

# The impact of IFRS 7 on the significance of financial instruments disclosure

## Evidence from Jordan

Impact of  
IFRS 7

241

Yasean A. Tahat

*College of Business Administration, Gulf University for Science and Tech,  
Hawally, Kuwait, and*

Theresa Dunne, Suzanne Fifield and David M. Power  
*School of Business, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK*

Received 15 August 2013  
Revised 31 May 2014  
Accepted 23 September 2014

### Abstract

**Purpose** – The main aim of this paper is to investigate Financial Instruments (FIs) disclosures provided by Jordanian listed companies under International Financial Reporting Standard No. 7 (IFRS 7) as compared to those supplied under International Accounting Standards (IAS) 30/32.

**Design/methodology/approach** – A sample of 82 Jordanian listed companies is used in this monograph. A disclosure index checklist was constructed to measure FI information provided by the sample companies.

**Findings** – The study finds that a larger number of Jordanian listed companies provided a greater level of FI-related information after IFRS 7 was implemented. Specifically, the sample firms provided 47 per cent of the disclosure index items after implementing IFRS 7 as compared to 30 per cent under IAS 30/32. In addition, the industrial analysis of FI disclosure revealed that the highest level of disclosure was provided by firms in the banking sector over the two periods; these companies disclosed 44 per cent of FI-related items pre-IFRS 7 and 69 per cent of items post-IFRS 7. Moreover, the industrial analysis of FI disclosure pre-and post-implementation of IFRS 7 revealed specific aspects of usefulness. In particular, some components of FI disclosure (Balance Sheet and Fair Value) showed no significant differences within and across sectors post the implementation of IFRS 7, suggesting that the new standard may have enhanced the comparability of such information.

**Research limitations/implications** – The results provide timely findings to Jordanian authorities who may be trying to evaluate the current reforms adopted; stringent enforcement mechanisms are needed to ensure full compliance with accounting standards. However, the present investigation was conducted on a single nation (Jordan); the circumstances in Jordan gave rise to the importance of the current study. A cross-country comparative analysis is needed in order to examine the application of IFRS 7 in a developing country context.

**Practical implications** – The results of the current study have a number of implications for policymakers. First, they provide a great deal of insight for the International Accounting Standards Board about the relevance of its standards to countries outside the Western context. In addition, the findings provide valuable insights for policymakers in Jordan who are concerned about the implications of mandatory disclosures.

**Originality/value** – The analysis of FI disclosure in developing countries in general, and in Jordan in particular has been overlooked by the extant literature and therefore this study is the first of its kind to examine this research issue for a sample of Jordanian firms.

**Keywords** Jordan, IFRS 7, Financial Instruments, Corporate disclosure

**Paper type** Research paper



Accounting Research Journal  
Vol. 29 No. 3, 2016  
pp. 241-273  
© Emerald Group Publishing Limited  
1030-9616  
DOI 10.1108/ARJ-08-2013-0055

## 1. Introduction

Regulatory bodies throughout the world, including the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) have sought to introduce accounting standards to deal with Financial Instruments (FIs) disclosure in an attempt to mandate the provision of a minimum level of FI-related information in companies' financial statements. Before accounting regulations were adopted, a number of investigations revealed that companies were reluctant to publish information about their usage of FIs on a voluntary basis (Mahoney and Kawamura, 1995; Berkman *et al.*, 1997; Grant and Marshall, 1997; Dunne, 2003). Because accounting standards in this area have been adopted, several studies have investigated their impact on the extent of FI disclosure in both developed and developing markets (Edwards and Eller, 1995; Roulstone, 1999; Chalmers and Godfrey, 2000; Chalmers, 2001; Dunne *et al.*, 2004; Woods and Marginson, 2004; Hamlen and Largay, 2005; Hassan *et al.*, 2006a; Lopes and Rodrigues, 2006; Rahahleh and Siam, 2009; Strouhal, 2009; Murcia and Santos, 2010). A number of results have emerged from these investigations. For example, the evidence has revealed that corporate disclosure behaviour in this area is mixed with a significant amount of non-compliance among firms. There is a great deal of variation in the amount of FI disclosure provided by companies in both developed and developing countries, although disclosure is lower in emerging markets[1] (Hamlen and Largay, 2005; Strouhal, 2009). In addition, large variations exist within FI-related disclosures *per se*, with fair value details being the most widely published, while hedge-related data are seldom disclosed in financial statements (Hassan *et al.*, 2006a, 2006b).

As part of its long-term project on FI disclosure, the IASB has consolidated all FI-related disclosure requirements in International Financial Reporting Standard No. 7 (IFRS 7): Financial Instruments: Disclosure (2005) which became effective on 1st 2007 January. In particular, IFRS 7 has two main requirements, namely:

- (1) that an entity must provide information about the significance of FIs to a firm's financial position and performance; and
- (2) that a firm should supply information about risks arising from FI usage.

The main focus of the current paper is on investigating the first requirement of the standard. Specifically, based on an analysis of the financial statements for 2006 and 2007, this study examines the impact of the first-time adoption of IFRS 7 on the information about the significance of FIs to a firm's financial position and performance provided by Jordanian listed companies as compared to that supplied under International Accounting Standards (IAS 30/32). This investigation is motivated by the expectations, as well as the concerns about the change when the standard was enacted[2]. In addition, the current evidence about the impact of IFRS 7 is confined to developed countries in general, and European nations in particular (Bischof, 2009); hence, more international evidence is needed before any global trend can be confirmed. Finally, the circumstances in Jordan make it an ideal place for such an investigation. Specifically, the increasing usage of FIs by Jordanian companies, as well as the publicity about FI-related financial losses in the press, provides a great deal of inspiration for the current study.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. Section 2 outlines the institutional setting and the accounting and business environment within Jordan. Section 3 reviews the literature and develops the research hypotheses. Section 4 details

the research design. Section 5 provides the results of the current investigation. Finally, the implications of the findings are discussed in Section 6.

## 2. Institutional setting

Jordan is classified by the World Bank as an upper middle-income country with a population of 6.5 million, a per-capita gross national income of \$4,340 and a per-capita gross domestic production (GDP) of \$6,000 (World Bank, 2013). The real GDP of the country grew steadily over the past two decades, peaking in the 1990s at an average growth of 7 per cent a year before falling to 3 per cent over the past five years because of the recent global financial crisis. According to the Index of Economic Freedom, Jordan is the third freest economy in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region and the 32nd freest economy in the world.

To develop this open market economy reputation, the government has implemented a comprehensive economic reforming programme over the past two decades. First, the government established the Amman Stock Exchange (ASE)[3] in 1999 (Al-Omari, 2010). This body[4] commenced its operations in 1999; since then, the number of listed companies has dramatically increased reaching around 270 in 2010. In addition, the market capitalisation has risen considerably from \$1,314 in 1985 to 4,943m in 2000 before increasing to around \$30,000m in recent years[5]. The ASE is split into two markets, namely, the first market and the second market; companies are usually listed in the second market and transferred to the first if certain conditions are met[6]. Currently, Jordanian listed firms are drawn from a wide range of industrial sectors including financial, services and manufacturing industries. The financial industry dominates the Exchange with 60 per cent of the ASE's market capitalisation, the service sector ranked second with 15 per cent, while the manufacturing sector is third with 25 per cent of the market capitalization. According to ROSC (2004), the Jordanian Stock Exchange is considered one of the largest emerging capital markets relative to the country's GDP; the market capitalisation represents over 80 per cent of the GDP (ROSC, 2005).

In the early of 1990s, the Government launched a privatization program. As a result, the government's participation in the provision of goods and services decreased; specifically, the involvement of the State in public shareholding companies declined to less than 6 per cent[7] (Al-Kheder *et al.*, 2009). This reduction in the government's stake has led to an increase in market capitalization of the ASE to over \$35bn in 2008, as state-owned shares were offered for sale to the public (Executive Privatization Unit, 2007). Specifically, over \$2.0bn was raised by the State and over \$1bn was invested in the country by foreign investors (Executive Privatization Unit, 2007).

In addition, the Jordanian Government has entered into a number of international business agreements. For example, Jordan signed Free Trade Agreements with the USA, the European Union (EU), Canada, Singapore, Malaysia, Tunisia, Algeria, Libya, Algeria and Turkey in the period between 1995 and 2005. In addition, Jordan is a member in a number of international economic organizations such the World Trade Organization, the Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Agreement Group and the Greater Arab Free Trade Agreement Group (ASE, 2003).

### 2.1 The financial reporting framework in Jordan

The legal framework for corporate disclosure in Jordan is represented by various Company and Security Acts. The 1964 Company Act was the first piece of legislation

which included guidelines for the preparation of financial statements. This was followed by the 1989 Company Act which reaffirmed the requirements of the 1964 Company Act, as well as expanding the corporate disclosures which companies had to supply. Although both Acts required companies to prepare a profit-and-loss account and a balance sheet according to the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), neither of them defined or specified the GAAP to be used. In 1989, the Jordanian Association of Certified Public Accountants (JACPA) was established as a local professional accounting body. However, no local accounting standards were created for them to apply. Therefore, JACPA played an important role in facilitating the adoption of IASs/IFRSs within Jordan; by 1990, it recommended that all Jordanian companies should adopt IASs. However, JACPA was unable to force listed companies to comply with this recommendation. The absence of any legal or professional requirement to implement IASs allowed firms to choose whichever GAAP they wanted to adopt.

In 1997, the Company Act No. 22 was introduced. The new Act covered a wide range of issues relating to corporate disclosure requirements. In particular, it stated that Jordanian listed companies' financial statements should be prepared in accordance with IAS/IFRS. The Securities Act No. 23 of 1997 reaffirmed that Jordanian listed companies should apply IAS/IFRS in the preparation of their financial statements, with penalties including fines and delisting for non-compliance. Indeed, this Act was a watershed for corporate disclosure in Jordan, as it provided Directives for Disclosure, Auditing and Accounting Standards. Furthermore, this Act provided for the establishment of:

- the Jordan Securities Commission (ASE, 2005);
- the Securities Depository Centre; and
- the ASE.

In addition, the Act provided the first guidelines on the corporate governance structure of Jordanian listed companies; it sought to protect the rights of shareholders and highlight responsibilities of the board of directors in the new rules (Hutaibat, 2005). The Act mandated that all public shareholding firms should have an audit committee comprising three non-executive directors; it required this committee to meet at least four times a year to examine and discuss the firm's internal control mechanisms including the work of both the external and internal auditors (ROSC, 2004). This committee also has responsibility for monitoring compliance with the requirements of various Company and Securities Acts (e.g. corporate disclosure).

Jordan has traditionally been classified as a code law country (ROSC, 2005) where:

- the financing of companies has largely involved bank debt (Abu-Nassar, 1993);
- the basic shareholder rights to participate in company decisions and vote at the annual general meeting are not strong; and
- the security associated with the registration of ownership is weak (Haddad, 2005).

However, as a result of the many economic reforms discussed in this section (e.g. the establishment of the capital market, the initiation of the privatization program, joining several Free Trade Agreements, the introduction of a number of business laws and the adoption of IAS/IFRS), the legal system of country has developed. Specifically, Al-Akra *et al.* (2009, 2010, 2012) concluded that following to these referendums, the Jordanian legal system has shifted towards a common law system; investor protection is

improved, the capital market presents the main source of financing and users are provided with more timely public information (Al-Akra *et al.*, 2010, 2012).

