

Research on Anticipated and Actual Effects of Converged Reporting: Examining IFRS Adoption in Europe

Edward J. Riedl

May 2008





A Tale of Two Papers

Market Reaction
to the Adoption
of IFRS in Europe

Causes and Consequences of
Choosing Historical Cost
versus Fair Value



A Tale of Two Papers

Market Reaction
to the Adoption
of IFRS in Europe

Causes and Consequences of
Choosing Historical Cost
versus Fair Value

Similarities:

IFRS

EU (multi-country setting)

Address notion of convergence

A Tale of Two Papers

Market Reaction
to the Adoption
of IFRS in Europe

Causes and Consequences of
Choosing Historical Cost
versus Fair Value

Similarities:

IFRS

EU (multi-country setting)

Address notion of convergence

Differences:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| – across industries | – single industry |
| – multiple standards | – single standard |
| – anticipated effects | – actual effects |

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe

- Research Questions:
 - Do investors *anticipate* net benefits or costs with IFRS?
 - Do these perceptions vary predictably across firm characteristics?

- Setting:
 - Event-study (16 events affecting IFRS adoption)
 - EU (18 countries)

- Research Design (three levels)
 - aggregate reaction to IFRS across sample dates (portfolio level)
 - univariate reactions by firm characteristics (portfolio level)
 - multivariate analysis (firm level)

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe

Variable	Intended as Proxy for	Predicted Sign	Coefficient (<i>p</i>-value)
<i>Intercept</i>		+	0.0070 (0.000)
<i>ADR</i>	information quality	–	–0.0016 (0.007)
<i>Turnover</i>	pre-adoption information asymmetry	–	–0.0019 (0.000)
<i>Closely_Held</i>	“	+	0.0043 (0.006)
<i>Herf</i>	“	+	0.0116 (0.093)
<i>Code</i>	comparability/ enforcement	–	–0.0028 (0.000)
<i>Big4</i>	“	+	0.0001 (0.495)
<i>Bank</i>	industry	+/-	0.0013 (0.048)
<i>N</i>			35,136
<i>Adjusted-R²</i>			0.0013

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe

Variable	Intended as Proxy for	Predicted Sign	Coefficient (p-value)
<i>Intercept</i>		+	0.0070 (0.000)
<i>ADR</i>	information quality	-	-0.0016 (0.007)
<i>Turnover</i>	pre-adoption information asymmetry	-	-0.0019 (0.000)
<i>Closely_Held</i>	"	+	0.0043 (0.006)
<i>Herf</i>	"	+	0.0116 (0.093)
<i>Code</i>	comparability/enforcement	-	-0.0028 (0.000)
<i>Big4</i>	"	+	0.0001 (0.495)
<i>Bank</i>	industry	+/-	0.0013 (0.048)
<i>N</i>			35,136
<i>Adjusted-R²</i>			0.0013

Consistent with overall positive reaction to IFRS

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe

Variable	Intended as Proxy for	Predicted Sign	Coefficient (p-value)
<i>Intercept</i>		+	0.0070 (0.000)
<i>ADR</i>	information quality	-	-0.0016 (0.007)
<i>Turnover</i>	pre-adoption information asymmetry	-	-0.0019 (0.000)
<i>Closely_Held</i>	“	+	0.0043 (0.006)
<i>Herf</i>	“	+	0.0116 (0.093)
<i>Code</i>	comparability/enforcement	-	-0.0028 (0.000)
<i>Big4</i>	“	+	0.0001 (0.495)
<i>Bank</i>	industry	+/-	0.0013 (0.048)
<i>N</i>			35,136
<i>Adjusted-R²</i>			0.0013

Consistent with lower reaction if pre-adoption reporting quality is high

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe

Variable	Intended as Proxy for	Predicted Sign	Coefficient (p-value)
<i>Intercept</i>		+	0.0070 (0.000)
<i>ADR</i>	information quality	-	-0.0016 (0.007)
<i>Turnover</i>	pre-adoption information asymmetry	-	-0.0019 (0.000)
<i>Closely_Held</i>	"	+	0.0043 (0.006)
<i>Herf</i>	"	+	0.0116 (0.093)
<i>Code</i>	comparability/enforcement	-	-0.0028 (0.000)
<i>Big4</i>	"	+	0.0001 (0.495)
<i>Bank</i>	industry	+/-	0.0013 (0.048)
<i>N</i>			35,136
<i>Adjusted-R²</i>			0.0013

