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1. Introduction

Since 1990’s years, traded companies in various countries utilize the World Wide Web ("WWW") as new support of corporate information publication and they adopt the “Internet financial reporting” (IFR) practices, which refers to “the public reporting of operating and financial data by a business enterprise via the World Wide Web or related Internet-based communications medium” (Lymer et al., 1999: 2). In this sense, IFR was reviewed as a type of voluntary disclosure (Ashbaugh et al., 1999; Oyelere et al., 2003; Poon et al., 2003), implying that the Web content is unregulated and largely discretionary.

IFR was been enabled by the eXtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL), which improves the distribution, the revolution and the security of corporate information on the Internet (Schuster & O’Connell, 2006). Compared with traditional printed report, the Internet “offers many more opportunities to communicate financial and its importance in this regard is rapidly increasing” (Pirchegger & Wagenhofer, 1999: 383), specially, companies can communicate information quickly and directly to investors and stakeholders, exposing an important amount of information available through Web over time and at very lower costs (FASB, 2000). Presentation format modes facilitate the navigation on corporate Websites and help investors and stakeholders to acquire corporate information, insuring more interactivity, flexibility and timeliness of corporate information (Khan, 2015).

The widespread adoption of Websites information dissemination practices has captured the attention of the accounting professional bodies and academics in the world (Debrency et al., 2001). Scholars analyze the managers’ motivations to distribute business and financial information through Websites in various countries (Kelton & Yang, 2008; Bekiaris et al., 2014; Aboutera & Hussien, 2017; Arrif et al., 2018), which are principally firm specific characteristics. IFR Empirical investigations were been referring to Ashbaugh et al. (1999) and Debrency et al. (2002) studies. Previously, Debrency et al. (2002) were developed a theoretical and empirical framework deriving and determining that IFR practices differences in 22 countries and they showed that these practices are a function of firms and country specific characteristics.

According to international comparative accounting literature, Debrency et al. (2002) confirmed that country level characteristics explain also the IFR differences, such as country Internet penetration and the national disclosure environment. This literature highlighted that the international difference accounting development in different countries was been a function of external environment circumstances (Mueller, 1987; Radebaugh, 1975; Nair & Frank, 1980; Nobes, 1983; Choi & Mueller, 1984; Nobes & Parker, 1985). Gray (1988) established a theoretical model, explaining “the
importance of Hofstede's dimensions of national culture in accounting is the national culture's influences on the nature of accounting practices” (Kolesnik, 2013: 34), evolving four distinct hypotheses involving the influence of cultural values on accounting values: professionalism, uniformity, conservatism and secrecy.

Numerous comparative accounting studies investigated the influence of culture values and institutional factors on financial transparency, qualifying the national accounting systems (Nobes, 1998) and they were elaborated a cross country analysis, testing the relationship between national culture, institutional factors and financial disclosure (Zarzeski, 1996; Jaggi & Low, 2000; Hopes, 2003, and others). Nevertheless, previous and existing explanatory IFR studies didn’t investigate the relationship between countries specific characteristics and IFR practices, as principal explaining factors, simply, it is present some empirical evidence which integrated both firms and countries characteristics in the same empirical model (Debreceny et al., 2002; Bollen et al., 2006; Turrent & Ariza, 2012; Zeghal & Moussa, 2015). In their analysis, they haven’t valorized the importance of technologies investigating on the Websites, as a principal component of Internet financial disclosure.

Thus, the main objective of this purpose is to examine the impact of environment specific characteristics on online disclosure practices in Europe, appropriated to large companies with a high market capitalization. It aims to explain the web disclosure practices differences between Anglo-Saxon and Continental countries.

Maintaining a high level of investor protection throughout European community, European financial authority harmonizes between national mandatory reporting laws and standards. In 2004, it established 2004/109/EC directive (“Transparency directive”), as a legislative framework which defined and detailed transparency requirements relating the financial publication on European regulated capital market.

This directive was considered that ‘electronic mean’ (e.g. corporate Website) as a communication support and it authorize traded companies to disseminate periodic and ongoing information electronically to European regulation market.

Therefore, this study wants to contribute in IFR explanatory studies which explore empirical evidence testing the relationship between country characteristics and web financial disclosure. It will demonstrate the importance of Web communication dimensions as a composing the Web disclosure level that dressing empirical models testing the impact of environment specific characteristics on content, timeliness, technology and user support indices.

This paper proceeds as a follows: The second section presents literature review. The third section details main research objectives and hypotheses development. Research methodology is detailed in the fourth section. The fifth section discus and analyzes
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the results. The conclusion section reviews main findings, gives limitation, contributions and orientation for futures research.

2. Web disclosure practices differences

Accounting professional and scholars delineate characteristics and motivations of IFR practices in various countries.

2.1. Accounting professional pronouncement

Internet financial reporting is a voluntary disclosure practices and unregulated, in this sense, companies are no under obligation to maintain a Web site (Ettredge et al., 2001) and governing regulation, previously, didn’t mandate information disclosure on Website (Prentice et al., 1999). Over time, accounting professional and financial markets authorities orientate the “IFR best practices” and others require the creation and the publication of particular information on the Web.

Accounting professionals delivered several studies and projects improving the distribution of business and financial information through Internet: they analyzed the consequence of this new practice in the accounting profession and proposed set of recommendation and guidance recoding the “best practices” of Web financial publication. In (1999), ISAC investigated a study of Web based business reporting by 660 corporations in 22 countries. It established a set of measures helping companies to ensure production of reliable information through Internet, essentially, the establishment of code of conduct detailing the corporate information publication via Internet.

CICA piloted study overviewed the use of internet as a financial reporting medium in North America. This research was done by Trites (1999) who selected 370 from 10000 companies traded in the New York exchange, the NASDAQ and the Toronto stock exchange. It reported that 69% of these companies have Website and 35% have some form of financial information on their Websites. This study discussed the implication of electronic information reporting on accounting standards (e.g. the separation between non-audited and audited information).