This major change to the Jordanian business environment over the past few decades provides one motivation for undertaking the current investigation. In addition, Jordan represents a very different context as compared to the Western settings which previous research in the FI area has focused on. Further, the importance of FIs in general, and derivatives in particular, in Jordan, has increased over the past few years, providing another rationale undertaking the current study. Indeed, the corporate usage of derivatives among Jordanian firms (especially large companies) has risen dramatically (Al-Rai, 2004). Indeed, the growing reliance of the Jordan economy on external exports has forced Jordanian companies to increase their usage of FI products (mainly derivatives) to maintain the stability of their cash flows and smooth revenues (Siam and Abdullatif, 2011). In addition, the misuse and the abuse of FIs (both derivative and non-derivative) was a key factor that led to the collapse of one of the largest Jordanian banks in 1990, the Petra Bank (The Judicial View, 2008). In particular, the audits carried out by Arthur Andersen revealed that the bank's assets had been overstated by \$200m as a result of trading in derivative contracts such as foreign exchange and equity instruments (The Guardian, 2003). Furthermore, the audits confirmed that transactions relating to this loss were approved by the bank's top management (The Guardian, 2003).

### 3. Literature review and hypotheses development

Disclosure about the usage of FIs is an important part of financial reporting research (Bischof, 2009). However, DeMarzo and Duffie (1995) have argued that this topic has always been seen as problematic for companies because of the commercial sensitivity involved. This sensitivity has risen over time as the usage of FIs (especially derivatives) has increased [8]. The extant literature has highlighted a number of factors that have led to this explosive growth in the usage of FI. In particular, the finance industry has been successful in creating a variety of new over-the-counter (OTC) and exchange-traded products that are designed to suit the specialist needs of certain firms (Froot *et al.*, 1993; Li and Gao, 2007). In addition, deregulation of the financial services industry, increased competition among financial institutions, changes in tax laws and developments in information technology have also contributed to an increase in the usage of these products (Jacque, 2010; Gebhardt, 2012). Indeed, prior studies have documented that a variety of derivative instruments have been used by companies (e.g. options, forwards, futures, swaps and OTC products) for different purposes such as hedging, earnings management and/or speculation (Bodnar *et al.*, 1998; Saito and Schiozer, 2005; El-Masry, 2006; Yakup and Asli, 2010; Naito and Laux, 2011). However, most firms claim to use FIs for hedging purposes (Mallin *et al.*, 2001). Despite this claim by firms that they mainly use FIs to hedge their financial exposures, the past two decades have witnessed many financial scandals and corporate collapses which have been attributed to the misuse of FI (Jacque, 2010). As a result, the level of public concern about the use of such products and the control of their associated risks has increased (Beresford, 1997; Ighian, 2012). Hence, the main accounting regulators, including the FASB and the IASB, have sought to issue new accounting standards and tighten regulations to tackle this dilemma (Richie *et al.*, 2006). The objective of these pronouncements is to enhance users'



understanding of the significance of FIs for a firm's financial position and performance (Ighian, 2012). In this regard, Chau *et al.* (2000) have argued that, at the time of these scandals, accounting for FI needed to consider three major issues which were recognition, measurement and disclosure. The main focus of the current study is to examine FI disclosure provided by Jordanian listed firms under IFRS 7 as compared to that supplied under IAS 30/32; Jordan has applied IAS/IFRS since 1997.

### *3.1 Accounting standards concerning Financial Instrument disclosure issued by the International Accounting Standards Board*

The IASB introduced several accounting standards to deal with FI disclosure, namely, IAS 30, IAS 32 and IFRS 7. The International Accounting Standards Committee (IASC) issued IAS 30: Disclosures in Financial Statements of Banks and Financial Institutions in 1990, and the standard became effective in 1991. This standard prescribed a specific presentation for disclosures about FIs by financial institutions to provide users with appropriate financial statement information about how these organisations managed and controlled liquidity, as well as solvency risks. Indeed, it required full disclosure on a broad spectrum of risks associated with the operations of banks (IASC, 1990). In 1996, the IASC issued IAS 32: Financial Instruments: Disclosure and Presentation which dealt with most types of FIs (recognised and unrecognised)[9]. The main objective of IAS 32 was to ensure that companies provided information that enhanced users' understanding of the impact of FI usage on an entity's financial position and performance (IASC, 1996, Para. 1). However, IAS 32 and IAS 30 did not encompass all types of FI and their associated risks (Conti and Mauri, 2006); they only referred to specific FI risks, namely: interest rate risk and credit risk. In this regard, Richie *et al.* (2006) argued that it was widely recognised that accounting standards and disclosure practices for FIs needed to be improved.

More recently, the IASB issued *IFRS 7* in 2006; IFRS 7 has replaced FI disclosure requirements which had previously been contained in both IAS 30 and IAS 32 (IASB, 2006). IFRS 7 requires companies to publish their FI information under specific categories irrespective to whether they relate to derivatives or non-derivatives[10]. IFRS 7 applies to all listed firms (financial and non-financial); it covers all types of FIs, as well as the risks arising from their usage (IASB, 2006). In fact, IFRS 7 has considerably expanded the scope of FI disclosure relative to the requirements of previous standards (Coestee, 2010). In particular, it requires firms to provide two main types of FI disclosure. First, an entity must supply information about the significance of FIs in their organisation:

- accounting policy disclosures;
- balance sheet disclosures;
- income statement disclosures;
- hedging disclosures;
- fair value disclosures; and
- other disclosures (IFRS 7, Para. 7-29).

Second, an entity must provide information about the nature and extent of the risks arising from the use of FIs including:

- qualitative disclosures about risks associated with the FIs used; and
- quantitative disclosures of risks associated with FI usage including all types of risks, namely, credit risk, liquidity risk and market risk (IASB, 2006, Para. 30-42).

As discussed earlier in this paper, the current investigation focuses on the first part of IFRS 7.

IFRS 7 represents one of the most significant changes in how firms account for FIs since the introduction of IAS 39 (Conti and Mauri, 2006). It makes a number of changes to FI-related requirements which had previously been in place. For example, the standard takes a management approach, whereby information in financial statements about FIs must be based on data provided internally to the entity's key management personnel (Ernst and Young, 2007). It was thought that this development would help integrate the internal and external reporting systems within firms. Furthermore, the standard applies for all companies irrespective of their industry or size; the significance of FIs to an entity's financial position and performance is the main determinant of FI disclosures. Indeed, Gornik-Tomaszewski (2006) has argued that the most important of the changes mandated by IFRS 7 is that the level of disclosure is determined by the extent to which an entity uses FIs rather than its industrial sector. Finally, IFRS 7 adds new disclosure requirements about FIs to those that were mandated under previous standards, namely:

- disclosure about the credit quality of financial assets that are neither due nor impaired;
- various disclosures for financial assets that are either due or impaired;
- information about the carrying amounts for each class of FI;
- details on the ineffectiveness of any hedge; and
- comparative fair value numbers about FI (Gornik-Tomaszewski, 2006).

Thus, it was expected that IFRS 7 would have a sizeable impact on the usefulness of FI disclosure provided in companies' financial statements.

### 3.2 Literature review and hypotheses development

A growing body of empirical accounting research has investigated FI disclosure in several countries such as the USA (Goldberg *et al.*, 1994, 1998; Palmer and Schwarz, 1995; Mahoney and Kawamura, 1995; Edwards and Eller, 1995; Hamlen and Largay, 2005; Zhang, 2009), the UK (Dunne *et al.*, 2004; Woods and Marginson, 2004; Bamber and McMeeking, 2010), other EU countries (Lopes and Rodrigues, 2006, 2008; Bischof, 2009; Bamber and McMeeking, 2010; Prihatiningtyas, 2011; Gebhardt, 2012), Australia (Berkman *et al.*, 1997; Chalmers and Godfrey, 2000; Chalmers, 2001) and Malaysia (Hassan *et al.*, 2006a). Table I summarises the key features of these studies. An inspection of this table shows that most of these studies have:

- focused on the information provided about derivative products and overlooked other types of FIs;
- analysed disclosures in the annual reports of companies; and
- used either the disclosure index technique or the content analysis method.

| Author (s)   | Method                    | Sample size | Standard          | Industry   |
|--|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------|
| <i>Panel A: Studies on FI disclosure standards in the USA</i>  |                           |             |                   |            |
| Goldberg <i>et al.</i> (1994)  | Content analysis          | 438         | SFAS 105          | FNF        |
| Goldberg <i>et al.</i> (1998)  | Content analysis          | 104         | SFAS 105/107      | FNF        |
| Palmer and Schwarz (1995)  | Content analysis          | 35          | SFAS 105          | Banking    |
| Mahoney and Kawamura (1995)  | Content analysis          | 65          | SFAS 119          | FNF        |
| Edwards and Eller (1995)   | Content analysis          | 10          | SFAS 119          | Banking    |
| Kawamura (1996)  | Content analysis          | 75          | SFAS 119          | FNF        |
| Herz <i>et al.</i> (1996)  | Questionnaire/10-K filing | 67/78       | SFAS 119          | NF         |
| Hodder <i>et al.</i> (2002)  | Content analysis          | 230         | SFAS 115          | Banking    |
| Bhamornsiri and Schroeder (2004)   | Content analysis          | 30          | SFAS 133          | FNF        |
| Hamlen and Largay (2005)   | Content analysis          | 30          | SFAS 133          | Industrial |
| <i>Panel B: Studies on FI disclosure standards in the UK</i>   |                           |             |                   |            |
| Woods and Marginson (2004)   | Content analysis          | 9           | FRS 13            | Banking    |
| Dunne <i>et al.</i> (2004)   | Content analysis          | 78          | FRS 13            | NF         |
| Bamber and McMeeking (2010)  | Content analysis          | 100         | IFRS 7            | NF         |
| <i>Panel C: Studies on FI disclosure standards in New Zealand and Australia</i>  |                           |             |                   |            |
| Berkman <i>et al.</i> (1997)   | Content analysis          | 116/195*    | ED-65 and FRS-31  | FNF        |
| Chalmers and Godfrey (2000)  | Questionnaire             | 150         | AASB-1033         | FNF        |
| Chalmers (2001)  | Disclosure index          | 140         | AASB-1033         | FNF        |
| Hassan <i>et al.</i> (2006a)   | Disclosure index          | 137         | AASB-1033         | Industrial |
| <i>Panel D: Studies on FI disclosure standards in other EU countries</i>   |                           |             |                   |            |
| Lopes and Rodrigues (2006)   | Disclosure index          | 55          | IAS 32/39         | FNF        |
| Lopes and Rodrigues (2008)   | Disclosure index          | 50          | IAS 32/39         | FNF        |
| Bischof (2009)   | Content analysis          | 171         | IFRS 7            | Banking    |
| Gebhardt (2012)  | Content analysis          | 600         | IFRS 7 and IAS 39 | NF         |
| <i>Panel E: Studies on FI disclosure standards in developing countries</i>   |                           |             |                   |            |
| Hassan <i>et al.</i> (2006b)   | Disclosure index          |             |                   |            |
| Strouhal (2009)  | Content analysis          |             |                   |            |
| Rahahleh and Siam (2009)   | Questionnaire survey      |             |                   |            |
| Murcia and Santos (2010)   | Content analysis          |             |                   |            |
| <b>Notes:</b> This table shows empirical studies that have investigated the accounting standards concerning FIs. FNF = financial and non-financial Firms, *this is a comparative study between New Zealand (106 firms) and Australia (195) |                           |             |                   |            |

**Table I.**  
Key features of extant empirical studies on FI disclosure in developed countries

A comparison of the findings from these studies is not easy. For instance, the investigations use different sample sizes ranging from a few companies (only ten annual reports for Edwards and Eller, 1995) to 600 firms (Gebhardt, 2012). In addition, some of the studies are sector-specific and concentrate on banking (Edwards and Eller, 1995), industrial companies or firms from manufacturing industry (Hassan *et al.*, 2006a). Others are more general and include both financial and non-financial firms (Lopes and Rodrigues, 2006, 2008). Furthermore, these studies examine the impact of a variety of accounting standards on FI disclosure. Nevertheless, despite these differences, a number of findings emerge from an analysis of these investigations.



