Business Risk: Financial Reporting in Portugal and Spain[1]

Maria Teresa Alves
School of Business and Administration, Polytechnic Institute of Setubal, Portugal

Ana Isabel Morais
ISEG – Lisbon School of Economics and Management, Lisbon University, Portugal

Disclosing information about business risk is a quite relevant question. Companies, already, have to report about risk. Our objective is to acknowledge that disclosing such information fulfils important needs of financial information users. We analyse the 2002 Annual Reports of companies integrating our samples, and make a content analyses. We observe that there is a statistical significant relation between disclosing operational, financial, strategic and business risks and size, when it concerns the Portuguese sample and between financial risk and leverage, when it concerns the Spanish sample. Yet, we found no evidence of relationship between financial disclosure and cost of debt.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, companies have to perform their activities in a complex environment, facing several risks. To know about business risk is of the utmost importance, especially for investors and other users of financial information, to help making informed decisions. So financial statements cannot ignore such situations, otherwise they will not be useful for the investors and other stakeholders.

There are, already, some accounting standards and other rules that deal with this subject. But, we can also come across voluntary information about business risk.

Voluntary business risk financial disclosure is justified because there is a great need of improving relations with stockholders and to legitimate the activities developed, and because of the usefulness of that information for a wide range of stakeholders.

Financial Accounting is facing the important challenge of trying to be able to fulfil financial information needs of its users.

According to Hodgkinson *et al.* (1998) the *Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales* (ICAEW) and several authors, like Cea García (1995) or Dunkley (2001), argue that business risk financial reporting may bring advantages, such as a reduction of cost of capital.

In this paper we reflect about *pros and contras* of disclosing such information, and finally acknowledge that it really fulfils important needs of financial information users. Having that in mind, we make a theoretical approach to the question of the need of revealing business risk also beyond the traditional information disclosed in Annual Reports.

Then, we investigate the present state of financial information disclosure about business risk. We analyse the 2002 Annual Financial Reports of Portuguese and Spanish companies, whose stocks were included in PSI 20 or in IBEX 35, make a content analyses; build information indexes; and test, using

logistic regression, the relationship between business risk and the following variables: size, cost of debt and leverage.

We expect to find statistical significant relations, at least, between business risk disclosure and the variables mentioned.

This study proceeds as follows: Section 2 reveals some *pros and contras* of disclosing business risk information and enhances the need of revealing such information. Section 3 resumes the way this information is being disclosed. Section 4 describes the sample selection and research design. Section 5 provides the results of the analyses and, finally, Section 6 provides some concluding remarks.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pros and *Contras* of revealing Business Risk Information and the need of that information

Disclosing business risk information may have some inconvenient but it may, as well, have large advantages.

According to the literature, among the inconvenient is the higher probability of an exposition to litigation; the possibility of competitive disadvantages; heavy costs for smaller enterprises; difficulty to quantify the information; costs that the economy, as a hole, has to bear. Some of the advantages are the reduction of cost of capital; and the better allocation of capital. Besides, it is expected that better relations between economic agents will emerge; better decision making; and better market working.

It is fundamental that people balance *pros and contras* of business risk financial information disclosure and that enough information is disclosed to allow an adequate interpretation of financial statements.

Such information is quite relevant. There are some reasons to disclose business risk financial information, for example:

- Globalization is inducing to a process of change, which shows the need of making economic decisions, in order to take advantages of opportunities, considering the risks involved;
- Risk management is fundamental because of its relation with a better performance and, hence, with value for shareholders. Risk management and reporting are deeply linked;
- The major risks in any business are the unknown risks. It is expected that risks are identified, which means a crucial step in the process of managing risk (Dunkley, 2001);
- The need to satisfy financial standards requests and other regulations;
- The information about business risk fulfils not only the needs of the companies that prepare and report such information, but also the needs of financial information users and market regulators (Cravo and Machado, 2000).