FASB (2000) report examined the financial information dissemination on the Web in USA and it contained a descriptive study which determined the types of information were communicated electronically. This report developed a comprehensive list of 325 attributes evaluating the corporate 150 fortune web sites. The following results showed that 99% have a Web site and 93 of the 100 fortune corporation presented financial information on their Web sites. Indeed, it fund a set recommendations which indicated that companies should ensure the accessibility and availability of complete financial reports through their websites and publish
timely their interim and annual report and notes to financial statements. This project recommended companies to incorporate “investor relation” on the Web site, separated section and easily accessible from its home page.

IFAC (2000) addressed guidance to companies which choose to use Website, as a supplementary medium of financial report. It encouraged to managers elaborate an Internet reporting policy and developed controls and procedures ensuring the Internet financial reporting process.

Again, securities exchange markets authorities monitor the distribution of financial information through Internet in various countries. Some of them created a set of guidance and others required the publication of specific information. COB (1998) recommended that securities laws related to papers reporting are also applied to electronic reporting, ensuring the reliability, credibility and investors’ equivalence principals.

TSX (2003) prompted listed companies to maintain a corporate Website and investor relations information available in the site. There should establish a Web reporting policies, according to TSX guidance and there guarantee maximum securities of its sites and E-mail. FSA (2000) authorized companies to distribute their annual report electronically which can forward to third parties an electronic version of annual report, financial statements, and management and auditor reports. SEC (2003) mandated companies to communicate beneficial ownership reports in their Website and they will publish reports forms 3, 4 and 5 in their Websites.

Others financial market commissioners were proposed to harmonize between national financial transparency standards and oriented the use the ‘electronic mean’ as a communication support: that is the European commission was defined in 2004 a list of norms mandated the financial publication on European regulated capital market.

2.2. European standards harmonization: transparency directive

European Commission proposed a set of recommendations oriented the electronic financial reporting practices in European countries. Fixing information transparency requirements, 2004/109/CE European directive authorized the use of “electronic mean”, as a tool of information publication to regulated market. Indeed, European companies can utilize their corporate Web sites and they could communicate regulated information through websites. Transparency directive recommended creating a platform of electronic network across European member states.

Amending this directive, 2013/50/CE directive simplified transparency obligations applicable to listed small and medium-sized firms and improved the effectiveness of
the existing transparency regime and the respect of corporate ownership information disclosure. It indicated that European electronic access point will be established from 1 January 2018 developing by the European Securities and markets Authority (ESMA) and it certified that the preparation of electronic annual financial reports will be mandatory from 1 January 2020.

2.3. Academic research

Producing since (1996), primary studies are descriptive which “give a general overview of the current state of corporate reporting on the Internet” (Marston & Poel, 2004, p. 287). Some of these studies described Web based reporting in signal country (Gray & Debreceny, 1997; Gowthorpe & Amat, 1999; Turel, 2010; Khan et al., 2013) and others were compared IFR practices in two and more countries (Lymer & Tallberg, 1997; Deller et al., 1999; Allam & Lymer, 2003; Chatterjee & Hawkes, 2008; Al-Sartawi, 2016).

For example, Lymer (1997) described the utilization of the Web as a medium for financial reporting by 50 UK companies. It indicated that 92% have a Website and 52% published financial reports. Gowthorpe & Amat (1999) examined the extent of usage for Internet financial communication by Spanish listed companies. The results showed that 16% have a web site and 34% presented some kind of financial information on their Web pages. Deller et al. (1999) compared the Internet “investor relations” activities on USA, UK and German firms. They found that USA corporations used more Internet “investor relations” activities than UK and German corporations.

Al-Sartawi (2016) illustrated the level of online financial disclosure usage in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) listed companies. They showed that the majority of the GCC companies disclosed a good level of content and format presentation dimension information through their Web site. They indicated that the content dimension differs from one country to other and from industry type to other and that the level of presentation dimension was better in Oman than in Bahrain and on banking companies than insurance and investment companies.

Since (2000), researchers attempted to determined factors explaining IFR practices in various countries. Giving the IFR preliminary empirical evidence, Ashbaugh et al. (1999) want to explain “why some firms disseminate financial information on their corporate Web sites, while others do not” (Kelton & Yang, 2008: 65). They found that larger and more profitable US firms are more likely to engage on the IFR practices but it did not provide a theoretical rational of IFR determinants.

Extending this paper, Debreceny et al. (2002) established general model explaining Web financial publication determinants, which are firm and environment specific.
characteristics. Conformity to these processors, scholars documented empirical
evidence explaining the IFR practices in developed and developing countries. They
are cases studies (Abdelsalam et al., 2007; Kelton & Yang, 2008; Hindi & Rich,
2010; Boubaker et al., 2012; Alali & Romero, 2012; Dunne et al., 2013; Momany et
al., 2013) and comparative studies (Pervan, 2006; Bonson & Escobar, 2006;

Kelton & Yang (2008) analyzed the impact of corporate governance on Internet
financial reporting in USA. They demonstrated that shareholders, blockholder
ownership, board independence, audit committee expertise and diligence explain the
Internet financial reporting. Aboutera & Hussien (2017) examined the Internet
financial reporting practices determinants in Egypt. Empirical result showed that
firm size, auditor type and firm age are significantly associated with level of
electronic information disclosure.

Henchiri (2011) compared the voluntary information publication through websites’
companies listed in Moroccan and Tunisian stock exchanges. They demonstrated
that firm size, firm performance and foreign ownership determine the extent of
online information. Turrent & Ariza (2012) investigated a comparative study of the
E-transparency practices in Mexico and Spain, measuring by a disclosure index.
They showed significant differences in the disclosure level between listed companies
in two countries. The result indicated that ownership concentration, chairman of the
board-Chief executive officer (COB-CEO) duality, economic development and
inflation are the important factors explaining the E-disclosure practices differences.
Mohamed & Baswory (2014) examined the characteristics of voluntary Internet
disclosure in three Gulf cooperation Council countries: Qatar, Oman, and Bahrain.
They signaled that firm size is a major factor influencing internet financial reporting
practices.