Panel A of [Table I](#) lists US studies concerning FIs' disclosure. In general, these studies have concluded that the introduction of new accounting standards covering FI disclosure has resulted in more detailed information being provided. Prior to the existence of FI-related regulation, [Goldberg \*et al.\* \(1994\)](#) examined the impact of Statements of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) 105 on FI-related hedge information. They found that SFAS 105 enhanced the hedging information provided by forcing firms to publish significant details about their hedging activities. In 1991, the FASB issued SFAS 107 which concentrated on the fair value of FIs. [Goldberg \*et al.\* \(1998\)](#) compared disclosures about foreign exchange derivatives under SFAS 105 and SFAS 107. They pointed out that:

- a larger number of companies publish FI-related information;
- there was widespread compliance with the requirements of SFAS 105 and SFAS 107; and
- disclosures varied greatly in terms of both form and content with inconsistency in terminology being particularly evident.

In 1994, FASB issued SFAS 119 in 1994. As a result, a number of studies were dedicated to investigating its influence ([Edwards and Eller, 1995](#); [Mahoney and Kawamura, 1995](#); [Kawamura, 1996](#); [Herz \*et al.\*, 1996](#)). These studies concluded that more entities complied with the disclosure requirements of the standard outlining FI disclosure requirements. They suggested that SFAS 119 was moderately effective, allowing the readers of financial statements to make judgments on whether FIs could have a material impact on a firm's financial position and performance. Further, they documented that the amount of detail presented and the clarity of the information (both quantitative and qualitative) provided in annual reports about derivative activities had greatly improved for the whole sample with the introduction of SFAS 119 relative to what had been supplied beforehand. However, they pointed out that some firms' disclosures appeared incomplete, particularly with respect to trading matters and hedges of anticipated transactions[11].

Panel B of [Table I](#) lists the UK studies on the impact of accounting standards for FI disclosure ([Woods and Marginson, 2004](#); [Dunne \*et al.\*, 2004](#)). The evidence about the impact of FRS 13 is mixed. For example, [Woods and Marginson \(2004\)](#) investigated the impact of FRS 13 on UK banks' derivatives disclosures. The findings revealed that the narrative disclosures provided were fairly generic in nature, while the numerical data were either incomplete or misleading for users. In a follow-up study, [Dunne \*et al.\* \(2004\)](#) investigated the implementation of this standard for a larger sample of FTSE 100 non-financial companies and found that the implementation of FRS 13 contributed to an increase in derivatives-related disclosure in the sampled annual reports. Responding to the adoption of IFRS GAAP by UK firms in 2005, [Bamber and McMeeking \(2010\)](#) investigated the impact of IFRS 7 in the first year of its adoption by FTSE 100 non-financial companies, using content analysis. The study found that the adoption of IFRS 7 caused companies to publish more accounting information (especially qualitative details) about FI usage which may have been useful for decision-makers in the assessment of a firms' overall strategy for managing these products.

A significant body of research has examined the impact of accounting standards on FI disclosure in Australia (see Panel C of [Table I](#)). Before any specific rules on FI

information existed, [Berkman et al. \(1997\)](#) compared disclosure practices among New Zealand and Australian companies. They concluded that companies in both countries reported relevant information in their annual reports, but there was far more disclosure provided by New Zealand firms than by their Australian counterparts. The authors argued that this was largely due to the mandatory reporting requirements of Financial Reporting Standard No. 31 (FRS 31) in New Zealand compared to the voluntary proposals contained within Exposure Draft No. 65 in Australia. Following the enactment of the AASB 1033 in Australia in 1996, FI disclosure requirements became mandatory; this change gave rise to a number of empirical studies which investigated the level of associated FI disclosure ([Chalmers and Godfrey, 2000](#); [Chalmers, 2001](#); [Hassan et al., 2006a](#)). The findings from these studies indicated that although more companies provided a higher level of FI disclosure, the quality of the information disclosed was less than satisfactory. In particular, the authors noted that:

- the information was not easy to find, as its positioning in the financial statements' notes varied within a firm and across firms; and
- there was considerable variation in disclosure phraseology.

They suggested that these flaws hindered the understandability, comparability and consistency of FI information in the financial statements. Generally, the study raised a number of major weaknesses concerning existing FI disclosure requirements in Australia:

- the lack of accounting policy disclosures relating to specific FIs;
- the incompleteness of fair value disclosures about FIs[12]; and
- the vagueness of many disclosures.

Panel D of [Table I](#) summarises key features of studies on FIs disclosure conducted in EU countries ([Lopes and Rodrigues, 2006, 2008](#); [Bischof, 2009](#); [Gebhardt, 2012](#)). For example, [Lopes and Rodrigues \(2006\)](#) investigated existing measurement and disclosure practices for FIs among Portuguese listed companies to gauge the extent of their compliance with IAS 32 and IAS 39. In general, the study found that Portuguese disclosure practices for FIs differed substantially from the requirements in IAS 32/39. In particular, they noted that the overall level of FI disclosure among their sample firms was less than satisfactory; the non-disclosing percentage was 27 per cent for financial firms and 95 per cent for non-financial firms. In addition, they discovered that fair value measurement of derivatives was adopted by most derivative users (73 per cent). The authors suggested that the mandatory adoption of more stringent standards (IAS 32/39) would probably have a positive impact on the FI-related information disclosed by Portuguese firms. In a comprehensive European study of this topic, [Bischof \(2009\)](#) investigated the impact of the first time adoption of IFRS 7 on FI disclosure using annual reports for 171 banks from 28 European countries. The study found that the disclosure level about FIs (both qualitative and quantitative) among European banks increased in the financial statements. Specifically, she found that while financial statement information had increased from 69 pages before IFRS 7 adoption to 75 pages afterwards, risk management reporting within the financial statements accounted for most of this change; it increased from 13 to 21 pages; both differences were significant with a  $p$ -value of less than 0.01.

Empirical studies on FI disclosure in developing countries are very scarce (Hassan *et al.*, 2006a). The main exception to this generalisation relates to a number of studies conducted in Malaysia (Hassan *et al.*, 2006b), the Czech Republic (Strouhal, 2009) and Brazil (Murcia and Santos, 2010) which are explained in Table I. The findings indicate that even though companies do provide information about their FIs in their financial statements, there is a gap between what is supplied and the requirements of IASB's standards such as IAS 32 and IAS 39. Hence, they have concluded that the adoption of IAS/IFRS may have a positive impact on both quantity and quality of FI disclosure. To date, the only study about FI disclosure in Jordan has been conducted by Rahahleh and Siam (2009). They investigated the impact of applying IAS 32 by Jordanian commercial banks from the perspective of auditors, preparers and investors. The study distributed a questionnaire survey (five-point Likert scale) to interested parties and obtained replies from 89 auditors, 84 preparers and 78 institutional investors with an overall response rate of 84 per cent. The study highlighted that there was a consensus among these groups about the importance of IAS 32 for Jordanian commercial banks with mean values of 4.2, 4.1 and 4.0 being documented. The results suggested that the financial statement disclosures were more comparable and consistent as a result of applying IAS 32; the needs of financial statement users were better satisfied after IAS 32 was implemented. In addition, the study found that IAS 32 significantly enhanced the presentation of, and improved the disclosure of, FI information in the financial statements. The authors suggested that the level of agreement among these stakeholder groupings indicated that the information which had to be published according to the standard fulfilled the expectations of the financial statement users.

In conclusion, the general findings of the extant FI-related disclosure literature indicate that the introduction of new accounting standards have resulted in:

- an increase in the number of companies supplying FI disclosure (Edwards and Eller, 1995; Chalmers and Godfrey, 2004; Chalmers, 2001; Hassan *et al.*, 2006b); and
- an improvement in the level of corporate FI disclosure provided (Roulstone, 1999; Chalmers and Godfrey, 2000; Chalmers, 2001; Dunne *et al.*, 2004; Woods and Marginson, 2004; Hamlen and Largay, 2005; Lopes and Rodrigues, 2006; Strouhal, 2009; Murcia and Santos, 2010).

However, the vast majority of this literature has concentrated on developed countries which have a very different contextual background compared to developing countries. In this respect, Cooke and Wallace (1990) and Belkaoui (1983) have argued that accounting is the product of its environment, so accounting policies and techniques are influenced by the contextual factors[13] within a country. Indeed, the extant literature has highlighted the crucial role played by the external environment on a country's accounting system (Cooke and Wallace, 1990). With respect to Jordan, the country has undergone significant changes over the past few decades. This makes Jordan an ideal place to undertake the current investigation. First of all, Jordan went through major and dramatic economic developments which resulted in significant growth of the economy (e.g. market capitalization and the GDP). In particular, the establishment of the Jordanian capital market in the early of 1990s and reorganization of this market in 1999, the initiation of the privatization program in 1990s and the introduction of several business laws are real instances of these developments. Moreover, Jordan has

experienced dramatic changes in accounting regulations. In particular, the adoption IAS/IFRS in Jordan since 1997 presents a very important development of the accounting practices in Jordan; a Jordanian study needed therefore to shed light on recent enforcement mechanisms that have been introduced and their effectiveness in improving mandatory disclosure compliance. Finally, recent accounting research postulates that culture plays an important role in developing and changing the accounting and disclosure practices of a country (Jaggi, 1975; Hofstede and Bond, 1984; Nobes, 1984; Gray, 1988). Indeed, Riahi-Belkaoui and Picur (1991) argued that accounting is determined by culture which accounts for the lack of consensus across different countries as to what represents appropriate accounting methods. With respect to Jordan, its culture is based on a strong Arab tradition, although the impact of Western ideas has grown over recent decades (Al-Akra *et al.*, 2010). Further, Jordan is a collective society characterized by Islamic values, with a preference for strong social links. These links have encouraged secrecy (Piro, 1998). Hence, it is anticipated that the behaviour of Jordanian firms will have been affected by this cultural factor when preparing the accounting information.

These changes and characteristics of Jordan's economy provide a great many rationales to examine FI disclosure in the context of Jordan. Hence, the current study aims to investigate the impact of the introduction of IFRS 7 on FI disclosure in a developing country (Jordan) which has its unique background that differs greatly from that of developed countries where most previous studies have been conducted. Specifically, the current study aims to examine the impact of IFRS 7's introduction on FI disclosure provided by Jordanian listed companies as compared to that supplied beforehand. The above discussion of the literature presented, as well as the Jordan's characteristics, lead us to postulate the following two hypotheses:

- H1. The proportion of Jordanian listed companies providing FI disclosure has increased significantly following the introduction of IFRS 7.
- H2. The level of FI disclosure has increased significantly following the introduction of IFRS 7 compared to information provided previously by Jordanian listed companies.

With respect to the industry membership, Wallace *et al.* (1994) argued that a company's sector can affect the corporate reporting culture of its constituent companies; they suggested that policies on financial information disclosure differ across sectors. In fact, the extant literature has provided mixed evidence about the impact of industry on the extent of corporate disclosure. For example, Cooke (1989) found that manufacturing companies disclosed more information than their counterparts in other sectors. Indeed, the extant literature on corporate disclosure in general, and on FI disclosure in particular, has focused on whether there is a relationship between corporate disclosure and industry membership. The current study goes beyond this focus by analysing the differences in the behaviour of risk-related disclosure within and across industries; this analysis is used for both financial and non-financial companies.

The sample of the current study is drawn from four sectors which are banks, financial services, services and manufacturing companies. The current study assumes that the type of industry that a company is located in can explain some of a firm's behaviour in relation to corporate FI disclosure. To this end, the empirical section examines FI-related disclosure on a sectoral basis pre- and post-the implementation of

IFRS 7 by examining both percentage changes and results from statistical tests which investigate whether changes in risk information were significant within and across sectors. Hence, the final hypothesis of the current study is proposed:

- H3. There are significant differences in FI disclosures by Jordanian listed companies within and across sectors.