Present State of Business Risk Financial Information Disclosure

Nowadays, the information disclosed, shows several limitations, such as the fact of being essentially quantitative, and complying with complex financial standards. Besides, it will never be able to reflect all the complexity that business reality involves; as a rule it refers only to the present and preceding exercise. However, it should reflect future perspectives and identify risk and the way it is being measured and managed.

In general, business risk is said to include all the risks a company may face. For example: financial risk, operational risk, strategic risk, economic risk, global risk, market risk, and credit risk. We can find definitions of risk in International Accounting Standard (IAS) 32 (International Accounting Standards Board (IASB, 2003, § 52), International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 7 (IASB, 2005), Hodgkinson *et al.*, 1998, Friedman and Terzuoli (1995), Parker (1995), Haskins (1996, p. 374), Quesada Sánchez (1999), Dunkley (2001, p. 2), Ribeiro (2001, p. 18), Mota and Barroso (2002, p. 24), just to mention some.

In Portugal, it is already required to disclose business risk information. For instance, the Plano Oficial de Contabilidade ((POC) expired, but it was in force at the date of the present study) but requires information disclosure about some risk factors. Besides, according to the Commercial Companies Code

(CSC), within Management Report, it is required a description of the main risks the entity may face. On the other hand Directriz Contabilística 17 (also expired, but in force in the date of the present study), describes hedging operations and hedging accounting. It shows a typology of risk similar to IASB.

The organization that stands for the Portuguese Stock Exchange, Comissão de Mercado de Valores Mobiliários (CMVM) requires companies to disclose information related to business risk.

At international level, IASB acknowledges that it knows that financial information users value information about risk. To fulfill that need, it has already issued and published some standards that focus on this type of information. IAS 32 and IFRS 7 are examples of such standards. Also, the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) requires information risk disclosure and accounting.

So, as referred above, some risk factors are already disclosed. Some of that information is disclosed in the notes to the financial statements other is disclosed in the Management Report. We argue that, for the moment, both can be an adequate means for disclosing this information. However, it is desirable that, in due time, a special document "Business Risk Financial Statement" (as defended by Cea Garcia, 1996 or Hogkinson *et al.*, 1998), may be created to allow a deeper and more organized way of disclosing such relevant information. This statement should include the identification and the hierarchy of key risks, a description of the actions developed in order to manage each type of risk and the way risks are measured.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND SAMPLE

In this study, according to agency theory and signalling theory and like several studies (e.g. Healy & Palepu, 2000), we assume that managers have a superior knowledge of information about expected future performance of their companies then the investors, and that disclosing information has the objective of reducing that asymmetry of information, with recognized advantages for the company.

We try to show the present situation of financial information in Portugal, in what concerns business risk. Then we compare that situation with the one in Spain, the other Iberian country.

We study the relation between companies' size, cost of capital and leverage and the level of information reported about risk.

The Portuguese sample includes seventeen companies, which on the 31st of December 2002 were included in PSI 20, while the Spanish sample includes thirty companies, included in IBEX 35, at the same date. Like Román Martinez *et al.* (2001) we have excluded financial entities due to the fact that different specific characteristics and disclosure requirements can change the results.

Based on previous literature, we draw the following hypotheses, to be tested for business risk and, particularly, several types of risk:

1. There is a direct relationship between company size and risk information disclosure;
2. There is a direct relationship between leverage and risk information disclosure;
3. There is an inverse relationship between cost of capital and risk information disclosure.

Several authors have undertaken empirical studies on which we have based our investigation.

Shrives and Linsley (2002) investigate the operating and financial review sections of the annual reports and compared with companies risk level measured by the company's beta factor, using a sample composed of non-financial companies included in UK FT-SE 100 (82 companies). They looked for a direct relationship between company's risk level and the level of disclosed risk information. This would contribute to a reduction of the company's cost of capital. The authors argue that, according to agency theory, through a larger disclosure the company tries to reduce the cost of capital having reduced the uncertainty for stakeholders. They did not find a positive correlation with the company beta factor, which is considered a measure of risk.