Generally, explanatory studies tested the impact of firm specific characteristics on
the level and the quality of IFR in various countries. Empirical investigations were
demonstrated that organizational and corporate governance mechanisms are
determining factors of financial disclosure through Websites in different countries.
Nevertheless, comparative accounting studies reveal that country’ macro-economic
situation can also influence the IFR, as voluntary disclosure.

3. Conceptual framework

International comparative financial accounting research wants to “identify the
accounting differences between various countries and to explain why these
differences exist” (Ding, 2001: 156), that was identified previously that national
culture as an important environment factor explaining cross-national accounting
development differences. In (1986), Harrison and McKinnon have proposed a
.methodological framework incorporating national culture as important element analyzing the change and functioning of national accounting, as a social system.

Complementing Harrison and McKinnon study, Gray (1988) established a theoretical model, explaining how national culture values reinforce the development of accounting systems and practices in various countries. His model developed the causal association between Hofstede (1980)' cultural values (Individualism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity) and accounting values, deriving the level of a country’s accounting subculture: professionalism versus statutory control; uniformity versus flexibility; conservatism versus optimism and secrecy versus transparency.

Several studies were contributed in the existing literature and they attempted to lengthen the Gray (1988) conceptual framework (Perera, 1989; Frechner & Kilgore, 1994; Baydoun & Willet, 1995; Salter & Niswander, 1995; Chanchani & MacGregor, 1999). In 1995, Doupnik and Salter amplified this theoretical framework and they developed a general model determining country’ accounting development: cultural dimensions, external environment and institutional structure can explain accounting development differences (Doupnik & Salter, 1995).

“Secrecy versus transparency” was been extensively studied in prior review because disclosure index “make it the easiest accounting value to operationalize” (Tsakumis, 2007: 31). Most of international accounting studies were tested empirically the link between culture, institutional factors and information disclosure (Zarzeski, 1996; Wingate, 1997; Jaggi & Low, 2000; Hopes, 2003; Doupnik & Richter, 2004).

In the 21st century, the corporate reporting processes perceive an important evaluation; it will be more digitally. Listed companies utilize more electronic means as a corporate financial reporting support, essentially, corporate websites will be more privileged and popular use as a communication medium. It offers many advantages, serving as a fantastic mean which deliver corporate information “in a timely fashion to foreign and often sophisticated investors” (Ojaha & Mokoteli, 2012: 71).

Referring to the Gray (1988)' conceptual framework and Debrency et al. (2002) model, we can predict that environment factors explicate the Internet financial disclosure differences, as a financial transparency practices. We simplified the study' conceptual model by following figure:
4. Hypotheses development

Following to previous review, we explain in the section the incidence of national culture and institutional factors on the financial disclosure via corporate Websites, as an accounting practice, respectively.

4.1. National culture

Culture refers to “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another” (Hofstede, 2001: 9). Culture presents asset of collective beliefs and values that distinguish individuals in the country vary. Investigating a multinational IMB data, Hofstede (1984) identified four culture values:

- **Individualism versus collectivism**: individualism concerns “a preference for a loosely knit social framework in society wherein individuals are supposed to take care of themselves”. It is an opposite, collectivism refers to “a preference for a tightly knit social framework in which individuals can expect their relatives”.
- **Large versus small power distance**: power distance illustrates “the extent to which the members of a society accept that the power in institutions and organizations is unequally distributed”.
- **Strong versus weak uncertainty avoidance**: Uncertainty avoidance defines “the degree to which the members of a society fell uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity”.
Masculinity versus femininity: Masculinity refers to the extent of masculine values on a society such as achievement, heroism, assertiveness and material success and femininity completes the relationship, modesty, caring for the weak and the quality of life.

The relationship between culture and financial “secrecy/ transparency” is described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secrecy</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gray (1988: 11)

Following to Bryan et al. (2012), Kanagaretnam et al. (2014) and Hooghiestra et al. (2015), we focused essentially on individualism and uncertainty avoidance, explaining the implication of manager’s choices, behaviors and their relationship to shareholders.

4.1.1. Individualism

Individuals in collectivistic cultures focus on the group interests, implying strong relationship between members. In this sense, companies in these societies apply less control and disclose less information in their annual report (Gray, 1988; Zarzeski, 1996; Hopes, 2003).

In individualistic societies, the environment is more competitive and less secretive, involving a high level of information transparency (Gray, 1988; Jaggi & Low, 2000). Companies are more developed and large state-owned through capital markets, in this situation, managers are more likely to publish information in their annual report to shareholders. It is expected a positive relationship between individualism and information disclosure in annual report (Akman, 2011; Hooghiestra et al., 2015; Maali, 2016).

Individualism level determines the information technology (IT) adoption by organizations in different countries. In collectivistic countries, individuals comply with standards of the group, maintain collective decisions process and they are more likely to adopt antique innovation (Lee et al., 2007; Ugur, 2017).

In individualistic countries, firms keep personal decisions markers process when employees are more oriented to efficiency, performance, freedom in work and personal achievement (Bagchi et al., 2003). They considered IT as the better mean
to acquire available information and to achieve personal goals. Managers in individualistic societies are more likely to utilize the Internet, as a new medium of financial disclosure. We suppose a positive relationship between individualism and Web based disclosure. As extension a Gray (1988)' hypothesis, we hypothesized that:

H₁: Companies in individualistic countries disclose more financial information through their corporate Web sites.

4.1.2. Uncertainty avoidance

In strong uncertainty avoidance cultures, people create laws and rules to avoid ambiguity and uncertain events. Companies attempt the stability and they are less well-off conflict and competition (Bryan et al., 2012), in order to preserve security, managers tend to disclose less information in annual reports, addressing essentially to private users (banks and financial institutions) (Zarzeski, 1996). In weak uncertainty avoidance societies, individuals are more likely to handle ambiguous events and accept competition, conflicts and confrontation, in this situation, corporation are dominated by diffused ownership and complicated business relationship. Market participants need more information to understand the corporate financial situation, thus, managers tend to publish more information in annual report to shareholders and public (Gray, 1988; Zarzeski, 1996). Prior studies was confirmed the negative relationship between uncertainty avoidance and voluntary disclosure (Hopes, 2003; Akram, 2011; Hooghemstra et al., 2015).