## 4. Research design

### 4.1 Sample firms

The present paper investigates impact of IFRS 7 on FI disclosure for a sample of Jordanian listed companies. The sample initially consisted of 227 quoted companies which issued annual reports during the period of the current investigation. However, some of these firms had to be excluded for various reasons. First, the study omitted companies listed in the second market (132 firms). The second market in Jordan represents firms whose shares are not actively traded in the ASE; the volume of transactions in these securities is quite small (ASE, 2007); this means that the demand for corporate information about such firms is low; thus, they tend to disclose relatively little information[14]. Second, the study excluded insurance companies listed on the first market from the sample (seven companies) because they comply with special regulations which are issued by the Jordanian Insurance Commission rather than IAS/IFRS. Third, the study also eliminated six additional companies from the sample; two of these companies had incomplete financial statements, while the remaining four had no annual reports available. The final sample of the current study includes 82 financial and non-financial companies including 12 banks, 26 financial services firms, 18 services companies and 26 manufacturing firms[15].

### 4.2 Measurement of Financial Instrument disclosure

The extent of FI disclosure provided by Jordanian listed companies is measured using a disclosure index. The disclosure index was constructed by the researchers based on the requirements (FI disclosure items) of accounting standards considered (IFRS 7, IAS 32, IAS 30) in the current study. In addition, the study consulted the Big Four accounting firms' checklists of these standards, as well as the extant literature on FI disclosure to ensure that the checklist was comprehensive (Bischof, 2009; Bamber and McMeeking, 2010). Thus, the number of items included in the current study's index was determined by the standards themselves and subsequently assessed by the researchers[16]. The resulting checklist included 39 items spread across six categories of information (Appendix 1). Each company's annual report was scanned for these items and measured using an un-weighted disclosure index. Aly *et al.* (2010) noted that a majority of studies in this field have used an un-weighted disclosure index. Indeed, Cooke (1989) has argued that un-weighted indices are more suitable research instruments in corporate disclosure studies when the research is focused on all groups who use a company's annual report rather than the requirements of any specific user category. Hence, the level of FI disclosure is measured using the following equation:

$$FID_j = \sum_{i=1}^n L_i \quad (1)$$

where  $L$  is 1 if the item  $i$  is disclosed and 0 otherwise;  $n$  is number of items which has an upper limit of 39 in the current study. Companies are not penalised for non-disclosure of information about items which were not relevant to their circumstances; hence, the percentage of overall FI disclosure level for each company is measured as follows:

$$POFID_j = \sum_{i=1}^n L_i / N_i \quad (2)$$

$n$  is the total number of applicable to each firm.

To increase the reliability of the disclosure index, the current study performed the test of internal consistency for both the items and the categories included in the index. The results suggest that there is a high level of internal consistency (reliability) in the disclosure index as a measure of FI information provided by Jordanian listed companies in the current research[17]. To assess the validity of the current study's disclosure index, a construct validity test was performed by examining the correlation between the percentage of the overall FI disclosure and a number of firm characteristics, namely, firm size, industry, auditor, profitability and leverage. The results of the correlation test between FI disclosure and these firm characteristics were consistent with the findings from the extant literature indicating the disclosure index of the current study is validly constructed[18].

#### 4.3 Statistical analysis used

A number of statistical tests have been carried out by the current study to examine the hypotheses proposed; both parametric and non-parametric measures are used. First, a Wilcoxon Rank test (non-parametric) and the Paired-Samples  $t$ -test (parametric) are used to test whether there are significant differences between the proportions of Jordanian listed companies disclosing FI information ( $H1$ ) and to examine whether there are significant differences between the levels of FI disclosure provided ( $H2$ ) pre- and post-introduction of IFRS 7. Second, a Kruskal–Wallis test and its parametric equivalent (the one-way ANOVA) are used to investigate whether FI disclosure provided by Jordanian listed companies varies within and across industry ( $H3$ ).

## 5. Results and discussion

### 5.1 The proportion of companies disclosing Financial Instrument disclosure

This section provides the results of analysing  $H1$  examined by the present paper which stated that “The proportion of Jordanian listed companies providing FI disclosure has increased significantly following the introduction of IFRS 7”. Table II details the proportion of Jordanian listed companies disclosing FI-related information pre- and post-implementation of IFRS 7 (by category), as well as the test of significance on the difference between these two (including both parametric and non-parametric measures). A visual inspection of Table II reveals that the implementation of IFRS 7 was associated with a growth in the number of companies supplying information within and across all disclosure categories. In general, the bottom row of Table II indicates that the mean (median) proportion of companies publishing FI information increased significantly after IFRS 7 was implemented; it grew from a mean (median) of 0.27 (0.24) pre-IFRS 7 to 0.49 (0.41) post-IFRS 7 with a  $t$ -value ( $z$ -value) of 6.449 (5.445) and a  $p$ -value of less than 0.05. A further analysis of Table II illustrates that the increase in the proportion of



| FI disclosure categories  | Pre-IFRS 7 mean (%) | Post-IFRS 7 mean (%) | Mean difference (%) | Paired-samples <i>t</i> -test | Pre-IFRS 7 median (%) | Post-IFRS 7 median (%) | Median difference (%) | Wilcoxon signed test |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Accounting policies of FI | 41                  | 74                   | 33                  | 4.292*                        | 41                    | 78                     | 37                    | 1.826*               |
| Balance sheet             | 48                  | 78                   | 30                  | 2.826*                        | 63                    | 88                     | 25                    | 2.326*               |
| Income statement          | 38                  | 54                   | 16                  | 1.835                         | 35                    | 71                     | 36                    | 2.214                |
| Hedge disclosures         | 04                  | 16                   | 12                  | 5.974**                       | 2                     | 11                     | 7                     | 2.689**              |
| Fair value                | 59                  | 90                   | 31                  | 2.161*                        | 72                    | 100                    | 28                    | 2.023*               |
| Other disclosures         | 02                  | 15                   | 12                  | 4.275**                       | 3                     | 15                     | 12                    | 2.384**              |
| Overall FI disclosure     | 27                  | 49                   | 22                  | 6.449**                       | 24                    | 41                     | 37                    | 5.445**              |

**Notes:** This table shows the proportion of Jordanian listed companies publishing FI disclosure pre- and post-implementation of IFRS 7, as well as tests for significance differences \*indicates 5% significance level and \*\*refers to 1% significance level

**Table II.**  
The proportion of Jordanian listed firms disclosing items of FI information: 2006 and 2007

companies disclosing FI-related information was spread across all categories of FI disclosure. However, this growth was not consistent for each type of disclosure; there was a great deal of variation among FI disclosure categories. In particular, the FI-related accounting policies category accounted for the largest change; the mean (median) percentage of companies disclosing such information increased by 33 per cent (37 per cent) after IFRS 7 was adopted; this growth was statistically different with a  $t$ -value ( $z$ -value) of 4.292 (1.826) and  $p$ -values of less than 5 per cent. On the other hand, FI-related hedge disclosures documented the smallest growth; the mean (median) proportion of companies publishing hedge information rose by just 12 per cent (7 per cent) after IFRS 7 was adopted, although this growth was significant with a  $t$ -value ( $z$ -value) of 5.974 (2.689) and  $p$ -values of less than 1 per cent. Moreover, Table II indicates that even though the fraction of companies publishing income statement information grew by 16 per cent, this improvement was not significantly different from 0. Overall, the results presented in Table II suggest that the introduction of IFRS 7 was not problematic, as a larger number of firms complied with the requirements of the new standard. Specifically, IFRS 7 seems to have increased awareness among companies that FI-related disclosures were required, whereas compliance with IAS 30/32 had been less than fulsome. However, for some categories of disclosure (hedge disclosure and other disclosure), the percentage of companies complying with IFRS 7 is very low.

According to the results presented in Table II,  $H1$  is accepted. In particular, the introduction of IFRS 7 increased the number of firms providing FI disclosure. Specifically, IFRS 7 seems to have increased awareness among companies that FI-related disclosures were required, whereas compliance with IAS 30/32 had been less than fulsome. This change may be attributable to a number of factors. For instance, Jordanian listed companies may have complied with IFRS 7 because it was new and published by JACPA. Also, Jordanian companies are now familiar with IASB disclosure requirements, as they applied IAS/IFRS since 1997 (Al-Akra *et al.*, 2009); hence, the adoption of new accounting standards is no longer problematic for accounting preparers. In addition, the publicity accorded to IFRS 7 in the financial press (JSC, 2009) may have put further pressure on Jordanian firms to increase their risk disclosure disclosures. Indeed, the JSC was keen to show that Jordanian companies were in the lead in terms of compliance with new standards from the IASB to attract new (mainly foreign) investors into the Jordan economy (Mardini, 2012). Alternatively, the introduction of the new standards (IFRS 7), as well as the increasing usage of FIs by Jordanian listed companies over the past few years, may have caused financial statement preparers to re-evaluate their FI disclosure practices (Tahat, 2013).

### 5.2 The level of Financial Instrument disclosure provided by Jordanian listed companies

This section provides the results of analysing  $H2$  examined by the present paper which stated that "The level of FI disclosure has increased significantly following the introduction of IFRS 7 compared to information provided previously by Jordanian listed companies". Table III examines the level of FI disclosure supplied by Jordanian listed companies pre- and post-IFRS 7; it investigates the number of FI-related items published by the sample firms and tests whether changes in the level of FI disclosure over the two periods are statistically significant. Table III shows the tests of significance for differences in the mean (median) number of disclosure items before and after the

| Categories of<br>FI disclosure | Wilcoxon signed test  |                        |                       | Paired-samples t-test |         |                     |                      |                     |         |         |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------|---------|
|                                | Pre-IFRS<br>7 medians | Post-IFRS<br>7 medians | Medians<br>difference | Z-value               | p-value | Pre-IFRS<br>7 means | Post-IFRS<br>7 means | Means<br>difference | t-value | p-value |
| Accounting policies            | 2.0                   | 3.0                    | 1.0                   | 7.45*                 | 0.000   | 2.0                 | 3.0                  | 1.0                 | 15.50*  | 0.000   |
| Balance sheet                  | 3.0                   | 6.0                    | 3.0                   | 7.65*                 | 0.000   | 4.0                 | 6.0                  | 2.0                 | 16.40*  | 0.000   |
| Income statement               | 3.0                   | 4.0                    | 1.0                   | 6.80*                 | 0.000   | 2.0                 | 3.0                  | 1.0                 | 09.50*  | 0.000   |
| Hedge accounting               | 0.0                   | 0.0                    | 0.0                   | 4.75*                 | 0.000   | 0.29                | 1.0                  | 1.0                 | 05.25*  | 0.000   |
| Fair value                     | 3.0                   | 5.0                    | 2.0                   | 7.70*                 | 0.000   | 3.0                 | 5.0                  | 2.0                 | 20.00*  | 0.000   |
| Other disclosures              | 0.0                   | 0.0                    | 0.0                   | 4.65*                 | 0.000   | 0.07                | 1.0                  | 1.0                 | 05.30*  | 0.000   |
| Overall FI disclosure          | 10                    | 18                     | 8                     | 8.877                 | 0.000   | 11.0                | 19.0                 | 8.0                 | 20.453  | 0.000   |

**Notes:** This table shows a comparison of FI items published pre- and post-implementation of IFRS 7. Non-parametric and parametric measures are employed \* indicates that values are significant at the 1% level. Medians and means were calculated based on the actual number of disclosed items for each company

**Table III.**  
Tests of significance  
among median and  
mean differences in  
items disclosed for FI  
categories pre- and  
post-IFRS 7

implementation of IFRS 7; this analysis is based on the actual items disclosed in the companies' annual reports.

As can be seen from Table III, there is very strong evidence that the overall number of FI items provided under IFRS 7 increased significantly. Specifically, the bottom row of Table III reveals that the overall mean (median) number of items rose from 11 (10) beforehand to 19 (18) items after IFRS 7 became effective. The mean (median) difference of the overall number of items published was significantly different from 0; it had a  $t$ -value of 20.453 ( $z$ -value of 8.877) and  $p$ -values of less than 1 per cent.