Babio Arcay and Muiño Vásquez (2001) developed an index (dependent variable) to measure the volume of information disclosed. Independent variables included company size and leverage, using a sample of 63 companies among the 104 non-financial companies included in Madrid's General Index and using regression analysis. These authors tried to prove that company size is often positively correlated with information disclosure and, also, that there is a relationship between leverage and the level of information disclosure.

Sengupta (1998) using a sample of 102 companies taken from those assessed by financial analysts and included in the annual volumes of the Report of the Financial Analysts Federation Corporation Information Committee, made an association of the score which summarizes the evaluations included in the volumes mentioned with the cost of a company's debt measured either by the yield to maturity or the total interest cost both related to new debt issues. The results showed a "negative relationship between a company's overall disclosure policy and the interest rate at which they can borrow money from public sources".

According to Babio Arcay and Muiño Vázquez (2001, p.13) size is frequently positive and significantly associated with financial disclosure. These authors state that several other studies show the same relation and add that larger companies have a diversity of *stakeholders* who are interested in such information and probably have lower costs of preparing that information or are less sensitive to possible competitive disadvantages.

Lang and Lundholm (1993, as cited in Leuz and Verrecchia, 2000) consider that, in general, voluntary disclosure is positively related, amongst other variables, with company's size.

In our study we choose an index as dependent variable. Several authors have already used this methodology. Examples are Babio Arcay and Muiño Vásquez (2001) and, also (according to these authors) McNally *et. al.* (1982), Chow and Wong-Boren (1987), Garcá Benau and Monterrey Mayoral (1993, 1994), Raffournier (1995), Meck *et al.* (1995), or Giner (1997).

This index tries to measure the volume of information published by the company in its Annual Report, particularly in the Management Report and in the notes to the financial statements, due to the importance of its content. The importance of the Annual Report as a means of communication to the stakeholders is underlined, for example, by Casasola Basells (2003) and Unerman (2000).

Each element collected is valued as one. We have three indexes whose values were determined as follows:

- By adding, for each company, the number of elements obtained related to each type of risk and dividing by the total number of informative elements analysed in relation to that company;
- By adding, for each company, the number of elements obtained related to each type of risk and dividing by the total number of informative elements analysed in relation to that type of risk;
- By adding, for each company, the number of elements obtained related to each type of risk and dividing by the total number of informative elements analysed.

The independent variables in this study are the cost of debt, leverage and the company size.

We tested the relation between the indexes and the independent variables using regression analysis.

We read the above-mentioned parts of the 2002 Annual Report of the companies included in the samples in order to develop a content analysis and subsequently analyse and categorize the sentences reflecting the disclosure of business risk. We have built a data basis, which includes the references to business risk, by index, company, and type of risk, as well as, data referring to the above-mentioned variables, which have been measured as follows: leverage as the ratio between total debts and equity; cost of debt as the ratio between financial costs and liabilities; and company size as asset carrying amount or amount of sales and services.

According to Jones and Shoemaker (1994) content analysis is an investigation method which allows the formulation of inferences from the information, by means of a systematic identification of the characteristics included in the information analysed. It is a discrete analyse because the documents can be evaluated without the communicator knowledge, in what it differs significantly from other forms of scientific evaluation. The author considers the possibility of identification of two main perspectives complementary to the textual analyse, with different objectives, using content analysis. Thematic perspective intends to withdraw and analyse inherent themes in the message, while syntactic perspective intends to analyse and quantify the cognitive difficulty of reading the message. So, while the first one identifies specific trends, attitudes, or categories of content from the text and then infers from them, the second is focused on the analysis of the legibility of the text using syntactic textual characteristics. We consider that our study is related to the thematic perspective of content analysis.