Uncertainty avoidance influences the innovation adoption and information technology usage. Companies in strong uncertainty avoidance countries are more resistant to innovations, high formalized management style and constraining of innovations by rules (Hofstede, 2001; MohammadiSadri et al., 2012). Managers create more rigid rules to control the risk and they are less likely to encourage the experimentation and innovation on their firms.

In weak uncertainty avoidance societies, companies have greater tendency to nurture experimentation and they prompt employees to create new ideas and develop emerging innovation, which implicates the rapid development and adoption the new communication technologies in the corporate activities, presuming firm profitability and continuity. Managers in Weak uncertainty avoidance countries, are more likely to adopt the Web site, as a business financial reporting support. As an extension to Gray (1988)" hypothesis, we hypothesized that:

H₂: Companies in weak uncertainty avoidance countries disclose more financial information through their corporate Web sites.
4.2. Institutional factors

Comparative studies demonstrated that countries levels institutional factors are important determinants of financial disclosure practices, essentially, legal system, capital market and economic development (Jaggi & Low, 2000; Hopes, 2003).

4.2.1. Capital market size

Larger capital markets present an important number of participants and shareholders, favoring the information demand (Adhikari & Tondkar, 1992). Exercising more pressure, investors require sophisticated information helping to make optimal investment decision (Gray et al., 1984) and order companies to produce more rigorous information and to respect disclosure requirements. Therefore, companies in countries with larger capital market are more motivated to disclose more regular information in their annual report to public (Adhikari & Tondkar, 1992; Jaggi and Low, 2000; Bushuman et al., 2004).

Larger markets present important activities and voluminous transactions (Salter, 1998), which showed fulfill numerous norms such as reliability, credibility and security. Market participants demand also the quality of financial services and they request the use of new means facilitating the transmission of news and information on the markets. Internet is considered an attractive medium for financial services and transactions at low cost. It “offers unprecedented immediacy, flexibility and interactivity, magnifying the financial services industry’s ability to reach into the retail market” (ISOCO, 1998).

Utilizing Internet technologies, investors can access immediately and rapidly to news and actual information available on the market, helping to make optimal choices and conduct investment activity. Consequently, markets participants incite firm to use Internet and create own Web sites, such as a mean corporate information communication.

According to these arguments, we suggest that companies in countries with larger capital markets disclose more electronic financial information. We hypothesized that:

H3: Companies in countries with larger capital markets disclose more financial information through their corporate Web sites.

4.2.2. National economic development

Developed countries have more resources to devote accounting standard-setting and regulated process (Adhikari & Tondkar, 1992), which involve disclosure
requirements. Consequently, companies wanted to communicate more financial information in annual reports (Doupink & Salter, 1995; Salter, 1998; William, 2004).

The level of national income explains the capacity of a country to maintain new innovation (Pohjohe, 2003; Erumbam & Jong, 2005). Countries with high income process more human and technical resources helping individuals to create and adopt new innovations (such as new information technologies).

Internet will generate new opportunities which will translate voluminous national economic activities and domicile managerial companies. Managers will incorporate Web technologies in corporate activities and they develop new activities such as E-Business and E-Voting. However, managers have more incentives to construct their corporate Websites, as a new and important medium of business financial publication and increase the amount of information disclosure. In this study, we predicate a positive relationship between economic growth and Web based financial information. We hypothesized that:

H4: Companies in developed countries disclose more financial information through their corporate Websites.

5. Methodology design

5.1. Sample description

The initial sample was included 271 largest groups of companies traded on European securities exchange, in July 2013. The selection criterion of this sample was presumed, as following:
- Internet financial disclosure practices is appropriated to listed firms on international exchanges markets (Ashbaugh et al., 1999; Debreency et al., 2002);
- Firms, with highest market capitalization, are more likely to adopt the Internet financial disclosure practice (Ducasy, 2008);
- European commission fixed appropriated legal framework, identifying transparency norms in the case where listed firms use “electronic mean” as information publication medium.

We eliminated financial sector firms (banks, insurance and other financial services firms) because they have specific and different disclosure requirements (Gul & Leung, 2004), three groups which did not have a Website or downloadable site (Ezat & El-Masy, 2008) and eight groups which are listed on two or more securities exchanges. The final sample is composed by 205 groups, observed in 2011-2012 accounting exercise.
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Table 2. Sample composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Accounting systems</th>
<th>Total traded Companies</th>
<th>Financial sector companies</th>
<th>Web inaccessibility</th>
<th>Double listing</th>
<th>Final sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Web based disclosure extent

Pirchegger & Wagenhofer (1999) identified four dimensions, evaluating the Web diffusion:
- **Content**: encompasses financial and corporate information available on the site;
- **Timeliness**: Web can provide companies and users the possibility to acquire rapid and updating information in real time;
- **Technology**: it is “the extent to which the companies under investigation make use of some of the more advanced features” (Pirchegger & Wagenhofer, 1999: 365);
- **User support**: measures the design and layout of the Website.

This framework was reviewed as a “very comprehensive checklist for the evaluation of Web site”, Marston & Poeli (2004: 296) and it was been utilized by a great number of IFR studies (Purba et al., 2013; Bekiaris et al., 2014; Pascareno & Hermana, 2015). Consequently, we employed Pirchegger & Wagentofer’ instrument and we defined a Web disclosure index measuring the extent of information communicated through corporate European Web site.

In order to develop this index, we were achieved the next steps:

- **Checklist instrument construction**: We chose to adopt transparency directive requirements as a “standard”, which fixed “regulated information” and we considered others information which communicated through European Web sites, exceeded directive requirements, as “voluntary disclosure”. Regulated information includes periodic and ongoing information. Voluntary information, incorporates others financial and non-financial information, concerning business, governance, segment and responsibility information. Completing the voluntary information, timeliness, technology and user support items, we were referred to checklist instruments developed by previous studies dealing the Web based financial disclosure on the European countries (Larran & Giner, 2002; Geenings & Sánchez, 2008; Boubaker et al., 2012; Sanchez Canadas & Caba perrez, 2013).
The list of items composes 133 items: Web content items (104 items), timeliness items (9 items), technology items (11 items) and user support items (9 items) (Appendix A).