A number of points emerge from an analysis of Table III. First, the pattern of growth in the overall number of FI items disclosed was spread across all the six sub-categories of the checklist. However, the amount of increase varied from one category to another. A visual inspection of the table reveals that *balance sheet* and *fair value* categories accounted for the largest significant increase with mean (median) differences of 2.0 (3.0) and 2.0 (2.0) items, respectively; they had  $t$ -values of 16.40 and 20.00 ( $z$ -values of 7.65 and 7.70). On the other hand, the smallest significant change was associated with the *other disclosures* category with a mean (median) difference of 0.0 (1.0) item which was significant at the 1 per cent level. In addition, the table reports that disclosure items relating to other sub-categories of FI information also increased significantly after IFRS 7 was implemented, namely, accounting policies, income statement and hedge information; they all reported statistically positive and significant mean (median) differences (Table III). According to the results presented in Table III, an objective of the standard setter seems to have been achieved with the adoption of IFRS 7; the users of the annual reports were provided with more and new information about companies' usage of FIs which may have been useful.

Based on the results in Table III,  $H2$  is accepted. Specifically, the users of the annual reports were provided with more and new information about companies' FI in the Financial Instruments which may have been useful. In addition to the introduction of IFRS 7, some institutional reforms in Jordan may have played a role in this increased disclosure. For instance, the open market policies, as well as the economic reforms (e.g. privatization) initiated by the government, have led to an increase in the volume of foreign investment (Mardini, 2012). These changes in market conditions may have placed more pressure on preparers to meet the needs of foreign investors who are used to receiving a satisfactory level of such information in their home countries.

### 5.3 An analysis of Financial Instruments disclosure by industrial sector

This section provides the results of analysing  $H3$  examined by the present paper which stated that "There are significant differences in FI disclosures by Jordanian listed companies within and across sectors". A summary of the percentage disclosure index is shown for all sectors in Table IV by disclosure category and sector. Panel A provides the analysis before IFRS 7 became effective, while Panel B presents this analysis after IFRS 7 was implemented. An analysis of the bottom row of each panel in the table reveals that IFRS 7 was associated with a 17 per cent increase in the overall percentage of FI-related items disclosed; it grew from 30 per cent of items required to be disclosed pre-IFRS 7 to 47 per cent of items required to be published after IFRS 7 was adopted. In general, the findings of the current study are consistent with the notion that the new accounting standard put pressure on companies to publish more information to meet the needs of

**Table IV.**  
The percentage of FI  
disclosure index  
results for Jordanian  
listed companies by  
sectors: 2006 and  
2007

| Sector                            | AP<br>(%) | BS<br>(%) | ISD<br>(%) | HD<br>(%) | FVD<br>(%) | OD<br>(%) | OVD<br>(%) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| <i>Panel A: Pre-IFRS 7: 2006</i>  |           |           |            |           |            |           |            |
| Banks                             | 67        | 74        | 61         | 22        | 67         | 11        | 44         |
| Financial services                | 38        | 46        | 42         | 01        | 55         | 1         | 27         |
| Services                          | 33        | 58        | 34         | 02        | 57         | 1         | 28         |
| Manufacturing                     | 37        | 56        | 24         | 01        | 62         | 0         | 27         |
| Overall                           | 41        | 57        | 38         | 04        | 59         | 2         | 30         |
| <i>Panel B: Post-IFRS 7: 2007</i> |           |           |            |           |            |           |            |
| Banks                             | 98        | 86        | 76         | 69        | 93         | 52        | 69         |
| Financial services                | 77        | 78        | 58         | 07        | 81         | 08        | 45         |
| Services                          | 64        | 75        | 54         | 11        | 82         | 12        | 44         |
| Manufacturing                     | 65        | 76        | 41         | 4         | 81         | 3         | 40         |
| Overall                           | 73        | 78        | 55         | 16        | 83         | 14        | 47         |

**Notes:** This table presents details about the proportion of risk information by sector pre- and post-IFRS 7's implementation. AP = Accounting Policies Disclosures; BS = Balance Sheet Disclosures; ISD = Income Statement Disclosures; HD = Hedge Disclosures; FVD = Fair Value Disclosures; OD = Other Disclosures

financial statement users including capital market participants (Chalmers and Godfrey, 2004; Chalmers, 2001; Hamlen and Largay, 2005).

A more disaggregated analysis of Table IV reveals that the percentage of FI items provided by banks went up from 44 per cent pre-IFRS 7 to 69 per cent post-IFRS 7 was implemented. In terms of FI disclosure categories, Table IV reveals that, prior to the implementation of IFRS 7, the *Balance Sheet* category was the most reported category among the banks with 74 per cent (BS column) of balance sheet items being published by firms in this sector. On the other hand, after implementing IFRS 7, *Accounting Policies* was ranked first in terms of disclosure level with 98 per cent of accounting policy items being disclosed in the banks' financial statements. The largest change among the disclosure categories for banks related to *Hedge Disclosures* which grew by 47 per cent across all banks after the adoption of IFRS 7 (HD column). A further analysis of Table IV indicates that all other categories of FI disclosure among banks increased but at different growth rates.

An inspection of Table IV reveals that the overall results of the FI disclosure for companies in the financial sector increased from 27 per cent of items pre-IFRS 7 to 45 per cent of items post-IFRS 7. In contrast to the banks, Table IV reveals that the *Fair Value* category recorded the highest level of disclosure among the different categories over the two periods with 55 per cent of fair value items being published pre-IFRS 7 and 81 per cent of items being provided post-IFRS 7 (OVD column). On the other hand, *Hedge Disclosure* had the lowest level of FI disclosure among financial firms over the two periods; only 6 per cent of the items in this category were published in the financial statements. In addition, Table IV shows that all other categories of FI disclosure have grown by different rates, i.e. *Accounting Policies* (39 per cent), *Balance Sheet* (32 per cent) and *Other Disclosures* (7 per cent). Such a finding represents a valuable contribution to the literature in this area, as the question of analysing disclosure for financial

(non-banking) companies has been overlooked in most previous studies; prior research has focused either on banks, manufacturing firms and/or service companies. Although one might have expected that financial companies would follow the disclosure behaviour of banks because their activities are similar, the evidence in the current study suggests that this is not the case; disclosure practices about FIs among non-banking financial companies is much lower than the information provided by their counterparts in the banking industry.

With respect to the service sector, [Table IV](#) reveals that, in general, the overall level of FI disclosure for companies in this industry increased to 44 per cent of the items required under IFRS 7 as compared to 28 per cent of items required under IAS 32. An analysis of [Table IV](#) suggests that although all sub-categories of FI disclosure increased for service firms after IFRS 7 was implemented, the increase varied from one category to another. A visual inspection of this table reveals that the largest improvement was documented for the *Accounting Policies* category where an additional 31 per cent of disclosure items were provided by companies in this sector in 2007. Not surprisingly, the smallest change was associated with the *Hedge Disclosure* category which grew by only 9 per cent after IFRS 7 was adopted. In addition, [Table IV](#) explains that *Balance Sheet* and *Fair Value* information had the highest overall levels of disclosure among service companies over the two periods, with 58 and 57 per cent of the items required under IAS 32 being published as compared to 75 and 82 per cent of this information being disclosed after IFRS 7 became effective.

Finally, [Table IV](#) displays the findings about the level of FI disclosure supplied by manufacturing companies. A visual inspection of this table reveals that the overall level of FI disclosure for companies in this sector increased by 13 per cent of items required to be published; it rose from 27 per cent before IFRS 7 to 40 per cent after IFRS 7 was implemented. A more disaggregated analysis of results in this sector reveals that *Accounting Policies* recorded the largest increase among all categories analysed with the number of *Accounting Policies*-related items provided by manufacturing companies growing by 28 per cent after IFRS 7 was adopted. As with all of the other sectors, the smallest improvement was found in the *Hedge Disclosure* category which grew by just 3 per cent. As with the services sector findings, [Table IV](#) highlights that the *Fair Value* and *Balance Sheet* categories had the highest percentage of items disclosed over the two periods by manufacturing companies in the sample; they varied from 62 and 56 per cent (pre-IFRS 7) to 81 and 76 per cent (post-IFRS 7), respectively.

[Table V](#) reports the results of whether FI disclosure within each sector varied by a statistically significant amount; the table provides both the  $\chi^2$  (chi-square) statistic for the Kruskal–Wallis test and *F*-statistic for the one-way ANOVA test[19]. A visual inspection of the bottom row of [Table V](#) reveals that the mean (median) differences in the overall FI disclosure within sectors were significant pre- and post-implementation of IFRS 7; the  $\chi^2$  values were 18.86 and 26.10 (the *F*-statistic was 9.50 and 33.30, respectively) for the disclosure index values before and after the implementation of IFRS 7, respectively; all statistics had *p*-values of less than 1 per cent. These statistics represent very strong evidence that the overall number of FI items disclosed was significantly different within sectors. However, this pattern was not consistent across all categories of FI disclosure. For example, while the mean (median) differences associated with *Balance Sheet* were significant with a  $\chi^2$  value of 33.31 (*F*-statistic of 16.40) and *p*-value of 1 per cent pre-IFRS 7, these differences



| FI disclosure categories | Kruskal – Wallis Test |     |     |            |                |                | One-way ANOVA       |      |      |             |               |               |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----|------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|------|------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
|                          | Difference in medians |     |     | Chi-square |                |                | Difference in means |      |      | F-statistic |               |               |
|                          | BN                    | FS  | SR  | MA         | Pre-IFRS7      | Post-IFRS7     | BN                  | FS   | SR   | MA          | Pre-IFRS7     | Post-IFRS7    |
| Accounting policies      | 1.5                   | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.5        | 22.12 (0.000)* | 19.16 (0.000)* | 1.25                | 1.54 | 1.23 | 1.16        | 13.5 (0.000)* | 7.90 (0.000)* |
| Balance sheet            | 2.0                   | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.0        | 33.31 (0.000)* | 04.57 (0.206)  | 1.58                | 2.73 | 1.72 | 1.81        | 16.4 (0.000)* | 1.50 (0.218)  |
| Income statement         | 1.0                   | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.0        | 34.62 (0.000)* | 23.13 (0.000)* | 0.91                | 0.96 | 1.16 | 0.96        | 17.8 (0.000)* | 9.20 (0.000)* |
| Hedge                    | 4.5                   | 0   | 0   | 0          | 30.42 (0.000)* | 32.09 (0.000)* | 3.25                | 0.50 | 0.83 | 0.27        | 18.5 (0.000)* | 33.5 (0.000)* |
| Fair value               | 3.0                   | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0        | 10.16 (0.017)* | 07.60 (0.055)  | 2.25                | 2.08 | 2.11 | 1.77        | 3.00 (0.033)* | 2.30 (0.086)  |
| Other disclosure         | 3.0                   | 0   | 0   | 0          | 13.19 (0.004)* | 40.10 (0.000)* | 0.78                | 0.19 | 2.5  | 0.35        | 5.6 (0.002)*  | 27.0 (0.000)* |
| Overall FI disclosure    | 15                    | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.5        | 18.26 (0.000)* | 26.10 (0.000)* | 10.02               | 8.0  | 9.55 | 6.32        | 9.5 (0.000)*  | 33.3 (0.000)* |

**Notes:** This table shows the test of significance within sectors; a Kruskal–Wallis and a one-way ANOVA test were conducted. BN is banks, FS is financial services, SR is services, MA is manufacturing. \*refers to where the difference is significant at the 1% level

**Table V.**  
Results from the significance tests for differences in FI items disclosed within industrial sectors pre- and post-IFRS 7

were not significant within sectors after IFRS 7 was adopted; they had a  $\chi^2$  value of 4.57 ( $F$ -statistic of 1.50) and a  $p$ -value of over 0.20. Table V also shows that the mean (median) differences of *Fair Value* information was not significantly different within sectors post the implementation of IFRS 7 with a  $\chi^2$  value of 7.60 ( $F$ -statistic of 2.30) and  $p$ -values greater than 0.05 as compared to significant differences beforehand. Importantly, the industrial analysis of FI disclosure pre- and post-implementation of IFRS 7 has revealed specific aspects of usefulness. In particular, the analysis relating to *Balance Sheet* and *Fair Value* suggests that the new standard enhanced the comparability of such information within sectors. Prior to IFRS 7, different accounting standards were applied to both financial and non-financial institutions; while the former applied IAS 30, the latter adopted IAS 32. By contrast, IFRS 7 is applied by all companies irrespective of their industrial affiliation. This result suggests that more Jordanian listed companies complied with *Balance Sheet* and *Fair Value* disclosure requirements than with other categories of information mandated about FIs[20]. Hence, financial statements are likely to have increased comparability after the implementation of this standard.