Shrives and Linsley (2002) mention Milne and Adler referring the reliability of content analysis, even if it is developed by inexperient coders. According to these authors we made a pre-test, whose results were used to create decision rules and consistent codification for the total sample by the coders and use six categories of risk disclosure. These categories of risk are based on the *Business Risk Model*^{TM} and on those used by Shrives e Linsley (2002) in their study. These investigators refer that sentence characteristics (monetary, non monetary, good news, bad news, and so on) were adapted from characteristics used by Hackston and Milne (1996). These latest authors use the number of sentences, which they think are more significant, considering that this way we can infer the meaning of all the words together, forming a sentence, because the word has no meaning if not related to other words.

To accomplish the analysis, for each sentence, we had to decide between nine types of risk; three types of news, and the characteristics of past or future and monetary or non-monetary, in this sequence.

The analysis required a previous definition of several rules, for example, when a sentence included two different ideas, we consider the clearer one, and we only count the sentences, which have any meaning in relation to our subject.

In what concerns the inclusion of the sentences in each type of risk, we followed Shrives and Linsley (2002). For example, sentences related to currencies, rates, cash flows, are included in financial risk, while sentences related to client satisfaction, product development, suppliers, are included in operational risk.

To separate sentences as good news, bad news or neutral we followed Hacston and Milne (1996), and we have considered the perspective of the stakeholder group involved. Obviously, the segregation of the sentences as past or future had to do with the time they refer to. Finally, sentences were considered as monetary if cash flows were explicit or implicit, and otherwise non monetary.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Comparing our samples we acknowledge significant differences between them. To begin with, the size of the samples is quite different as the Portuguese sample includes seventeen companies, while the Spanish one includes thirty. Differences may be found, also, about the activities undertaken by its companies, and their size, assets, cost of capital or leverage. Table 1 shows some statistics, which emphasize what we have just mentioned.

TABLE 1
STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF THE TWO SAMPLES REGARDING THE VARIABLES MENTIONED

		Portuguese sample	Spanish sample
Minimum	Sales (€)	0	515.000
	Assets (€)	2.236.751	214.653.000
	Cost of debt	0,02%	0,53%
	Leverage	0,04	0,02
Maximum	Sales (€)	1.056.016.564	2.222.177.580.000
	Assets (€)	12.986.993.773	1.052.692.910.000
	Cost of debt	13,93%	5,05%
	Leverage	7,19	2,27
Average	Sales (€)	118.840.385	74.912.984.795
	Assets (€)	2.345.865.355	42.122.411.366
	Cost of debt	3,93%	2,67%
	Leverage	1,14	0,98
Standard deviation	Sales (€)	280.132.326	405.555.940.731
	Assets (€)	3.796.206.588	191.165.790.075
	Cost of debt	3,01%	1,24%
	Leverage	1,69	0,65

As we can observe companies included in the Spanish sample are, on average, larger than companies included in the Portuguese sample, they have a lower cost of debt and a lower level of leverage. The best minimum and maximum values belong to the companies included in the Spanish sample, except the minimum cost of debt that belongs to a Portuguese company. In what concerns the standard deviation, the highest level belongs to the Spanish sample, in what respects to the size, and to the Portuguese sample, in what respects the cost of debt and the leverage.

About the content analysis we notice that although the Spanish sample shows a larger number of disclosure sentences about business risk, the Portuguese sample has a higher average number of disclosures, but also a higher standard deviation. That shows that, on average, Portuguese companies disclose more information about business risk, but show a greater difference among them.

The company that discloses more and the company that discloses less information about risk are included in the Spanish sample.

To be more precise, from content analysis we notice that about 80% of the items disclosed by Portuguese companies are classified as "non monetary". Shrives and Linsley (2002) argue that this situation can be justified by the difficulty of quantifying the risk effects. It is also possible that managers avoid disclosing the potential risk size because they feel vulnerable regarding stakeholders' criticism in relation to losses emerged from past risks. Yet, when we observe the Spanish sample we notice that only 56% of the items disclosed are classified as "non monetary".

Concerning categories of news we found the following results:

- Portuguese sample: "good news": 55%; "bad news": 22% and "neutral": 23%;
- Spanish sample: "good news": 41%; "bad news": 14% and "neutral": 45%.

