitted values from equation (1), among others (also see n. 20).

[31] The results (not tabulated) from estimating the probit model are comparable to the results from the logistic regression model (see Table 5, model a).

[32] Specifically, we find that the coefficient on GAAP remains positive and statistically significant in equation (7). In equation (8), the effect of non-local GAAP adoption on forecast dispersion is no longer statistically significant. Controlling for possible self-selection bias does not influence the results obtained from estimating equation (9), i.e. we do not find an effect of non-local GAAP usage on stock return volatility. Furthermore, the coefficients on the control variables included in equations (7), (8) and (9) remain qualitatively similar. In addition to the two-stage model described in the text, we also use an instrumental variables approach (as described in Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000, fn. 23), with   on in the
equation   n of non-
local GA   Table 8,
panel B)   adoption
choice t   pe of the
paper.

Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature

Source: Journal of Accounting and Economics

The Impact of Size, Stock Market Listing and Industry Type on Disclosure in the Annual Reports of Japanese Listed Corporations

Source: Accounting and Business Research

Foreign Listing Location: A Study of MNCs and Stock Exchanges in Eight Countries

Source: Journal of International Business Studies

Why Firms Comply Voluntarily with IAS: an Empirical Analysis with Swiss Data

Source: Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting

Methodological Issues Related to the Estimation of Financial Distress Prediction Models

Source: Journal of Accounting Research

A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity

Source: Econometrica

Firm Characteristics of Swiss Companies that Utilize International Accounting Standards

Source: The International Journal of Accounting

Impact of Culture, Market Forces, and Legal System on Financial Disclosures

Source: The International Journal of Accounting

Financial accounting developments in the European Union: past events and future prospects

Sour

Dome

Predi

Sourc

Capit   e
differ   ased
earni

Sourc

T

S

ADRs   a Firm's
Inform

Sourc

Non-

Sourc

Conc   st When
Inves

Source: Journal of Accounting Research

Incentives versus standards: properties of accounting income in four East Asian countries
Source: Journal of Accounting and Economics

Predicting takeover targets
Source: Journal of Accounting and Economics

Der Einfluß des Wechsels vom Rechnungslegungsstandard auf die Risikoparameter von schweizerischen Aktien
Source: Schmalenbach Journal of Business Research

Using Forecasts of Earnings to Simultaneously Estimate Growth and the Rate of Return on Equity Investment
Source: Journal of Accounting Research

Analyst Activity Around the World
Source: SSRN Electronic Journal

Information Asymmetry, Valuation, and the Corporate Spin-off Decision
Source: SSRN Electronic Journal

Factors Influencing Voluntary Annual Report Disclosures By U.S., U.K. and Continental European Multinational Corporations
Source: Journal of International Business Studies

Properties of implied cost of capital using analysts' forecasts
Source: Australian Journal of Management

Law and Finance
Source: Unknown Repository

Li

Relat