According to the results provided in Tables IV and V,  $H3$  is approved. The industrial analysis of FI-related disclosure revealed that the highest level of FI disclosure was provided by firms in the banking sector over the two periods. Other sectors provided slightly lower proportions of FI disclosures. This result is consistent with previous studies in the corporate disclosure literature which have pointed out that banks tend to provide a larger volume of information as compared to other sectors; presumably because banks are more likely to use FIs, employ the most sophisticated information systems, have enough resources to produce the information required and hire auditors from the Big Four firms who require such information to be published to avoid a qualified audit report (Owusu-Ansah, 1998; Hossain, 2000; Akhtaruddin, 2005).

In addition, the industrial analysis of FI disclosure revealed specific aspects of usefulness. In particular, some components of FI disclosure (*Balance Sheet* and *Fair Value*) showed no significant differences within and across sectors post the implementation of IFRS 7, suggesting that the new standard may have enhanced the comparability of such information regarding these categories. Prior to IFRS 7, different accounting standards were applied to both financial and non-financial institutions; while the former applied IAS 30, the latter adopted IAS 32. By contrast, IFRS 7 is applied by all companies irrespective of their industrial affiliation. Certainly, the comparability attribute has been emphasised by both the accounting literature (Staubus, 1976; Pownall and Schipper, 1999) and the accounting standard-setters (including the IASB and the FASB) as one of the basic qualitative characteristics necessary for accounting information to be considered useful (Whittington, 2008a, 2008b).

## 6. Conclusion

This paper examines FI disclosure provided by Jordanian listed companies pre- and post-implementation of IFRS 7. In general, evidence is provided about the positive impact of IFRS 7 on FI disclosure supplied by Jordanian listed firms. In particular, the study finds that a larger number of Jordanian listed companies provided a greater level of FI-related information after IFRS 7 was implemented. Specifically, the sample firms provided 47 per cent of the disclosure index items after implementing IFRS 7 as

compared to 30 per cent under IAS 30/32. In addition, the industrial analysis of FI disclosure revealed that the highest level of disclosure was provided by firms in the banking sector over the two periods; these companies disclosed 44 per cent of FI-related items pre-IFRS 7 and 69 per cent of items post-IFRS 7. Moreover, the industrial analysis of FI disclosure pre-and post-implementation of IFRS 7 revealed specific aspects of usefulness. In particular, some components of FI disclosure (*Balance Sheet* and *Fair Value*) showed no significant differences within and across sectors post the implementation of IFRS 7, suggesting that the new standard may have enhanced the comparability of such information.

The results of the current study have a number of implications for policymakers. First, the findings of the present paper provide a great deal of insight for the IASB about the relevance of its standards throughout the world. Indeed, the current study provides valuable evidence about how an emerging capital market such as Jordan (outside the Western context which previous studies mainly cover) with different contextual settings responds to new accounting standards introduced. This insight can help the IASB consider institutional differences among countries when revising its pronouncements. For instance, the relatively low degree of compliance with FI disclosure requirements after IFRS 7 was implemented (47 per cent) may be due to cultural factors such as prevalence for secrecy among Jordanian managers. This influential characteristic of Jordanian society may have led the management (preparers) of Jordanian listed companies to publish less information about FIs than might have been disclosed in more open societies.

Second, the results provide timely findings to Jordanian authorities who may be trying to evaluate the current reforms adopted; stringent enforcement mechanisms are needed to ensure full compliance with accounting standards. Hence, the findings provide valuable insights for policymakers in Jordan who are concerned about the implications of mandatory disclosures and show to what extent Jordanian listed companies comply with accounting regulation in general, and an accounting standard such as IFRS 7 in particular. For example, given the relatively low level of risk disclosure provided by Jordanian listed companies in the current study, regulatory bodies may be concerned about whether investors who rely on financial statements have enough information about their investee companies.

This study is the first comprehensive investigation about the extent to which Jordanian listed companies comply with the new accounting standards enacted; however, it has a number of limitations. First, this study has only investigated the impact of IFRS 7 on risk disclosure for the first year of its adoption in the financial statements of Jordanian listed companies in 2007. Hence, an analysis of data from subsequent years would be needed before any trends can be confirmed. Specifically, companies may need some time for any worries to dissipate about being placed at a competitive disadvantage by IFRS 7 disclosures. Second, the present investigation was conducted on a single nation (Jordan); the circumstances in Jordan gave rise to the importance of the current study. However, this uniqueness obviously limits the extent of any generalisability among the findings. Thus, a cross-country comparative analysis is needed to examine the application of IFRS 7 in a developing country context. Finally, neither determinants of risk disclosure nor the capital market impact of IFRS 7 were addressed by the current study. The results of the current study provide a great deal of motivation for future research in these areas, as the adoption of IFRS 7 was associated with a significant increase in the level of FI disclosure provided by

Jordanian listed companies. Theoretically, connections between the extent of FI disclosure, firm characteristics and the capital market should be examined in the first-time adoption of the standard.

### Notes

1. [Ahmed and Nicholls \(1994\)](#) suggested that an inadequate regulatory framework and the absence of both strict enforcement mechanisms and a well-established accounting profession represented the main reasons why companies in developing countries did not comply fully with accounting regulations in this area.
2. Indeed, expectations about the impact of this standard on FI disclosure were high ([Gornik-Tomaszewski, 2006](#)). For example, 79 per cent of the respondents on the IFRS 7 Exposure Draft suggested that the new standard itself was their key source of information about gaining an understanding of the requirements involved and there was no complexity associated with IFRS 7 ([ACCA, 2009](#)). In addition, [Ernst and Young \(2006\)](#) argued that there was an expectation that the FI information which would be provided under IFRS 7 would be more useful, as management was responsible for the process of preparing such information. However, some concerns were raised about the new standard. For example, the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB) stated that the proposed disclosures required by IFRS 7 were particularly onerous; the Board expressed concern that the additional disclosure was a substitute for what may be perceived as an unsatisfactory consolidation framework ([AASB, 2011](#)).
3. The Jordanian Capital Market was established in 1975 which was called “the Amman Financial Market”. However, the market did not commence trading until January 1978; on that date, 51 companies were listed with a market capitalisation of \$406m ([Alsharairi and Al-Abdullah, 2008](#)).
4. The major tasks of the ASE include: the provision of a secure environment for the trading of listed securities and the protection of investor rights; the development of a transparent and efficient market; providing enterprises with a means for raising capital by listing on the exchange; the provision of modern facilities and effective equipment for recoding trades and the publication of prices; the monitoring and regulating of market trading, in conjunction with the JSC, to ensure compliance with legislation, a fair market and investor protection; the development and enforcement of a professional code of ethics among members and staff; and the provision of timely and accurate information by issuers to the market and the dissemination of market information to the public ([ASE, 2008](#)).
5. This large growth in the value of the ASE is due to a number of economic reforms which has initiated by the government. For example, the government entered into a number of international and national agreements: an agreement with the International Monetary Fund; a commercial agreement with the US in 1998; the establishment of a number of the Qualifying Industrial Zones; and joining the World Trade Organization in 2000 ([ASE, 2008](#)). In addition, the government launched a privatization program in the early of 1990s. As a result of this privatization program, the government’s participation in the provision of goods and services decreased; the involvement of the State in public shareholding companies declined to less than 6 per cent ([Al-Kheder et al., 2009](#)). The major privatization transactions that have occurred and the sizable revenues that have been raised with the considerable investment by the private sector; specifically, over \$2.0bn was raised by the State and over \$1bn was invested in the country by foreign investors (Executive Privatization Unit, 2007).

6. According to the Securities Act No. 76 of 2002, the company will be transferred to the first market if it meets the following conditions: it should be listed for at least one full year on the Second Market; the company's net shareholders' equity must not be less than 100 per cent of the paid-up capital; the company must make net pre-tax profits for at least two fiscal years out of the past three years preceding the transfer of listing; the company's free float to the subscribed shares ratio by the end of its fiscal year must not be less than 5 per cent if its paid-up capital is Jordanian Dinars 50m or more and 10 per cent if its paid-up capital is less than Jordanian Dinars 50m; the number of company shareholders must not be less than 100 by the end of its fiscal year; the minimum days of trading in the company shares must not be less than 20 per cent of overall trading days over the last 12 months; and at least 10 per cent of the free float shares must have been traded during the same period.
7. Prior to the privatisation programme, the government had acquired up to 70 per cent of listed public shareholding firms in Jordanian capital market (Al-Akra *et al.*, 2009).
8. Specifically, Derivatives Market Activity Reports indicate that derivatives usage increased from \$100,000bn in 2001 to \$700,000bn in 2010 (Bank for International Settlements, 2010).
9. There were a number of FIs not covered by IAS 32. These exceptions were: share-based payments (IFRS 2); interests in subsidiaries (IAS 27); interests in associates (IAS 28); interests in joint ventures (IAS 31); employers' right and obligations under employee benefits plan (IAS 19); rights and obligations arising under insurance contracts (IFRS 4); and contracts for contingent consideration in a business combination (IFRS 3).
10. These categories are: FI at fair value through profit or loss – held for trading; FI at fair value through profit or loss – designated; held-to-maturity investments; available-for-sale financial assets; loans and receivables; and financial liabilities measured at amortised cost.
11. Following the introduction of SFAS 133, Bhamornsiri and Schroeder (2004) and Hamlen and Largay (2005) investigated the derivative reporting practices of 30 high-profile companies included in the Dow Jones Industrial Average Index. They found that the amount of disclosure provided about derivatives had increased significantly after SFAS 133 was implemented. Specifically, 90 per cent of sample firms complied with SFAS 133's requirements; as a result, financial statement users were able to assess these company's strategies for using derivative products.
12. Although firms disclosed information about the fair value of financial instruments, they seemed reluctant to reveal the underlying assumptions and methods of measurement underpinning these disclosures.
13. Studies in this area have identified a number of factors that can affect a country's accounting practices: namely, the political and economic system; the legal system; the accounting profession; and the culture (Mueller, 1967; Frank, 1979; Douppnik and Salter, 1995; Nobes, 1998; Gernon and Meek, 2001; Ashraf and Ghani, 2005; Mashayekhi and Mashayekh, 2008).
14. A pilot study examined a sample of ten companies from the Second Market (20 annual reports) and found that: their annual reports were incomplete and FI disclosure in their financial statements was limited to simple FIs (e.g. loans, receivables, payables); and no disclosures were provided about hedge and risk activities associated with FI as IFRS 7 requires. For example, a detailed reading of the annual report for one firm revealed that "their activities are locally limited, so they are not exposed to any kind of risks; hence, they do not need hedge and risk instruments" (Annual Reports of ALFA Co., 2007). The possible bias from including such companies which might publish little or no information in their annual reports is therefore avoided.