Where 84% or 56% of the items disclosed as "good news" are "non monetary", respectively, for the Portuguese sample or for the Spanish sample.

Regarding the Portuguese sample the category of business risk information that shows a larger number of items disclosed is classified as "non monetary, good news, past", being about 49% included in

"strategic risk". These are, especially, situations linked to the economy; to the industry where the company operates; to the strategy developed by the company; and to the relations with the market. Also operational risk represents a large number of items disclosed (33%). The great majority of the companies disclose information about their activity, their performance, provisions and, number of employees.

Regarding the Spanish sample the category of business risk information that shows a larger number of items disclosed is classified as "monetary, neutral, past", being about 42% included in "operational risk". These are, especially, situations linked to details about sales; fixed assets; provisions; amortizations; inventories; employee costs; and auditor wages.

Also financial risk represents a large number of items disclosed (37%). The great majority of the companies disclose information operations concerning equity and own shares; financial assets; details about debt to financial institutions; and debts to other companies.

Finally, about logistic regression results, we found statistically significant but different relations in both samples. That fact may be explained by the big differences between the companies included in both samples, as we have already referred. That difference is more evident in terms of size. In terms of leverage, the difference is significant only for the maximum values.

Tables 2 to 5 (Appendix) show the results of regression analysis applied to the Portuguese and to the Spanish samples. As we can note, concerning the Portuguese sample, we found statistically significant relations between size measured by "sales and services" and operational risk and also business risk, being this last relation stronger than the first. The same variable measured by the total assets is positive and significantly associated with both financial and strategic risks. We found, as well, a statistically significant relation between leverage and processing and technology of information risk.

When studying the Spanish sample we found statistically significant relations between size measured by "sales and services" and processing and technology of information risk and also integrity risk, beeing the first relation stronger than the last. The same variable measured by the total assets does not show any significantly association with any kind of risk. We found, as well, a positive and statistically significant relation between leverage and financial risk and integrity risk.

In what concerns the cost of debt, we did not find any statistically significant relation whatever the sample studied. However the sign of the relation is almost always confirmed in the Portuguese sample while in the Spanish sample it is rarely confirmed. No other statistical significant relations were found although in several cases the sign of the relations is confirmed.

CONCLUSIONS

Business risk information disclosure became an undeniable need due to the growing volatility of our times and consequent need to manage within such an environment.

Prior research has focused on voluntary disclosure. In terms of risk, we come across information disclosed voluntarily but also mandatorily.

We investigate the relative association of information about business risk disclosed in Annual Reports by the companies included in the samples with some company's features, which are quite different. In order to accomplish this objective we have built an informative index and used regression analysis. From content analysis, we notice that the Spanish sample present a larger number of sentences about business risk, but the Portuguese sample has a higher average number and a superior standard deviation. That means that, on average, Portuguese companies disclose more information about business risk, but show a larger difference between them. On the other hand, the company, which discloses less information, and the company, which discloses more information, are Spanish.

About regression analysis the results of our observations did not always confirm our expectations, which are linked to theoretical and empirical literature review. We observed no common results to both samples, but in the Portuguese sample we found a direct relation between company size measured by "sales and services" and the level of operational risk and business risk information disclosure and company size measured by "assets" and the level of financial and strategic risks. Finally, in the Spanish sample we found a direct relation between company size measured by "sales and services" and the level

of processing and technology risk and integrity risk information disclosure and company leverage and the level of financial and integrity risks.

This study has some limitations regarding, for example, the difference of sizes between samples or the fact that the standards mentioned are now updated. However these standards were in force at the time of the study.

We believe that future research can rely on larger samples to allow an industry analysis. It can, also, like suggested by Babio Arcay et al (2001), consist of an analysis of the opinions of financial information preparers in order to obtain a detailed knowledge of the reasons standing on the decisions of disclosing or not disclosing business risk information.