- **Web sites consultation and analysis**
We consulted and analyzed financial reports, others documents and pages available and downloadable via sites Web during a short period of three months (as a court period) from 1st July to 31 September 2013.

- **Web reporting index calculation:**
We performed unweighted dichotomous disclosure index: we noted a score of 1 if a company reported an item figured from the checklist and a score of 0 if the company did not disclose an item. Unweighted scoring procedure reduces the subjectivity and accords equal important to an each disclosure item (Cooke, 1989; Hossain et al., 1995). The Web reporting index of each company is calculated to dividing the total score disclosed by total number of items (n =133), as following:

\[
\text{Web reporting index (WR1)} = \frac{\text{total Score obtained by firm}}{\text{Number total of items}}
\]  

(1)

In addition, the total Web reporting index (TWDI) corresponds to the sum of four indices: content (CONI), timeliness (TIMI), technology (TEHI) and user support (SUPI) indices.

\[
\text{TWDI} = \text{CONI} + \text{TIMI} + \text{TEHI} + \text{SUPI}
\]  

(2)

5.3. Explanatory variables measurement

We defined measurement of culture dimensions and institutional factors (Appendix B), as a following:

5.3.1. Culture

Following to prior studies (Jaggi & Low, 2000; Williams, 2004; Hooghiemstra et al., 2015), we use the Hofstede’s (1984) score represented countries cultural values levels. In this analysis, we focused essentially to individualism (INDV) and avoidance uncertainty (UCER) scores.

5.3.2. Institutional factors

Measurements test and control variable are consistent with the international accounting research, as a following:

- **Stock market size (MCAP)**: measured by the market capitalization, equal to the market capitalization of domestic companies dividing by Gross
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Domestic Product (GDP) (Adhikari & Tondher, 1992; Larson & Kenny, 1995).


We identified two control variables can explain the Web based disclosure:

- National inflation level (INFL): Archambault & Archambault (1999) showed that companies operating in countries with high inflation are more likely to use price level accounting and they increase the information publication level, made available to investors. We suggested a positive relationship between inflation and Internet financial reporting and we measured countries inflation level (INFL) by 2012 inflation rate.

- National education level (EDUC): increasing the level of national education involves the importance of financial statements users’ numbers (Doupnik & Salter, 1995). They acquire more competences, expertise, permitting more capacities to understand and interpret corporate information and helping to make optimal investment decisions, consequently, they will demand a high quality and important amount of financial information (Archambault & Archambault, 2003).

We suggested that countries' education level (EDUC) affect positively the Web based financial disclosure, measuring by the tertiary education ratios in 2012.

5.4. Research models

We developed a general model testing the influence of country specific characteristics and Web based financial disclosure:

\[ WRI = \beta_0 + \beta_1 INDV + \beta_2 UCER + \beta_3 MACP + \beta_4 ECGW + \beta_5 INFL + \beta_6 EDUC + \epsilon \]  
(3)

We elaborated five distinct models, detailing the influence of culture, institutional factors on Web reporting dimensions: Web content index, Web timeliness index, Web technology index and Web user support index, respectively:

- Web content index model (WCONI)

\[ WCONI = \beta_0 + \beta_1 INDV + \beta_2 UCER + \beta_3 MACP + \beta_4 ECGW + \beta_5 INFL + \beta_6 EDUC + \epsilon \]  
(4)

- Web timeliness index model (WTMI)

\[ WTMI = \beta_0 + \beta_1 INDV + \beta_2 UCER + \beta_3 MACP + \beta_4 ECGW + \beta_5 INFL + \beta_6 EDUC + \epsilon \]  
(5)
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Web technology index model (WTEI):
\[ WTEI = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{INDV} + \beta_2 \text{UCER} + \beta_3 \text{MACP} + \beta_4 \text{ECGW} + \beta_5 \text{INFL} + \beta_6 \text{EDUC} + \epsilon \] (6)

Web user support index (WUSI):
\[ \text{WSUPI} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{INDV} + \beta_2 \text{UCER} + \beta_3 \text{MACP} + \beta_4 \text{ECGW} + \beta_5 \text{INFL} + \beta_6 \text{EDUC} + \epsilon \] (7)

Total Web disclosure index model (TWDI):
\[ \text{TWDI} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{INDV} + \beta_2 \text{UCER} + \beta_3 \text{MACP} + \beta_4 \text{ECGW} + \beta_5 \text{INFL} + \beta_6 \text{EDUC} + \epsilon \] (8)

Where:
- WRI = Web reporting index
- WCONI = Web content index
- WTIMI = Web timeliness index
- WTEHI = Web technology index
- WSUPI = Web user support index
- TWDI = Total Web disclosure index
- INDV = Country individual level
- UCER = Country avoidance uncertainty level
- MACP = Country stock market capitalization
- ECGW = Country economic growth
- INFL = Country inflation level
- EDUC = Country education level
- \( \beta_i \) = coefficients
- \( \epsilon \) = error

6. Empirical findings

This study aims to explore an appropriated empirical investigation testing the macroeconomic conditions that have a direct and significant impact on web disclosure differences in Europe, as corporate transparency practicing in the 21st century. European countries present a specific characteristics on this issue with imposing listed companies on regulated European market to respect, apply financial transparency standards (transparency directive) and encourage utilizing the ‘electronic mean’ as a communication support. This section presents the characterization of web disclosure on European context and the linear regression analysis determining the influence of environment specific characteristics on Web disclosure extent.

6.1. Descriptive analysis

We presented a summary statistics, describing the level of information communicated through European corporate Websites and country specific characteristics.
6.1.1. IFR practices tendencies

Appendix C presents descriptive statistics for content, timeliness, technology, user support and total Web disclosure indices, in terms minimum, maximum, means and standards’ derivation respectively. The highest mean value of content index in France (58%), Germany (56%), Italy (58%), Netherlands (52%), Spain (53%) and UK (50%) indicated that institutional websites as an important medium of corporate information. European group communicated enormously their annual report, financial accounts and financial information through their sites which facilitates the relationship between company and investors. Analyzing the information publication via companies’ Websites listed in Eastern Europe countries, Bonson and Escobar (2006) showed that 34.5% of companies published their annual reports, 18.6% communicated their income statements via Internet.