15. These companies are listed on the first market of the ASE and used to compute the general index of the Jordanian Stock Exchange (ASE, 2008). In addition, the equities of the companies in the sample of the current study are heavily traded – on average, share prices change for these companies' shares on 80 per cent of the days when the exchange is open (ASE, 2008).
16. A number of steps were followed when constructing the disclosure index in this study to ensure that the index encapsulates all FI information included in the annual reports of the Jordanian listed companies. To this end, a pilot study of eight firms was undertaken for both 2006 and 2007 years (16 annual reports). The findings of the pilot study revealed that the disclosure index was an appropriate vehicle to pick up the relevant FI information provided by the sampled firms. Prior to the analysis stage, two researchers applied individually the disclosure index to the annual reports of a number of companies and differences were noted and reconciled.
17. The results indicated that the coefficient for Cronbach's alpha was 0.80 (pre-IFRS 7) and 0.89 (post-IFRS 7) with the disclosure items, and 0.75 (pre-IFRS 7) and 0.78 (post-IFRS 7) with the disclosure categories. This result is consistent with the findings of [Botosan \(1997\)](#) and [Hassan \(2006b\)](#) who used the same test to measure the internal consistency of their measures of disclosure; while [Botosan \(1997\)](#) documented a coefficient of 0.64, [Hassan's \(2006b\)](#) coefficient was 0.80.
18. The results of correlation test show a positive and significant correlation between the level of FI disclosure and firm size with coefficients of 0.816 (pre-IFRS 7) and 0.723 (post-IFRS 7), profitability with coefficients of 0.686 (pre-IFRS 7) and 0.581 (post-IFRS 7) and the auditor with coefficients of 0.584 (pre-IFRS 7) and 0.667 (post-IFRS 7), and *p*-values of less than 1 per cent. On the other hand, there was a negative association between FI disclosure and industry with coefficients of  $-0.447$  (pre-IFRS 7) and  $-0.459$  (post-IFRS 7) and leverage with coefficients of  $-0.074$  (pre-IFRS7) and  $-0.055$  (post-IFRS7) and *p*-values greater than 5 per cent.
19. To test whether these changes in FI disclosure were significantly different within and across sectors, further statistical analysis was conducted. In particular, the Kruskal–Wallis test and its parametric equivalent, the one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether sectoral changes that were uncovered were similar. To determine whether the equal-variance assumption underpinning the one-way ANOVA was satisfied, *Levene's test for homogeneity of variance* was conducted for each of the two years; the results for Levene's test, which were not significant at the 5 per cent level, indicated that the equal variance assumption for the industry type groups was approximately met for both years' information.
20. The study also performs the test of significance of FI disclosure across industries using the *Bonferroni* test; this test explores whether all sectors behaved in a similar fashion pre-and post-IFRS 7. For example, while there were significant differences between the overall disclosure of FI items between banks and the other three sectors (financial, services and manufacturing companies) with a *p*-value of less than 1 per cent, there were no significant differences across the other three sectors; the *p*-values for financial, services and manufacturing industries were all greater than 5 per cent. However, this pattern of sectoral disclosure was not consistent across all sub-categories of FI disclosure; while some categories were significantly different across all sectors, others were not. For example, there were significant differences across sectors in the *Balance Sheet* category pre-IFRS 7, it was not significantly different across sectors after IFRS 7 was adopted. In another example, while *Fair Value* information was significantly different across all sectors' pre-IFRS 7, there were no significant differences in this information post-IFRS 7. These results imply that the implementation of IFRS 7 improved the comparability of financial statements across sectors with regard to these categories.



## References

- Abu-Nassar, M. (1993), "The development of financial reporting in Jordan: a survey of preparers' and users' attitudes and reporting practices", PhD thesis, University of Kent, UK.
- ACCA (2009), *Complexity in Financial Reporting*, ACCA, London, pp. 1-52.
- Ahmed, K. and Nicholls, D. (1994), "The impact of non-financial company characteristics on mandatory disclosure compliance in developing countries: the case of Bangladesh", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 29, pp. 62-77.
- Akhtaruddin, M. (2005), "Corporate mandatory disclosure practices in Bangladesh", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 40, pp. 399-422.
- Al-Akra, M. and Ali, M.J. (2012), "The value relevance of corporate voluntary disclosure in the Middle-East-the case of Jordan", *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 533-549.
- Al-Akra, M., Eddie, I.A. and Ali, M.J. (2010), "The association between privatisation and voluntary disclosure: evidence from Jordan", *Accounting and Business Research*, Vol. 40, pp. 55-74.
- Al-Akra, M., Jahangir Ali, M. and Marashdeh, O. (2009), "Development of accounting regulation in Jordan", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 44, pp. 163-186.
- Al-Kheder, S., Al-Shawabkeh, Y. and Haala, N. (2009), "Developing a documentation system for desert palaces in Jordan using 3d laser scanning and digital photogrammetry", *Journal of Archaeological Science*, Vol. 36, pp. 537-546.
- Al-Omari, A.M. (2010), "The institutional framework of financial reporting in Jordan", *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 22, pp. 32-50.
- Al-Rai (2004), "The usage of financial instruments", *Al-Rai*, 2 August, available at: [www.alrai.com](http://www.alrai.com)
- Alsharairi, M. and Al-Abdullah, R. (2008), "The impact of adopting IASs on the Jordanian environment: the perspective of accountants, auditors and academicians' an exploratory study", Working paper, German Jordanian University.
- Aly, D., Simon, J. and Hussainey, K. (2010), "Determinants of corporate internet reporting: evidence from Egypt", *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 182-202.
- ASE (2003), *Rules and Regulation*, Amman, available at: [www.ase.com.jo](http://www.ase.com.jo) (accessed 10 May 2003).
- ASE (2005), *Market Statistical Information*, Amman, available at: [www.ase.com.jo](http://www.ase.com.jo) (accessed 7 November 2005).
- ASE (2007), *Rules and Regulation*, Amman, available at: [www.ase.com.jo](http://www.ase.com.jo) (accessed 27 August 2007).
- Ashraf, J. and Ghani, W.Q.I. (2005), "Accounting development in Pakistan", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 40, pp. 175-201.
- Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB) (2011), *Review of IFRS 12 Disclosure of Interests in Other Entities*, AASB.
- Bamber, M. and McMeeking, K. (2010), "An examination of voluntary financial instruments disclosures in excess of mandatory requirements by UK FTSE 100 non-financial firms", *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, Vol. 11, pp. 133-153.
- Belkaoui, A. (1983), "Economic, political, and civil indicators and reporting and disclosure adequacy: empirical investigation", *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, Vol. 2, pp. 207-219.
- Beresford, D.R. (1997), *The Need for Accounting Standards*, CPA Journal, available at: [www.nysscpa.org/cpajournal](http://www.nysscpa.org/cpajournal)

- Berkman, H., Bradbury, M.E., Hancock, P. and Innes, C. (1997), "An analysis of disclosures of derivatives financial instruments in Australia and New Zealand", *Accounting Forum*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 207-228.
- Bhamornsiri, S. and Schroeder, R.G. (2004), "The disclosure of information on derivatives under SFAS No. 133: evidence from the Dow 30", *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 19, pp. 669-680.
- Bischof, J. (2009), "The effects of IFRS 7 adoption on bank disclosure in Europe", *Accounting in Europe*, Vol. 6, pp. 167-194.
- Bodnar, G.M., Hayt, G.S., Marston, R.C. and Smithson, C.W. (1998), "Wharton survey of financial risk management by us non-financial firms", *Financial Management*, Vol. 25, pp. 70-91.
- Botosan, C.A. (1997), "Disclosure level and the cost of equity capital", *The Accounting Review*, Vol. 72, pp. 323-349.
- Chalmers, K. (2001), "The progression from voluntary to mandatory derivative instrument disclosures—look who's Talking", *Australian Accounting Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 34-44.
- Chalmers, K. and Godfrey, J.M. (2004), "Reputation costs: the impetus for voluntary derivative financial instrument reporting", *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 29, pp. 95-125.
- Chalmers, K.G. and Godfrey, J.M. (2000), "Practice versus prescription in the disclosure and recognition of derivatives", *Australian Accounting Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 40-50.
- Chau, G., Chan, D. and Chan, T. (2000), "Accounting for financial instruments: an overview of issues and some evidence from Hong Kong", *Asian Review of Accounting*, Vol. 8, pp. 97-113.
- Coestee, D. (2010), "A critical review of the effect of accounting for financial instruments on the accounting framework", *Southern African Business Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 115-129.
- Conti, C. and Mauri, A. (2006), "Corporate financial risk management: governance and disclosure post IFRS 7", Working paper, The ICAFI University.
- Cooke, T.E. (1989), "Disclosure in the corporate annual reports of Swedish companies", *Accounting and Business Research*, Vol. 19 No. 74, pp. 113-124.
- Cooke, T.E. and Wallace, R.S. (1990), "Financial disclosure regulation and its environment: a review and further analysis", *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, Vol. 9, pp. 79-110.
- DeMarzo, P.M. and Duffie, D. (1995), "Corporate incentives for hedging and hedge accounting", *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 8, pp. 743-771.
- Doupnik, T.S. and Salter, S.B. (1995), "External environment, culture, and accounting practices: a preliminary test of a general model of international accounting development", *International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 189-207.
- Dunne, T. (2003), "Derivatives reporting: the implications of recent accounting standards for corporate governance and accountability", PhD thesis, University of Dundee.
- Dunne, T., Helliar, C., Power, D., Mallin, C., Ow-Yong, K. and Moir, L. (2004), "The introduction of derivatives reporting in the UK: a content analysis of FRS 13 disclosures", *Journal of Derivatives Accounting*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 205-219.
- Edwards, G.A., Jr and Eller, G.E. (1995), "Overview of derivatives disclosures by major US banks", *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, Vol. 81, pp. 817-831.
- El-Masry, A.A. (2006), "Derivatives use and risk management practices by UK nonfinancial companies", *Managerial Finance*, Vol. 32, pp. 137-159.
- Ernst & Young (2006), *The Impact of IFRS on European Banks*, Ernst & Young Global, London.
- Executive Privatization Unit (2007), *Completed Privatised Projects*, Amman, Jordan.

- Frank, W.G. (1979), "An empirical analysis of international accounting principles", *Journal of Accounting Research*, Vol. 17, pp. 593-605.
- Froot, K.A., Scharfstein, D.S. and Stein, J.C. (1993), "Risk management: coordinating corporate investment and financing decisions", *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 48, pp. 1629-1658.
- Gebhardt, G. (2012), "Financial instruments in non-financial firms: what do we know?", *Accounting and Business Research*, Vol. 42, pp. 267-289.
- Gernon, H. and Meek, G.K. (2001), *Accounting: An International Perspective*, Irwin.
- Goldberg, S.R., Godwin Kim Tritschler, J.H. and Myung-Sun, C.A. (1998), "On the determinants of corporate usage of financial derivatives", *Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting*, 9 No. 2, pp. 132-166.
- Goldberg, S.R., Tritschler, C.A. and Godwin, J.H. (1994), "Financial reporting for foreign exchange derivatives", Working paper, Purdue University.
- Gornik-Tomaszewski, S. (2006), "New international standard for disclosures of financial instruments", *Bank Accounting and Finance*, Vol. 19 No. 2, p. 43.
- Grant, K. and Marshall, A.P. (1997), "Large UK companies and derivatives", *European Financial Management*, Vol. 3, pp. 191-208.
- Gray, S.J. (1988), "Towards a theory of cultural influence on the development of accounting systems internationally", *Abacus*, Vol. 24, pp. 1-15.
- Haddad, A.E. (2005), "The impact of voluntary disclosure level on the cost of equity capital in an emerging capital market: the case of the Amman Stock Exchange", PhD thesis, University of East Anglia, UK.
- Hamlen, S.S. and Largay, J.A. (2005), "Has SFAS 133 made derivatives reporting more transparent? A look at the Dow-Jones 30", *Journal of Derivatives Accounting*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 215-230.
- Hassan, M.S.B., Percy, M. and Stewart, J.D. (2006a), "The value relevance of fair value disclosures in Australian firms in the extractive industries", *Asian Academy of Management Journal of Accounting and Finance*, Vol. 2, pp. 21-41.
- Hassan, M.S., Mohd-Saleh, N. and Abd-Rahman, M.R. (2006b), "Determinants of financial instruments quality among listed firms in Malaysia", Working paper, Universiti Kebangsaan.
- Herz, R.H., Bushee, B.J. and Elmy, F.J. (1996), "Derivatives: were 1994 disclosures adequate?", *Journal of Corporate Accounting and Finance*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 21-34.
- Hodder, L., Koonce, L. and McAnally, M.L. (2002), "SEC market risk disclosures: implications for judgment and decision making", *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 15, pp. 49-70.
- Hofstede, G. and Bond, M.H. (1984), "Hofstede's culture dimensions", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 15, pp. 417-433.
- Hossain, M.A. (2000), "An evaluation of the international accounting standards in developing countries: a case study of Bangladesh", Research Report, Rajshahi University.
- Hutaibat, K.A. (2005), "Management accounting practices in Jordan: a contingency approach", PhD thesis, University of Bristol, UK.
- Ighian, D.C. (2012), "A study on accounting standards with regards to financial instruments", *Economics and Applied Informatics*, Vol. 1, pp. 69-76.
- International Accounting Standards Committee (1990), *IAS 30: Disclosures in the Financial Statements of Banks and Similar Financial Institutions*, IASC.