ENDNOTE

1. This paper has been, previously, presented at the International Conference on Business, Economics, Management and Marketing, June 26-28, 2006, Athens, Greece.

REFERENCES

Babio Arcay, M. R. & Muiño, M. F. (2001). *Praticas de Gobierno y Transparencia Informativa*, In: XI Congreso AECA, Madrid.

Casasola Basells, M. A. (2003). *Análisis de las Cartas del Presidente a sus Accionistas. Los Casos de CEPSA y REPSOL-YPF*. In: XII Congreso AECA, Cádiz.

Cea García, J.L. (1995). La informacion contable sobre el riesgo empresarial. Una necessidad insatisfecha, *Bolletin AECA* (Asociación Española de Conatbilidad Y Administración de Empresas) (38), 34-37.

Comissão do Mercado de Valores Mobiliários (CMVM) (2003). *Regulamento da CMVM nº 11/2003 Regulamento de alteração ao Regulamento 7/2001 e ao Regulamento 11/2000 sobre o Governo das Sociedades Cotadas.* Retrieved from http://www.cmvm.pt.

Comissão de Normalização Contabilística (CNC). (1996). DC 17 Contratos de Futuros. Retrieved from: http://www.cnc.min-financas.pt/.

(1989) Plano Oficial de Contabilidade (POC). Retrieved from: http://www.cnc.min-financas.pt/.

Cravo, D. J. S., & Machado, E. F. (2000). O Alargamento da Base Informativa das Empresas – da obrigatoriedade da informação sobre factos relevantes à informação sobre o risco do negócio. In: *VIII Congresso de Contabilidade e Auditoria*, Aveiro.

Dunkley, P. (2001). *No Surprises. Some Thoughts on Risk in the New Millennium*. Retrieved from: http://www.trema.com/.

Friedman, J. P., & Terzuoli, F. (1995). Operating Risk in Financial Services, in William Beaver e George Parker, ed: *Risk Management: Problems & Solutions.* Stanford: McGraw-Hill, Inc..

Hackston, D., & Milne, M. J. (1996). Speech, Some Determinants of Social and Environmental Disclosures in New Zealand Companies, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 9(1), 77-108.

Haskins, M. E., Ferris, F. R. & Selling, T. I. (1996). *International Financial Reporting and Analysis: a Contextual Emphasis.* EUA: Irwin.

Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. (2000). *Information Asymetry, Corporate Disclosure and the Capital Markets: A Review of the Empirical Disclosure Literarure*, Harvard Business School, Harvard. JAE Rochester Conference April. Retrieved from: http://papers.ssrn.com/.

Hodgkinson, R. J. Anderson, *et. al.*, (1998). *Financial Reporting of Risk.* Proposals for a Statement of Risk Business, ICAEW. Retrieved from: http://www.icaew.co.uk.

International Accounting Standards Board (IASB). (2003) IAS 32 Instrumentos Financeiros: Divulgação e Apresentação;

(2005). IFRS 7 Financial Instruments: Disclosures;

Jones, M. J., & Shoemaker, P. A. (1994). Accounting Narratives: A Review of Empirical Studies of Content and Readability, *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 13, p. 142-184.

Leuz, C., & Verrecchia, R. (2000). The Economic Consequences of Increased Disclosure. *Journal of Accounting Research, 38*, 91-124. doi:10.2307/2672910

Mota, A. G. & Barroso, C. S. (2002). Relevação e auditoria dos riscos financeiros, Uma perspectiva de gestão, *Revista Portuguesa e Brasileira de Gestão*, 24-28.

Parker, G. (1995). Dimensions of Risk Management: Definition and implications for financial services, em: William Beaver e George Parker, ed: *Risk Management: Problems & Solutions.* Stanford: McGraw-Hill, Inc..

Quesada Sánchez, F. J. (1999). Estúdio Contable de los Riesgos y Contingencias Empresariales, *Revista Técnica Contable* (603), 161-168.