These statistics reveal the importance the Web technology which helps information users’ navigation. Timeliness, technologies and user support index values didn’t different between companies in European countries. Total Web disclosure indices mean values are ranked in 0.64 to 0.72 which involved that European groups adopt Web sites, new support communication. This result is consistent with results of different studies conducted in European context such as Pirchegger & Wagenhofer (1999), Geerings et al. (2003), Marston and Polei (2004), Bonson and Escobar (2006). Geerings et al. (2003)’s study showed that Euronext listed companies noted a high degree of Web’ use as a vehicle for improving investors relations: France (94%), Netherlands (92%) use more Internet’ investor relations activities than in Belgium (70%).

Table 3: Web content index mean variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Regulated</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>content</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>50.37%</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicated that regulated information constitutes the principal component of informational content of corporate Websites (more of 50% of content items). Periodic information is the major regulated information categories, composing the Websites content (Appendix D).

European groups developed storage systems through their own Websites cumulating the annual reports, financial statements, and others obligatory information during five years, conformity to the transparency directive requirements. This archive allows investors and websites’ visitors the possibility to acquire more regulated
information helping to realizing the comparison and more understanding the evolution of corporate financial situation, which favors the optimal investment decision.

6.1.2. External environment characteristics

Table 4 indicated that Anglo-Saxon countries present a high level of market capitalization, economic development and education than continental countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Continental countries</th>
<th>Anglo-Saxon countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>St. derivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>66.74</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>78.52</td>
<td>8.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital market</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2. Multicollinearity problem analysis

We will realize a linear regression testing the influence of environment factors on web based financial disclosure, as an accounting practice. Before running regression model, we should verify the empirical correlation between different explanatory variables variable and detect the multicollinearity problem between (Field, 2009). Multicollinearity, testing was based on the correlation matrix, which will be detected when the correlation coefficients exceeded 0.6 (Hooghiemstra et al., 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDV</th>
<th>UCER</th>
<th>MCAP</th>
<th>ECGW</th>
<th>INFL</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCER</td>
<td>-0.863**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAP</td>
<td>0.658**</td>
<td>-0.797**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGW</td>
<td>0.419**</td>
<td>-0.201**</td>
<td>0.515**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFL</td>
<td>0.597**</td>
<td>-0.586**</td>
<td>0.410**</td>
<td>0.516**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>-0.501**</td>
<td>0.248**</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.221**</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: INDV: individualism level; UCER: avoidance uncertainty level; MCAP: capital market capitalization; ECGW: economic growth; INFL: inflation rate; EDUC: territory education level.
Pearson matrix indicated that multicollinearity problem exists between three explanatory variables, describing by a high correlation coefficient: individualism and uncertainty avoidance; individualism and capital market size. Therefore, individualism was not included on the regression model.

6.3. Linear regression method: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) transformation

Applying the Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression on financial disclosure studies involves many problems, dealing with disclosure index use (Cooke, 1998). As a solution, major of accounting disclosure studies (Lang & Lundholm, 1993, 1996; Wallace et al., 1994; Wallace & Naser, 1995; Cooke, 1998) legitimated the transformation of both dependent and independents variables before the application of OLS regression, such as full rank transformation and normal scores transformation.

Rank transformation consists to adjust continuous variables with n observations, ranked from the smallest to the highest values. This method is advantageous when the dependent variable is a monotonic and non-linear function of the independent variables. Normal scores transformation was obtained by dividing the distribution into the number of observation plus one regression on the basis that each region has equal probability (Cooke, 1998). This method is considered more advantageous than rank scores (Camfferman & Cooke, 2002), that it contributes to exact statistical properties (adjusted R² significance levels, meaningful F and t tests).

The OLS regression method application depends to the verification of several assumptions, principally multicollinearity, homoscedasticity, linearity and normality (Cooke & Hannifa, 2002). We performed Q-Q plot testing the linearity of the variable distribution, histograms examining the homoscedasticity residuals analysis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S Lilliefors) test, capturing the normality problem. The results indicated that OLS assumptions are violated, en consequence, we ruined normal scores regression model, testing the link between institutional factors and Web disclosure index.

6.4. OLS regression findings

In order to validate the research hypotheses and the study' conceptual framework, we performed normal scores OLS regression related to five distinct linear models, programming with SPSS 20. These models predicted respectively the incidence of culture and institutional factors on content, timeliness, technology, user support and total web disclosure indexes. OLS regression models results (appendix E) showed that four models are significant at p<0.001, except to timeliness model. Content, technology and total disclosure models explain respectively 29.5%, 14.8% and 29.4% of the endogenous variable variation.
In this section, we interpreted and analyzed empirical findings from five models, investigating the incidence of environment specific characteristics on Web disclosure dimensions (content, timeliness, technology and user support indices) and total web disclosure index.

6.4.1. Web disclosure dimensions

Normal scores OLS regression showed that institutional factors are significantly appropriated to content and technology models. Uncertainty avoidance, market capitalization and education level are significantly related to the corporate site content.

Contrary to our expectation, uncertainty avoidance is significantly and positively related to the Web content index, which involved that these companies with high uncertainty avoidance culture have more likely to increase the level of online information. This result can possibly be explained by the composition of sample including in majority continental countries, noted high uncertainty avoidance level. Our findings confirm that companies in countries with high tertiary education have more incentives to use the Web such communication tool and increase the online information quantity. These countries are dominated by developed accounting profession which demand the respect of auditing and accounting norms favoring the relevance and the comprehensively of information, consequently, companies will communicate more audited annual reports and statements via Internet.