Consistent with larger reaction if have higher pre-adoption information asymmetry

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe

Variable	Intended as Proxy for	Predicted Sign	Coefficient (p-value)
<i>Intercept</i>		+	0.0070 (0.000)
<i>ADR</i>	information quality	-	-0.0016 (0.007)
<i>Turnover</i>	pre-adoption information asymmetry	-	-0.0019 (0.000)
<i>Closely_Held</i>	“	+	0.0043 (0.006)
<i>Herf</i>	“	+	0.0116 (0.093)
<i>Code</i>	comparability/enforcement	-	-0.0028 (0.000)
<i>Big4</i>	“	+	0.0001 (0.495)
<i>Bank</i>	industry	+/-	0.0013 (0.048)
<i>N</i>			35,136
<i>Adjusted-R²</i>			0.0013

Consistent with lower reaction if domiciled in country with likely weaker enforcement

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS in Europe

Variable	Intended as Proxy for	Predicted Sign	Coefficient (p-value)
<i>Intercept</i>		+	0.0070 (0.000)
<i>ADR</i>	information quality	-	-0.0016 (0.007)
<i>Turnover</i>	pre-adoption information asymmetry	-	-0.0019 (0.000)
<i>Closely_Held</i>	“	+	0.0043 (0.006)
<i>Herf</i>	“	+	0.0116 (0.093)
<i>Code</i>	comparability/enforcement	-	-0.0028 (0.000)
<i>Big4</i>	“	+	0.0001 (0.495)
<i>Bank</i>	industry	+/-	0.0013 (0.048)
<i>N</i>			35,136
<i>Adjusted-R²</i>			0.0013

Robust to:

- Five proxies for information quality
 - *Standards applied*
 - *# Exchanges*
 - *Analyst following*
 - *Size*
- Bootstrap
- Clustering by country/industry, and firm/industry

Market Reaction to the Adoption of IFRS In Europe

(1) Do investors anticipate net benefits or costs with IFRS?

- Net benefits, reflected in positive market reaction to IFRS adoption
- Broad positive reaction (16 of 18 countries)
- Reaction is not primarily driven by banks/IAS 39

(2) Do these perceptions vary predictably across firm characteristics?

- Positive reaction if have high pre-adoption information quality
 - consistent with perceived benefits from IFRS due to convergence
- More positive reaction if have low pre-adoption information quality
 - consistent with anticipated improvements in information quality
- More positive reaction if have higher information asymmetry
 - consistent with IFRS expected to reduce information asymmetry
- Lower reaction if domiciled in code-law country
 - consistent with concerns regarding implementation/enforcement

Causes and Consequences of Choosing Historical Cost versus Fair Value

- Research Questions:
 - Do investors perceive fair value (FV) as beneficial?
 - What are the determinants of choosing historical cost (HC) versus FV?
 - Does disclosure versus recognition of FV matter?

- Setting:
 - Pre/post periods surrounding IFRS adoption, EU (13 countries)
 - Investment property (real estate) industry – IAS 40
 - Firms must choose either HC model (with FV disclosure) or FV model

- Research Design:
 - Causes/consequences of providing FV pre-IFRS
 - Which firms are affected most from required FV provision under IFRS
 - Causes/consequences of choosing HC model (with required FV disclosure) versus FV model post-IFRS under IAS 40

Causes and Consequences of Choosing Historical Cost versus Fair Value

Country	Firms	Pre-IFRS		Model choice under IFRS	
		No FV	FV	Cost	FV
	#	#	#	#	#
Austria	3	2	1	1	2
Belgium	8	1	7	0	8
Denmark	3	0	3	0	3
Finland	4	0	4	0	4
France	13	6	7	7	6
Germany	11	5	6	5	6
Italy	3	1	2	2	1
Netherlands	4	0	4	1	3
Poland	2	0	2	0	2
Spain	3	1	2	2	1
Sweden	8	0	8	0	8
Switzerland	5	0	5	0	5
UK	33	0	33	0	33
Total	100	16	84	18	82