Ribeiro, M. S. (2001). Abordagens de Risco em Empresas Não Cotadas, *Revista de Contabilidade e Finanças*, APPC II Série - Ano VI (22).

Román Martinez, I., Torre Martinez, J. M. & Zafra Gómez J. L. (2001). *Analisis Sectorial de la Predicción del Riesgo de Insolvencia: Un Estudio Empírico*, XI Congreso AECA, Madrid.

Sengupta, P. (1998). Corporate Disclosure Quality and the Cost of Debt, *The Accounting Review*, 73 (4), 459-474.

Shrives, P., & Linsley, P. (2002). *Communicating Risk to Shareholders and other Stakeholders: An Emprirical Study*, 25th European Accounting Annual Conference, Denmark. 1-24.

Unerman, J. (2000). Methodological Issues – Reflections on Quantification in Corporate Social Reporting Content Analysis, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 13 (5), 667-680.

APPENDICES

TABLE 2
STATISTIC RELATION BETWEEN SIZE AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF RISK

Dependent variables		Size (sales and services)			
		Portuguese sample		Spanish sample	
		Estimate	*p-value*	Estimate	*p-value*
Financial risk	1	-0,0000000008100	0,093870154	0,0000000000006	0,7933023
	2	0,0000000003840	0,546099538	0,0000000000005	0,8019401
	3	0,0000000003710	0,533894564	0,0000000000005	0,7980403
Operational Risk	1	-0,0000000008100	0,093870154	-0,0000000000024	0,3323671
	2	0,0000000025490	**0,00112778**	-0,0000000000017	0,6315621
	3	0,0000000023570	**0,00157901**	-0,0000000000017	0,6319073
Empowerment Risk	1	-0,0000000005160	0,411308748	-0,0000000000002	0,9556774
	2	0,0000000008040	0,36677744	-0,0000000000013	0,7243408
	3	0,0000000007770	0,35559774	-0,0000000000001	0,9771042
Processing and technology of information risk	1	-	-	0,0000000006130	**0,005964**
	2	-	-	0,0000000010745	**0,005786**
	3	-	-	0,0000000007961	**0,011103**
Integrity risk	1	-	-	0,0000000002518	0,1508305
	2	-	-	0,0000000003404	**0,027487**
	3	-	-	0,0000000003123	**0,029035**
Strategic risk	1	0,6918661129420	0,07378675	0,0000000000030	0,2900937
	2	0,7777961518310	0,18475999	0,0000000000023	0,5197886
	3	0,7263937872760	0,18668862	0,0000000000023	0,5166064
Business risk		**1,8213045049160**	**0,02514489**	-0,00000000000014	0,995267

TABLE 3
STATISTIC RELATION BETWEEN SIZE AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF RISK

Dependent variables		Size (total assets)			
		Portuguese sample		Spanish sample	
		Estimate	*p-value*	Estimate	*p-value*
Financial risk	1	0,0000000000051	0,8837456	0,000000000000159	0,7196134
	2	0,0000000000815	**0,039229**	0,000000000000161	0,6804991
	3	0,0000000000755	**0,041679**	0,000000000000158	0,6777762
Operational Risk	1	0,0000000000051	0,8837456	-0,000000000000568	0,2736238
	2	-0,0000000000152	0,8094829	-0,000000000000382	0,6108152
	3	-0,0000000000139	0,8149022	-0,000000000000372	0,6117825
Empowerment Risk	1	0,0000000000316	0,5200975	0,000000000000067	0,9274852
	2	0,0000000001091	0,0850702	-0,000000000000184	0,8189705
	3	0,0000000001001	0,0955043	0,000000000000107	0,8874568
Processing and technology of information risk	1	0,0000000000247	0,5507658	-0,000000000015828	0,7584224
	2	0,0000000000924	0,1297978	0,000000000002771	0,9755385
	3	0,0000000000865	0,1302946	0,000000000010756	0,8779903
Integrity risk	1	-0,0000000000161	0,7184412	-0,000000000034016	0,1595376
	2	0,0000000000573	0,3393753	-0,000000000019144	0,413369
	3	0,0000000000556	0,3321215	-0,000000000017862	0,4090117
Strategic risk	1	0,0000000000338	0,2867461	0,000000000000632	0,2928861
	2	0,0000000000896	**0,031949**	0,000000000000504	0,5018665
	3	0,0000000000865	**0,032855**	0,000000000000496	0,4994328
Business risk		0,0000000000746	0,0673099	0,000000000000025	0,9609788