Linear regression demonstrates that uncertainty avoidance, market capital size, economic growth and education are associated significantly with technology index. Conformity to our prevision, findings indicated that uncertainty avoidance affects significantly and negatively the Website technology index, as a communication support. In countries with weak uncertainty avoidance, managers are more likely to incorporate new Internet technology in their corporations facilitating the communication with investors, stakeholders and public. That also, managers encourage the communication responsible to create and diffuse new and sophisticated IT means and applications favoring the Websites pages and assuring the financial information quality.

Websites are important mean on larger capital markets, facilitating financial and listing activities and services: incorporating a higher level and sophisticated technologies improve the transmission of information and news. Companies in countries with larger capital market are more likely to integrate new technologies in their Websites. In these countries, corporate Websites pages constitute a creative privileged support allowing companies to respond to information demand on larger and developed markets. Developing news IT applications, companies can supply more financial information, news and press releases in the time to privileged, foreign
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investors and others markets' participants. Managers, in developed countries, have more resources to adopt new technologies and they are more likely to incorporate more technologies instruments in corporate Web site.

People in countries with higher education rate were been incited to create new innovation and they accord more attention to new technologies and communication innovations, which have a positive impact to innovations organizational and markers' decisions process. Thus, companies are more likely to integrate and develop new Web technologies though their sites, helping Web navigators.

6.4.2. Total Web disclosure index

Normal scores OLS regression signed that uncertainty avoidance, capital market size, economic growth and level of education are significant related to total IFR index. Our results highlight a significant relationship and to the expectation between uncertainty avoidance and total Web disclosure. Thus, we not support the H2 hypothesis. This result is consistent with Archambault & Archambault (2003) and opposite to Zarzeski (1996), Hope (2003) and Dejong et al. (2006)' studies results which analyzing the financial information published on the annual reports.

Maali (2016)' study analysis was demonstrated the similar result which indicated that uncertainty avoidance was positively related to multinational corporation transparency index. Analyzing the multinational governance disclosure policies through websites, Zeghal & Moussa (2015) were demonstrated that uncertainty avoidance is negatively associated to governance disclosure index. They explained this result by the nature of multinational firms which are dominated by “global market culture than a specific country culture”.

Linear regression found that capital market size is significantly and negatively (opposite direction to prediction) to the level of online information, therefore we cannot verify our expectation and support H3 hypothesis. Examining the annual reports content, Jaggi & Low (2000), Archambault & Archambault (2003) demonstrated a significant and positive relationship between capital market size and financial disclosure. Zeghal & Moussa (2015) haven’t confirmed a significant association related the “capital development” variable and corporate governance disclosure policies through multinational Websites.

In addition, the normal score regression highlight a significant and positive coefficient appropriated to “economic growth” variable, thus, we confirm our expectation, we accept that country’s economic development affects significantly and positively the total disclosure index and supported (H4) hypothesis. Companies in developed countries disclose more regulated and voluntary information through their own websites than listed companies in developing countries which they are
more likely to adopt this medium. They have more resources to acquire more technologies developing corporate activities, such as financial reporting strategic. Possessing various resources, communication responsible desires to maintain an “efficient communication process”, achieving by the exploitation of new Internet technologies such as corporate websites and social media. Turrent & Aziza (2012) study were confirmed this result, which examine the factors determining the E-transparency in Spain and Mexico and they considered that companies with developed countries disclose more information than companies from others countries.

7. Conclusion

This study analyzes the relationship between environment specific characteristics Websites based disclosure in six developed European countries (France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Spain and UK). Our sample was composed in 205 groups of companies traded in selected countries capital markets.

Referring to 2004/109/CE requirements, we defined web content items and we considered that content included regulated and voluntary information. Descriptive analysis underlined the web disclosure practices similarly between European countries.

We performed a normal scores OLS regression testing the incidence of environmental factors on Web based disclosure. Market size, economic growth and education level determinate technologies investigating on corporate Websites. Appropriate regression showed that country economic development (significant and positive) is the determining factor of IFR practices.

Our study contributes to the comparative accounting review through its originality in attempting to examine the influence of external environment to the Web based corporate disclosure, nevertheless, it involves certain limitations related essentially to the sample selection. It was a limited sample, which didn't present equilibrium between Anglo-Saxon and continental selected countries. This choice is principally justified by a legal/regulatory raison: examining financial disclosure practices differences necessitates the corporate transparency requirements understanding (as a well 2004/109/CE directive). Cross country Web disclosure analysis depends to disclosure requirements and standards. Thus, the accounting professional and regulatory bodies' position in this subject will help, in future, scholars to explain the influence of external environment to Websites based corporate and financial disclosure internationally.
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### Appendix A. Website based disclosure items categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information items categories</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Websites content items</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I - Regulated information items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Annual information items</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Interim information items</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Information about major holding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Obligatory information for holders of securities admitted to trading on a regulated market</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II - Voluntary information items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Financial information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Investor relation information items</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Others financial information items</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Corporate governance information items</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Environmental and social information items</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- segment information items</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Websites timeliness items</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Websites technology items</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Websites user support items</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total items</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix B. Variables Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>sources data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WCONI</td>
<td>Web Content Index</td>
<td>content score obtained by firm</td>
<td>Corporate Web sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTIMI</td>
<td>Web Timeliness Index</td>
<td>Timeliness score obtained by firm</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTEHI</td>
<td>Web Technology Index</td>
<td>Technology score obtained by firm</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUPI</td>
<td>Web User Support Index</td>
<td>User support score obtained by firm</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTWDI</td>
<td>Web Total Web Disclosure Index</td>
<td>total score obtained by firm</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Endogenous variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>sources data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDV</td>
<td>National individualism level</td>
<td>Hofstede scores</td>
<td>Hofstede (1964)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanatory variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>sources data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Test variables**
### Variable Definition & Measurement