Causes and Consequences of Choosing Historical Cost versus Fair Value

Variable	Predicted	Sample 1 – All Obs		Sample 2 – ex-UK	
Panel A. Bid-ask spread model					
<i>Intercept</i>	?	5.972 (7.04) ***	6.139 (7.24) ***	4.509 (4.21) ***	4.901 (4.66) ***
<i>LogMCAP</i>	–	–0.351 (6.06) ***	–0.348 (6.05) ***	–0.225 (3.04) ***	–0.232 (3.23) ***
<i>LogPRICE</i>	–	–0.035 (0.64)	–0.041 (0.74)	0.060 (0.90)	0.074 (1.15)
<i>LogSTD_RET</i>	+	0.237 (1.92) **	0.263 (1.93) **	0.337 (2.18) **	0.364 (2.43) ***
<i>LogCLOSEHELD</i>	+	–0.038 (0.57)	–0.031 (0.47)	–0.415 (2.47)	–0.397 (2.43)
<i>IMR</i>	–	–0.148 (1.97) **	–0.111 (1.42) *	–0.540 (4.22) ***	–0.459 (3.54) ***
<i>FV_PRE</i>	–		–0.317 (1.59) *		–0.435 (2.21) **
<i>N</i>		100	100	67	67
<i>Adj-R²</i>		49.88%	50.68%	53.89%	56.66%

- Consequences in pre-IFRS period
- Control for self-selection (1st stage model of providing fair value in pre-IFRS period)
- Firms providing fair value have lower information asymmetry
- Similar results using trading volume and standard deviation of returns

Causes and Consequences of Choosing Historical Cost versus Fair Value

Variable	Predicted	Sample 1 – All Obs		Sample 2 – ex-UK	
Panel A. Bid-ask spread model					
<i>Intercept</i>	?	5.972 (7.04) ***	6.139 (7.24) ***	4.509 (4.21) ***	4.901 (4.66) ***
<i>LogMCAP</i>	–	–0.351 (6.06) ***	–0.348 (6.05) ***	–0.225 (3.04) ***	–0.232 (3.23) ***
<i>LogPRICE</i>	–	–0.035 (0.64)	–0.041 (0.74)	0.060 (0.90)	0.074 (1.15)
<i>LogSTD_RET</i>	+	0.237 (1.92) **	0.263 (1.93) **	0.337 (2.18) **	0.364 (2.43) ***
<i>LogCLOSEHELD</i>	+	–0.038 (0.57)	–0.031 (0.47)	–0.415 (2.47)	–0.397 (2.43)
<i>IMR</i>	–	–0.148 (1.97) **	–0.111 (1.42) *	–0.540 (4.22) ***	–0.459 (3.54) ***
<i>FV_PRE</i>	–		–0.317 (1.59) *		–0.435 (2.21) **
<i>N</i>		100	100	67	67
<i>Adj-R²</i>		49.88%	50.68%	53.89%	56.66%

- Consequences in pre-IFRS period
- Control for self-selection (1st stage model of providing fair value in pre-IFRS period)
- Firms providing fair value have lower information asymmetry
- Similar results using trading volume and standard deviation of returns

Causes and Consequences of Choosing Historical Cost versus Fair Value

- Do investors perceive fair value (FV) as beneficial?
 - Yes, evidenced in lower bid-ask spread, higher turnover, lower standard deviation of returns for firms providing FV in pre-IFRS period
- What are the determinants of choosing historical cost (HC) versus FV?
 - Pre-IFRS (disclose versus do not disclose decision)
 - Post-IFRS (disclose versus recognition decision under IAS 40)
 - Both driven by ownership structure and commitment to transparency
- Does disclosure versus recognition of FV matter?
 - Limited evidence that it does not appear to matter
- Analysis is on-going, so stay tuned