TABLE 4
STATISTIC RELATION BETWEEN LEVERAGE AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF RISK

Dependent variables		Leverage			
		Portuguese sample		Spanish sample	
		Estimate	p-value	Estimate	p-value
Financial risk	1	-0,0493928	0,5284225	0,202718346	0,1125534
	2	-0,0322694	0,7347527	0,356788258	0,0005768
	3	-0,0326278	0,7144686	0,347930729	0,0005729
Operational Risk	1	0,010533	0,8937536	-0,086645743	0,5735899
	2	0,1214533	0,3853953	0,130516949	0,5543705
	3	-0,0357832	0,7883584	0,130516949	0,5543705
Empowerment Risk	1	-0,1340544	0,2158354	0,104948329	0,6251562
	2	-0,0576853	0,6994807	0,117857702	0,6176295
	3	0,1796369	0,1913899	0,300040859	0,1718922
Processing and technology of information risk	1	-0,2568297	0,0005132	-0,530980644	0,3888994
	2	-0,2703338	0,040341	1,210884029	0,130528
	3	-0,2606791	0,0337942	0,989543426	0,1073288
Integrity risk	1	-0,0116773	0,9067587	-0,51576547	0,3389041
	2	-0,0180079	0,8962599	14,23167958	0,000000001
	3	-0,0166891	0,8995217	0,033212145	0,9413855
Strategic risk	1	0,0089152	0,9024104	-0,102730019	0,5637706
	2	0,0106204	0,9166259	0,096957789	0,661083
	3	0,0111519	0,9098071	0,094165025	0,6634868
Business risk		0,0069317	0,9430755	0,192439821	0,1976983

TABLE 5
STATISTIC RELATION BETWEEN COST OF DEBT AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF RISK

Dependent variables		Cost of debt			
		Portuguese sample		Spanish sample	
		Estimate	p-value	Estimate	p-value
Financial risk	1	-0,1009332	0,8449966	5,481007456	0,4193229
	2	-0,376777	0,5440153	11,08209977	0,0566716
	3	-0,3496253	0,5478193	10,76282903	0,0576475
Operational Risk	1	-0,1009332	0,8449966	-6,283815741	0,4333785
	2	-0,5048345	0,5846116	1,022470992	0,9295674
	3	-0,4607287	0,596308	1,10617548	0,9219006
Empowerment Risk	1	-0,5393252	0,4545577	6,860540878	0,5404464
	2	-0,8176649	0,3988282	12,38250481	0,3119617
	3	-0,7729741	0,3986575	13,34783705	0,2468919
Processing and technology of information risk	1	0,7470859	0,885496	26,91963007	0,2332984
	2	-4,4169183	0,5761865	52,59068773	0,1767061
	3	-3,8598038	0,6025648	41,98201989	0,1626255
Integrity risk	1	3,6827772	0,5072963	-35,71976609	0,2477109
	2	-1,4328044	0,8523509	-4,737238911	0,8554953
	3	-1,2292706	0,8675002	-4,6750093	0,8458815
Strategic risk	1	0,4453533	0,3422227	1,934251895	0,8356087
	2	-0,0687254	0,9176082	7,261472315	0,5288723
	3	-0,0635632	0,9214598	7,074719239	0,5306919
Business risk		-0,274381	0,6650279	6,44741988	0,4128976

Copyright of Journal of Accounting & Finance (2158-3625) is the property of North American Business Press Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.