**UCER**
- National avoidance uncertainly level

**MCAP**
- Market capitalization

**ECGW**
- Economic growth

**Variables**
- Domestic companies capitalization

**Control variables**

**INFL**
- Inflation

**EDUC**
- Education

**Variables**
- World bank indicators

**Appendix C. Web disclosure descriptive statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial reporting component</th>
<th>M in</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St derivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France (n=33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content index</td>
<td>0.4511</td>
<td>0.6842</td>
<td>0.588517</td>
<td>0.0443734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0677</td>
<td>0.047163</td>
<td>0.0084034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.043974</td>
<td>0.0068089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User support index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0752</td>
<td>0.048530</td>
<td>0.0097836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total web disclosure index</td>
<td>0.6090</td>
<td>0.8195</td>
<td>0.727956</td>
<td>0.0461754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (n=25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content index</td>
<td>0.4662</td>
<td>0.6930</td>
<td>0.564152</td>
<td>0.0537036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness index</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0708</td>
<td>0.050050</td>
<td>0.0089346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology index</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0619</td>
<td>0.044583</td>
<td>0.0070145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User support index</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0677</td>
<td>0.04484</td>
<td>0.0089478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total web disclosure index</td>
<td>0.5789</td>
<td>0.8850</td>
<td>0.703669</td>
<td>0.0642297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (n =25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content index</td>
<td>0.3684</td>
<td>0.6466</td>
<td>0.558195</td>
<td>0.0521044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.047519</td>
<td>0.0086057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology index</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.047519</td>
<td>0.0064094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User support index</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0677</td>
<td>0.004211</td>
<td>0.0715506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total web disclosure index</td>
<td>0.4737</td>
<td>0.8120</td>
<td>0.697444</td>
<td>0.0642875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands (n=19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content index</td>
<td>0.4436</td>
<td>0.6090</td>
<td>0.525524</td>
<td>0.0512343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.043926</td>
<td>0.0118255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology index</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.052236</td>
<td>0.0068516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User support index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.049861</td>
<td>0.0083915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total web disclosure index</td>
<td>0.5714</td>
<td>0.7594</td>
<td>0.671547</td>
<td>0.0554815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain ( n=24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content index</td>
<td>0.4586</td>
<td>0.6316</td>
<td>0.533521</td>
<td>0.0426181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.045739</td>
<td>0.0091192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Financial reporting component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St derivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology index</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>0.044486</td>
<td>0.0053931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User support index</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.046053</td>
<td>0.0063880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total web disclosure index</td>
<td>0.6015</td>
<td>0.7669</td>
<td>0.669799</td>
<td>0.0415992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UK (n=79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St derivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content index</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>0.044486</td>
<td>0.0053931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness index</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.046053</td>
<td>0.0063880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology index</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.046053</td>
<td>0.0063880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User support index</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.046053</td>
<td>0.0063880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total web disclosure index</td>
<td>0.5499</td>
<td>0.7293</td>
<td>0.669799</td>
<td>0.0415992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix D: Regulated information categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periodic information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0.1203</td>
<td>0.1053</td>
<td>0.0451</td>
<td>0.0827</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>0.0977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.1654</td>
<td>0.1579</td>
<td>0.1654</td>
<td>0.1504</td>
<td>0.1579</td>
<td>0.1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.151287</td>
<td>0.136842</td>
<td>0.131529</td>
<td>0.125049</td>
<td>0.13220</td>
<td>0.130294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St deriviation</td>
<td>0.124341</td>
<td>0.016530</td>
<td>0.028722</td>
<td>0.019608</td>
<td>0.02427</td>
<td>0.015263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0.1053</td>
<td>0.1128</td>
<td>0.1053</td>
<td>0.0827</td>
<td>0.0902</td>
<td>0.0977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.1053</td>
<td>0.1128</td>
<td>0.1053</td>
<td>0.0827</td>
<td>0.0902</td>
<td>0.0977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.063796</td>
<td>0.066466</td>
<td>0.073684</td>
<td>0.057380</td>
<td>0.06203</td>
<td>0.054725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St deriviation</td>
<td>0.026256</td>
<td>0.023545</td>
<td>0.178983</td>
<td>0.020238</td>
<td>0.01278</td>
<td>0.293170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.0451</td>
<td>0.0451</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
<td>0.0376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.039872</td>
<td>0.01579</td>
<td>0.030075</td>
<td>0.028097</td>
<td>0.02944</td>
<td>0.028601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St deriviation</td>
<td>0.006445</td>
<td>0.006863</td>
<td>0.005742</td>
<td>0.005150</td>
<td>0.00491</td>
<td>0.005068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others obligatory information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0301</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>0.0451</td>
<td>0.0451</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.039872</td>
<td>0.039398</td>
<td>0.040000</td>
<td>0.040364</td>
<td>0.03797</td>
<td>0.034047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Country-specific characteristics influencing Websites based information disclosure practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.007659</td>
<td>0.007606</td>
<td>0.007741</td>
<td>0.005720</td>
<td>0.007171</td>
<td>0.005878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St derivatio n</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Storage system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St derivatio n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.01538</td>
<td>0.003449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.003449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.01538</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.003449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.014246</td>
<td>0.003449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.01538</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.003449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.003449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** UNCER: uncertainty avoidance, MCAP: capital market capitalization, ECGW: economic growth, INFL: inflation, EDUC: education, * sig<0.1, ** sig<0.05, *** sig<0.01.

Appendix E. OLS regression models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Content model</th>
<th>Timeliness model</th>
<th>Technology model</th>
<th>User support model</th>
<th>Total index model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCER</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAP</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECGW</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFL</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²  | 0.312  | 0.029  | 0.169  | 0.051  | 0.294  |
Adj. R² | 0.295  | 0.005  | 0.148  | 0.027  | 0.276  |
Sig. F | 0.000  | 0.318  | 0.000  | 0.000  | 0.000  |
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i Secrecy versus transparency is "a preference for confidentiality and the restriction of
disclosure of information about the business only to those who are closely involved with its
management and financing as opposed to a more transparent, open and publicly accountable
approach" (Gray, 1988, p. 8).

ii Gray (1998) was noted that countries' legal systems can influence indirectly accounting
values in determining the financial disclosure practices. He indicated that "it is curious to
note here that the language variable, as a proxy for culture, was perceived to be a mean of
capturing similarities in legal systems which were thought to be particularly important in
the determination of disclosure patterns (Gray, 1988, p. 4). For this reason, we excluded
"legal system" variable, as an institutional factor, in this analysis.