- International, Accounting Standards Committee (1996), *IAS 32 Financial Instruments: Disclosure and Presentation*, IASC.
- International, Financial Reporting Board (2006), *IFRS 7: Financial Instruments: Disclosure*, IASB.
- Jacque, L.L. (2010), *Global Derivative Debacles: From Theory to Malpractice*, World Scientific, London.
- Jaggi, B.L. (1975), "The impact of the cultural environment on financial disclosure", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 1, pp. 75-84.
- JSC (2009), *Business Laws*, available at: [www.jsc.gov.jo](http://www.jsc.gov.jo) (accessed 1 March 2009).
- Kawamura, Y. (1996), "FASB derivatives disclosure survey: how complete are annual reports?", *Journal of Corporate Accounting and Finance*, 7 No. 4, pp. 39-51.
- Li, S. and Gao, S. (2007), "The usefulness of derivative-related disclosure: evidence from major Australian Banks", *International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation*, Vol. 4, pp. 248-262.
- Lopes, P.T. and Rodrigues, L.L. (2006), "Accounting practices for financial instruments, how far are Portuguese companies from IFRS?", *Financial Reporting Regulation and Governance*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 1-36.
- Lopes, P.T. and Rodrigues, L.L. (2008), "Accounting for financial instruments: a comparison of European companies' practices with IAS 32 and IAS 39", *Research in Accounting Regulation*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 273-275.
- Mahoney, J.P. and Kawamura, Y. (1995), *Review of 1994 Disclosures About Derivative Financial Instruments and Fair Value of Financial Instruments*, Financial Accounting Series.
- Mallin, C., Ow-Yong, K. and Reynolds, M. (2001), "Derivatives usage in UK non-financial listed companies", *The European Journal of Finance*, Vol. 7, pp. 63-91.
- Mardini, G. (2012), "The impact of IFRS 8 on segmental reporting by Jordanian listed companies: an analysis of disclosure practices and some stakeholders' perceptions", PhD thesis, University of Dundee, UK.
- Mashayekhi, B. and Mashayekh, S. (2008), "Development of accounting in Iran", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 43, pp. 66-86.
- Mueller, G.G. (1967), "International accounting", *The International Executive*, Vol. 9, pp. 1-2.
- Murcia, F.D.R. and Santos, A.D. (2010), "Evidences of international financial reporting standards (IFRS) Implementation in Brazil: the case of derivatives", Working paper, University of São Paulo.
- Naito, J. and Laux, J. (2011), "Derivatives usage: value-adding or destroying?", *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 41-50.
- Nobes, C.W. (1984), *International Classification of Financial Reporting*, Croom Helm, London.
- Nobes, C.W. (1998), "Towards a general model of the reasons for international differences in financial reporting", *Abacus*, Vol. 34, pp. 162-187.
- Owusu-Ansah, S. (1998), "The impact of corporate attributes on the extent of mandatory disclosure and reporting by listed companies in Zimbabwe", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 33, pp. 605-631.
- Palmer, R.J. and Schwarz, T.V. (1995), "Improving the FASB's Requirements for Off-Balance-Sheet Market Risk Disclosures", *Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance*, Vol. 10, pp. 521-521.
- Piro, T.J. (1998), *The Political Economy of Market Reform in Jordan*, Rowman & Littlefield Publisher, USA.

- Pownall, G. and Schipper, K. (1999), "Implications of accounting research for the SEC's consideration of international accounting standards for US securities offerings", *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 13, pp. 259-280.
- Prihatiningtyas, L. (2011), "Hedge accounting disclosure under IAS 39 and IFRS 7: an analysis of hedge accounting disclosure policy in the Netherland's listed firms", Master's thesis, Tilburg University.
- Rahahleh, M.Y. and Siam, W.Z. (2009), "The importance of applying the international accounting standard IAS 32 and its effect on financial statement presentation at Jordanian commercial banks", *International Management Review*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
- Riahi-Belkaoui, A. and Picur, R.D. (1991), "Cultural determinism and the perception of accounting concepts", *The International Journal of Accounting*, Vol. 26, pp. 118-130.
- Richie, N., Glegg, C. and Gleason, K.C. (2006), "The effects of SFAS 133 on foreign currency exposure of US-based multinational corporations", *Journal of Multinational Financial Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 424-439.
- ROSC (2004), *Jordan: Report on the Observance of Standards and Codes – Data Module-Update*, World Bank, IMF.
- ROSC (2005), *Report on the Observance of Standards and Codes, Corporate Governance Country Assessment, Electronic Version*, World Bank, IMF.
- Roulstone, D.T. (1999), "Effect of SEC financial reporting release no. 48 on derivative and market risk disclosures", *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 13 No. 20, pp. 343-363.
- Saito, R. and Schiozer, R.F. (2005), "Derivatives usage and risk management by non-financial firms: a comparison between Brazilian and international evidence", Working paper, Getulio Vargas Foundation.
- Siam, W. and Abdullatif, M. (2011), "Fair value accounting usefulness and implementation obstacles: views from bankers in Jordan", *Research in Accounting in Emerging Economies*, Vol. 11, pp. 83-107.
- Staubus, G.J. (1976), "The effects of price-level restatements on earnings", *The Accounting Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 574-589.
- Strouhal, J. (2009), "Reporting frameworks for financial instruments in Czech: Czech accounting practices versus international financial reporting standards", *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, Vol. 6, pp. 352-361.
- Tahat, Y. (2013), "The usefulness of financial instruments disclosure: evidence from Jordan", PhD thesis, University of Dundee, UK.
- The Guardian (2003), "Financial scandal claims hang over leader in waiting", *The Guardian*, 14 April, available at: [www.guardian.co.uk](http://www.guardian.co.uk)
- The Judicial View (2008), "Petra Bank shareholder sues Jordan for ruining equity value", Vol. 24.
- The World Bank (2013), "World development indicators", available at: <http://data.worldbank.org/> (accessed 5 April 2013).
- Wallace, R.S.O., Naser, K. and Mora, A. (1994), "The relationship between the comprehensiveness of corporate annual reports and firm characteristics in Spain", *Accounting and Business Research*, Vol. 25, pp. 41-53.
- Whittington, G. (2008a), "Fair value and the IASB/FASB conceptual framework project: an alternative view", *Abacus*, Vol. 44, pp. 139-168.
- Whittington, G. (2008b), "Harmonisation or discord? The critical role of the IASB conceptual framework review", *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, Vol. 27, pp. 495-502.

- Woods, M. and Marginson, D.E.W. (2004), "Accounting for derivatives: an evaluation of reporting practice by UK Banks", *European Accounting Review*, Vol. 13, pp. 373-390.
- Yakup, S. and Asli, T. (2010), "Derivatives usage in risk management by Turkish non-financial firms and banks: a comparative study", *Annales Universitatis Apulensis Series Oeconomica*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 1-10.
- Zhang, H. (2009), "Effect of derivative accounting rules on corporate risk management behavior", *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 47, pp. 244-264.

**Further reading**

- Amman Stock Exchange (2005), *Rules and Regulation*, Amman, Jordan.
- Amman Stock Exchange (2007), *Rules and Regulations*, Amman, Jordan.
- Bank for International Settlements (2010), *Positions in Global Over-The-Counter (OTC) Derivatives Markets at End-June 2010*, Bank for International Settlements, available at: [www.bis.org](http://www.bis.org)
- Beyer, A., Cohen, D.A., Lys, T.Z. and Walther, B.R. (2010), "The financial reporting environment: review of the recent literature", *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 50, pp. 296-343.
- Ernst & Young (2008), *IFRS 7 in the Banking Industry*, Ernst & Young Global, London.
- Hassan, M.S. and Mohd-Saleh, N. (2010), "The value relevance of financial instruments disclosure in Malaysian firms listed in the main board of Bursa Malaysia", *International Journal of Economics and Management*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 243-270.
- Inchausti, A.G. (1997), "The influence of company characteristics and accounting regulation on information disclosed by Spanish firms", *The European Accounting Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 45-68.
- International Accounting Standards Board (2008), *Discussion Paper: Reducing Complexity in Reporting Financial Instruments*, IASC, London.
- International Accounting Standards Committee (1998), *IAS 39 Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement*, IASC.



| FI disclosure requirements based on IFRS 7 |  | (v) Information on cash flow hedge (CFH) |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| No.  | Categories/Items   | No.                                      |   |
|  | (i) Accounting policies  | 23                                       | Gains or losses on CFH associated with FIs                      |
| 1  | The nature of FIs  | 24                                       | Period when CFH are expected to occur and affect profit or loss |
| 2  | Terms and conditions for FI designation                                  | 25                                       | Forecast transaction for which hedge can be used                |
| 3  | Recognition and measurement of FI  | 26                                       | Amount recognised/removed in/from equity during the period      |
| 4  | Terms and conditions of impairment about FI                              |  | (vi) Fair value disclosure about FI                             |
|  | (ii) Balance sheet disclosure about FI                                   | 27                                       | Measurement methods   |
| 5  | FI at fair value (FV) through profit or loss - held for trading          | 28                                       | Information if FV cannot be measured                            |
| 6  | FI at FV through profit or loss—designated                               | 29                                       | Fair values for each class of FI                                |
| 7  | Held-to-maturity investments   | 30                                       | Changes in FV of FI   |
| 8  | Available-for-sale financial assets                                      | 31                                       | Comparable carrying amounts*                                    |
| 9  | Loans and receivables  | 32                                       | Amount recognised/removed in/from equity                        |
| 10   | Financial liabilities measured at amortised cost                         |  | (x) Other disclosures about FI                                  |
| 11   | The carrying amounts of each class of FI*                                | 33                                       | Information on reclassification                                 |
|  | (iii) Income statement disclosures about FI                              | 34                                       | Information on de-recognition                                   |
| 12   | Net gains/losses by classes of FI  | 35                                       | FI pledged as collateral  |
| 13   | Interest income associated with FI                                       | 36                                       | Allowances account for credit losses                            |
| 14   | Interest expense associated with FI                                      | 37                                       | Compound FI   |
| 15   | Fee income associated with FI  | 38                                       | Defaults and breaches   |
| 16   | Interest income on impaired FI   | 39                                       | FI either past due or impaired* New                             |
| 17   | Impairment losses associated with FI                                     |  |   |
|  | (iv) Hedge disclosures about FI  |  |   |
| 18   | Description of each type of hedge associated with FI                     |  |   |
| 19   | FI designated as hedging instruments and their FV                        |  |   |
| 20   | Nature of risks being hedged associated with FI                          |  |   |
| 21   | Recognised gains/losses on hedge ineffectiveness associated with FI* New |  |   |
| 22   | For FV hedge: gains or losses on hedging instruments                     |  |   |

**Notes:** \* indicates those items that were required for the first time under IFRS 7, whereas the absence of \* indicates that an item had been required under IAS 30/32

**Table AI.**  
The disclosure index

### Corresponding author

Yasean A. Tahat can be contacted at: [tahat.y@gust.edu.kw](mailto:tahat.y@gust.edu.kw)

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.